

POCATELLO DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Board of Commissioners Meeting
18 March 2009 – 11:00am

City Hall
911 North 7th Avenue

11:00am Council Chambers

Call to order - Chairman Brown

Acknowledge guests of the Board

Disclosure of conflicts of interest

Agenda – add or delete action or discussion items

Action and Discussion Items

Minutes of February 18, 2009 – Motion to approve and/or amend

Financial Report: February Income and Expenses
 Comprehensive Annual Finance Report, 2008

Central Corridor: Whitman Hotel Disbursement

PDA Project Application Review

Executive Session: If necessary

Items from staff

Items from commission members

Adjourn

Executive Session

Matters exist for discussion in an executive session as per I.C. 67-2345 (b) and (e)

Motion: "I move that we enter into an executive session as per Idaho Code 67-2345 (b) and (e) to consider staffing services for the PDA and to consider preliminary negotiations involving matters of trade or commerce in which the PDA may be in competition with other jurisdictions."

POCATELLO DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
STATEMENT OF CASH AS OF FEBRUARY 28, 2009

| | |
|---|----------------|
| Cash in Checking | \$90,783.51 |
| Cash in Savings (Wells Fargo Money Market Account) | 132,801.21 |
| Cash in held by third parties (Wells Fargo Corporate Trust) | 4,306,719.14 |
| Total cash | 4,530,303.86 |
| Cash restricted by bond covenants | -2,840,063.38 |
| Total cash available | \$1,690,240.48 |

STATEMENT OF CHANGES IN CASH AND CASH EQUIVILENTS
FOR THE MONTH ENDED FEBRUARY 28, 2009

| | | |
|---------------------------------------|---|----------------|
| Receipts for the month | | |
| CC | Property taxes received - Central Corridor | \$17,386.24 |
| NY | Property taxes received - North Yellowstone | \$1,422.65 |
| GF | Interest earnings on savings - Wells Fargo Managed Cash | 66.77 |
| | Interest earning on Trust Accounts - Wells Fargo Trusts | 249.41 |
| | Total receipts | 19,125.07 |
| Total expenditures for the month | | |
| # 3038 | GF CDFI | 3,764.76 |
| | Payment #13 on triangle project | |
| # 3039 | GF Mama Inez | 95.24 |
| | Luncheon in February | |
| | NY Wells Fargo Corporate Trust | 226,662.50 |
| | Interest on North Yellowstone Bonded Debt | |
| | GF Wells Fargo Bank | 34.14 |
| | Client Analysis Service Charge | |
| | (to be refunded along with January's \$24.39) | |
| | Total expenditures | 230,556.64 |
| | Net change in cash | -\$211,431.57 |
| Cash balances as of February 28, 2009 | | \$4,530,303.86 |
| Cash balances as of January 31, 2009 | | \$4,741,735.43 |
| | Net change in cash | -\$211,431.57 |

CC = Central Corridor, NY = North Yellowstone, GF = General Fund

POCATELLO DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
CASH ANALYSIS FOR THE MONTH ENDING FEBRUARY 28, 2008

| | Balance 31-Jan-09 | Balance 28-Feb-09 | Change in Balance |
|---|-----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|
| Total Cash: | | | |
| General Fund | | | |
| Cash in checking | \$190,684.02 | \$186,789.88 | -\$3,894.14 |
| Money Market Account | 132,734.44 | 132,801.21 | \$66.77 |
| Total General Fund Cash | <u>323,418.46</u> | <u>319,591.09</u> | <u>-\$3,827.37</u> |
| Central Corridor District | | | |
| Cash in checking | -90,767.31 | -73,381.07 | \$17,386.24 |
| Bond Trust Fund (Wells Fargo) | 23.96 | 886,067.50 | \$886,043.54 |
| Revenue Allocation Trust Fund (Wells) | 2,058,357.34 | 1,172,488.28 | -\$885,869.06 |
| Total Central Corridor District Cash | <u>1,967,613.99</u> | <u>1,985,174.71</u> | <u>\$17,560.72</u> |
| North Yellowstone District | | | |
| Cash in checking | -31,171.69 | -29,749.04 | \$1,422.65 |
| Bond Trust Fund (Wells Fargo) | 226,662.50 | 0.25 | -\$226,662.25 |
| Revenue Allocation Trust Fund (Wells) | 912,685.14 | 914,417.23 | \$1,732.09 |
| Total Yellowstone District Cash | <u>1,108,175.95</u> | <u>884,668.44</u> | <u>-\$223,507.51</u> |
| Central Corridor District Debt Service | 651,782.85 | 651,845.88 | \$63.03 |
| North Yellowstone District Debt Service | 683,620.44 | 681,900.00 | -\$1,720.44 |
| Naval Ordinance Plant - Cash in checking | 7,123.74 | 7,123.74 | 0.00 |
| Total cash | <u>\$4,741,735.43</u> | <u>\$4,530,303.86</u> | <u>-\$211,431.57</u> |
| Cash Restricted By Bond Covenants: | | | |
| Central Corridor Cash | | | |
| Next bond payment | 931,430.00 | 931,430.00 | 0.00 |
| North Yellowstone Cash | | | |
| Next bond payment | 578,325.00 | 574,887.50 | -3,437.50 |
| Central Corridor District Debt Service | 651,782.85 | 651,845.88 | 63.03 |
| North Yellowstone District Debt Service | 683,620.44 | 681,900.00 | -1,720.44 |
| Total restricted cash | <u>2,845,158.29</u> | <u>2,840,063.38</u> | <u>-5,094.91</u> |
| Total unrestricted cash | <u>1,896,577.14</u> | <u>1,690,240.48</u> | <u>-206,336.66</u> |
| Cash Available | | | |
| General Fund | 323,418.46 | 319,591.09 | -\$3,827.37 |
| Central Corridor District | 1,036,183.99 | 1,053,744.71 | 17,560.72 |
| North Yellowstone District | 529,850.95 | 309,780.94 | -220,070.01 |
| Central Corridor District Debt Service | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| North Yellowstone District Debt Service | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Naval Ordinance Plant District | 7,123.74 | 7,123.74 | 0.00 |
| Total available cash | <u>1,896,577.14</u> | <u>1,690,240.48</u> | <u>-206,336.66</u> |

