



**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
SPECIAL MEETING AGENDA**

**JANUARY 31, 2023
5:30 PM**

Location: City Council Chambers, 408 N. Spokane Street, Post Falls, ID 83854

THE MEETING MAY BE VIEWED ON CABLE CHANNEL 1300 OR LIVESTREAMED ON THE CITY'S YOUTUBE CHANNEL (<https://www.youtube.com/c/CityofPostFallsIdaho>).

WRITTEN TESTIMONY AT PUBLIC HEARINGS IN LIEU OF ATTENDING IN PERSON IS ENCOURAGED. WRITTEN TESTIMONY WILL BE CONSIDERED TO THE SAME EXTENT AS LIVE TESTIMONY.

SPECIAL MEETING – 5:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

*** PLEASE TURN OFF YOUR CELL PHONES ***

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL OF PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Carey, Hampe, Steffensen, Davis, Kimball, Ward, Schlotthauer

CEREMONIES, ANNOUNCEMENTS, APPOINTMENTS, PRESENTATION:

AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Final action cannot be taken on an item added to the agenda after the start of the meeting unless an emergency is declared that requires action at the meeting. The declaration and justification must be approved by motion of the Council.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT, EX-PARTE CONTACTS AND SITE VISITS

Commission members are requested to declare if there is a conflict of interest, real or potential, pertaining to items on the agenda.

1. CONSENT CALENDAR

The consent calendar includes items which require formal Commission action, but which are typically routine or not of great controversy. Individual Commission members may ask that any specific item be removed from the consent calendar in order that it be discussed in greater detail. Explanatory information is included in the Commission agenda packet regarding these items and any contingencies are part of the approval.

ACTION ITEMS:

- a. Meeting Minutes 1-10-2023

2. CITIZEN ISSUES

This section of the agenda is reserved for citizens wishing to address the Commission on an issue that is not on the agenda. Persons wishing to speak will have 5 minutes. Comments related to pending public hearings, including decisions that may be appealed to the City Council, are out of order and should be held for that public hearing. Repeated comments regarding the same or similar topics previously addressed are out of order and will not be allowed. Comments regarding performance by city employees are inappropriate at this time and should be directed to the Mayor, by subsequent appointment. In order to ensure adequate public notice, Idaho Law provides that any item, other than emergencies, requiring action must be placed on the agenda of an upcoming meeting. As such, the Commission cannot take action on items raised during citizens issues at the same meeting but may request additional information or that the item be placed on a future agenda.

NONE

3. UNFINISHED / OLD BUSINESS

This section of the agenda is to continue consideration of items that have been previously discussed by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

There are generally two types of public hearings. In a legislative hearing, such as adopting an ordinance amending the zoning code or Comprehensive Plan amendments, the Mayor and City Council may consider any input provided by the public. In quasi-judicial hearings, such as subdivisions, special use permits and zone change requests, the Mayor and City Council must follow procedures similar to those used in court to ensure the fairness of the hearing. Additionally, the Mayor and City Council can only consider testimony that relates to the adopted approval criteria for each matter. Residents or visitors wishing to testify upon an item before the Council must sign up in advance and provide enough information to allow the Clerk to properly record their testimony in the official record of the City Council. Hearing procedures call for submission of information from City staff, then presentation by the applicant (15 min.), followed by public testimony (4 min. each) and finally the applicant's rebuttal testimony (8 min.). Testimony should be addressed to the City Council, only address the relevant approval criteria (in quasi-judicial matters) and not be unduly repetitious.

ACTION ITEMS:

- A. **Recommendation** Development Impact Fee Update – Jon Manley, Planning Manager, to introduce an amendment to the Development Impact Fee to accomplish: Adjust impact fees based upon inflationary cost escalations, Basis on a ten (10) to twenty (20) year growth cost depending on the Impact Fee category.

5. ADMINISTRATIVE / STAFF REPORTS

6. COMMISSION COMMENT

7. ADJOURNMENT

Questions concerning items appearing on this Agenda should be addressed to the Community Development Department – Planning Division at 408 Spokane Street or call 208-773-8708.

The City Hall building is handicapped accessible. If any person needs special equipment to accommodate their disability, please notify the City Media Center at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting date. The Media Center telephone number is 208-457-3341.

Chair: Ryan Davis Vice Chair: Ray Kimball
Members: Vicky Jo Cary, Nancy Hampe, Ross Schlotthauer, James Steffensen, Kevin Ward



**PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION
MEETING MINUTES**

**JANUARY 10, 2023
5:30 PM**

Location: City Council Chambers, 408 N. Spokane Street, Post Falls, ID 83854

THE MEETING MAY BE VIEWED ON CABLE CHANNEL 1300 OR LIVESTREAMED ON THE CITY'S YOUTUBE CHANNEL (<https://www.youtube.com/c/CityofPostFallsIdaho>).

WRITTEN TESTIMONY AT PUBLIC HEARINGS IN LIEU OF ATTENDING IN PERSON IS ENCOURAGED. WRITTEN TESTIMONY WILL BE CONSIDERED TO THE SAME EXTENT AS LIVE TESTIMONY.

REGULAR MEETING – 5:30 PM

CALL TO ORDER

*** PLEASE TURN OFF YOUR CELL PHONES ***

PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

ROLL CALL OF PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION MEMBERS

Carey, Hampe, Steffensen, Davis, Kimball, Ward, Schlotthauer - Present

CEREMONIES, ANNOUNCEMENTS, APPOINTMENTS, PRESENTATION:

- NATIONAL BITTERSWEET CHOCOLATE DAY

AMENDMENTS TO THE AGENDA

Final action cannot be taken on an item added to the agenda after the start of the meeting unless an emergency is declared that requires action at the meeting. The declaration and justification must be approved by motion of the Council.

Manley- Item 3 Unfinished Old Business has the continued Recommendation for Development Impact Fee Update. It doesn't mention "Action Item", so we need to move to a later date. We can meet at our Regular February Meeting, or we can hold a Special Meeting January 31st and cancel the February Meeting.

Davis – All in favor of having it January 31st.

