



Commission Workshop Agenda
September 19, 2024 - 9:20 am
Chamber Conference Room
201 E 4th Avenue, Post Falls ID 83854

1. Call to Order, Commissioner Roll Call
2. Conflict Disclosure
3. Citizen Comment
This section of the agenda is reserved for citizens wishing to address the Commission regarding an Agency related issue. Comments related to future public hearings should be held for that public hearing. Persons wishing to speak will have 5 minutes.
4. Minor Projects Program **ACTION ITEM**
5. Urban Renewal topics for Joint Workshop with City
6. Commissioner Comments
7. Adjournment

Requests for accommodation of special needs to participate in the meeting should be addressed to the Office of the Executive Director, 201 E. 4th Avenue, Post Falls, Idaho 83854, or call (208) 777-8151.

Mission Statement: To encourage sound economic and community improvement that enhances the overall quality of life in Post Falls by: providing and improving infrastructure, attracting jobs, and enhancing citizen safety and health.

POST FALLS URBAN RENEWAL MINUTES

Workshop Minutes

September 19, 2024 – Chamber of Commerce – Board Room

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL

Chairman Jamè Davis called the meeting to order at 9:20 a.m. Executive Director Joseph Johns called the roll. Present, in addition to Davis were Commissioners Collin Coles, Eric Clemensen, Melissa Hjeltness, Len Crosby, and Pat Leffel. Commissioner Fleischman was absent. Counselor Pete Bredeson was also present.

CONFLICT DISCLOSURE

None

CITIZEN COMMENT

None

MINOR PROJECTS PROGRAM. Executive Director Johns informed the Commission of the process by which the Minor Projects Program documentation was initially drafted and subsequently reviewed/ revised by both Johns and Counselor Bredeson. Crosby asked Bredeson if agency policy was amended to include the Minor Projects Program, could the district plan for any new district include the language, "such minor projects as may come to the attention of the Commission and are determined by the Commission to be in keeping with the guidelines and objectives of the district"? Bredeson stated he thought it would be fine as long as projects met the district plan objectives. Crosby provided an overview of the August 28, 2024, meeting with representatives of A&A Construction about the Minor Project Program guidelines and the potential of implementing it in the Downtown District. At the meeting Johns provided an impact analysis to the reimbursement of A&A Construction in the Downtown District should they agree to an amendment of the current OPA. Commissioner Coles would prefer the use of "ancillary projects" or something other than "minor projects" for the program name since such projects could lend toward the completion of major projects contained in a district plan. Additionally, the specification of business types, particularly non-profits, should not be contained in the program guidelines according to Coles. Commissioner Davis responded the intent is to prevent any existing business from being left out. Among the business community there is a perspective that urban renewal funds only go to benefit new businesses. Crosby added that the proposed program facilitates an expansion of existing districts to benefit existing businesses and it isn't intended to attract new employers into a district. Commissioner Clemensen asked if the program could be characterized as a means to fund unfunded mandates. Coles confirmed and commented further the program addresses projects having nothing to do directly with jobs. It could provide for filling in infrastructure gaps or complete a missing link of existing infrastructure. Crosby noted prior processes of addressing, with the City, projects beneficial to the community toward the end of a district's life, such as the roundabouts constructed by the City when the East Post Falls District came to a close. Coles would like addressing such projects during the formation of a district. These projects could be identified by the City and a percentage of the anticipated increment revenue covering their estimated cost could be withheld up front and put into a fund for the projects. Crosby responded that while it's possible for the City to identify projects to be put into a plan, it's not possible to know projects clearly enough twenty years ahead of time. Coles stated the City knows what needs to get done, but whether it gets done or not is the issue. There needs to be a means to set funds aside for fill-in projects which is what the whole concept should be. Crosby believes that is already built into the program as it is. Bredeson added that "minor projects" is a pretty open, general term which is why he created it, used it. Crosby clarified that the current proposed program has a project limit of \$250,000 which is defensible while allowing urban renewal to help existing businesses. Davis agreed that the name Minor Projects provides a good description. Clemensen asked whether the amount set aside is to be \$250K per year, for the life of the district, or per project? Crosby