Cash movement analysis:

For the month of February, Pocatello Development Authority received cash of \$19,125.07 and paid out cash payments of \$230,556.64 so that there was an decrease in cash of \$211,431.57.

General Fund revenue received \$66.77 in interest earnings on the Money Market Account. Expenses were \$3,764.76 for Triangle payment #13, Bank service charges of \$34.14 and luncheon costs of \$95.24. The General Fund cash decreased \$ 3,827.37 in February.

The Central Corridor District received interest revenues on trust funds of \$237.51 and property taxes of \$17,386.24 The Corridor had no expenses. The Corridor's cash increased by \$17,623.75 in February.

The North Yellowstone District received interest revenues on trust funds of \$11.90 and property taxes of \$1,422.65. It paid \$226,662.50 to bond holder for interest on the districts debt. The district's cash decreased by \$225,227.95.

The Naval Ordinance Plant Distict had no transactions in February.

Internal Debt:

The North Yellowstone District has borrowed \$615,514.38 from the General Fund in order to pay its commitments with the Rail Crossing. In March a request was made to the Wells Fargo Corporate Trust to draw down \$330,000.00 of uncommitted funds to make a payment on this debt.

The Naval Ordinance District has borrowed \$75,000.00 from the General Fund in order to pay its commitments with a manufacturer, Wisper Creek.

The General Fund has borrowed \$401,393.30 from the Consolidated Corridor in order to pay its obligations on the Triangle Project.

POCATELLO DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
GENERAL FUND CASH FLOW PROJECTIONS
2009 THROUGH 2013

| YEARS ENDED | Budget 2009 | YTD 2009 As of February | Remaining 2009 | Budget 2010 | Budget 2011 | Budget 2012 | Budget 2013 |
|--|----------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|----------------------|
| Previous Year Balance: | \$370,297.35 | \$364,666.59 | \$319,591.09 | -\$197,861.35 | -\$317,516.35 | -\$295,656.97 | -\$320,714.42 |
| INCOME: | | | | | | | |
| TetriDyn Solutions Repayment: ¹⁰ | | | | | | | |
| Garfield Property | | | | | | | |
| Central Corridor Admin fee | | | | | | 899,990.85 | |
| Central Corridor Loan | | 401,393.30 | | | | | |
| North Yellowstone Loans | 100,000.00 | | 100,000.00 | 300,000.00 | 215,514.38 | | |
| Naval Ordinance loan | | | | | 75,000.00 | | |
| Interest Income | 6,000.00 | 708.70 | 5,293.30 | 7,000.00 | 8,000.00 | 9,000.00 | 9,000.00 |
| Total Projected Income: | 106,000.00 | 402,100.00 | 105,293.30 | 307,000.00 | 298,514.38 | 902,990.85 | 9,000.00 |
| EXPENSE: | | | | | | | |
| IsoRay: Committed \$75,000 ^{1 BUDGETED 75,000.00} | 75,000.00 | | 75,000.00 | | | | |
| Triangle Project: Committed \$300,000 ^{9 BUDGETED \$289,128.70} | 289,128.70 | 446,615.63 | 0.00 | | | | |
| Portneuf Valley Investment Partners: Committed \$40,000 ⁸ | | | 0.00 | | | | |
| Unnamed project #2 (amend budget 300,000.00) | 300,000.00 | | 300,000.00 | 250,000.00 | 250,000.00 | 500,000.00 | |
| Loan to Naval Ordinance Plant District | | | | 150,000.00 | | | |
| Legislative Action | | | | | | | |
| North Yellowstone Loan | | | | | | 401,393.30 | |
| Management salaries | | | | 16,625.00 | 16,625.00 | 16,625.00 | 16,625.00 |
| Luncheon costs | 1,320.00 | 501.34 | 818.66 | 1,320.00 | 1,320.00 | 1,320.00 | 1,320.00 |
| Office expenses | 200.00 | | 200.00 | 200.00 | 200.00 | 200.00 | 200.00 |
| Legal advertising | 50.00 | | 50.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 | 50.00 |
| Banking expenses | 360.00 | 58.53 | 301.47 | 360.00 | 360.00 | 360.00 | 360.00 |
| Audit | 3,500.00 | | 3,500.00 | 3,500.00 | 3,500.00 | 3,500.00 | 3,500.00 |
| Actuary Studies | | | | 4,600.00 | 4,600.00 | 4,600.00 | 4,600.00 |
| Professional services | 4,600.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | | | | |
| Total Projected Expense: | 674,158.70 | 447,175.50 | 379,870.13 | 426,655.00 | 276,655.00 | 928,048.30 | 26,655.00 |
| CALCULATED ANNUAL BALANCE | -\$197,861.35 | \$319,591.09 | \$45,014.26 | -\$317,516.35 | -\$295,656.97 | -\$320,714.42 | -\$338,369.42 |
| | \$705,943.52 | | | | | | |
| | \$31,784.82 | | | | | | |

