

File No. 130264

Committee Item No. 6

Board Item No. 15

COMMITTEE/BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

AGENDA PACKET CONTENTS LIST

Committee: Budget and Finance Sub-Committee Date 04/17/2013

Board of Supervisors Meeting

Date APRIL 23, 2013

Cmte Board

- | | | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------------------------|--|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Motion |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Resolution |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Ordinance |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Digest |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Budget and Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Legislative Analyst Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Youth Commission Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Introduction Form (for hearings) |
| <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> | Department/Agency Cover Letter and/or Report |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | MOU |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Information Form |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Grant Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Subcontract Budget |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Contract/Agreement |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Form 126 – Ethics Commission |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Award Letter |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Application |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | Public Correspondence |

OTHER (Use back side if additional space is needed)

| | | |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|-------|
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |
| <input type="checkbox"/> | <input type="checkbox"/> | _____ |

Completed by: Victor Young Date April 12, 2013

Completed by: Victor Young Date 4/18/13

1 [Adoption of Guidelines for the Establishment and Use of an Infrastructure Financing District
2 on Port Land]

3 **Resolution adopting Guidelines for the Establishment and Use of an Infrastructure**
4 **Financing District with Project Areas on Land Under the Jurisdiction of the San**
5 **Francisco Port Commission.**

6
7 WHEREAS, Government Code Sections 53395-53398.47 (IFD Law) authorizes certain
8 public agencies, including the City and County of San Francisco, to establish infrastructure
9 financing districts (IFDs) to finance the planning, design, acquisition, construction, and
10 improvement of public facilities meeting the requirements of IFD Law; and

11 WHEREAS, IFDs are formed to facilitate the design, acquisition, construction, and
12 improvement of necessary public facilities and provide an alternative means of financing when
13 local resources are insufficient; and

14 WHEREAS, Government Code Sections 53395.8 and 53395.81 authorize the
15 establishment of IFDs on land under the jurisdiction of the Port Commission of San Francisco
16 (Port) to finance additional public facilities to improve the San Francisco waterfront and further
17 authorizes the establishment of project areas within an IFD for the same purposes; and

18 WHEREAS, By Board Resolution No. 110-12, adopted on March 27, 2012, and Board
19 Resolution No. 227-12, adopted on June 12, 2012, the Board stated its intention to form a
20 single IFD consisting of all Port land (waterfront district) with project areas corresponding to
21 Port development projects within the waterfront district; and

22 WHEREAS, By Board Resolution No. 66-11, adopted on February 8, 2011, the Board
23 adopted "Guidelines for the Establishment and Use of Infrastructure Financing Districts in the

24 *///*

1 City and County of San Francisco," which do not apply to land owned or managed by the Port;
2 and

3 WHEREAS, A draft document entitled "Guidelines for the Establishment and Use of an
4 Infrastructure Financing District with Project Areas on Land under the Jurisdiction of the San
5 Francisco Port Commission" (Port Guidelines) setting forth proposed policy criteria and
6 guidelines for the waterfront district is on file with the Clerk of the Board of Supervisors in File
7 No. ¹³⁰²⁶⁴, which is hereby declared to be a part of this Resolution as if set forth fully herein;
8 now, therefore, be it

9 RESOLVED, That the Board of Supervisors finds that the Port Guidelines will ensure
10 that a rational and efficient process is established for the formation the waterfront district and
11 project areas within it, and adopts the Port Guidelines; and, be it

12 FURTHER RESOLVED, That this Resolution and the Port Guidelines will be effective
13 on the date the Board of Supervisors adopts this Resolution.

14
15 APPROVED AS TO FORM:

16 DENNIS J. HERRERA
17 City Attorney

18 By: 
19 Joanne Sakai
20 Deputy City Attorney

OFFICE OF THE MAYOR
SAN FRANCISCO



EDWIN M. LEE
MAYOR

TO: Angela Calvillo, Clerk of the Board of Supervisors
FROM: *for* Mayor Edwin M. Lee *gr*
RE: Adoption of Guidelines for the Establishment and Use of an Infrastructure Financing District on Port Land
DATE: March 19, 2013

Attached for introduction to the Board of Supervisors is the Resolution adopting "Guidelines for the Establishment and Use of an Infrastructure Financing District with Project Areas on Land Under the Jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission".

Please note this item is cosponsored by Supervisors Kim

I request that this item be calendared in Budget and Finance Committee.

Should you have any questions, please contact Jason Elliott (415) 554-5105.

RECEIVED
BOARD OF SUPERVISORS
SAN FRANCISCO
2013 MAR 19 PM 2:18
[Handwritten signature]

cc. Supervisor Jane Kim

130264 ✓

Item 6
File 13-0264

Department:
The Port

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Legislative Objectives

- The proposed resolution would adopt “Guidelines for the Establishment and Use of an Infrastructure Financing District (IFD) with Project Areas on Land under the Jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission”. The Port IFD Guidelines establish the threshold criteria that must be met in order to establish a Port IFD and the strategic criteria that should be considered by the Board of Supervisors but are not required to establish the Port IFD.

Key Points

- State law authorizes the establishment of a Port IFD to finance public improvement projects along the San Francisco waterfront. The Port IFD may finance the same types of improvement projects that are financed by non-Port IFDs (open space, parks, and street improvements), as well as projects specific to the Port, including removal of bay fill, storm water management facilities, shoreline restoration, and maritime facility improvements. Increased property tax revenues resulting from certain Port development projects (tax increment) may be redirected from the General Fund to the Port IFD in order to finance public improvements, subject to Board of Supervisors approval.
- The Board of Supervisors previously approved a resolution of intention (1) to establish the Port IFD consisting of eight project areas; and (2) directing the Port Executive Director to prepare a financing plan, subject to Board of Supervisors’ approval. The Port intends to submit a Port IFD financing plan for proposed development on Piers 30-32 and Seawall Lot 330 to the Board of Supervisors in late 2014.
- The Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends amendments to the proposed Port IFD guidelines, including to Threshold Criteria 6, 7, and 8, to clarify the intent of the threshold criteria, as noted in the recommendations below.

Fiscal Impact

- Threshold Criteria 5 requires that financing plans for each of the Port IFD project areas demonstrate a net economic benefit, while the City’s IFD Guidelines. Previously approved by the Board of Supervisors require that the IFD demonstrate a net fiscal benefit to the General Fund. The City’s IFD Guidelines acknowledge that the Port’s use of IFD law differs from the City. However, in order to fully disclose the fiscal impact of the Port IFD on the City’s General Fund, the proposed Port IFD Guidelines should be amended to require that project area financing plans project the net fiscal impact to the City’s General Fund, as well as the net economic benefits.

Policy Considerations

- Property taxes are apportioned to the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund (ERAF), the City’s General Fund, and other taxing entities. Under State law, in five of the Port IFD project areas, the ERAF portion of tax increment may be redirected to the Port IFD in an amount proportional to the General Fund portion of tax increment that is redirected to the Port IFD. Threshold Criteria 6 maximizes redirection of the ERAF portion of tax increment to the Port IFD in order to maximize the Port’s ability to finance public improvements. Redirecting the ERAF’s share of tax increment could potentially result in a State General Fund cost to backfill those monies intended for education.
- The proposed Port IFD Guidelines will guide future Board of Supervisors’ decisions on allocation of City and ERAF tax increment. Therefore, approval of the proposed resolution is a policy decision for the Board of Supervisors.

