

ABBREVIATED MINUTES
POCATELLO DEVELOPMENT AUTHORITY
Meeting July 16, 2003

Members present: Steve Brown, Terry Brower, Roger Chase, Jim Guthrie, Ray Burstedt, John Ricks, Dan Schroeder

Staff present: Dean Tranmer, City Attorney; Char DeWall, Bannock Development

1. Preliminary matters. The meeting was called to order at 11:05 by Chairman Neuhardt. No conflicts were declared. The minutes from June were reviewed. **It was MSC (Ricks, Schroeder)** to approve the minutes of the June meeting.

The financial report for June was then reviewed by C. DeWall. There are still no bank fees being charged; expenses were for Roosevelt District and the 2002 audit; income was from interest. **It was MSC (Chase, Ricks)** to approve the June report. Approval of the quarterly payment for administrative charges to BDC was then requested. **It was MSC (Schroeder, Ricks)** to approve the payment.

2. St. Vincent DePaul request. Board members discussed the advisability of removing the item from the table in order to pursue purchasing the property and making a counter-offer to the group. There was no motion to do so; the item remains tabled.

3. Old Town Revitalization update. Jim Jenkins reported that the group will have a meeting next week with property owners, the bid specs are nearly complete and that the plan is to have bid openings the day before the August PDA meeting. At this point, Chairman Neuhardt noted the property owners behind the Masonic Temple have asked to have 4 more lights included in the project so their block can also be similarly lit. Members concluded that the owners could "piggy-back" those lights on our order, and that we could inform them of the approved bidder to contact that firm for installation of the lights but that the PDA funds would not be used for installation.

4. South Cliffs. Members reviewed the invoices briefly following which **it was MSC (Ricks, Chase)** to authorize payment, with the provision that the spreadsheet headings need to be corrected to reflect that the landscaping funds are not a grant, but a loan.

NOTE: Roosevelt discussion postponed until RMES arrival.

5. Central Corridor Amendment. Members reviewed the proposed alterations to the last revised map that had been presented. Jim Guthrie asked that the Board take note of the County Commissioners' concerns that the County was being ill-served by TIF's rather than helped by them and their reluctance to have any further expansion. PDA Counsel Tranmer clarified for the Board that the County has the right to prohibit expansion of a TIF into County areas outside City limits. General discussion ensued: Revenue allocation districts do "lock up" the increment, but without the funding available from the districts, in the majority of cases, there would be no development and therefore no increment—the City, County, and other taxing entities would still receive approximately what they would have if the development had not occurred. Tax revenues are limited by the "3% Initiative" so increased base value will not provide additional revenue beyond the existing cap—the tax base will be broadened and tax payers would theoretically pay lower taxes because of owning a smaller slice of the pie, so to speak. The Corridor will be dissolved in 2009 under the conditions established for its creation, unless amended, but none of the current Board members wish to prolong the time line.

Robert Chambers and Tim Tingey then presented the new map which no longer includes areas in the County outside the City's jurisdiction. After additional discussion, it was **MSC (Chase, Burstedt; Brown, Guthrie dissenting)** to approve the proposed new boundaries and forward the proposal for amendment to the Community Development Commission and Council.

6. Roosevelt District. Mitch Greer was present to answer questions and provide an update on the progress. It was **MSC (Burstedt, Ricks)** to approve payment of invoice #98485. Mitch noted that the concrete removal item will show cost overruns because a number of sidewalks have been discovered buried under several inches of dirt and sod. It was **MSC (Ricks, Chase)** to approve payment of \$131,251.80 as requested. It was noted that the bill from Kiggins is for slightly less than what has been completed, Regarding Phase II: the phase is about 78% completed; we've paid out 90% of what was expected to be paid by now, but not 90% of the total project budget. It was **MSC (Burstedt, Schroeder)** to approve the Phase II pay request for \$90,348.00. Greer also recommended that the contractor's request for an additional 2 weeks without penalty be allowed; the Board had no objection. He is not recommending an extension for Phase I at this time; it is close to being on-schedule. There is some difficulty with the Common Sense owners in Texas who don't want the improvements and some problems revealed by the first compression tests. RMES will monitor the tests and will require a pay reduction if the standard isn't met.

7. By-law amendments. The State law provides that the City Council can be the PDA Board, but that if it chooses not to do so, the Mayor makes all appointments to the Board with no criteria established for these appointments. After the first PDA Board was appointed, it proceeded to adopt by-laws, deciding that, in addition to the Mayor and City Council and County Commissioner (or designee) members, a person representing the interests of School District and a member of the banking community should be included as required members.

Discussion: The Board currently does not necessarily need the services of a "banker" but the presence of someone versed in financial matters would still be of great benefit and altering the wording either to expand the criteria or alter the "seat" to at-large status would provide additional members of the community with the opportunity to serve. It was **MSC Brown, Schroeder)** to alter the wording to provide for a member with financial expertise (such as accounting, banking, lending institution experience).

Discussion: The School District is to an extent impacted by the establishment, not of Urban Renewal Areas, but of Revenue Allocation Districts (TIFs) and the first Board decided that a person representing the interests of District 25 should be included. In practice, the Mayor has telephoned the School District business office, at times proposing a specific person's name and at times requesting that the Superintendent assign someone to be the representative. The last request for a representative resulted in the appointment of John Ricks, who was a Trustee at the time. Ricks was interested in continuing service to the Board for an additional term and a call was again made to the Superintendent's office, noting that re-appointment would be made absent another representative being proposed. No change was requested and Ricks is now serving another term as their representative. Pros and cons of having someone "involved" with the local schools appointed as opposed to a specific "representative" were considered; Terry Anderson, a current Trustee was present to note her belief that a current Trustee should be a member of the PDA. It was **MS (Ricks, Brown)** to leave the current wording in the bylaws. A substitute motion was thereafter made with consent of the first moving party, Ricks. It was **MSC (Chase, Burstedt; Guthrie, Brown, Ricks dissenting)** that the wording "member of the education community" be substituted for the current wording regarding a representative of the School District.

8. Adjournment. There being no further business the meeting was adjourned at 12:40 p.m.

Rayna Valentine