DECLARATION OF CONFLICT, EX-PARTE CONTACTS AND SITE VISITS

Commission members are requested to declare if there is a conflict of interest, real or potential, pertaining to items on the agenda.

NONE

1. CONSENT CALENDAR

The consent calendar includes items which require formal Commission action, but which are typically routine or not of great controversy. Individual Commission members may ask that any specific item be removed from the consent

calendar in order that it be discussed in greater detail. Explanatory information is included in the Commission agenda packet regarding these items and any contingencies are part of the approval.

ACTION ITEMS:

- a. Meeting Minutes 12-13-2022
- b. Zoning Recommendation Nagra Annexation File No. ANN-22-11
- c. Reasoned Decision Sinclair Addition Special Use Permit File No. SUP-22-4

Motion to approve as presented by Steffensen

2nd by Carey

Vote Hampe – Yes; Schlotthauer – Yes; Ward – Yes; Davis – Yes; Kimball – Yes; Carey – Yes; Steffensen - Yes

Moved

2. CITIZEN ISSUES

This section of the agenda is reserved for citizens wishing to address the Commission on an issue that is not on the agenda. Persons wishing to speak will have 5 minutes. Comments related to pending public hearings, including decisions that may be appealed to the City Council, are out of order and should be held for that public hearing. Repeated comments regarding the same or similar topics previously addressed are out of order and will not be allowed. Comments regarding performance by city employees are inappropriate at this time and should be directed to the mayor, by subsequent appointment. In order to ensure adequate public notice, Idaho Law provides that any item, other than emergencies, requiring action must be placed on the agenda of an upcoming meeting. As such, the Commission cannot take action on items raised during citizens issues at the same meeting but may request additional information or that the item be placed on a future agenda.

NONE

3. UNFINISHED / OLD BUSINESS

This section of the agenda is to continue consideration of items that have been previously discussed by the Planning and Zoning Commission.

- A. ***Continued* Recommendation** Development Impact Fee Update – Jon Manley, Planning Manager, to present an amendment to the Development Impact Fee to accomplish: Adjust impact fees based upon inflationary cost escalations, Basis on a ten (10) to twenty (20) year growth cost depending on the Impact Fee category.
Davis – This item was moved to January 31st for a Special Meeting.

4. PUBLIC HEARINGS

There are generally two types of public hearings. In a legislative hearing, such as adopting an ordinance amending the zoning code or Comprehensive Plan amendments, the Mayor and City Council may consider any input provided by the public. In quasi-judicial hearings, such as subdivisions, special use permits and zone change requests, the Mayor and City Council must follow procedures similar to those used in court to ensure the fairness of the hearing. Additionally, the Mayor and City Council can only consider testimony that relates to the adopted approval criteria for each matter. Residents or visitors wishing to testify upon an item before the Council must sign up in advance and provide enough information to allow the Clerk to properly record their testimony in the official record of the City Council. Hearing procedures call for submission of information from City staff, then presentation by the applicant (15 min.), followed by public testimony (4 min. each) and finally the applicant's rebuttal testimony (8 min.). Testimony should be addressed to the City Council, only address the relevant approval criteria (in quasi-judicial matters) and not be unduly repetitious.

ACTION ITEMS:

- A. **Recommendation** D-Bat Facility Zone Change File No. ZC-22-6 – Ethan Porter, Associate Planner, to present a request to rezone approximately 2.13 acres from Heavy Industrial (HI) to Industrial (I). The Commission is to recommend approval/denial of the requested zoning designation to City Council. To provide a recommendation to City Council for the zoning designation of Industrial (I) from Heavy Industrial (HI) on approximately 2.13 acres. This request is generally located south of E. Seltice Way east of E. Commerce Loop. The land is currently vacant that sits over the Rathdrum Prairie Aquifer and the City of Post Falls will be both water and sewer provider. It is surrounded by Industrial with 2 larger parcels directly south Heavy Industrial (a legacy zone).

Zone Change Review Criteria:

- The Future Land Use Map designates this site as commercial within the Maplewood focus area. This category includes a broad mix of commercial, retail, professional office, civic, and cultural uses. Residential uses may be permitted by the implementing zoning district and active uses are emphasized along key block frontages to focus pedestrian and commercial activity. The implementing zoning districts is per focus area. It promotes infill development, commercial and industrial uses along Seltice Way; so being just south of Seltice Way along Commerce Loop this would utilize that Seltice Way Arterial.
- In seeking long-term prosperity, residents understand the need to build economic diversity – capitalizing on access to neighboring job centers as well as developing a strong business base within City limits. There were a couple other Goals and Policies that this request is consistent with that are within the Comprehensive Plan.
- Commerce Loop is classified as a Local Commercial Roadway; Seltice Way is classified as a Principal Arterial Roadway. Future traffic patterns to/from the site are benefitted from the proximity to Seltice Way that would distribute traffic from the subject site to SH41, I-90, and Coeur d’Alene, as identified in the City’s Transportation Master Plan.
- Commerce Loop and Seltice Way can support commercial zoning.
- Not applicable
- Both Seltice Way and Commerce Loop provide sufficient access based on the City’s Master Transportation Plan and the proposed zoning.

All other agencies have been notified; the Yellowstone Pipeline responded with no impact/no comment; Kootenai County Fire and Rescue reserves comments for the review process; Post Falls Police remain neutral, and the Post Falls Highway District had no comment.

Hampe – There is still Heavy Industrial but, there is no use for it correct?

Porter – Correct. The Heavy Industrial that remains is considered a legacy zone and will require a rezone, which is the main purpose of this meeting tonight. The applicant wants to utilize the land and develop it, but the zoning must be changed first. I am not sure how much Heavy Industrial is left in the city.

Hampe – Was it ever permitted?

Porter – I believe.

Manley – At one point in time Heavy Industrial was a zone that was an allowed permitted use. Years ago, they established a code stating no additional permits are allowed on a Heavy Industrial Lot which like this area forced them to ask for a rezone to obtain permits for development.

Hampe – Wouldn't it have made more sense to just make it Industrial at that time? Because it isn't usable as Heavy Industrial now.

Manley – We can't go back in time and figure out the rationale of why they did what they did about 20 years ago.

Hampe – So, it wasn't under your watch.