Recommendations

1. Amend the proposed resolution to request the Port to amend:
 - (a) The Port IFD Guidelines to specify that the threshold criteria must be met in order to establish a Port IFD or project area, and the strategic criteria should be considered by the Board of Supervisors but are not required to establish a Port IFD;
 - (b) Threshold Criteria 5 to require that the project area financing plan projects the net fiscal impact to the City's General Fund, as well as the net economic benefits, over the term of the Port IFD;
 - (c) Threshold Criteria 6 and 7 to specify that the share of tax increment allocated to the City and ERAF is the tax rate established annually by the State for the ERAF and by the Board of Supervisors for the City pursuant to the California Revenue and Taxation Code; and
 - (d) Threshold Criteria 8 to specify that ERAF's excess share of tax increment may not be re-allocated to the City's General Fund or to improvements in the City's seawall and other measures to protect against sea level rise.
2. Approval of the proposed resolution, as amended, is a policy decision for the Board of Supervisors.

MANDATE STATEMENT AND BACKGROUND

Mandate Statement

California Government Code Section 53395 et seq., which became law in 1990, authorizes cities and counties to establish Infrastructure Financing Districts (IFD), subject to approval by the city council or county board of supervisors, to finance "public capital facilities of communitywide significance." The definition of such public facilities includes parks, other open space, and street improvements. In addition, Section 53395.8 authorizes the establishment of an IFD by the Port of San Francisco (Port IFD) to finance additional improvement projects along the San Francisco waterfront, such as structural repairs and improvements to piers, seawalls, and wharves as well as historic rehabilitation of and seismic and life-safety improvements to existing buildings. The establishment of a Port IFD is subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors.

Background

State Law Authorizes the Establishment of Infrastructure Financing Districts

In order to provide alternative financing mechanisms for local jurisdictions to fund public works and services, State law¹ authorizes cities and counties to establish IFDs within individual city or county boundaries to finance the:

- Purchase, construction, expansion, improvement, seismic retrofit or rehabilitation of any real or other tangible property with an estimated life of 15 years or longer, including parks, other open space, and street improvements;
- Planning and design work directly related to the purchase, construction, expansion, improvement, seismic retrofit or rehabilitation of that property;
- Reimbursement to a developer of a project located entirely within the boundaries of an IFD for any permit expenses incurred and to offset additional expenses incurred by the developer in constructing affordable housing units;

¹ California Government Code Section 53395 et seq.

- Costs incurred by a county in connection with the division of taxes collected.

An IFD, once established with specific boundaries, obtains revenue in the same manner as former redevelopment districts. Assessed values on properties located within the IFD, and the property taxes derived from those values, are fixed at a baseline value. Increases in assessed value above the baseline and the associated increase in property tax, known as tax increment, may then be used to pay for the new public facilities that the IFD was established to pay for.

The City's Guidelines for IFDs, "Guidelines for the "Establishment and Use of Infrastructure Financing Districts in the City and County of San Francisco" were adopted by the Board of Supervisors on February 8, 2011 (Resolution No. 66-11). The City's Guidelines do not apply to an IFD on land owned or managed by the Port. The City currently has one established IFD, located in Rincon Hill, which is subject to the adopted guidelines, and was approved by the Board of Supervisors on February 15, 2011 (Ordinance No. 19-11).

State Law Authorizes the Establishment of an Infrastructure Financing District on Port Property

State law² authorizes the establishment of a Port IFD to finance additional improvement projects along the San Francisco waterfront. The additional improvement projects include removal of bay fill, storm water management facilities, shoreline restoration, maritime facility improvements, historic rehabilitation, and other improvement projects not included in non-Port IFDs.

A Port IFD may be divided into individual project areas, subject to Board of Supervisors approval. The State laws described in this report would apply to each Port project area that the Board of Supervisors approves.³ On March 27, 2012, the Board of Supervisors approved a resolution of intention to establish a Port IFD (Resolution No. 110-12), with seven project areas. On June 12, 2012, the Board of Supervisors amended the resolution of intention to include Seawall Lot 351 as the eighth project area in the Port IFD (Resolution No. 227-12). The eight project areas for the Port IFD in the amended resolution of intention are:

1. Seawall Lot 330 (Project Area A)
2. Piers 30-32 (Project Area B)
3. Pier 28 (Project Area C)
4. Pier 26 (Project Area D)
5. Seawall Lot 351 (Project Area E)
6. Pier 48 (Project Area F)
7. Pier 70 (Project Area G)
8. Rincon Point-South Point (Project Area H)

The resolution of intention allows the Port to establish additional project areas in compliance with State law, as noted below.

The previously approved resolution of intention directs the Port Executive Director to prepare a financing plan, which is subject to approval of the Board of Supervisors. According to Mr. Brad

² California Government Code Section 53395.8

³ California Government Code Section 53395.8(g)

Benson, Port Special Projects Manager, the Port intends to submit a Port IFD financing plan associated with the proposed multi-purpose venue on Piers 30-32 and the companion mixed use development on Seawall Lot 330 to the Board of Supervisors in late 2014, after the City has completed environmental review of the proposed project.

According to State law⁴, the portion of the tax increment allocated to local educational agencies, San Francisco Unified School District, San Francisco Community College District, and the San Francisco County Office of Education, may not be allocated to the Port IFD. The tax increment from other recipients of City property taxes, including the Bay Area Air Quality Management District and Bay Area Rapid Transit District, may be allocated to the Port IFD if a resolution approving the financing plan is adopted by that recipient and sent to the Board of Supervisors.⁵

Except for specified circumstances, State law⁶ mandates that any tax increment allocated to the Port IFD must be used within the Port IFD's boundaries. In addition, a minimum of 20 percent of the tax increment allocated to the Port IFD must be set aside to be expended exclusively on shoreline restoration, removal of bay fill, or waterfront public access to or environmental remediation of the San Francisco waterfront.

Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund Tax Increment Allocated to Port IFD in Specific Project Areas

According to State law⁷, the Port may use tax increment generated by the five project areas noted below, which would otherwise be allocated to the Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund⁸'s (ERAF), subject to specific limitations. Two of the five project areas – Seawall Lot 330 and Pier 70 - were included in the resolution of intention, previously approved by the Board of Supervisors, while three of the five project areas – Piers 19, 23, and 29 – may be proposed by the Port for inclusion in the Port IFD at a future date. According to Ms. Joanne Sakai, Deputy City Attorney, the Board of Supervisors may opt to not allocate ERAF's share of tax increment generated by any of the five project areas to the Port IFD on a case-by-case basis when considering whether to approve the proposed Port IFD financing plan.

⁴ California Government Code Section 53395.8.g.3.c.i

⁵ California Government Code Section 53395.8.g.5.

⁶ California Government Code Section 53395.8.g.3.c.ii

⁷ On September 29, 2012, Assembly Bill (AB) 2259 was passed.

⁸ The Educational Revenue Augmentation Fund redirects one-fifth of total statewide property tax revenue from cities, counties and special districts to school and community college districts. The redirected property tax revenue is deposited into a countywide fund for schools and community colleges (ERAF). The property tax revenue is distributed to the county's non-basic aid schools and community colleges (i.e, school and community college districts that receive more than the minimum amount of state aid required by the State constitution). In 2004, the State approved a complex financing mechanism, known as the triple flip, in which one-quarter cent of the local sales tax is used to repay the Proposition 57 deficit financing bond; property taxes are redirected from ERAF to cities and counties to offset revenue losses from the one-quarter cent sales tax; and State aid offsets losses to school and community college districts from the redirected ERAF funds.

