The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.
Project Background

- **Existing conditions:**
  - ~324 acres within Grand Terrace included in the preliminary EIFD project area, including ~665,000 SF of existing buildings and ~204 acres of vacant land
  - Agreements recently reached with Lewis Group for purchase and sale of ~55-acre freeway opportunity site; various other private development projects planned or proposed
  - Required infrastructure improvements to support future private development, including roadway, water/sewer, parks, other

- **Challenges:**
  - Unlikely for existing infrastructure to support high quality development without significant upgrades
  - There are fewer economic development tools available to assist in area-wide revitalization following the dissolution of redevelopment agencies
  - Competition for new projects from neighboring jurisdictions

The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.
Opportunity:

- State has prioritized installation of key local and regional infrastructure to promote sustainability, energy and resource efficiency, and GHG reduction.
- In support of these objectives, State authorized new tools including Enhanced Infrastructure Financing Districts (“EIFDs”), enabling tax increment financing for local / regional infrastructure and real estate projects.
- Necessary infrastructure improvements and industrial renovations within and around the project area are eligible EIFD expenditures.
- Cities like Grand Terrace can additionally take advantage of the State’s preference to provide grant funds to EIFDs that pursue sustainable infrastructure and resource management.
Executive Summary

• Kosmont was retained by the City in October 2016 to evaluate the practical and financial/economic feasibility of an EIFD to support the financing of essential infrastructure improvements in the City, in order for the City to determine whether or not to proceed with EIFD formation

• Key findings:
  – EIFD has the capacity to serve as the financial vehicle to fund key infrastructure and unlock revitalization in the City
  – Most effective with multi-jurisdictional / taxing entity partnerships (e.g. City, County, special districts) and complementary funding sources (e.g. grant funds, CFD, impact fees, reimbursable developer contributions); i.e. Grand Terrace sponsored EIFD will likely be more effective with County participation

• Next steps include outreach to potential public and private sector stakeholders / partners (e.g. land owners / developers, County / other taxing entities)
1. Review of EIFD Fundamentals (SB 628 / AB 313)

2. Strategic / Boundary Considerations for Grand Terrace
   a) Land Ownership / Proposed Future Development
   b) Infrastructure Needs
   c) Potential Public and Private Partners

3. Funding and Financing
   a) Preliminary Tax Increment Analysis
   b) Complementary Funding Sources / Financing Mechanisms

4. Implementation and Next Steps

The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.
1. Review of EIFD Fundamentals (SB 628 / AB 313)
The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.
SB 32: Acceleration of GHG Reduction

CALIFORNIA: WORLD LEADER IN FIGHT AGAINST CLIMATE CHANGE

SB 32:

Requires State to reduce greenhouse gas emissions 40% below 1990 levels by 2030.

The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.
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State has approved new “districts” including EIFDs (and CRIAs, others):

- Enable tax increment financing for local/regional projects (e.g. purchase, construction, expansion, improvement, seismic retrofit, rehabilitation)
- Compel joint ventures with cities, counties, special districts, and private developers
- Districts geared to infrastructure, sustainability, energy efficiency
- Can combine tax increment with other regional and state-authorized financing programs such as GGRF grant funds, PACE, etc.

District lifespan is 45 years to collect and spend property tax increment

Any property with estimated useful life of 15+ years & of communitywide significance

Managed by newly created Public Financing Authority (led by City or County) – board of 5+ members, includes at least 2 public members

EIFD activities directed by PFA-adopted Infrastructure Financing Plan (IFP)

No public vote required to create district

55% landowner or registered voter election needed for tax increment bonds

No school district increment allowed

Does not increase property taxes
The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.
1. Enhanced Infrastructure Financing District (EIFD)
   - Governmental entity established by a city or county that carries out a plan within a defined area to construct, improve and/or rehabilitate infrastructure

2. Public Financing Authority (PFA)
   - Legislative body that governs the EIFD
   - Majority comprised of participating government council/boards and at least two members of the public

3. Infrastructure Financing Plan
   - Plan adopted by city or county. Describes public facilities & development to be financed by the EIFD
   - Implemented by PFA
EIFDs – Diverse Funding Approach

- **Can use multiple funding sources with tax increment:**
  *If Bond Issuance then 55% voter approval required*

- **Potential to apply State funding sources:**
  - Proposition 1 bond funds
  - Cap-and-trade proceeds

- **Federal & State Grants**
  - Greenhouse Gas Reduction Funds
  - Federal DOT/EPA/DOE funding programs