Manley – It wasn't, it was before my time.

Herrington – The City typically wont rezone property, the city usually waits for landowners to come forward and request a rezone.

Hampe – I can see that but, when you say you can no longer build with the zone, you're taking away its value.

Manley – Typically, the uses within Heavy Industrial, are smokestacks, steel refining companies, they are more of a heavy pollutant for the communities. I can only guess at one point in time there was a discussion stating they wanted more clean industrial uses rather than the heavy industrial uses. So, ultimately you are increasing opportunities with Industrial and Commercial rather than the use of Heavy Industrial.

Hampe – I understand, it is just a little confusing that it even exists if there is no use for it.

Schlotthauer – Do you have an idea of what used to there?

Manley – I don't know what was out there.

Ward – I'm going to guess heavy industrial.

Manley – Yeah, I am not sure what the use was, as far as business.

Davis – I will say with landowner rights, it makes sense for them to come to us with the zone they are requesting.

Applicant – Rex Anderson with Fusion Architecture in Spokane – I've been working with Luke and Shannon on the development of this property and over the course of the development it became apparent that to develop we would need to rezone the property. Our narrative shows that our request meets the Goals and Policies within the Post Falls Municipal Code and I think Mr. Porter's introduction to the project speaks to how inline the location and zoning addresses the Future for the City of Post Falls. I also think the construction type will meet the Industrial Zoning. Luke, would you like to fill anything else in?

Luke Greenside – We want to develop this land and feel it will be a great addition to the community obviously we have a hurdle to work through with the Heavy Industrial, this request is to adjust that so we can move forward with this addition to Post Falls.

Anderson – The Commissioners comment was an interesting point; I understand land rights in Idaho and how it maybe imperative for the owners to present their case to the Jurisdiction. I feel it is an interesting case and maybe there isn't a pathway for the zoning classification to be phased out better and possibly this can be investigated further.

Testimony

In Favor - None

Neutral - None

In Opposition - None

Deliberations:

Zoning Criteria:

1. Amendments to the Zoning Map should be in accordance with the Comprehensive Plans and Future Land Use.

All Commissioners agreed this was clear

2. Amendments to the Zoning Map should be in accordance with the Goals and Policies found in the Post Falls Comprehensive Plan.
Davis – I think Porter covered it; he did a great job any other addition? No?
3. Zoning assigned to following consideration such as items of street classification, traffic patterns, existing development, future land use, community plans, geographic and natural features.
Kimball – These fits in with the existing development pattern and this is just housekeeping really.
Steffensen – Fits well with the traffic patterns too.
4. Commercial and high-density residential zoning typically assigned along streets with a higher road classification.
Not applicable
5. Limited neighborhood commercial, low-density residential zoning is typically assigned for properties as they proceed further away from higher intensity Urban activities ensuring that adequate land is available for future housing needs.
Not applicable
6. Industrial zoning is typically assigned to properties with sufficient access to major transportation routes and maybe situated away from residential zoning.
Kimball – It has access directly on Commerce Drive which is a commercial route and butts up to Seltice Way which is an arterial, so it fits.
Steffensen – It does have buffering between the residential zone that is to the south.

Motion to recommend to City Council finding it meets approval criteria in the PFMC and as outlined in our deliberations and direct staff to prepare a Zoning Recommendation with the zone change from Heavy Industrial to Industrial. - Hampe

2nd by Schlotthauer

Vote Steffensen – Yes; Carey – Yes; Kimball – Yes; Ward – Yes; Schlotthauer – Yes; Hampe - Yes

Moved

- B. **Recommendation** Post Falls Title 18A Idaho St. Housekeeping Ordinance File No. TA-22-6 – Jon Manley, Planning Manager, to present adding development standards; ensuring non-residential uses on the main floor of the development along Idaho St; within Title 18A for the SC5 and SC6 zoning districts. The requested action is to review and approve the requested amendments to the Title 18A. This amendment is specific to zones SC5 and SC6; The ground floor of any structure constructed on a lot with frontage on Idaho or Spokane Streets must be used for non-residential uses. The purpose is so we don't have apartments right along the prime commercial corridors for mixed use. As you can see our downtown area is SC5 and SC4 and along 4th and Idaho St you have SC5. A Developer was looking for this part of the code that never was codified, which is why we are bringing it forward again to gain adoption in a timely manner, so applicants want this code and so does staff. SmartCode 5 encourages a walkable corridor verses a typical auto centric type of development. All agencies have been notified with Yellowstone Pipeline and Post Falls Highway District having no comment/objection.
Ward – Just north of the Freeway on Spokane St., is that part of it?
Manley – This map was part of the previous public hearing on this, call me lazy but I didn't change it. So, this area has already been changed to SC5.

Ward – It was already approved for a bunch of apartments, right?

Manley- It’s been planned for a mixed-use development along Spokane St and behind that they had planned on some residential units.

Herrington – To clarify, Spokane St. is already included in our current code. This request is just to add Idaho St.

Manley – Also it is only for the SC5 and SC6 areas.

Testimony:

In Favor - None

Neutral - None

In Opposition - None

Motion to recommend approval to City Council as presented by Kimball
2nd by Carey

Vote Hampe - Yes; Schlotthauer – Yes; Ward – Yes; Davis – Yes; Kimball – Yes; Carey – Yes; Steffensen - Yes

Moved

5. ADMINISTRATIVE / STAFF REPORTS

None

6. COMMISSION COMMENT

HAMPE – NEW UPDATED ALLOWED USE TABLE

7. ADJOURNMENT 6:06PM

Questions concerning items appearing on this Agenda should be addressed to the Community Development Department – Planning Division at 408 Spokane Street or call 208-773-8708.

The City Hall building is handicapped accessible. If any person needs special equipment to accommodate their disability, please notify the City Media Center at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting date. The Media Center telephone number is 208-457-3341.