Pier 70 Project Area

A Pier 70 project area may not be formed prior to January 1, 2014. According to Mr. Benson, the Port intends to submit a financing plan for the Pier 70 project area for Board of Supervisors consideration after it completes environmental review of the proposed Pier 70 mixed use development, likely in 2015 or 2016. The Port may allocate ERAF's share of tax increment from the Pier 70 project area to the Port IFD to fund public improvements at Pier 70. Under State law, the amount of ERAF's share of tax increment allocated to the Port IFD is proportional to the City's share of tax increment allocated to the Port IFD.⁹

The Port may issue debt, secured by the ERAF share of tax increment from the Pier 70 project area for up to 20 fiscal years from the first Pier 70 debt issuance. Once any ERAF-secured debt issued within the Pier 70 project area has been paid, ERAF's share of tax increment will be paid into ERAF. Beginning in the 21st fiscal year, ERAF's share of tax increment may only be used to meet debt service obligations for previously issued debt secured by ERAF's allocation of tax increment. ERAF's share of tax increment exceeding debt service obligations must be paid into ERAF.

Seawall Lot 330 and Piers 19, 23, and 29 Project Areas

ERAF's share of tax increment from Seawall Lot 330 and Piers 19, 23, and 29 may only be allocated to fund (a) construction of the Port's Cruise Terminal at Pier 27, (b) planning and design work directly related to construction of the Port's Cruise Terminal at Pier 27, (c) future installations of shoreside power facilities on Port maritime facilities, and (d) planning, design, acquisition, and construction of improvements to publicly-owned waterfront lands held by trustee agencies, such as the National Park Service, California State Parks, and City and County of San Francisco Departments to be used as a public spectator viewing site for America's Cup related events.

ERAF's share of tax increment allocated to Seawall Lot 330 and Piers 19, 23, and 29 project areas must be equal to the percentage of the City's share of tax increment allocated to these project areas and cannot exceed \$1,000,000 annually. The Port must set aside a minimum of 20 percent of ERAF's share of tax increment allocated to these project areas to pay for planning, design, acquisition, and construction of improvements to waterfront lands owned by Federal, State, or local trustee agencies, such as the National Park Service or the California State Parks.¹⁰

Any improvements made with ERAF's share of tax increment for the above purposes are not required to be located within the individual project areas from which ERAF's share of tax increment is allocated. To enable allocation of ERAF's share of tax increment from all of the eligible project areas noted above, the Board of Supervisors would have to approve an amendment the previously approved resolution of intention to form the Port IFD to authorize Piers 19, 23 and 29 as Port IFD project areas.

⁹ For example, for every \$1.00 in Property Taxes (not including Property Taxes designated to pay General Obligation bonds), \$0.25 is allocated to ERAF, \$0.65 is allocated to the City's General Fund, and \$0.10 is allocated to the other taxing entities (SFUSD, Community College District, BART, and Bay Area Air Quality Management District). If the Board of Supervisors were to approve 50% of the City's General Fund share of tax increment (or \$0.325 of \$0.65), then the ERA share of tax increment is 50% (or \$0.125 of \$0.25).

¹⁰ State law sets aside 20 percent from ERAF's tax increment in lieu of the minimum of 20 percent of the tax increment allocated to the Port IFD required to be set aside to be expended exclusively on shoreline restoration, removal of bay fill, or waterfront public access to or environmental remediation of the San Francisco waterfront.

Maps of the Port IFD, with specific project area boundaries defined, are provided in the Attachment to this report.

DETAILS OF PROPOSED LEGISLATION

The proposed resolution would adopt “Guidelines for the Establishment and Use of an Infrastructure Financing District with Project Areas on Land under the Jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission” (Port IFD Guidelines). The City’s Capital Planning Committee recommended approval of the Port IFD Guidelines on January 2, 2013.

The Port IFD Guidelines identify 10 threshold criteria and four strategic criteria. According to Mr. Benson, the threshold criteria must be met in order to establish a Port IFD and the strategic criteria should be considered by the Board of Supervisors but are not required for the establishment of a Port IFD. Because neither the proposed Port IFD Guidelines nor the proposed resolution define the purpose of the threshold criteria and strategic criteria, the proposed Port IFD Guidelines should be amended to specify that (1) the threshold criteria must be met in order to establish a Port IFD, and (2) the strategic criteria should be considered by the Board of Supervisors but are not required for the establishment of a Port IFD, comparable to language in the City’s Guidelines.

The Port IFD Guidelines are summarized below.

Threshold Criteria of the Port IFD Guidelines

1. Any Port IFD initially established is subject to Board of Supervisors approval and must:
 - Consist exclusively of Port property;
 - Meet the threshold criteria proposed in the Port IFD Guidelines;
 - Be accompanied by a project area-specific financing plan that meets State law requirements.
2. Potential property annexations to the Port IFD of non-Port property adjacent to Port property are subject to Board of Supervisors approval and will be evaluated individually to determine whether to annex the non-Port property. If annexation is approved, the percentage of the tax increment generated by the non-Port property not used to finance Port public facilities should be subject to the City’s IFD Guidelines.
3. No tax increment will be allocated to the Port IFD without completion of environmental review and recommendation for approval by the City’s Capital Planning Committee.
4. Public facilities financed by tax increment in project areas and any adjacent property annexations approved by the Board of Supervisors must be consistent with:
 - State law regarding IFDs;
 - The Port’s Waterfront Land Use Plan;
 - Any restrictions on Port land use pursuant to the Burton Act;
 - The Port’s 10-Year Capital Plan.
5. The Port must demonstrate that the project area will result in a net economic benefit to the City in the project area-specific financing plan by including:

- Total revenue that the General Fund is projected to receive;
 - Total number of jobs and other economic development benefits the project is expected to produce.
6. When an allocation of ERAF's share of tax increment, identified in the Port IFD Guidelines as \$0.25 per \$1.00 in tax increment, is authorized under State law, the City, subject to Board of Supervisors approval, should maximize such contributions to those project areas by allocating the maximum amount of City tax increment to those areas, identified in the Guidelines as \$0.65 per \$1.00 in tax increment. As previously noted, ERAF's share of tax increment is authorized for allocation within the Seawall Lot 330, Pier 19, Pier 23, Pier 29, and Pier 70 project areas.
 7. Tax increment amounts based on project area-specific financing plans for project areas are subject to approval by the Board of Supervisors and should be sufficient to enable the Port to:
 - Obtain fair market rent for Port leases after build-out of the project area;
 - Enable proposed development projects to attract equity;
 - Fund debt service and debt service coverage for any bonds issued in public facilities financed by tax increment in Port IFD project areas;
 - Fund the Port's administrative costs and authorized public facilities with available revenue on a pay-as-you-go¹¹ basis.
 8. Excess tax increment not required to fund public facilities in project areas will be allocated to either (a) the City's General Fund, (b) funding improvements to the City's seawall, or (c) protecting the City against sea level rise, as allowed by State law, contingent upon Board of Supervisors approval.
 9. The Port will include pay-as-you-go tax increment revenue allocated to the project area in the Port's Capital Budget if the Port issues revenue bonds to be repaid by tax increment revenue generated in one or more Port project areas in order to provide debt service coverage for Port revenue bonds as a source of funding.
 10. The Port is required to identify sources of funding to construct, operate and maintain public facilities by project area tax increment in the project area-specific financing plan.

Strategic Criteria of the Port IFD Guidelines

The four strategic criteria for the Board of Supervisors to consider, when approving the Port IFD, provide guidance in the appropriate use of Port IFD financing and in the selection of projects within the Port IFD. These strategic criteria are:

- Port IFD financing should be used for public facilities serving Port land where other Port monies are insufficient;
- Port IFD financing should be used to leverage non-City resources, such as any additional regional, State, or Federal funds that may be available;
- The Port should continue utilizing the "best-practices" citizen participation procedures¹² to help establish priorities for public facilities serving Port land;

¹¹ Pay-as-you-go is a method of financing expenditures with funds that are currently available rather than borrowed.