- **Other Funding Sources:**
  - Property tax revenue including RPTTF
  - Vehicle license fee (VLF) prop. tax backfill increment
  - Development agreement / impact fees
  - User fees
  - City / county / special district loans
  - Hotel bed tax (TOT)
  - Benefit assessments
    - Contribution from Special District (e.g. CFD)
    - Levied by EIFD
  - Private investment

The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.
2. Strategic / Boundary Considerations for Grand Terrace

a) Land Ownership / Proposed Future Development
b) Infrastructure Needs
c) Potential Public and Private Partners
The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.
• Development in and around EIFD project area is key driver for district formation

• Redevelopment of existing infrastructure and installment of new infrastructure essential to serve and incentivize future private development

• Primary goals of District formation:
  – Maximize revenue streams to support needed infrastructure improvements for proposed future development/reenvelopment in project area
  – Establish EIFD and assessment baseline as soon as possible to capture maximum increase in assessed value

• Grand Terrace may consider partnering with San Bernardino County to maximize increment pledged to EIFD
Summary of Strategic Considerations

Parcel Details / Potential Projects

- ~324 total acres in prelim EIFD area, 150 parcels, 95 unique land owners
- ~$54.9 million in existing assessed value
- ~665,000 SF of existing buildings
- Lewis project/properties along I-215
- Town Sq. and other projects along Barton Rd.
- Vivienda Ave. residential (east of I-215)
- Other potential future development

Desired Uses

- For sale & rental residential
- Retail / commercial / shops / restaurant
- Mixed-use (residential & retail)
- Professional office
- Commercial manufacturing
- Industrial warehousing / logistics
- Supporting public amenities

Infrastructure Needs

- Roadway / right of way
- Water / sewer / flood control
- Parks / landscaping
- Traffic signalization
- Other
- Approx. $15.6M in improvements identified (initial list)

Potential Partners

Public Agencies:
- San Bernardino County
- San Bernardino Associated Governments
- County Flood Control / Library / Fire
- SB Valley Municipal Water District

Private Sector:
- Lewis Group
- Other major landowners / developers
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Initial Infrastructure Cost Estimates

- City and private development firms provided Kosmont with cost infrastructure estimates within proposed EIFD Project Area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Infrastructure / Improvements</th>
<th>Estimated Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>New Library / Community Center</td>
<td>$7,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Right of Way</td>
<td>$2,582,609</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Signalization</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Offsite Drainage</td>
<td>$618,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brownfield Remediation (MR – Restricted Manufacturing Area 2)</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trails (M2 – Industrial Area 3)</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>$1,883,499</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contingency</td>
<td>$2,598,818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Identified Infrastructure / Improvements</strong></td>
<td>~$15.8 million+</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.
3. Financing and Funding

a) Preliminary Tax Increment Analysis
b) EIFD formation Considerations
c) Complimentary Funding Sources / Financing Mechanisms
The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.

Grand Terrace EIFD Property Tax Distribution Detail

- Tax Rate Area (TRA) 16001 covers potential EIFD area
- Grand Terrace captures ~20 cents for every $1 in property tax general levy
- San Bernardino County captures ~13 cents
- Other top non-school taxing entities listed below:

### Tax Rate Area (TRA) 16001

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Taxing Entity</th>
<th>Distribution from 1% General Tax Levy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Grand Terrace</td>
<td>0.19971271</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.B. County General Fund</td>
<td>0.12716695</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.B. County Fire Protection District</td>
<td>0.10335846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.B. Valley Municipal Water</td>
<td>0.02299892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.B. County Flood Control</td>
<td>0.02257486</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S.B. County Library</td>
<td>0.01231400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
- Factors represent cents for every dollar of 1% property tax general levy
- Source: San Bernardino County Auditor-Controller / Assessor-Recorder
Former RDA Overlap – Implications

- Significant portion of City (and preliminary EIFD area) overlaps former Redevelopment (RDA) projects areas
- The Grand Terrace former RDA has long-term enforceable obligations (~$35.2 million of in tax allocation bonds and other obligations) through 2033
- Pursuant to EIFD legislation (SB 628):
  - Any debt or obligation of an EIFD is subordinate to any and all existing enforceable obligations of the former redevelopment agency
  - Available revenues to the EIFD shall not include any taxes required to be deposited [first] into the Redevelopment Property Tax Trust (RPTTF), but shall include periodic distributions to the City or County from the RPTTF after all pre-existing legal commitments and statutory obligations funded from that revenue are made (i.e. residual revenues)
Preliminary Tax Increment Analysis