**POCATELLO DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
CENTRAL CORRIDOR CASH FLOW PROJECTIONS
2009 THROUGH 2012****

| YEARS ENDED | Budget 2009 | YTD 2009 As of February | Remaining 2009 | Budget 2010 | Budget 2011 | Budget 2012 |
|--|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|---------------------|---------------------|
| Previous Year Balance*: | \$3,029,561.15 | \$3,029,561.15 | \$2,619,634.35 | \$2,919,372.71 | \$1,583,432.50 | \$336,161.20 |
| INCOME: | | | | | | |
| Projected Estimated Tax Revenues: ^{8,9} | 1,445,541.56 | 262,610.18 | 1,182,931.38 | 1,435,937.16 | 1,445,541.56 | |
| Taxes Received from Previous Years & yearly interest: ⁷ | | | 0.00 | | | |
| South Cliffs Repayment: ¹² | | | 0.00 | 196,867.85 | | |
| AMI Repayment (Building Owners): ¹² | | | 0.00 | | | 1,200,000.00 |
| Positron Repayment: ^{12 (\$60,000.00)} | | | 0.00 | | | |
| Interest earning on trust accounts | 70,000.00 | 8,153.23 | 61,846.77 | 80,000.00 | 90,000.00 | 20,000.00 |
| Total Projected Income: | 1,515,541.56 | 270,763.41 | 1,244,778.15 | 1,712,805.01 | 1,535,541.56 | 1,220,000.00 |
| EXPENSE: | | | | | | |
| Current Year Debt Service: | 931,430.00 | | 931,430.00 | 928,795.00 | 933,432.50 | |
| Cheyenne Crossing: Committed \$3 million total ^{16 & 18} | 337,800.00 | 20,396.91 | 317,403.09 | 2,117,700.22 | 1,347,130.36 | 3,802,630.58 |
| Whitman/Yellowstone Hotel: Committed \$613,000 ^{10 org 350 500} | 356,500.00 | 256,500.00 | 100,000.00 | | | |
| Clark Street Overpass: Committed \$258,880.93 | | | | | | 258,800.93 |
| Admin Transfer to Unrestricted Account: ¹¹ | | | 0.00 | | | 1,091,360.27 |
| General Fund - loan for Triangle development | | 401,393.30 | | | | |
| City of Pocatello, triangle land reimbursement | | | | | | 206,000.00 |
| Arbitrage | | 2,400.00 | 0.00 | | | |
| Trustee fees | 2,250.00 | | 2,250.00 | 2,250.00 | 2,250.00 | |
| <u>Unapproved Projects</u> | | | | | | |
| Unnamed Project #1 org. 500,000.00 | 200,000.00 | | 200,000.00 | | | |
| Unnamed Project #3 (\$500,000.00 new Jan 2009): ¹⁹ | 500,000.00 | | 500,000.00 | | 500,000.00 | |
| South 5th Project org 100,000.00 | 0.00 | | 0.00 | | | |
| Total Projected Expense: | 1,625,730.00 | 680,690.21 | 2,051,083.09 | 3,048,745.22 | 2,782,812.86 | 1,556,161.20 |
| CALCULATED ANNUAL BALANCE | \$2,919,372.71 | \$2,619,634.35 | \$1,813,329.41 | \$1,583,432.50 | \$336,161.20 | \$0.00 |
| Debt service restriction (reserve \$650,000.00) | | | \$1,573,795.00 | \$1,583,432.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Available cash | | | \$234,534.41 | \$0.00 | \$336,161.20 | \$0.00 |