- The Port, the Mayor's Budget Office and the Controller should collaborate to conduct periodic nexus studies every ten years, at minimum, to examine whether the cost of basic municipal services, such as services provided by the Fire and Police Departments, are covered by the sum of the portion of property taxes the City receives from Port land, hotel, sales, payroll or gross receipts taxes, and any other taxes the City receives from Port land, and any other revenues that the City receives from Port land.

FISCAL ANALYSIS

While there is no direct fiscal impact of the proposed resolution to adopt the Port's Guidelines for Establishment and Use of an Infrastructure Financial District with Project Areas on Land under the Jurisdiction of the Port Commission, there are criteria within the Port IFD Guidelines that may have fiscal impacts to the Port and the City.

Threshold Criteria 5 Requires Net Economic, Not Fiscal, Benefit to the City

Threshold Criteria 5 requires that the project area financing plan demonstrate a net economic benefit to the City that, over the term of the project area, includes the (a) total estimated amount of revenue to the City's General Fund; and (b) number of jobs and other economic development benefits. In contrast, the City's IFD Guidelines require that the IFD provide a net fiscal benefit over the 30-year term of the IFD, "guaranteeing that there is at least some gain to the General Fund in all circumstances". In addition, State law¹³ requires only an analysis of costs and revenues to the City.

Threshold Criteria 5 states that the project area financing plan should be similar to findings of fiscal responsibility and feasibility reports prepared in accordance with Administrative Code Chapter 29. Administrative Code Chapter 29 requires more detailed evaluation of fiscal benefits to the City than required by the proposed Port IFD Guidelines, including direct and indirect financial benefits to the City, project construction costs, available funding to pay project costs, ongoing maintenance and operating costs, and debt service costs.

The City's IFD Guidelines acknowledge that the Port's use of IFD law differs from the City in that the Port intends to build infrastructure to attract private investment to create jobs, small business, waterfront visitors and other growth, and therefore would not necessarily be "predicated on up-zonings¹⁴ that result in net fiscal benefits to the General Fund". However, in order to fully disclose the fiscal impact of the Port IFD on the City's General Fund, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends that the proposed Port IFD Guidelines be amended to require that the project area financing plan project the net fiscal impact to the City's General Fund, as well as the net economic benefits, over the term of the Port IFD.

¹² Best practices citizen participation procedures include regular publicly-noticed meetings of waterfront advisory committees to support ongoing communication with neighborhood and waterfront stakeholders as well as community planning processes for major waterfront open space, maritime, and development project opportunities and needs.

¹³ California Government Code Section 53395.8.g.3.c.vii

¹⁴ "Up-zonings" are increases in height, bulk or density, allowing increased development.

Threshold Criteria 6 and 7 Refer to Specific Tax Increment Percentages Which are Subject to Change

Threshold Criteria 6 and 7 refer to specific property tax rate allocations, as they are currently allocated. The City's property tax allocation is referred to in specific numeric terms as \$0.65 per \$1.00 in tax increment and ERAF's Property Tax allocation is referred to as \$0.25 per \$1.00 in tax increment. However, future State law may change these property tax allocations. In addition, these property tax allocations are subject to approval by the State for ERAF and by Board of Supervisors for the City on an annual basis. Therefore, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends that Threshold Criteria 6 and 7 specify that the share of tax increment allocated to the City and ERAF is the tax rate established annually by the State for ERAF and by the Board of Supervisors for the City pursuant to the California Revenue and Taxation Code.

Threshold Criteria 8 Does Not Specify ERAF's Excess Share of Tax Increment May Not be Re-Allocated to the City's General Fund

Threshold Criteria 8 states that excess tax increment not required to fund project area-specific public facilities should be allocated to the General Fund or to improvements in the City's seawall and other measures to protect against sea level rise. However, Threshold Criteria 8 does not specify that ERAF's excess share of tax increment may not be diverted in the manner outlined by Threshold Criteria 8. State law contains specific restrictions for how ERAF's share of tax increment may be used, as described in the Background Section of this report. Therefore, the Budget and Legislative Analyst recommends that Threshold Criteria 8 should specify that ERAF tax increment may not be re-allocated to the City's General Fund or to improvements in the City's seawall and other measures to protect against sea level rise.

POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

State Law Allows ERAF Tax Increment Intended to Fund Local Education to be used to Fund Construction of the Pier 27 Cruise Terminal and Development at Pier 70

As previously noted, ERAF's share of tax increment may be allocated to five project areas within the Port IFD and used for limited purposes. Threshold Criteria 6 specifies that the City should maximize ERAF contributions in designated project areas by allocating the maximum City contribution to those same project areas.¹⁵ The rationale for maximizing ERAF contributions is to maximize the Port's ability to pay for development of public infrastructure along the Port, such as the Cruise Terminal at Pier 27. Such allocations are subject to Board of Supervisors approval for each individual project area.

According to the Senate Appropriation Committee's fiscal summary of the State law, diverting ERAF's share of tax increment could potentially result in a State General Fund cost to backfill those monies intended for education. However, the potential State General Fund cost is unknown because the economic activity that would be generated absent a Port IFD is unclear.


¹⁵ ERAF's share of tax increment is allocated in proportion to the percentage of City tax increment allocated to the designated project areas.


Approval of the Proposed Resolution is a Policy Decision for the Board of Supervisors

The proposed Port IFD Guidelines will guide future Board of Supervisors' decisions on allocation of City and ERAF tax increment. Therefore, approval of the proposed resolution is a policy decision for the Board of Supervisors.


RECOMMENDATIONS


1. Amend the proposed resolution to request the Port to amend:
 - (a) The Port IFD Guidelines to specify that the threshold criteria must be met in order to establish a Port IFD or project area, and the strategic criteria should be considered by the Board of Supervisors but are not required to establish a Port IFD;
 - (b) Threshold Criteria 5 to require that the project area financing plan projects the net fiscal impact to the City's General Fund, as well as the net economic benefits, over the term of the Port IFD;
 - (c) Threshold Criteria 6 and 7 to specify that the share of tax increment allocated to the City and ERAF is the tax rate established annually by the State for the ERAF and by the Board of Supervisors for the City pursuant to the California Revenue and Taxation Code; and
 - (d) Threshold Criteria 8 to specify that ERAF's excess share of tax increment may not be re-allocated to the City's General Fund or to improvements in the City's seawall and other measures to protect against sea level rise.
2. Approval of the proposed resolution, as amended, is a policy decision for the Board of Supervisors.









| | | |
|---|--|--|
| <p>SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING</p> | <p>Amended Map of Proposed Boundaries of City and County of San Francisco Infrastructure Financing District No. 2 (Port of San Francisco), City and County of San Francisco, State of California</p> | <p>DATE: APR. 16, 2012 SCALE: 1" = 2000' SHEET NO. 3 OF 11 SHEETS</p> |
|---|--|--|










-  IFD PROJECT AREAS
-  INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING DISTRICT NO. 2 BOUNDARY LINE
-  AREA FOR CAPTURE OF ERAF SHARE



Port of San Francisco
Infrastructure Financing Districts in the
Northern Waterfront Defined by AB 2259



Revised 4-11-13

**Draft Guidelines for the Establishment and Use of an
Infrastructure Financing District with Project Areas on
Land under the Jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission**
(Revised 4/16/13 per Budget Analyst's recommendations)

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

Threshold Criteria: The following Threshold Criteria must be met to establish an infrastructure financing district (IFD) or project area on Port land.