responded that in the meeting with A&A Construction it was explained that a limit of \$250K would come out with future proponent/participants, but that their OPA couldn't be amended without their consent. Johns clarified that fifteen percent of the annual increment tax received would go into the minor projects fund with the fund having a cap of \$250K. In years when the fund held \$250K, and no minor projects are being funded, all the incoming increment tax received would go toward reimbursement of the existing obligations to proponent/developers. This concept was viewed favorably by A&A Construction. Johns described an impact analysis presented to A&A Construction at the meeting. Their full reimbursement is estimated to be prolonged by one-year if the Minor Project Program is implemented and they are willing to amend the current OPA to begin the allocation of increment tax to the fund in the Downtown District. Clemensen asked if a program participant would have to accept delayed reimbursement if the fund balance was insufficient to provide full reimbursement initially. Crosby replied that a participant could go to their lender for a short-term loan with a commitment for reimbursement from urban renewal. Crosby clarified that the program requires applicants to provide cost estimates and owner/landlord consent if the property is leased. Reimbursement consideration will require documentation of actual costs, completion of the project, and acceptance from the City. Bredeson has prepared a draft Minor Project Reimbursement Agreement which spells out the requirements for reimbursement and will be legally binding. Coles voiced a desire to spend more time clarifying details of the program. Crosby asked Commissioner Hjeltness her opinion from a real estate perspective. Hjeltness stated she sees it helping, "the little guy", and agrees with it. It has the potential to improve the appearance of property, including the completion of missing sidewalks. Coles voiced concern the program is limited to commercial participants when a need exists to complete things like sidewalks located other areas yet are in the district plan. Clemensen asked if citizens went to the City and requested improvements that meet district plan criteria, like sidewalks, could they be funded. Coles responded the City could do it and seek reimbursement. Crosby responded that if something is in the district plan, we can do it. Davis noted that it would fall under the regular reimbursement process. Crosby added that if the City wants to do something they can do it and get reimbursement from urban renewal, just like stop lights, etc. Coles would like the City to approve, or vet, all such projects and leave reimbursement as the only consideration by urban renewal. He would also prefer the program parameters on façade improvements be changed or removed since it's a matter of opinion, like public art. Hjeltness voiced support of projects utilizing concrete or brick as they are more timeless and improve the appearance of the community more than other materials. Bredeson clarified that the program language states, "façade related improvements that promote district plan objectives and are authorized by the plan" which is not completely subjective. Coles added that the district plan doesn't contain much detail regarding facades. Bredeson noted the district plan contains general objectives and program projects would have to be analyzed for whether they met them. Crosby asked for clarification about whether a motion was needed to adopt the program. Coles responded it needs more work. Bredeson recommended that it be considered as an addendum to Policy #7 instead of as a separate draft document. Crosby asked if Bredeson would redraft the Minor Projects Program guidelines as a policy addendum for presentation and consideration at a future meeting. Bredeson agreed and stated it could be ready next month. Davis asked for a motion to have the program added to Policy #7. Commissioner Crosby made a motion to adopt the program as part of Policy #7, seconded by Clemensen. Roll Call Vote: Leffel – Aye; Coles – Nay; Crosby – Aye; Hjeltness – Aye; Clemensen – Aye; Davis – Aye. Motion carried.

URBAN RENEWAL TOPICS FOR JOINT WORKSHOP WITH CITY. Commissioner Crosby recommended getting ideas and direction from the City Council on creating a new district, possibly two. Commissioner Coles agreed, and would like the meetings to include more substantive discussion. Commissioner Davis noted that the subject of a new district was on the previous joint workshop agenda. Executive Director Johns stated members of the City Council spoke favorably toward the idea of a new district, but not in specific terms. City staff is also very favorable of a new district. Crosby also recommended the subject of Public Art. He would like the City to have a Public Art Commission and take it off the table of urban renewal. Coles agreed. Crosby believes the City has room to grow public art but it needs to be something the City does, likely through a commission. Davis described serving previously on a public art committee which could possibly be

reestablished. It may have been something the Mayor put together and the structure for it might already exist. Hjeltness would also like to remove public art out of consideration by urban renewal. Johns clarified the Downtown URD Plan includes public art so it will likely remain an urban renewal topic until the district closes in 2041. Davis said it is a matter of who's approving the art. Clemensen and Coles would like public art to not be a part of future districts. Coles believes a new district along East Seltice Avenue has good potential but working out the details could be difficult. Crosby agreed. Coles would like to see the Pleasant View District closed and started again someday if things can come together. The time passed since its formation without development may be too much to overcome. Clemensen asked Johns if the City was continuing to seek grant opportunities that would benefit the Pleasant View District. Johns will check with the City. Crosby suggested Johns meet with the City Administrator to discuss potential workshop topics. Hjeltness suggested annexation of property into the City for a URD along East Seltice could be problematic. Coles believes it may be possible for the City to incentivize annexation and closing Pleasant View could provide a basis for opening a new URD. Hjeltness excused herself from the workshop at 10:07am. Johns will put together a list of workshop topics to propose to the City. Crosby recommended that Chairman Davis join Johns in a meeting with the City about the joint workshop topics and how to facilitate the most productive use of the time.


COMMISSIONER COMMENTS

No additional comments

ADJOURNMENT

The workshop was adjourned at 10:13 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph Johns, Executive Director



Jame Davis, Chairman