** TIF District slated to close in 2012

ESTIMATED \$800K LESS DUE TO AMI ADJUSTMENT. AMOUNT IS DEDUCTED FROM THIS BOX. Actual amount is \$433,786.14, but left as \$800k for a safeguard took from Mayor's CC \$

1. City advance payback of \$325600 was not needed because of interest earned in account. Removed from both income and expense lines.
 2. City water portion of OTP was removed from spreadsheet. Not included in out portion
 3. Bank adjustment added to spreadsheet to align Actual 2007 starting balance. Verifying amounts
 4. Old Town Reinvestment Phase 3 is money left from Phase 2 commitment. The board needs to decide what they are going to do with this.
 5. Reserve Debt Service must roll each year to keep the required amount in our account. Will receive as income at closing in 2010 estimated receivable 2011.
 6. Reserve Fund Income will roll to pay off bonds at closing. If bonds are paid off, will become available to PDA. Need to check with Dean regarding the use of those funds.
 7. Will add taxes received from previous years and yearly interest at the end of each year
 8. Change in tax revenues reflects change in Ballard Building: 100% land, 50% building, and no equipment
 9. Includes all Central Corridor Tax Districts—Newtown, Ahin Roken, Old Town, North Main, Central Corridor
 10. Whitman needs to return to board for approval of funds. Committed an additional \$100,000 on 9/19/07 making total commitment 613,000. \$100k available 4th quarter of 2009 or sooner depending on cash flow due back to PDA in 2024. \$100k was taken from the Mayor's Cheyenne money.
 11. Estimated admin can go up to \$2,347,921.65. Board needs to decide on an amount. Funds go to unrestricted account and can be used for any eligible project in the City boundaries
 12. Amount may change with board approval. If change happens, it will affect admin amount, looks as if the loan may not be repaid,
 13. Total PVP commitment was \$85,000. \$40,000 from Board Disc. And \$45,000 from Central Corridor
 14. Reserve debt service income and reserve fund will pay final years debt service. Remaineder in RAF becomes income in 2011.
 15. Total amout approved for Triangle Project: \$932,801.57. \$300,000 from board disc. And \$632,801.57
 16. \$2 million committed Cheyenne Crossing project on August 15, 2007. \$100k was given to the Whitman project on 9/19/07 making total available to the crossing \$1.9 million. Committed \$750000 to Petersen contract and \$317,907.18 was deducted for AMI withholding
 17. Board committed they may pay up to \$206,610 to the land acquisition fund
 18. At February meeting Mayor Chase indicated he would not need all CC dollars in 2008. Split up between three years
- Arbitrage bills will be absorbed in interest and past year taxes per Gynii. Should be every 5 years
19. Board approved \$1,000,000.00 to unnamed company #3. \$500,000.00 late 2009 and \$500,000.00 in 2011.

Project Approval Dates

| | | | | | |
|-------------------------------------|--|-------------------|-------------|------------|-----------|
| AMI | 2002 | Triangle Progress | -932,801.57 | | |
| Cheyenne Crossing \$1million | | Pay request #1 | 31,876.48 | | |
| Cheyenne Crossing \$2million | 8/15/2007 | Pay request #2 | 44,676.88 | 76,553.36 | |
| Clark St Overpass | 11/17/2004 | Pay request #3 | 20,669.19 | 97,222.55 | |
| Engineering Expenses (JUB) | 12/20/2006 | Pay request #4 | 37,133.69 | 134,356.24 | |
| Federal Express | 11/17/2004 | Pay request #5 | 33,170.85 | 167,527.09 | |
| Old Town Building | 9/25/2006 | Pay request #6 | 80,369.92 | 247,897.01 | |
| Old Town Reinvestment | 3/19/2003 | Pay request #7 | 41,231.69 | 289,128.70 | |
| Portneuf Valley Investment Partners | 3/21/2007 Minute breakdown in white binder | Pay request #8 | 132,044.51 | 421,173.21 | |
| Positron | 10/8/2002 | Pay request #9 | 242,797.45 | 663,970.66 | |
| South Cliffs | 6/11/02 & 10/22/02 | Pay request #10 | 106,180.34 | 770,151.00 | |
| Triangle | 8/16/2006 | Pay request #11 | 52,415.51 | 822,566.51 | |
| Whitman/Yellowstone Hotel | 4/11/2006 & 9/19/07 | Pay request #12 | 41,642.57 | 864,209.08 | 821035.58 |
| Land Acquisition Fund | 11/14/2007 | Pay request #13 | | 864,209.08 | 43,173.50 |
| | | | -68,592.49 | 864,209.08 | |