- 1. At formation, limit waterfront districts and project areas to Port land.** Consistent with California Infrastructure Financing District (IFD) law (Gov. Code §§ 53395-53398.47) (IFD law), the City may form an IFD consisting only of land under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission (Port) without an election (waterfront district). The formation of a waterfront district consisting of all Port land with project areas corresponding to Port development projects within the waterfront district¹ will be subject to the criteria in these *Guidelines for Establishment and Use of Infrastructure Financing Districts and Project Areas on Land under the Jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission* (Port Guidelines). The City will consider allocating property tax increment from a project area to the waterfront district when the Port submits a project area-specific infrastructure financing plan that specifies: (a) the public facilities to be financed by tax increment² generated in the project area; (b) the projected cost of the proposed public facilities; (c) the projected amount of tax increment that will be generated over the term of the project area; (d) the amount of tax increment that is proposed to be allocated to the IFD to finance public facilities; and (e) any other matters required under IFD law.
- 2. Consider requests to annex non-Port land to a project area on a case-by-case basis.** If an owner of non-Port land adjacent to a project area petitions to add the adjacent property to the project area in accordance with the IFD law, the City will consider on a case-by-case basis: (a) whether to annex the non-Port property to the project area to assist in financing public facilities; and (b) the extent to which tax increment generated by the non-Port land but not used for Port public facilities should be subject to the *Guidelines for the Establishment and Use of Infrastructure Financing Districts in the City and County of San Francisco* (City Guidelines).³
- 3. Require completion of environmental review and the affirmative recommendation of the Capital Planning Committee before approving any infrastructure financing plan that allocates tax increment from a project area.** The City may form the Port-wide waterfront district without allocating tax increment to the waterfront district. The City will

¹ In accordance with Board of Supervisors intent as stated in Board Resolution No. 110-12, adopted on March 27, 2012, and Board Resolution No. 227-12, adopted on June 12, 2012. These Port Guidelines will apply even if the Board later decides to create multiple IFDs on Port land, rather than a single waterfront district.

² IFD law generally authorizes certain classes of public facilities to be financed through IFDs. The Legislature has broadened the types of authorized public facilities for waterfront districts to include: (1) remediation of hazardous materials in, on, under, or around any real or tangible property; (2) seismic and life-safety improvements to existing buildings; (3) rehabilitation, restoration, and preservation of structures, buildings, or other facilities having special historical, architectural, or aesthetic interest or value and that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places individually or because of their location within an eligible registered historic district, or are listed on a state or local register of historic landmarks; (4) structural repairs and improvements to piers, seawalls, and wharves, and installation of piles; (5) removal of bay fill; (6) stormwater management facilities, other utility infrastructure, or public open-space improvements; (7) shoreline restoration; (8) other repairs and improvements to maritime facilities; (9) planning and design work that is directly related to any public facilities authorized to be financed by a waterfront district; (10) reimbursement payments made to the California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank in accordance with IFD law; (11) improvements, which may be publicly owned, to protect against potential sea level rise; (12) Port maritime facilities at Pier 27; (13) shoreside power installations at Port maritime facilities; and (14) improvements to publicly-owned waterfront lands used as public spectator viewing sites for America's Cup activities in San Francisco. Gov. Code §§ 53395.3, 53395.8(d), and 53395.81(c)(1).

³ Adopted on February 8, 2011, by the Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 66-11. The City Guidelines do not apply to IFDs on land owned or managed by the Port.

not approve an infrastructure financing plan that would allocate property tax increment to the waterfront district from any project area, however, until the following have occurred: (a) the City has completed environmental review of the proposed development project associated with the project area and any proposed public facilities to be financed with property tax increment from the project area; and (b) the Capital Planning Committee has recommended approval of the related infrastructure financing plan.

4. **Public facilities financed by tax increment must be consistent with applicable laws, policies, and the Port's capital plan.** Project areas in the waterfront district must finance public facilities that are consistent with: (a) IFD law; (b) the Port's Waterfront Land Use Plan; (c) any restrictions imposed by the public trust for commerce, navigation, and fisheries, the Burton Act (stats. 1968, ch. 1333), or other applicable statute; and (d) the Port's 10-Year Capital Plan, all as in effect on the date the City approves any project area infrastructure financing plan.
5. **The Port must demonstrate the net fiscal impact of the proposed project area on the City's General Fund and show that the project area will result in a net economic benefit to the City, including the Port.** The Port must include in the infrastructure financing plan for each project area: (a) the total amount of revenue that the City's General Fund is projected to receive and the projected costs to the City's General Fund over the term of the project area; and (b) the number of jobs and other economic development benefits that the project assisted by the waterfront district is projected to produce over the term of the project area. The projections in the infrastructure financing plan should be similar to those prepared to demonstrate that certain projects are fiscally feasible and responsible in accordance with Administrative Code Chapter 29 and include projections of direct and indirect financial benefits to the City, construction costs, available funding to pay project costs, ongoing operating and maintenance costs, and debt service.
6. **Where applicable, maximize State contributions to project areas through matching City contributions.** IFD law authorizes the allocation of the State's share of property tax increment to certain Port project areas in proportion to the City's allocation of tax increment to the Port project area to assist in financing specified Port public facilities, such as historic preservation at Pier 70 and the Port's new James R. Herman Cruise Terminal at Pier 27. When an allocation of the State's share of property tax increment to a Port project area is authorized under IFD law, the City will allocate to the waterfront district the amount of tax increment from the project area that will maximize the amount of the State's tax increment that is available to fund authorized public facilities. In accordance with the California Revenue and Taxation Code, the Board of Supervisors annually approves the share of City property tax dollars allocated to the City (\$0.646 in FY 2012-2013), and the State annually approves the State's share of City property tax dollars (\$0.253 in FY 2012-2013). To maximize State contributions to project areas through matching City contributions in project areas where the City's use of the State's share is authorized, the City would budget up to \$0.90 per the sum of all of the City's share of property tax dollars from the project area plus all of the State's share of property tax dollars from the project area (i.e., the sum of \$0.65 of tax increment allocated by the City to the waterfront district from the project area and the State's share of tax increment), until the earlier to occur of: (a) full financing of the authorized public facilities by tax increment; or (b) the allocation to the waterfront district of the full amount of tax increment from the project area authorized under the approved infrastructure financing plan.
7. **Determine the amount of tax increment to be allocated to the waterfront district from a project area in relation to project economics.** The City will consider approving infrastructure financing plans for Port project areas that provide for allocations of tax increment of up to \$0.65 per up to the sum of property tax dollars allocated to the City from

Formatted: Font: Not Bold

the project area in accordance with tax rates established annually by the Board of Supervisors for the City, or, where permitted by IFD law, the sum of the City's share of property tax dollars from the project area \$0.65 of tax increment so that, in combination with plus State the State's share of property tax dollars from the project area as established annually by the State's share of tax increment, the total allocated is up to \$0.90 per property tax dollar, to fund authorized public facilities necessary for each proposed development project. Each infrastructure financing plan must include projections of the amount of tax increment that will be needed to fund necessary public facilities. The allocation should be sufficient to enable the Port to: (a) obtain fair market rent for Port ground leases after build-out of the project area; and (b) enable proposed development projects to attract private equity. No tax increment will be used to pay a developer's return on equity or other internal profit metric in excess of limits imposed by applicable state and federal law; the IFD law currently measures permissible developer return by reference to a published bond index and both the State Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act and federal tax law require a return that is consistent with industry standards. The Board of Supervisors in its discretion may allocate additional tax increment to other public facilities serving the waterfront district that require funding.

