



District Review Committee
June 20, 2024 – 8:15 a.m.
Post Falls City Hall – Ante Room

1. Call to Order, Commissioner Roll Call
2. Conflict Disclosure
3. Citizen Comments
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. Engineer's Estimate of Project Costs – Millworx Project, Downtown District **Action**
5. Minor/Small Project Funding – Agency OPA revision **Action**
6. 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
District Review Committee**

June 20, 2024 – Post Falls City Hall – Council Chambers Ante-room

CALL TO ORDER, ROLL CALL

Chairman Collin Coles called the meeting to order at 8:15 a.m. Present in addition to Coles were Commissioner Melissa Hjeltness, Commissioner Pat Leffel and Executive Director Joseph Johns.

CONFLICT DISCLOSURE

None

CITIZEN COMMENT

None

Engineer's Estimate of Project Costs – Millworx Project, Downtown District. The original engineer's estimate of costs for the roundabout at Idaho St./4th Ave. were included into the Owner Participation Agreement with A&A Construction via the First Addendum to the OPA, approved in December 2023. Director Johns provided the committee members with copies of the revised engineer's estimate of project costs including the public art component. Commissioner Coles questioned the reimbursement of public art based on previous agency policy revisions. Johns clarified that "Public Art" remained as a project in the District Plan. Coles wanted to know if it had to be, "commission approved public art or something like that" according to policy. Johns answered that there had been no such revision to policy. Coles recalled removing public art from agency policy due to its subjectivity. Commissioner Hjeltness highlighted several items included in the estimated costs and sought clarification of the review process undertaken by the Agency to ensure the costs were necessary and reasonable. Johns explained that all the components of the construction project were according to design plan requirements reviewed and approved by the City. Furthermore, the as-built components, quantities and costs would be verified by the Agency's consulting engineers once construction was completed and reimbursement was being sought. Only approved, constructed and verified reasonable costs can receive approval for reimbursement. After further questions and discussion the committee recommended to have the revised cost estimates, including the public art component, included in a Second Addendum to the Owner Participation Agreement for consideration by the full Commission.

Minor/Small Project Funding – Agency OPA Revision. The proposed revision of the Agency Owner Participation Agreement is intended to accompany the implementation a Minor Project reimbursement concept being considered as part of a revision to Agency Policy #7 – Reimbursement from Tax Increment. The proposed revision to the OPA simply includes within Section 6.2 (reimbursement priority) the reimbursement of minor projects. Commissioner Coles outlined his intended concept of minor project support which is distinctly different than the current proposal. Coles would like to discuss a concept that calculates what proportion of the all the projects listed in a district plan are for non-site-specific projects (such as sidewalks, curbing, etc. along sections of public right-of-way, upsizing of lines, mains, etc.) critical to the success of the district that are unlikely to be completed by a proponent/developer. The resulting percentage of these kinds of projects would serve as an indicator of what would then be "reserved" from estimated increment tax revenues to fund their construction. A proponent/developer would be aware at the outset what percentage of increment tax revenue would not be available to them for reimbursement of their projects. Any unused minor project funds available toward the end of the district term could be released for other approved reimbursables within the plan. This concept wouldn't apply to URD's where the proponent is responsible for all the planned improvements, like the closed Expo District. The concept would require more work during the design

and implementation of a district but it would provide the opportunity to complete projects within a district that aren't the responsibility of a proponent/developer. The committee would like to discuss the concept further at the upcoming commission workshop.

ADJOURNMENT

Meeting was adjourned @ 8:55 a.m.

Respectfully submitted,



Joseph Johns, Executive Director



Collin Coles, Chairman