POCATELLO DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
NORTH YELLOWSTONE FUND CASH FLOW PROJECTIONS
2009 THROUGH 2028

| YEARS ENDED | Budget 2009 | YTD 2009 As of February | Remaining 2009 | Budget 2010 | Budget 2011 | Budget 2012 | Budget 2013 - 2028 |
|---|-----------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|-----------------------|
| Previous Year Balance: | \$1,276,749.60 | \$1,343,991.40 | \$1,565,145.79 | \$1,358,290.72 | \$1,380,446.37 | \$1,591,044.40 | \$1,591,044.40 |
| INCOME: | | | | | | | |
| Property taxes (orig \$781,120.03) | 902,884.32 | 451,442.16 | 451,442.16 | 964,120.03 | 964,123.03 | 964,123.03 | 15,425,968.48 |
| Interest on trust accounts | 25,000.00 | 1,634.73 | 23,365.27 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | 25,000.00 | 375,000.00 |
| Loan from General Fund | | | | | | | |
| Total Projected Income: | 927,884.32 | 453,076.89 | 474,807.43 | 989,120.03 | 989,123.03 | 989,123.03 | 15,800,968.48 |
| EXPENSE: | | | | | | | |
| Current Year Debt Service: | 578,325.00 | 226,662.50 | 351,662.50 | 681,450.00 | 678,525.00 | 680,050.00 | 10,874,860.00 |
| Rail Crossing | | | 0.00 | | | | |
| Peg Development Land Acquisition | | | 0.00 | | | | |
| Legal Advertising | | | 0.00 | | | | |
| Arbitrage fees | | 2,760.00 | | | | | |
| Trustee fees | | 2,500.00 | 0.00 | | | | 0.00 |
| Loan payment to PDA General Fund (orig 100,000) | 330,000.00 | | 330,000.00 | 285,514.38 | | | 615,514.38 |
| Costco employment payment (\$854,105.00) 1 | | | 0.00 | | 100,000.00 | 300,000.00 | 454,105.00 |
| Total Projected Expense: | 908,325.00 | 231,922.50 | 681,662.50 | 966,964.38 | 778,525.00 | 980,050.00 | 11,328,955.00 |
| CALCULATED ANNUAL BALANCE | \$1,296,308.92 | \$1,565,145.79 | \$1,358,290.72 | \$1,380,446.37 | \$1,591,044.40 | \$1,600,117.43 | \$6,063,057.88 |
| Bond reserve trust fund | | 681,900.00 | 681,900.00 | 681,900.00 | 681,900.00 | 681,900.00 | 0.00 |
| Current debt payment allocation fund reserve | | 582,545.00 | 582,545.00 | 676,600.00 | 677,440.00 | 677,440.00 | 0.00 |
| Amount available | | 300,700.79 | 93,845.72 | 21,946.37 | 231,704.40 | 240,777.43 | 6,063,057.88 |

Note: \$691,458.36 in bonded debt reserves are included in cash balance

1 = Per letter from David Messner, Costco Agent, the \$1 mil employment grant was reduced by a construction advance to PEG development of \$145,895.00, Dated 12/31/2007

**POCATELLO DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
NAVAL ORDINANCE PLANT FUND CASH FLOW PROJECTIONS
2009 THROUGH 2028**

| YEARS ENDED | Budget 2009 | YTD 2009 As of February | Remaining 2009 | Budget 2010 | Budget 2011 | Budget 2012 | Budget 2013 - 2028 |
|----------------------------------|--------------------|----------------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-----------------------|
| Previous Year Balance: | \$5,261.30 | \$5,261.30 | \$7,123.74 | \$11,261.30 | \$16,261.30 | \$21,261.30 | \$26,261.30 |
| INCOME: | | | | | | | |
| Property taxes | 6,000.00 | 1,862.44 | 4,137.56 | 80,000.00 | 80,000.00 | 80,000.00 | 1,200,000.00 |
| interest on trust accounts | | | 0.00 | | | | |
| Loan from General Fund | | | 0.00 | | | | |
| Total Projected Income: | 6,000.00 | 1,862.44 | 4,137.56 | 80,000.00 | 80,000.00 | 80,000.00 | 1,200,000.00 |
| EXPENSE: | | | | | | | |
| Log Homes (\$225,000.) | | | 0.00 | | 75,000.00 | 75,000.00 | 75,000.00 |
| Owner Contract | | | 0.00 | | | | 750,000.00 |
| Repay loan to General Fund | | | 0.00 | 75,000.00 | | | |
| | | | 0.00 | | | | |
| | | | 0.00 | | | | |
| | | | 0.00 | | | | |
| Total Projected Expense: | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 75,000.00 | 75,000.00 | 75,000.00 | 825,000.00 |
| CALCULATED ANNUAL BALANCE | \$11,261.30 | \$7,123.74 | \$11,261.30 | \$16,261.30 | \$21,261.30 | \$26,261.30 | \$401,261.30 |
| Assessed valuation 2009 | \$6,639,105.00 | | | | | | |
| Base valuation | \$3,458,800.00 | | | | | | |
| Increase 2009 | \$3,180,305.00 | | | | | | |