Development Assumptions

- Kosmont ran a baseline tax increment analysis to determine district revenue potential based on planned / proposed projects and future development potential.
- Development & assessed value assumptions:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Type</th>
<th>SF / Units</th>
<th>AV per SF / Unit</th>
<th>AV at Buildout</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rental Residential</td>
<td>632 DU</td>
<td>$150,000 / DU</td>
<td>$101,064,640</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Single Family Residential (R1)</td>
<td>40 DU</td>
<td>$400,000 / DU</td>
<td>$29,004,381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential (R2)</td>
<td>40 DU</td>
<td>$250,000 / DU</td>
<td>$22,589,830</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Retail / Commercial</td>
<td>325,513 SF</td>
<td>$200 / PSF</td>
<td>$84,996,883</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Corner Pad / Restaurant (fast food)</td>
<td>5,284 SF</td>
<td>$250 / PSF</td>
<td>$1,374,368</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Office Professional / General Comm.</td>
<td>79,699 SF</td>
<td>$175 / PSF</td>
<td>$23,140,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Manufacturing / Industrial</td>
<td>850,000 SF</td>
<td>$100 / PSF</td>
<td>$205,083,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Estimated Total</strong></td>
<td>1,656,028 SF</td>
<td></td>
<td>~$467 million</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Notes:** AV at buildout values represent construction/entitled value added to EIFD before the reduction in AV that occurs through the demolition of existing improvements (estimated at ~$42M)

- Kosmont evaluated two (2) City and County property tax increment contribution scenarios as outlined on following pages.
Summary of Net Available Revenues

Scenario 1

- **Scenario 1:**
  - City of Grand Terrace contributes half (~10 cents) of its total 19.97 cents of property tax increment
  - San Bernardino County contributes half (~6.35) of its total ~12.7 cents – *County must consent*
  - City dedicates half of its incremental property tax in lieu of MVLF (~$605 annually for every $1 million in new assessed value within the EIFD)

- Property tax increment + incremental property tax in-lieu of MVLF:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City Base Prop. Tax</th>
<th>County Prop. Tax</th>
<th>City VLF Prop Tax</th>
<th>Total Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 10 Annual Revenue</td>
<td>$297,217</td>
<td>$189,016</td>
<td>$179,939</td>
<td>$666,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 20 Annual Revenue</td>
<td>$548,170</td>
<td>$348,611</td>
<td>$331,869</td>
<td>$1,228,651</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 30 Annual Revenue</td>
<td>$684,705</td>
<td>$435,441</td>
<td>$414,529</td>
<td>$1,534,675</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>45-Year PV @ 7%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,799,778</strong></td>
<td><strong>$3,052,438</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,905,846</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,758,062</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Compare to initial infrastructure improvement costs identified at ~$15.8M

- Does not include potential additional contributions from County Fire, S.B. Valley Municipal Water, or other taxing entities

The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.
Summary of Net Available Revenues

Scenario 2

- **Scenario 2:**
  - City of Grand Terrace contributes ~15 cents of its total 19.97 cents of property tax increment
  - San Bernardino County contributes half (~6.35) of its total ~12.7 cents – **County must consent**
  - City dedicates half of its incremental property tax in lieu of MVLF (~$605 annually for every $1 million in new assessed value within the EIFD)

- Property tax increment + incremental property tax in-lieu of MVLF:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>City Base Prop. Tax</th>
<th>County Prop. Tax</th>
<th>City VLF Prop Tax</th>
<th>Total Available</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Year 10 Annual Revenue</td>
<td>$445,825</td>
<td>$189,016</td>
<td>$179,939</td>
<td>$814,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 20 Annual Revenue</td>
<td>$822,256</td>
<td>$348,611</td>
<td>$331,869</td>
<td>$1,502,736</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Year 30 Annual Revenue</td>
<td>$1,027,057</td>
<td>$435,441</td>
<td>$414,529</td>
<td>$1,877,027</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45-Year PV @ 7%</td>
<td>$7,199,668</td>
<td>$3,052,438</td>
<td>$2,905,846</td>
<td>$13,157,951</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Compare to initial infrastructure improvement costs identified at ~$15.8M

- Does not include potential additional contributions from County Fire, S.B. Valley Municipal Water, or other taxing entities

---

The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.
Cooperative Districts = Greater Funding Capacity

Scenario 1

- ~$467 million development projects (today’s dollars) developed over 20 years
- City base property tax contribution of half (~10 cents) of its property tax capture
- County base property tax contribution of half (~6.35 cents) of its property tax
- City additionally dedicates half of its property tax in-lieu of VLF from new development
- In this scenario, the EIFD’s cumulative property tax revenues accelerate from approximately $24 million to $55 million over 45 years (nominal 2017 dollars)
Cooperative Districts = Greater Funding Capacity

Scenario 2

- ~$467 million development projects (today’s dollars) developed over 20 years
- City base property tax contribution of ~15 cents of its property tax capture
- County base property tax contribution of half (~6.35 cents) of its property tax
- City additionally dedicates half of its property tax in-lieu of VLF from new development
- In this scenario, the EIFD’s cumulative property tax revenues accelerate from approximately $37 million to $67 million over 45 years (nominal 2017 dollars)
Start-up Capital – an important component of EIFD formation

- At formation, EIFDs have zero revenues and tax increment is minimal.