An approved infrastructure financing plan will state the City's agreement that, for any debt secured by tax increment allocated to the waterfront district from a project area to finance authorized public facilities, the City will disburse tax increment to the waterfront district from the project area in amounts sufficient to fund: (a) debt service and debt service coverage for bonds issued under IFD law (IFD Bonds), bonds issued under the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982⁴ (CFD Bonds), and other forms of indebtedness that the Port is authorized to issue to fund public facilities authorized to be financed in the infrastructure financing plan to the extent not funded by special tax levies; and (b) costs of administration and authorized public facilities on a pay-as-you-go basis.

8. **Use excess tax increment for citywide purposes.** Any portion of the City's share of Tax increment that the City allocated to the waterfront district from the project area but that is not required to fund eligible project-specific public facilities will be re-allocated to the City's General Fund or to improvements to the City's seawall and other measures to protect the City against sea level rise or other foreseeable risks to the City's waterfront. Under IFD law, any portion of the State's share of tax increment not needed to fund eligible public facilities reverts to the State and may not be re-allocated for citywide purposes.
9. **Port Capital Budget.** If the Port issues Port revenue bonds (instead of CFD Bonds or IFD Bonds) to be repaid by tax increment revenue generated in one or more Port project areas, to further the purposes Port Commission Resolution No. 12-22 adopting the Port's Policy for Funding Capital Budget Expenditures, the Port will include annually in its Capital Budget any tax increment revenue allocated to the waterfront district from the project area to provide debt service coverage on any Port revenue bond debt payable from tax increment.
10. **Require each project area infrastructure financing plan to identify sources of funding to construct, operate, and maintain public facilities financed by project area tax increment.** Tax increment will be allocated to the waterfront district from a project area under a project area infrastructure financing plan only if the Port has identified anticipated sources of funding to construct, operate, and maintain any public facilities to be financed with project area tax increment. Examples of acceptable sources for operation and maintenance are: (a) private financing mechanisms, such as a homeowners association assessment; (b) a supplemental special tax levied by a community facilities district formed

⁴ Gov. Code §§ 553311-53368.3 (Mello-Ross Act).

under the Mello-Roos Act or assessments levied by a community benefits district; and (c) the Port's maintenance budget or other allocation of the Port Harbor Fund.

Strategic Criteria: are to be considered by the Board of Supervisors, but are not required to establish a Port IFD or project area.

Formatted: Keep with next, Keep lines together

Formatted: Font: Not Bold, No underline

- **Use Port IFD financing for public facilities serving Port land where other Port moneys are insufficient.** Port IFD financing should be used to finance public facilities serving Port land when the Port does not otherwise have sufficient funds.
- **Use Port IFD financing to leverage non-City resources.** Port IFD financing should be used to leverage additional regional, state, and federal funds. For example, IFD funds may prove instrumental in securing matching federal or state dollars for transportation projects.
- **Continue the Port's "best-practices" citizen participation procedures to help establish priorities for public facilities serving Port land.** Continue to use the Port's "best-practices" citizen participation procedures to: (a) establish community and municipal priorities for construction of infrastructure serving Port land; and (b) ensure that infrastructure financing plans for Port project areas provide financing to help the Port and the City meet those priorities.
- **The Port, the Mayor's Budget Office, and the Controller should collaborate to conduct periodic nexus studies.** No less than every ten years, the Port, the Mayor's Budget Office, and the Controller should collaborate on a nexus study. The nexus analysis will examine whether the cost of basic municipal services provided to Port property, such as services provided by the Fire and Police Departments, is covered by the sum of: (a) the portion of property taxes the City receives from Port land that is not allocated to the waterfront district; (b) hotel, sales, payroll or gross receipts, and any other taxes the City receives from Port land; and (c) any other revenues that the City receives from Port land.

Draft
Guidelines for the Establishment and Use of an
Infrastructure Financing District with Project Areas on
Land under the Jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission

Threshold Criteria:

- 1. At formation, limit waterfront districts and project areas to Port land.** Consistent with California Infrastructure Financing District (IFD) law (Gov. Code §§ 53395-53398.47), the City may form an IFD consisting only of land under the jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission (Port) without an election (waterfront district). The formation of a waterfront district consisting of all Port land with project areas corresponding to Port development projects within the waterfront district¹ will be subject to the criteria in these *Guidelines for Establishment and Use of Infrastructure Financing Districts and Project Areas on Land under the Jurisdiction of the San Francisco Port Commission* (Port Guidelines). The City will consider allocating property tax increment from a project area to the waterfront district when the Port submits a project area-specific infrastructure financing plan that specifies: (a) the public facilities to be financed by tax increment² generated in the project area; (b) the projected cost of the proposed public facilities; (c) the projected amount of tax increment that will be generated over the term of the project area; (d) the amount of tax increment that is proposed to be allocated to the IFD to finance public facilities; and (e) any other matters required under IFD law.
- 2. Consider requests to annex non-Port land to a project area on a case-by-case basis.** If an owner of non-Port land adjacent to a project area petitions to add the adjacent property to the project area in accordance with the IFD law, the City will consider on a case-by-case basis: (a) whether to annex the non-Port property to the project area to assist in financing public facilities; and (b) the extent to which tax increment generated by the non-Port land but not used for Port public facilities should be subject to the *Guidelines for the Establishment and Use of Infrastructure Financing Districts in the City and County of San Francisco* (City Guidelines).³
- 3. Require completion of environmental review and the affirmative recommendation of the Capital Planning Committee before approving any infrastructure financing plan that allocates tax increment from a project area.** The City may form the Port-wide waterfront district without allocating tax increment to the waterfront district. The City will not approve an infrastructure financing plan that would allocate property tax increment to the

¹ In accordance with Board of Supervisors intent as stated in Board Resolution No. 110-12, adopted on March 27, 2012, and Board Resolution No. 227-12, adopted on June 12, 2012. These Port Guidelines will apply even if the Board later decides to create multiple IFDs on Port land, rather than a single waterfront district.

² IFD law generally authorizes certain classes of public facilities to be financed through IFDs. The Legislature has broadened the types of authorized public facilities for waterfront districts to include: (1) remediation of hazardous materials in, on, under, or around any real or tangible property; (2) seismic and life-safety improvements to existing buildings; (3) rehabilitation, restoration, and preservation of structures, buildings, or other facilities having special historical, architectural, or aesthetic interest or value and that are listed on the National Register of Historic Places, are eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places individually or because of their location within an eligible registered historic district, or are listed on a state or local register of historic landmarks; (4) structural repairs and improvements to piers, seawalls, and wharves, and installation of piles; (5) removal of bay fill; (6) stormwater management facilities, other utility infrastructure, or public open-space improvements; (7) shoreline restoration; (8) other repairs and improvements to maritime facilities; (9) planning and design work that is directly related to any public facilities authorized to be financed by a waterfront district; (10) reimbursement payments made to the California Infrastructure and Economic Development Bank in accordance with IFD law; (11) improvements, which may be publicly owned, to protect against potential sea level rise; (12) Port maritime facilities at Pier 27; (13) shoreside power installations at Port maritime facilities; and (14) improvements to publicly-owned waterfront lands used as public spectator viewing sites for America's Cup activities in San Francisco. Gov. Code §§ 53395.3, 53395.8(d), and 53395.81(c)(1).

³ Adopted on February 8, 2011, by the Board of Supervisors Resolution No. 66-11. The City Guidelines do not apply to IFDs on land owned or managed by the Port.

waterfront district from any project area, however, until the following have occurred: (a) the City has completed environmental review of the proposed development project associated with the project area and any proposed public facilities to be financed with property tax increment from the project area; and (b) the Capital Planning Committee has recommended approval of the related infrastructure financing plan.