**POCATELLO
DEVELOPMENT
AUTHORITY**

**PROJECT
APPLICATION
PACKET**

March 2004

**POCATELLO DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY (PDA)
Pre-Application for use of Tax Increment Financing**

Instructions:

1. Please complete each section of this pre-application.
2. The applicant should be the project owner or the duly appointed representative of the project owner.
3. This pre-application must be completed and submitted (PDA, 1651 Alvin Ricken Drive, Pocatello ID, 83201) by the first Monday of the month to be considered for the PDA meeting agenda on the 3rd Wednesday of that month.
4. Each pre-application is screened by staff and must meet a minimum score of 70 points (out of 100) for it to be considered for approval by the PDA Board.
5. PDA approval of this application is authorization to proceed to a full application.
6. A full application will consist of at minimum the following:
 - a. Project purpose statement.
 - i. Description of deteriorated or deteriorating conditions.
 - ii. Description of public benefits.
 - b. Scope of work.
 - i. The kind, number, and location of all proposed public works or improvements.
 - ii. A detailed list of estimated project costs.
 - iii. Construction timetables (including any proposed phasing).
 - iv. A detailed map and legal description of the project area.
 - c. Economic Analysis.
 - i. An economic feasibility study.
 - ii. A fiscal impact statement showing the impact of the project upon all taxing districts.
 - iii. A description of the methods of financing all estimated project costs.
7. Questions may be directed to the Executive Director for the Development Authority, 233-3500.

Application:

Name: _____ Date: _____

Mailing Address: _____

Work Phone: _____ Cell Phone: _____ E-Mail: _____

Project Description: _____

Project Location: _____

Is this project currently in an urban renewal area? Yes No

Is this project currently in a revenue allocation area? Yes No

If you answered 'no' to both questions above, please describe the "deteriorated or deteriorating" conditions associated with this location:

Current Assessed Value of Project Location: _____

Estimated Construction Value of Project: _____

Number of jobs created by this project: _____ Wage range of jobs: _____

Employee Benefits? Yes No If yes, please describe _____

PDA Pre-Application, Page 2

Time frame for job creation: _____

Construction start date for Project: _____ Anticipated completion date: _____

Briefly describe other public benefit(s) associated with this project: _____

Does this project compete with other, already established businesses? How? _____

Is this project currently subject to a competitive bid process? Please explain: _____

Are there other applicants that may be interested in applying for PDA assistance for this same project? Please explain: _____

Relationship of named applicant to the project: _____

Type of Assistance Requested
(check all that apply):

- Public Infrastructure (water, sewer, street, etc.).
- Public Facility (building, park, parking lot, etc.).
- Match for other funding.
- Inspections, tests, surveys, appraisals, etc.
- Property Acquisition.
- Structure Demolition and Clearance.
- Other? Please Specify _____

Amount of Assistance Requested: _____

Form of Assistance Requested:

- Grant of Funds.
- Loan of Funds.
- Reimbursement for Approved Expenditures.
- Pay-As-You Go.
- Bonding.
- Other? Please Specify _____

Other helpful information? Please list: _____

THANK YOU!

**PDA PRE-APPLICATION
REVIEW MATRIX**

Reviewer Name: _____

Date: _____

| Review Element | Point Value Earned | | | | |
|---|--------------------|----------|----------|----------|-----------|
| | 0-Points | 3-Points | 5-Points | 7-Points | 10-Points |
| Deteriorated/Deteriorating Condition | | | | | |
| Ratio of Construction Value to Current Assessed Value | | | | | |
| Quantity of Jobs Created | | | | | |
| Quality of Jobs Created (Type/Wage) | | | | | |
| Public Benefit of Project | | | | | |
| Competition With Other Businesses | | | | | |
| Ratio of Project Costs To Project Revenue | | | | | |
| Certainty and Immediacy of the Project | | | | | |
| Type of Assistance Requested | | | | | |
| Form of Assistance Requested | | | | | |
| Column Totals | | | | | |
| All Total | | | | | |
| | | | | | |

Review Elements Description (Each element has a point value potential of 10-points):

Condition of Blight

The City of Pocatello has created an inventory of properties meeting the conditions of blight. A project proposed that redevelops one of these sites will receive maximum points for this element. If a project is proposed for a location not on the inventory, it must meet blight criteria which generally include:

- Deteriorated/deteriorating areas injurious to public health, safety and welfare;
- Areas contributing to spread of disease and crime constituting an economic and social liability;
- Areas imposing onerous municipal burdens which decrease tax base or substantially impairs the sound growth of the community, retards the provision of housing, aggravates traffic problems, etc.;
- Areas which promote juvenile delinquency and consume an excessive proportion of its revenue due to extra services required by police, fire, etc.;
- Predominately open areas which because of obsolete platting, diversity of ownership, deterioration of structures or improvements, or otherwise, results in economic underdevelopment of the area or substantially impairs or arrests the sound growth of the municipality.