Chair: Ryan Davis Vice Chair: Ray Kimball

Members: Vicky Jo Cary, Nancy Hampe, Ross Schlotthauer, James Steffensen, Kevin Ward

Date: _____

Chair: _____

Attest: _____

**CITY OF POST FALLS
AGENDA REPORT**

DATE: January 27, 2023

TO: POST FALLS PLANNING & ZONING COMMISSION

FROM: COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT, ENGINEERING DIVISION
JON MANLEY, PLANNING, (208) 457-3344, jmanley@postfalls.gov

SUBJECT: STAFF MEMO FOR THE JANUARY 31, 2023, P&Z MEETING
DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEE UPDATE

Title 19 of Post Falls Municipal Code addresses Development Impact Fees, which are collected from developers with the purpose of providing public facilities and system improvements. Impact fees allows for the opportunity for growth to pay its associated impact on public safety, streets, multi modal systems and parks. The ordinance allows for the review and modification of capital improvement plans, and the associated fees to support those improvements, as the City deems necessary. It is the responsibility of the Planning and Zoning Commission, acting as the Development Impact Fee Advisory Committee (DIFAC), to review any changes to the ordinance, capital improvement plans and fees and recommend action by City Council.

This memo is being provided to the DIFAC to present the proposed update to the Post Falls Impact Fees. The following highlights the proposed changes:

- Adjust impact fees based upon inflationary cost escalations (**Note: Capital Improvement Plans were not adjusted**)
 - o Typically, the City utilizes the ENR index (Engineering News-Record) for these types of updates. Due to the degree of cost escalations, staff desired to complete a more comprehensive approach in this update
- Basis is on a ten (10) to twenty (20) year growth cost depending on the Impact Fee category

The City's Consultant utilized Tischler-Bise as the consultant for this inflationary cost update.

Attachment:

Exhibit S-1 Planning Commission Resolution Approving 2022 Impact Fee Update
Exhibit S-2 Developer Impact Fee Forum PowerPoint
link: <https://www.postfalls.gov/development-impact-fees/>
Exhibit S-3 Minutes 12-13-2022

Exhibits:

Exhibit PA-1 PFHD Comments

RESOLUTION NO. P&Z 22-_____

**RESOLUTION OF THE POST FALLS PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION
ACTING AS THE POST FALLS IMPACT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE
RECOMMENDING ADOPTION OF THE NOVEMBER 11, 2022 TISCHLER BISE
TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM AND RECOMMENDING THAT THE CITY'S
IMPACT FEES BE ADJUSTED BASED ON THE MEMORANDUM**

WHEREAS, the Post Falls Planning and Zoning Commission acts as the Impact Fee Advisory Committee for the City of Post Falls as authorized by I.C. 67-8205; and

WHEREAS, the Post Falls Planning Commission, acting as the Impact Fee Advisory Committee, held a properly noticed public hearing on December 13, 2022 to consider changes to the City of Post Falls Capital Improvement Plan and Impact Fees recommended in a November 11, 2022 Technical Memorandum from Tischler Bise, which is attached as Exhibit "A"; and

WHEREAS, the Post Falls Planning and Zoning Commission has evaluated the recommendations contained in the Technical Memorandum and all evidence received at the public hearing and has determined that the recommendations of the Technical Memorandum should be adopted.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE POST FALLS PLANNING AND ZONING COMMISSION:

Section 1. That the Planning and Zoning Commission, acting as the Post Falls Impact Fee Advisory Committee has evaluated the recommendations contained in the Technical Memorandum and recommends that the Post Falls City Council adopt the changes to the Capital Improvement Plan and the City of Post Falls Impact Fees recommended by the Technical Memorandum.

Section 2. That the clerk of the Planning and Zoning Commission is directed to provide this signed Resolution of the Planning and Zoning Commission to the Post Falls City Council evidencing this Commission's determination that the recommendations of the Technical Memorandum should be adopted.

Section 3. That this Resolution shall be in full force and effect immediately upon its adoption and approval.

APPROVED by the Post Falls Planning and Zoning Commission on this 13th day of December 2022.

Chairperson

ATTEST:

Amber Blanchette, Planning and Zoning Commission Clerk

TECHNICAL MEMORANDUM

TO: Shelly Enderud, City Manager
City of Post Falls, Idaho

FROM: Julie Herlands, AICP
Vice President, TischlerBise

DATE: November 11, 2022

SUBJECT: **City of Post Falls Development Impact Fee Interim Update**

TischlerBise has been retained by the City of Post Falls to do an interim update of the City's Impact Fees to reflect cost changes in all infrastructure categories.

TischlerBise prepared the City's current impact fee study over the period late 2018 through early 2021, with the COVID-19 pandemic occurring during the study. Impact fees documented in the TischlerBise report, *City of Post Falls Capital Improvement Plan and Development Impact Fee Report*, March 19, 2021 (herein referred to as *2021 Impact Fee Report*), were adopted in 2021. The City has updated the Impact Fee schedule on an annual basis using a construction cost index.¹

For the interim update, updated cost estimates have been provided by City staff and/or City consultants for Police Station, Police Support Facilities, Park Improvements, Park Land, Streets Capital Projects, and Multimodal Capital Projects. For minor infrastructure components without new engineering cost estimates, TischlerBise used the inflation factor/index used by the City to update the impact fee schedule in 2022 and 2023.

This memo provides documentation on cost changes and the resulting updated impact fees as an addendum to the *2021 Impact Fee Report*. The *2021 Impact Fee Report* is incorporated by reference.

¹ See resolutions adopting updated Community Development Fees, FY 2022 and FY 2023.

PROPOSED MEANS TO MEET THE DEMAND FOR PUBLIC FACILITIES

The State of Idaho requires development impact fees to be calculated using levels of service “applicable to existing development as well as new growth and development.” Figure 1 provides updated detail on levels of service (or level of usage) and cost factors for each impact fee infrastructure category.