- Grand Terrace may consider the following primary funding sources to provide initial capital for needed infrastructure in Project Area:
  1. Initial developer loan or pledge repaid through credit and reimbursement agreement
  2. Development impact fee levies
  3. Grant funding (e.g. GGRF grant application for sustainable infrastructure, Proposition 84 funds for flood control improvements)
  4. CFD / other special district fees and/or assessments
  5. City / county / special district loans
  6. PACE Financing (tax lien financing for energy efficiency improvements) as appropriate
4. Implementation and Next Steps
How is an EIFD Formed?

1. Adopt Resolution of Intention

2. Prepare & Adopt Infrastructure Financing Plan (IFP)

3. Enter into tax sharing agreements with other public / taxing entities

4. Approve IFP and form EIFD

5. Public Financing Authority (PFA) implements IFP

The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.
Key Considerations for Implementation

- **CEQA** – Legislation says IFP must be distributed with any required CEQA documentation for proposed public facilities and project development
  - IFP should leverage existing Specific Plan and/or General Plan environmental documentation to the extent possible

- **Funding Capacity** – EIFD is most effective with multi-jurisdictional / taxing entity partnerships (e.g. City, County, special districts) and complementary funding sources (e.g. GGRF grant funds, CFD, impact fees, developer contributions)
  - All affected taxing entities have more to gain if private development is induced
  - Cooperative taxing entity efforts can attract private investment (and State grant funds) more efficiently

- **Timing for adoption** – Necessary to coordination formation efforts with County Auditor-Controller and State Board of Equalization
  - Necessary filings per guidelines from Board for Change of Jurisdictional Boundaries by December 1st of the year immediately preceding division of taxes for EIFD
The analyses, projections, assumptions, rates of return, and any examples presented herein are for illustrative purposes and are not a guarantee of actual and/or future results. Project pro forma and tax analyses are projections only. Actual results may differ from those expressed in this analysis.

## EIFD Formation Timeline

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Step</th>
<th>Description</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Conduct public outreach with landowners and potential PFA members (e.g. County) <em>(ASAP)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Final determination of PFA composition, tax increment contributions <em>(target June 1, 2017)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Final determination of EIFD boundaries (e.g. Valero) <em>(target June 1)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>City/affected taxing agencies adopt resolution(s) of intention to form EIFD and PFA <em>(target July 1)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>PFA drafts IFP <em>(target completion by Sept. 1)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Draft / update / process necessary CEQA documents <em>(target completion by Sept. 1)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Distribute IFP to property owners with corresponding CEQA documentation <em>(by Oct. 1 – target Sept. 1)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>City / affected taxing entities contributing increment adopt resolution(s) approving IFP <em>(by Oct. 1)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>PFA conducts a public hearing to approve the IFP and form EIFD (after CEQA challenge period and at least 60 days after IFP is distributed <em>(target Oct 1)</em></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Filings with BOE per guidelines from Board for Change of Jurisdictional Boundaries <em>(by Dec. 1 2017; target Nov. 1 to allow for revision)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- **IFP takes effect upon adoption of approval resolution (#9 above)**
- **EIFD property tax division begins following fiscal year**
Next Steps

Current phase of work:

1. Present initial findings to City Council for feedback / direction

Potential future phase of work:

2. Outreach to land & building owners in EIFD area interested in early or long-term investment in development / tenant improvement projects, and finalize boundary

3. Outreach to San Bernardino County to determine interest in partnership

4. Refine tax increment / financing analysis based on public/private outreach above

5. Evaluate start-up / complementary funding sources (e.g. GGRF / other grants, CFD, private developer loans/contributions)

6. Initiate EIFD formation process including PFA formation, preparation of Infrastructure Financing Plan, etc.
Thank You / Questions?

Kosmont Companies
1230 Rosecrans Avenue, Suite 630
Manhattan Beach
Telephone: (424) 297-1070
www.kosmont.com