Ratio of Construction Value to Current Assessed Value

The difference between these values may constitute the increment, or revenue available for project implementation. It also describes the degree to which the value of the property location will be affected by the project. Obviously, the more value added by construction or redevelopment the greater the economic impact to the community.

Quantity of Jobs Created

All jobs created by the project should be provided. Estimates are acceptable with more firm numbers coming at full application (if invited). The higher the job creation potential, the higher the rating possible. Project phasing, which may affect the timing of job creation should also be explained. Be advised, that if the project is awarded funding assistance from the PDA, such assistance may be linked to a job creation requirement. Documentation will be required showing actual jobs created with a possible "payback" provision if targets are not met.

Quality of Jobs Created

Jobs having a higher "living wage" salary with benefit packages will be rated higher than those with lower wage scales and no benefits. Also, those jobs that are complimentary to the City's economic growth goals will be rated higher than those that are not.

Public Benefit of Project

All projects should have public benefit. The stronger the public benefit, the higher the rating.

Review Elements Description, Page 2

Competition with Other Businesses

Projects which may harm existing businesses or which provide an unfair advantage to one development firm over another may be ranked lower than those complimentary to the community.

Ratio of Project Costs to Project Revenue

The project should at minimum, generate enough increment revenue to fund the project proposed. Stronger projects may actually generate excess revenue allowing the potential shortening of increment requirements. Most revenue allocation districts do not extend beyond 10-years – the shorter, the better.

Certainty and Immanency of the Project

Speculative projects will be rated lower than projects that have firm timelines and commitments. In either case, the PDA should not be considered the sole source of funds for any project.

Type of Assistance Requested

Projects may be ranked in importance to the PDA by the following categories:

- Public infrastructure.
- Public facilities.
- Property acquisition.
- Site preparations including demolition and clearance.
- Match or leverage for other funding sources.
- Inspections, tests, surveys, appraisals, etc.
- Other (this category may rise in importance based upon public benefit).

Form of Assistance Requested

Projects may be ranked by PDA preference for how the projects are funded as follows:

- Loan of funds.
- Reimbursement for approved expenditures.
- Pay-as-you-go.
- Grant of funds.
- Bonding.
- Other (this category may rise in importance based upon benefit to PDA).

TAX INCREMENT FINANCING
Urban Renewal Law, IC Title 50, Chapter 20
Process Outline

Urban Renewal Law – Findings and Declaration of Necessity

Findings and declaration of necessity, adopted by resolution of the city's governing body finding that one or more deteriorated areas exist:

- Deteriorated/deteriorating areas injurious to public health, safety and welfare;
- Areas contributing to spread of disease and crime constituting an economic and social liability;
- Areas imposing onerous municipal burdens which decrease tax base or substantially impairs the sound growth of the community, retards the provision of housing, aggravates traffic problems, etc.;
- Areas which promote juvenile delinquency and consume an excessive proportion of its revenue due to extra services required by police, fire, etc.

Finding that the rehabilitation, conservation, redevelopment, or a combination thereof is necessary and in the public interest.

Finding that there is a need for an urban renewal agency to function in the City (may be an appointed board of commissioners, or may be the local governing board).

Urban Renewal Law – Powers

Powers of the urban renewal agency in carrying out urban renewal projects include:

1. contract making;
2. disseminating slum clearance and urban renewal information;
3. furnishing, repairing, installing, constructing, streets, public utilities, parks, playgrounds, off-street parking facilities, public facilities, other buildings or public improvements, and other improvements necessary or incidental to a redevelopment project;
4. accepting and agreeing to conditions attached to federal funding sources;
5. entering buildings and/or property to make inspections, surveys, appraisals, soundings or test borings, etc. with sufficient cause, hearing, and order from the court;
6. acquiring and disposing of real property (even by eminent domain);
7. demolition and clearance of blighted structures;
8. investing urban renewal funds held in reserves, borrowing money, accepting advances, loans, grants, contributions for the purposes outlined;
9. developing and demonstrating new or improved means of providing housing for low income person or families;
10. assisting in the relocation of persons displaced from an urban renewal area

Urban Renewal Law – Plan Preparation and Approval

Public or private submission of a plan is acceptable.

Plans are submitted by the local governing board to the planning commission for determination of conformity to the general plan of the community. The planning commission has 30-days after receipt of the plan to provide its recommendations.

Public hearing held before the local governing board.

Approval is subject to findings that:

1. A feasible method exists for the location of families who will be displaced from the urban renewal area in decent, safe and sanitary dwelling accommodations within their means and without undue hardship to such families.
2. The urban renewal plan conforms to the general plan of the City.
3. The urban renewal plan gives due consideration to the provision of adequate park and recreational areas and facilities that may be desirable for neighborhood improvement.
4. The urban renewal plan will afford maximum opportunity for the rehabilitation or redevelopment of the area by private enterprise.

Urban Renewal – Limitations

Action against a plan may not be taken until after the effective date of the ordinance adopting the plan.