Figure 1. Summary of Infrastructure Standards (Report Figure 12 [updated])

Type of Public Facility	Amount	Infrastructure Unit	Per Service Unit	Cost Factor
PARKS and RECREATION				
Parks: Level One Land	6.0	Acres of Parks	1,000 persons	\$147,000 per acre
Parks: Level Two Land	10.0	Acres of Parks	1,000 persons	\$87,000 per acre
Parks: Level One Improvements	6.0	Acres of Parks	1,000 persons	\$124,605 per acre
Parks: Level Two Improvements	10.0	Acres of Parks	1,000 persons	\$10,834 per acre
Indoor Recreation Facilities	0.30	Sq. Ft. of Indoor Rec Fac.	person	\$165 per sq. ft.
POLICE				
Police Station	0.49	sq. ft. of Police Station space	person	\$835 per sq. ft.
	0.10	sq. ft. of Police Station space	nonres. vehicle trip	
Support Facility	0.14	sq. ft. of Support Facility space	person	\$203 per sq. ft.
	0.03	sq. ft. of Support Facility space	nonres. vehicle trip	
Wireless Commun. Sites	1.02	Wireless sites	1,000 persons	\$15,373 per site
	0.21	Wireless sites	1,000 nonres. vehicle trip	
Other Comm. Facilities	\$13.96	System improvements	person	\$1,027,480 total cost
	\$3.62	System improvements	nonres vehicle trip	
TRANSPORTATION				
Streets	\$241.45	System improvements	Daily Vehicle Trips	\$82,238,325 growth-related costs
Multimodal Paths	3.89	Linear Feet of Paths	person	\$115 per linear foot
	0.80	Linear Feet of Paths	nonres. vehicle trip	

PARKS AND RECREATION DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES INTERIM UPDATE

Parks and Recreation Infrastructure Standards and Cost Factors

Updates to Parks and Recreation cost factors are provided in this section.

Parks Land and Improvements

Park land acquisition and improvement costs have been updated from the *2021 Impact Fee Report*. Land acquisition costs have increased from 2021 for both Level I and II parks. Updated land values are provided below in Figure 2.

Figure 2. Level I and II Park Land Acquisition Cost Estimates

Level I		Acres	Value	\$/Ac
Level I	2473 N Bradley Dr	1.00	\$185,000	\$185,000
Level I	S Shilling loop	1.76	\$250,000	\$142,045
Level I	Post falls Landing	1.02	\$272,000	\$266,667
Level I	Post falls Landing	1.22	\$325,000	\$266,393
Level I	Post falls Landing	1.02	\$272,000	\$266,667
Level I	Post falls Landing	1.02	\$272,000	\$266,667
Level I	Hargrave Ave	14.54	\$990,000	\$68,088
Level I	Montrose Property	6.60	\$1,581,228	\$239,580
Total/Weighted Average		28.18	\$4,147,228	\$147,169

Level II		Acres	Value	\$/Ac
Level II	S Carpenter Loop	7.00	\$299,999	\$42,857
Level II	Cable Creek Rd	5.00	\$349,900	\$69,980
Level II	Mellick Rd	8.73	\$350,000	\$40,092
Level II	Regent	6.54	\$399,500	\$61,086
Level II	W Deer Ridge Rd	12.89	\$482,750	\$37,452
Level II	Rambling Rose	4.52	\$449,500	\$99,447
Level II	2019 Veterans	10.00	\$450,000	\$45,000
Level II	Mellick Rd	20.00	\$599,000	\$29,950
Level II	Palomino Dr	11.00	\$750,000	\$68,182
Level II	N Pleasant View Rd	45.00	\$5,499,000	\$122,200
Level II	Pleasant View / Poleline	95.00	\$9,999,000	\$105,253
Total/Weighted Average		225.68	\$19,628,649	\$86,976

	Total Value	Acres	\$/Ac	Rounded \$/Ac
Level I Parks	\$4,147,228	28.18	\$147,169	\$147,000
Level II Parks	\$19,628,649	225.68	\$86,976	\$87,000

The full cost for improvements to Level I and Level II parks is included in the fee.² To derive the cost per demand unit, levels of service are multiplied by the cost per acre. For example, the cost per person of \$747.63 is derived by multiplying the Level I level of service of 6 acres per 1,000 persons by the improvement cost per acre (\$124,605). Further detail on costs per person is provided in Figure 4.

² Per the *2021 Report* and impact fee ordinance, if Level I or Level II land is dedicated and/or acceptable park improvements are provided, a credit or reimbursement should be provided.

Figure 3. Parks Level of Service Standards and Cost Factors (Report Figure 24[updated])