4. **Public facilities financed by tax increment must be consistent with applicable laws, policies, and the Port's capital plan.** Project areas in the waterfront district must finance public facilities that are consistent with: (a) IFD law; (b) the Port's Waterfront Land Use Plan; (c) any restrictions imposed by the public trust for commerce, navigation, and fisheries, the Burton Act (stats. 1968, ch. 1333), or other applicable statute; and (d) the Port's 10-Year Capital Plan, all as in effect on the date the City approves any project area infrastructure financing plan.
5. **The Port must demonstrate that the project area will result in a net economic benefit to the City, including the Port.** The Port must include in the infrastructure financing plan for each project area: (a) the total amount of revenue that the City's General Fund is projected to receive over the term of the project area; and (b) the number of jobs and other economic development benefits that the project assisted by the waterfront district is projected to produce over the term of the project area. The projections in the infrastructure financing plan should be similar to those prepared to demonstrate that certain projects are fiscally feasible and responsible in accordance with Administrative Code Chapter 29.
6. **Where applicable, maximize State contributions to project areas through matching City contributions.** IFD law authorizes the allocation of the State's share of property tax increment to certain Port project areas in proportion to the City's allocation of tax increment to the Port project area to assist in financing specified Port public facilities, such as historic preservation at Pier 70 and the Port's new James R. Herman Cruise Terminal at Pier 27. When an allocation of the State's share of property tax increment to a Port project area is authorized under IFD law, the City will allocate to the waterfront district the amount of tax increment from the project area that will maximize the amount of the State's tax increment that is available to fund authorized public facilities. To do so, the City would budget up to \$0.90 per property tax dollar (i.e., the sum of \$0.65 of tax increment allocated by the City to the waterfront district from the project area and the State's share of tax increment), until the earlier to occur of: (a) full financing of the authorized public facilities by tax increment; or (b) the allocation to the waterfront district of the full amount of tax increment from the project area authorized under the approved infrastructure financing plan.
7. **Determine the amount of tax increment to be allocated to the waterfront district from a project area in relation to project economics.** The City will consider approving infrastructure financing plans for Port project areas that provide for allocations of tax increment of up to \$0.65 per property tax dollar, or, where permitted by IFD law, \$0.65 of tax increment so that, in combination with State's share of tax increment, the total allocated is up to \$0.90 per property tax dollar, to fund authorized public facilities necessary for each proposed development project. Each infrastructure financing plan must include projections of the amount of tax increment that will be needed to fund necessary public facilities. The allocation should be sufficient to enable the Port to: (a) obtain fair market rent for Port ground leases after build-out of the project area; and (b) enable proposed development projects to attract private equity. No tax increment will be used to pay a developer's return on equity or other internal profit metric in excess of limits imposed by applicable state and federal law; the IFD law currently measures permissible developer return by reference to a published bond index and both the State Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act and federal tax law require a return that is consistent with industry standards. The Board of Supervisors

in its discretion may allocate additional tax increment to other public facilities serving the waterfront district that require funding.

An approved infrastructure financing plan will state the City's agreement that, for any debt secured by tax increment allocated to the waterfront district from a project area to finance authorized public facilities, the City will disburse tax increment to the waterfront district from the project area in amounts sufficient to fund: (a) debt service and debt service coverage for bonds issued under IFD law (IFD Bonds), bonds issued under the Mello-Roos Community Facilities Act of 1982⁴ (CFD Bonds), and other forms of indebtedness that the Port is authorized to issue to fund public facilities authorized to be financed in the infrastructure financing plan to the extent not funded by special tax levies; and (b) costs of administration and authorized public facilities on a pay-as-you-go basis.

8. **Use excess tax increment for citywide purposes.** Tax increment not required to fund eligible project-specific public facilities will be allocated to the City's General Fund or to improvements to the City's seawall and other measures to protect the City against sea level rise or other foreseeable risks to the City's waterfront.
9. **Port Capital Budget.** If the Port issues Port revenue bonds (instead of CFD Bonds or IFD Bonds) to be repaid by tax increment revenue generated in one or more Port project areas, to further the purposes Port Commission Resolution No. 12-22 adopting the Port's Policy for Funding Capital Budget Expenditures, the Port will include annually in its Capital Budget any tax increment revenue allocated to the waterfront district from the project area to provide debt service coverage on any Port revenue bond debt payable from tax increment.
10. **Require each project area infrastructure financing plan to identify sources of funding to construct, operate, and maintain public facilities financed by project area tax increment.** Tax increment will be allocated to the waterfront district from a project area under a project area infrastructure financing plan only if the Port has identified anticipated sources of funding to construct, operate, and maintain any public facilities to be financed with project area tax increment. Examples of acceptable sources for operation and maintenance are: (a) private financing mechanisms, such as a homeowners association assessment; (b) a supplemental special tax levied by a community facilities district formed under the Mello-Roos Act or assessments levied by a community benefits district; and (c) the Port's maintenance budget or other allocation of the Port Harbor Fund.

Strategic Criteria

- **Use Port IFD financing for public facilities serving Port land where other Port moneys are insufficient.** Port IFD financing should be used to finance public facilities serving Port land when the Port does not otherwise have sufficient funds.
- **Use Port IFD financing to leverage non-City resources.** Port IFD financing should be used to leverage additional regional, state, and federal funds. For example, IFD funds may prove instrumental in securing matching federal or state dollars for transportation projects.
- **Continue the Port's "best-practices" citizen participation procedures to help establish priorities for public facilities serving Port land.** Continue to use the Port's "best-practices" citizen participation procedures to: (a) establish community and municipal priorities for construction of infrastructure serving Port land; and (b) ensure that


⁴ Gov. Code §§ 553311-53368.3 (Mello-Ross Act).

infrastructure financing plans for Port project areas provide financing to help the Port and the City meet those priorities.

- **The Port, the Mayor's Budget Office, and the Controller should collaborate to conduct periodic nexus studies.** No less than every ten years, the Port, the Mayor's Budget Office, and the Controller should collaborate on a nexus study. The nexus analysis will examine whether the cost of basic municipal services provided to Port property, such as services provided by the Fire and Police Departments, is covered by the sum of: (a) the portion of property taxes the City receives from Port land that is not allocated to the waterfront district; (b) hotel, sales, payroll or gross receipts, and any other taxes the City receives from Port land; and (c) any other revenues that the City receives from Port land.

CITY POLICY FOR PORT IFD



BOARD OF SUPERVISORS BUDGET COMMITTEE



INFRASTRUCTURE FINANCING DISTRICTS

- A city or county may form an Infrastructure Financing District (technically a separate political subdivision) to finance public improvements like new **streets, utility infrastructure and parks.**
- The method of financing – *tax increment* – is similar to redevelopment, where growth in property taxes may be captured for periods of up to 45 years, except that in most cases, **only local property tax may be captured.**
- Tax increment may be used to pay for infrastructure via the sale of bonds, or on a pay-as-you go basis.
- Port IFDs are structured to provide different types of public benefits than redevelopment, which focused on affordable housing. By state law, **20% of the Port IFD tax increment must be spent on parks, Bay access and fill removal and environmental remediation.**

PORT 10 YEAR CAPITAL PLAN



IFD LEGISLATIVE EFFORTS

- **SB 1085 (2005)** – Authorized the Board of Supervisors to form Infrastructure Financing Districts along Port of San Francisco property
- **AB 1199 (2010)** – Pier 70 State Share of Tax Increment
- **AB 664 & AB 2259 (2012)** – 34th America’s Cup IFD State Share of Tax Increment

PROPOSED PORT IFD POLICY

Nexus Analysis

- Charter and the Burton Act established Port Harbor Fund
- 2004 and 2008 nexus analysis (taxes and revenues from Port vs. cost of City services)
- Taxes generated from Port property are sufficient to pay for City services on leased property and the workorder budget supports services on unleased property.
- **Principle:** General Fund should not subsidize City services for unleased Port property, and the Harbor Fund should not pay for City services on leased property.