For a period of 30-days following adoption of the plan, any person may contest the legality of the ordinance. After the expiration of the 30-day period, the validity, legality and regularity of the ordinance shall be conclusively presumed and no court shall thereafter have authority to inquire into such matters.

TAX INCREMENT FINANCING
Local Economic Development Act, IC Title 50, Chapter 29
Process Outline

Local Economic Development Act – Findings and Purpose

It is, by this act, found and declared that there exists in cities a need to raise revenue to finance the economic growth and development of urban renewal areas.

The purpose of this act is to provide for the allocation of a portion of the property taxes levied against taxable property located in a revenue allocation area for:

- a limited period of time;
- to encourage private development;
- to prevent or arrest decay of urban renewal areas due to the inability of existing financing methods to promote needed public improvements;
- to encourage taxing districts to cooperate in the allocation of future tax revenues;
- to facilitate the long-term growth of the common tax base; and
- to encourage private investment.

Local Economic Development Act – Deteriorated Area

This act re-emphasizes the conditions outlined in the Urban Renewal Law – Findings and Declaration Necessity. In addition, this act adds to the definition:

1. Any area which is predominately open and which because of obsolete platting, diversity of ownership, deterioration of structures or improvements, or otherwise, results in economic underdevelopment of the area.
2. any area which by reason of its proximity to the border of an adjacent state is competitively disadvantaged in its ability to attract private investment, business or commercial development which would promote the purposes of this chapter.

Local Economic Development Act – Increment Value

Increment value is the total value calculated by summing the differences between the current equalized value of each taxable property in the revenue allocation area and that property's current base value on the base assessment roll, provided such difference is a positive value.

Local Economic Development Act – Eligible Projects

Eligible projects are similar to those outlined in the Urban Renewal Law – Powers.

Local Economic Development Act – Eligible Project Costs

Capital Costs, including the actual costs of the construction of public works or improvements, facilities, buildings, structures, and permanent fixtures; the demolition, alteration, remodeling, repair or reconstruction of existing buildings, structures, and permanent fixtures; the acquisition of equipment; and the clearing and grading of land.

Financing Costs, including interest during construction and capitalized debt service or repair and replacement or other appropriate reserves.

Real Property Assembly Costs, meaning any deficit incurred from the sale or lease by a municipality of real or personal property within a revenue allocation district.

Professional Service Costs, including those costs incurred for architectural, planning, engineering, and legal advice and services.

Direct Administrative Costs, including reasonable charges for the time spent by municipal employees in connection with the implementation of a project plan.

Relocation Costs.

Other Costs, incidental to any of the foregoing costs.

Local Economic Development Act – Revenue Allocation Area

A revenue allocation area is that portion of an urban renewal area which the local governing board has determined will likely increase in value as a result of implementing projects within the urban renewal plan. The base assessment roll or rolls of revenue allocation areas shall not exceed at any time 10% of the current assessed valuation of all taxable property within the City.

Local Economic Development Act – Termination Date

Termination date means a specific date no later than 24-years from the effective date of an urban renewal plan (limited exceptions for bonding exist) in which a new revenue allocation provision must expire.

Local Economic Development Act – Recommendation of Urban Renewal Agency

A plan must be prepared and adopted by the local governing board for each revenue allocation area. The plan must include a statement listing:

1. The kind, number, and location of all proposed public works or improvements within the revenue allocation area.
2. An economic feasibility study.
3. A detailed list of estimated project costs.
4. A fiscal impact statement showing the impact of the revenue allocation area upon all taxing districts.
5. A description of the methods of financing all estimated project costs.
6. A termination date for the plan and the revenue allocation area.
7. A description of the disposition or retention of any assets of the agency upon the termination date.

Local Economic Development Act – Public Hearing and Ordinance Required

To adopt a new urban renewal plan with a revenue allocation provision, a public hearing is required at least 30-days but not more than 60-days prior to the date set for final reading of the ordinance.

Local Economic Development Act – Transfer of Power Ordinance

Urban renewal plans and revenue allocation financing provisions may be held ineffective if an urban renewal area or revenue allocation area extends outside the municipal boundary of an authorized City and a transfer of powers ordinance has not been adopted by the cooperating county.

Local Economic Development Act – Documents to Taxing Agencies

After the effective date of an ordinance enacted, the clerk of the authorized City shall transmit a copy of the ordinance, a copy of the legal description and map of the boundaries of the revenue allocation area, and a copy of the transfer of powers ordinance (if one is adopted). These documents are sent to:

- The County Auditor
- The Tax Assessor of the County
- The Affected Taxing Districts
- The State Tax Commission

Local Economic Development Act – Obligation of City

Bonds issued or other obligations incurred by any agency shall not constitute a general obligation or debt of any city, the state or any of its political subdivisions.

Local Economic Development Act – Limitations on Review

This is the same as the Urban Renewal Limitations regarding the contestation or litigation of plans and the ordinance.