Park	Level One Acreage	Level Two Acreage	TOTAL Acreage	Sports Fields	Sports Courts	Boating/ Fishing	Buildings/ Shelters	Restrooms	Miscellaneous & Infrastructure*	Parking & Roads	Playground Equipment	Maintenance Buildings	Trails	TOTAL
1 Arboretum		6.38	6.38	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$470,448	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$470,448
2 Beck Park	8.76		8.76	\$289,050	\$64,500	\$0	\$72,000	\$95,000	\$580,768	\$119,680	\$126,500	\$0	\$126,000	\$1,473,498
3 Black Bay Depot	0.92		0.92	\$71,500	\$0	\$0	\$3,500	\$0	\$248,384	\$104,100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$427,484
4 Black Bay Park: Level 1	23.00		23.00	\$0	\$276,200	\$0	\$72,381	\$0	\$397,457	\$536,000	\$0	\$870,933	\$139,680	\$2,292,651
5 Black Bay Park: Level 2		43.37	43.37	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,350	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$25,920	\$30,270
6 Centennial Trail		26.82	26.82	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$218,701	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,781,568	\$2,000,269
7 Centennial Trail: Fourth St. Trailhead	0.90		0.90	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$131,579	\$134,400	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$265,979
8 Cecil & Horsehaven	3.23		3.23	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
9 Chase Fields	9.00		9.00	\$818,895	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$187,000	\$309,518	\$352,400	\$69,690	\$0	\$40,500	\$1,778,003
10 Community Forest: Kroetch		75.63	75.63	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$109,000	\$109,000
11 Community Forest: Lower Q'emiln		37.50	37.50	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$90,000	\$90,000
12 Community Forest: May		62.30	62.30	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$53,000	\$53,000
13 Community Forest: Lost Mines			0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
14 Community Garden	2.06		2.06	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$78,256	\$0	\$60,380	\$5,100	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$143,736
15 Corbin Park: Level 1	26.01		26.01	\$250,000	\$8,000	\$30,000	\$53,000	\$95,000	\$148,100	\$291,795	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$875,895
16 Corbin: Hastings/Anselmo Level 1	5.55		5.55	\$179,141	\$0	\$0	\$259,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$438,141
17 Corbin Ditch: Level 2		14.97	14.97	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
18 Crown Pointe	4.20		4.20	\$0	\$86,500	\$0	\$65,000	\$95,000	\$255,878	\$33,600	\$86,250	\$0	\$65,628	\$687,856
19 Falls Park: Level 1	7.00		7.00	\$0	\$0	\$385,000	\$75,000	\$95,000	\$1,056,568	\$221,720	\$35,000	\$0	\$68,400	\$1,936,688
20 Falls Park: Level 2		15.00	15.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,650	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,650
21 Hilde Kellogg	5.00		5.00	\$125,960	\$0	\$0	\$19,958	\$0	\$184,034	\$101,600	\$43,700	\$0	\$0	\$475,252
22 Karen Streeter Greenway	3.90		3.90	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$242,768	\$12,600	\$0	\$0	\$95,100	\$350,468
23 Karen Streeter Trail		15.40	15.40	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$9,468	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$459,000	\$468,468
24 Kiwanis Park: Level 1	12.26		12.26	\$0	\$0	\$18,500	\$393,240	\$95,000	\$185,751	\$432,000	\$58,650	\$0	\$30,240	\$1,213,381
25 Kiwanis Park: Level 2		24.60	24.60	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$89,400	\$89,400
26 Park in the Meadows	5.37		5.37	\$0	\$86,500	\$0	\$0	\$95,000	\$328,668	\$124,000	\$98,900	\$0	\$78,750	\$811,818
27 Polites Park		1.79	1.79	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$62,934	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$62,934
28 Post Falls Landings	1.97		1.97	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,460,134	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$120,000	\$1,580,134
29 Ross Point Pumphouse	2.70		2.70	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	\$2,000	\$10,200	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$42,200
30 Q'emiln Park: Level 1	19.60		19.60	\$0	\$8,000	\$100,000	\$362,100	\$291,500	\$626,030	\$1,781,400	\$5,175	\$42,000	\$0	\$3,216,205
31 Q'emiln Park: Level 2		20.09	20.09	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$64,000	\$64,000
32 Singing Hills	7.57		7.57	\$147,580	\$0	\$0	\$4,000	\$0	\$557,393	\$84,800	\$13,225	\$0	\$157,500	\$964,498
33 Skate Park	1.15		1.15	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$510,634	\$77,600	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$588,234
34 Sports Complex	25.93		25.93	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$44,185	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$85,500	\$129,685
35 Sportsmans Park	6.29		6.29	\$726,000	\$43,000	\$0	\$40,900	\$95,000	\$386,451	\$111,200	\$0	\$15,000	\$0	\$1,417,551
36 Syringa Park	7.44		7.44	\$0	\$138,000	\$0	\$27,000	\$95,000	\$811,007	\$82,400	\$40,250	\$0	\$146,250	\$1,339,907
37 Trailer Park Wave		1.77	1.77	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$30,000	\$46,289	\$11,100	\$0	\$0	\$4,440	\$91,829
38 Treaty Rock		3.91	3.91	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$69,500	\$48,000	\$0	\$0	\$58,100	\$175,600
39 Tullamore Park	8.63		8.63	\$0	\$129,500	\$0	\$195,000	\$95,000	\$992,385	\$112,000	\$143,750	\$0	\$126,000	\$1,793,635
40 Warren Playfield	2.34		2.34	\$199,750	\$32,500	\$0	\$9,979	\$0	\$176,184	\$0	\$34,500	\$0	\$0	\$452,913
41 West Ridge	2.98		2.98	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
42 White Pine: Park	4.06		4.06	\$0	\$130,000	\$0	\$61,000	\$95,000	\$332,068	\$94,800	\$136,850	\$0	\$0	\$849,718
43 White Pine: Tennis Courts	1.15		1.15	\$0	\$240,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$4,725	\$48,000	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$292,725
44 Woodbridge	5.36		5.36	\$235,000	\$0	\$0	\$8,000	\$95,000	\$185,518	\$132,000	\$40,250	\$0	\$75,600	\$771,368
45 Woodbridge II: Level 1	0.82		0.82	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$1,350	\$0	\$5,750	\$0	\$38,952	\$46,052
46 Woodbridge II: Level 2		2.09	2.09	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$75,600	\$75,600
Master Planning/CIP Costs			0.00	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$179,995	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$179,995
Total Units	215.15	351.62	566.77											
\$ per Acre	\$147,000	\$87,000												
Current Value	\$31,627,050	\$30,590,940		\$3,042,876	\$1,242,700	\$533,500	\$1,799,314	\$1,583,500	\$11,283,249	\$5,062,495	\$938,440	\$927,933	\$4,204,128	\$30,618,134
TOTAL VALUES			Land	\$62,217,990									Improvements Total	\$30,618,134
													Level 1 Improvements	\$26,808,668
													Level 2 Improvements	\$3,809,466

Figure 4. Parks Level of Service Standards and Cost Factors (Report Figure 25 [updated])

Level of Service Standards					
	Population in 2018	35,007			
			Current	Adopted	
	Acres of Level One Park Land Per 1,000 Residents	6.15		6.00	
	Acres of Level Two Park Land Per 1,000 Residents	10.04		10.00	
LAND COSTS					
	Level One Land Cost per Acre	\$147,000			
	Level Two Land Cost Per Acre	\$87,000			
	<i>Weighted Average Land Cost Per Acre</i>	<i>\$109,776</i>			
	Level One Land Cost Per Person	\$903.45	\$882.00	100%	\$882.00
	Level Two Land Cost Per Person	\$873.85	\$870.00	100%	\$870.00
	Park Land Cost Per Person				\$1,752.00
IMPROVEMENT COSTS					
	<i>Level One Improvements Cost per Acre</i>	<i>\$124,605</i>			
	<i>Level Two Improvements Cost Per Acre</i>	<i>\$10,834</i>			
	Level One Improvements Cost Per Person	\$766.32	\$747.63	100%	\$747.63
	Level Two Improvements Cost Per Person	\$108.77	\$108.34	100%	\$108.34
	Park Improvement Cost Per Person				\$855.97

Indoor Recreation Facilities

Figure 5 updates indoor recreational facility space cost factors based on cost escalation factors used to update the City's impact fee schedules. The updated cost per capita is \$44.76.