PORTWIDE IFD

- **Waterfront project areas for each project**
- **Eligible uses:**
 - Piers, docks, wharves & aprons
 - Parks and Bay access
 - Fill removal
 - Environmental remediation
 - Historic rehabilitation
 - Seawall and sea level rise
 - Port maritime facilities
 - Installation of piles
 - Seismic upgrades
 - Utility infrastructure
 - Streets and sidewalks

PROPOSED PORT IFD POLICY

1. **Port land.** Districts formed on Port property.
2. **Annexing Non-Port Land.** Case-by-case policy decision about applying existing City IFD Guidelines.
3. **CEQA.** Conduct CEQA prior to adopting an Infrastructure Financing Plan.
4. **Priority of Improvements.** Consistent with: IFD law, Waterfront Plan, public trust and Capital Plan.
5. **Economic Benefit and General Fund Impact.** Results in total net revenue to General Fund, jobs and other economic development benefits.
6. **State and City matching contributions.** Maximize use of local increment to leverage the maximum available State share.

PROPOSED PORT IFD POLICY

7. **Amount of increment allocated.** Up to **\$0.65 per property tax dollar**, or, where permitted by State law, **up to \$0.90 per property tax dollar**, until the costs of required infrastructure are fully paid or reimbursed. No increment will be used to pay a developer's return, except as permitted by law.
8. **Excess increment.** To the City's General Fund or to improvements to the City's seawall or to address sea level rise.
9. **Port Annual Capital Program.** If the Port issues revenue bonds, debt service coverage to Port Capital Program.
10. **Funding for Infrastructure Maintenance.** Identify source to maintain improvements.

PORT IFD FORMATION

- Resolution 110-12 – “City and County of San Francisco Infrastructure Financing District No. 2 (Port of San Francisco)”
- City staff will develop an Infrastructure Finance Plan (“IFP”) which will include a separate “IFP appendix” for each project
- Port, DPW, SFPUC review of horizontal infrastructure proposals and third-party cost estimates
- Mechanisms to ensure a fair infrastructure price (e.g., GMP contracts)
- CPC recommendation to full BOS regarding each IFP appendix

STRATEGIC CRITERIA & NEXUS

1. Use IFDs where other Port moneys are insufficient.
2. Use IFDs strategically to leverage non-City resources.
3. Continue the “best-practices” citizen participation procedures used to help City agencies prioritize implementation.

Conduct periodic nexus analysis every ten years to review net economic benefits to City. What are the costs of City services to the proposed development vs. general taxes (net of tax increment)?

MAJOR WATERFRONT PROJECTS¹

- **SWL 337 & Pier 48**
3.6 million sf of mixed use development, est. all-in cost of \$1.47 billion
\$341 million in tax increment captured to service debt (12.5% of total generated over 75 year term)
- **Pier 70 Waterfront Site²**
> 3.5 million sf of mixed use development, est. all-in cost of \$1.76 billion
- **Piers 30-32 and SWL 330**
~2 million sf of mixed use development, est. cost of \$875-975 million

Notes:

- 1 Figures for all development projects (sf of development, cost estimates and financial projections are conceptual, pre-entitlement projections).
- 2 The Port proposes to form a broader infrastructure financing district project area over all of Pier 70 (69 acres). The Waterfront Site is 25 acres.

SWL 337 FISCAL IMPACT

BASED ON CHAPTER 29 FISCAL FEASIBILITY REPORT PROJECTION IS SUBJECT TO REFINEMENT




- Net Fiscal Benefit to CCSF
 - \$13 million tax and dedicated revenue
 - \$2.5 million Police, Fire and DPW costs
 - = \$10.5 million annual fiscal benefit
- While SFMTA is projected to receive \$1.7 million of this amount, the full costs of SFMTA service to the site will be further analyzed during CEQA and SFMTA's related planning studies
- After IFD pays for eligible infrastructure costs, the project will generate \$8 million annually (in 2013 dollars) which the Board may allocate to the City's seawall or for General Fund purposes.

SWL 337 & PIER 48: COSTS FOR PARKS, STREETS, HISTORIC REHAB, UTILITIES AND SITE WORK

| PHASE | COMPONENT | UNINFLATED COSTS | INFLATED COSTS (3%) | START YEAR |
|---------------|------------------|----------------------|----------------------|------------|
| Entitlements: | Entitlements: | \$20,000,000 | \$20,000,000 | 2012 |
| Phase 1 | Parcels A, B & C | \$18,390,613 | \$21,523,162 | 2017 |
| Phase 1a | Parcel D Garage | \$5,216,622 | \$6,164,578 | 2017 |
| Phase 2 | Parcels G & K | \$31,832,900 | \$38,227,462 | 2018 |
| Phase 3 | Parcels E & F | \$17,362,012 | \$21,364,776 | 2019 |
| Phase 4 | Parcels H, I & J | \$14,687,489 | \$18,441,259 | 2020 |
| Total | | \$107,489,636 | \$125,721,237 | |


Notes:

- Costs presented in 2012 USD.
- Phase 4 also includes projected costs for Pier 48 of \$22,050,000 (\$28,428,311 inflated), paid through tenant-funded capital improvements and project IFD proceeds.
- Total = hard costs + 10% contingency + 25% soft costs.



Pier 70 Waterfront Site

Total Infrastructure & Site Conditions Costs



| Type of Infrastructure | Est. Cost |
|------------------------|----------------------|
| Entitlements | \$21,000,000 |
| Roads and Utilities | \$38,856,000 |
| Site Preparation | \$27,837,000 |
| Seacant Wall | \$23,413,000 |
| Open Space | \$28,894,000 |
| Site Remediation | \$11,452,000 |
| Off-site Improvements | \$26,894,000 |
| Total | \$178,346,000 |

Notes:

- Costs presented in 2012 USD.
- Does not include approximately \$90 million in historic building rehab work, net costs of which (after federal historic tax credits and building revenues) will be eligible for IFD reimbursement.

WARRIORS: FISCAL FEASIBILITY & COSTS

1. **Direct & indirect economic benefits of the project**
 - City Revenue: \$19.4M (inc. tax increment) / \$53.8M (one-time)
 - Visitor Spending: \$60M/year
 - Jobs: 2,623 (construction) / 1,757 (permanent)


2. **Construction costs: \$875-975M (hard & soft costs)**
 - City will reimburse Warriors for agreed improvements to Piers 30-32 capped at \$120 M
 - Reimbursement from 3 sources: Piers 30-32 Rent Credits, Sale Price of SWL 330, IFD





SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
 PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO
 DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING

Amended Map of Proposed Boundaries of City and County of San Francisco Infrastructure Financing District No. 2 (Port of San Francisco), City and County of San Francisco, State of California

DATE: APR. 16, 2012
 SCALE: 1" = 2000'
 SHEET NO. 2
 OF 11 SHEETS








Amended Map of Proposed Boundaries of City and County of San Francisco Infrastructure Financing District No. 2 (Port of San Francisco), City and County of San Francisco, State of California

DATE: APR. 19, 2012
 SCALE: 1" = 100'
 SHEET NO. 8
 OF 11 SHEETS

SAN FRANCISCO PORT COMMISSION
 PORT OF SAN FRANCISCO
 DEPARTMENT OF ENGINEERING



Port of San Francisco
 Infrastructure Financing Districts in the
 Northern Waterfront Defined by AB 2259

0 250 500 1,000 Feet

Revised 4-11-13