Figure 5. Indoor Recreation Facility Level of Service Standards and Cost Factors (Report Figure 26 [updated])

Facility	Building Square Footage	Current Replacement Cost/SF*	Total Value*	City Share	
				City Cost	City Prorated SF
Boys & Girls Gym (partial City facility)	10,826	\$181.34	\$1,963,188	\$136,332	752
Trailhead Pavilion	3,712	\$148.22	\$550,180	\$550,180	3,712
The Tree House (former Chamber of Commerce Bldg)	1,330	\$96.89	\$128,864	\$128,864	1,330
Black Bay Depot	4,641	\$161.97	\$751,704	\$751,704	4,641
TOTAL	20,509	\$165.49	\$3,393,935	\$1,567,080	10,435

2018 Population	35,007
Square Foot Per Capita	0.30
Cost per Capita	\$44.76

* City of Post Falls; escalated to 2022 values per annual Community Development fee updates (3.8% in FY22; 8.9% in FY23).

Parks and Recreation Input Variables and Development Impact Fees Interim Update

Figure 6 summarizes service units, conversion factors, and updated cost factors per service unit for updated Parks and Recreation Development Impact Fees. The total capital cost per person is the sum of the individual cost factors at the top of the figure.

The Parks and Recreation Development Impact Fee is the product of persons per housing unit multiplied by the total net capital cost per person. Each household size is multiplied by the net capital cost per person to derive the development impact fee per unit. Also shown is a comparison with the City's current fees (fee schedule as of October 1, 2022).

Figure 6. Parks and Recreation Input Variables and Maximum Allowable Development Impact Fees Interim Update (Report Figure 28 [updated])

		Cost per Person
Park Land: Level One Land		\$882.00
Park Land: Level Two Land		\$870.00
Park Improvements: Level One Improvements		\$747.63
Park Improvements: Level Two Improvements		\$108.34
Indoor Recreation Facilities		\$44.76
Impact Fee Study		\$1.79
TOTAL GROSS COST		\$2,654.52
General Fund Reduction	0.2%	(\$5.68)
Debt Service Credit		\$0.00
TOTAL NET COST		\$2,648.84

Residential (Per Unit)

Unit Type	Persons per Housing Unit	Proposed Fees	Current Fees [^]	Increase (Decrease)
Multifamily/Other	1.95	\$5,165	\$3,130.04	\$2,035
Single Family	2.62	\$6,939	\$4,206.15	\$2,733

[^] City of Post Falls Fee Schedule as of 10/1/22.

PUBLIC SAFETY DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES INTERIM UPDATE

Public Safety Infrastructure Standards and Cost Factors

Police Station

The current City Police Station was built in 2003 with a total of 22,545 square feet. The City plans to expand and renovate the station. Levels of service for the current facility are 0.49 square feet per person and 0.10 square feet per nonresidential vehicle trip. The incremental expansion methodology is unchanged from the 2021 Impact Fee Report with levels of service held constant and costs updated.

A summary of levels of service is shown in Figure 7. Development impact fees are derived based on the existing level of service and estimated cost per square foot.

Figure 7. Police Station Level of Service Analysis (Report Figure 28 [unchanged])

	2018
Police Station (SF)	22,545
<i>Residential</i>	
Residential Proportionate Share	76%
Square Feet	17,134
Population	35,007
LOS (SF/person)	0.49
<i>Nonresidential</i>	
Nonresidential Proportionate Share	24%
Square Feet	5,411
Nonresidential Vehicle Trips	53,753
LOS (SF/trip)	0.10

Source: 2021 Impact Fee Report

Updated cost factors for the Police Station development impact fee are shown in Figure 8. Cost factors reflect recent (2022) estimates for planned expansion and renovation of the existing Police Station.

As noted, levels of service are .49 square feet per person and .10 square feet per nonresidential vehicle trip. To derive the cost per demand unit, levels of service are multiplied by the cost per square foot. For example, the cost per person of \$408.91 is derived by multiplying the cost per square foot (\$834.51) by the demand unit of 0.49 square feet per person.

Figure 8. Police Station Level of Service Standards and Updated Cost Factors (Report Figure 33 [updated])

Facility	Year of Cost Estimate	Square Feet	Cost*	\$/Sq. Ft.
Police Station Expansion and Renovation	2022	14,196	\$12,195,206	\$859.06
Police Station Men's Locker Room Renovation	2022	1,000	\$486,000	\$486.00
Total		15,196	\$12,681,206	\$834.51

Land Use	Proportionate Share	Level of Service^	Cost per Demand Unit
Residential	76%	0.49 SF per Person	\$408.91
Nonresidential	24%	0.10 SF per Nonres	\$83.45

* Includes construction, soft costs, and site improvements

^ Level of Service from adopted 2021 Impact Fees

Source: City of Post Falls

Vehicle Maintenance and Storage Facilities

Police support facilities include vehicle maintenance and storage facilities. An incremental expansion approach is used for this component of the development impact fee. Levels of service are summarized in Figure 9, which are held constant from the 2021 Impact Fee Report.

Figure 9. Support Facilities Level of Service Analysis (Report Figure 34 [unchanged])

Level of Service Summary

	2018
Police Support Facilities (SF)	6,600
<u>Residential</u>	
Residential Proportionate Share	76%
Square Feet	5,016
Population	35,007
LOS (SF/person)	0.14
<u>Nonresidential</u>	
Nonresidential Proportionate Share	24%
Square Feet	1,584
Nonresidential Vehicle Trips	53,753
LOS (SF/trip)	0.03

Source: 2021 Impact Fee Report

Level of service standards and updated cost factors for the Police Support Facilities portion of the development impact fee are shown in Figure 10. To derive the cost per demand unit, levels of service are multiplied by the cost per square foot. For example, the cost per person of \$28.40 is derived by multiplying the cost per square foot (\$202.88) by the demand unit of 0.14 square feet per person.

Figure 10. Support Facilities Level of Service Standards and Cost Factors (Report Figure 35 [updated])

Facility	Year of Cost Estimate	Square Feet	Cost*	\$/Sq. Ft.
Vehicle Maintenance Facility	2018 [^]	4,200	\$418,241	\$99.58
Police Station Modular Storage	2022 ^{^^}	3,582	\$1,160,568	\$324.00
Total		7,782	\$1,578,809	\$202.88

Land Use	Proportionate Share	Level of Service	Cost per Demand Unit
Residential	76%	0.14 SF per Person	\$28.40
Nonresidential	24%	0.03 SF per Nonres Trip	\$6.09

* Includes construction and soft costs

[^] Source: City of Post Falls; escalated to 2022 values per annual Community Development fee updates (3.8% in FY22; 8.9% in FY23).

^{^^} Source: City of Post Falls

Communications Infrastructure

Level of service standards and cost factors for Communications Infrastructure are shown in Figure 11 and Figure 12. The City of Post Falls Police Department has developed wireless infrastructure to provide services by officers in the field. The City will expand this system based on the current level of service (as shown in Figure 11). The updated cost to equip a location with a new wireless antenna is \$15,373.

Figure 11. Communications Infrastructure Level of Service Standards and Cost Factors: Wireless Antenna Network (Report Figure 36 [updated])

Facility	Total Number of Sites	\$/Site*	Total Cost
Wireless Antenna Network	47	\$15,373	\$722,540
Total	47	\$15,373	\$722,540

Land Use	Proportionate Share	Level of Service	Cost per Demand Unit
Residential	76%	1.02 Sites per 1,000 persons	\$15.68
Nonresidential	24%	0.21 Sites per 1,000 Nonres Trips	\$3.23

* Source: City of Post Falls; escalated to 2022 values per annual Community Development fee updates (3.8% in FY22; 8.9% in FY23)

In addition to the wireless network, additional communications infrastructure has been built by the City with excess capacity to serve future growth. A cost recovery methodology is used for this fee component, which is unchanged from the 2021 Impact Fee Report. Levels of service and cost factors are shown in Figure 12.

Figure 12. Communications Infrastructure Level of Service Standards and Cost Factors: Mobile Data Network and Communications Facilities (Report Figure 37 [unchanged])

Facility	Year Built	Total Cost
Mobile Data 700 MHz Network	2008	\$215,000
Blossom Mountain Communications Facility	2006	\$550,000
North Communications Facility	2016	\$262,480
Total		\$1,027,480

Land Use	Proportionate Share	2029 Demand Units	Cost per Demand Unit
Residential	76%	55,946 Population	\$13.96
Nonresidential	24%	68,140 Nonres Vehicle Trips	\$3.62

Source: City of Post Falls

Public Safety Input Variables and Development Impact Fees Interim Update

With the above updates and inflationary adjustments, the updated Public Safety Impact Fees are summarized in Figure 13. The total capital cost per person is the sum of the individual cost factors at the top of the figure. The Impact Fee is the product of persons per housing unit multiplied by the total net capital cost per person or trips per 1,000 square feet multiplied by total net capital cost per trip. Also shown is a comparison with the City's current fees (fee schedule as of October 1, 2022).

Figure 13. Public Safety Interim Impact Fees (Report Figure 28 [updated])

Fee Component	Cost per Person	Cost per Per Nonres. Trip
Police Station	\$408.91	\$83.45
Support Facilities	\$28.40	\$6.09
Communications Infrastructure: Wireless Sites	\$15.68	\$3.23
Communications Infrastructure: Facilities	\$13.96	\$3.62
Consultant Cost	\$1.05	\$0.45
TOTAL GROSS COST	\$468.00	\$96.84
General Fund Reduction	0.2%	(\$1.16)
Debt Service Credit		\$0.00
TOTAL NET COST	\$466.83	\$96.60

Residential (Per Unit)

Unit Type	Persons per Housing Unit	Proposed Fees	Current Fee [^]	Increase (Decrease)
Multifamily/Other	1.95	\$910	\$380	\$530
Single Family	2.62	\$1,223	\$511	\$712

Nonresidential Development (per Development Unit)

Land Use Type (ITE Code)	Demand Unit	Avg Wkdy Veh Trip Ends (per Demand Unit)	Trip Rate Adjustment	Proposed Fees (per Sq. Ft. or Room)	Current Fee [^]	Increase / Decrease
Commercial / Retail Average (820)	1,000 sq. ft.	37.75	33%	\$1.20	\$0.51	\$0.69
Office (710)	1,000 sq. ft.	9.74	50%	\$0.47	\$0.20	\$0.27
Light Industrial (110)	1,000 sq. ft.	4.96	50%	\$0.24	\$0.10	\$0.14
Manufacturing (140)	1,000 sq. ft.	3.93	50%	\$0.19	\$0.08	\$0.11
Warehousing (150)	1,000 sq. ft.	1.74	50%	\$0.08	\$0.03	\$0.05
Mini-Warehouse (151)	1,000 sq. ft.	1.51	50%	\$0.07	\$0.03	\$0.04
Elementary School (520)	1,000 sq. ft.	19.52	33%	\$0.62	\$0.26	\$0.36
Middle School/Junior High School (522)	1,000 sq. ft.	20.17	33%	\$0.64	\$0.27	\$0.37
High School (530)	1,000 sq. ft.	14.07	33%	\$0.45	\$0.19	\$0.26
Day Care (565)	1,000 sq. ft.	47.62	33%	\$1.52	\$0.64	\$0.88
Church (560)	1,000 sq. ft.	6.95	50%	\$0.34	\$0.15	\$0.19
Assisted Living (254)	1,000 sq. ft.	4.19	50%	\$0.20	\$0.09	\$0.11
Nursing Home (620)	1,000 sq. ft.	6.64	50%	\$0.32	\$0.14	\$0.18
Recreational Community Center (495)	1,000 sq. ft.	28.82	50%	\$1.39	\$0.59	\$0.80
Hotel (310)	Room	8.36	50%	\$404.00	\$171.82	\$232.18

[^] City of Post Falls Fee Schedule as of 10/1/22.

STREETS DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES INTERIM UPDATE

Cost estimates for the City’s Transportation Master Plan were updated by JUB Engineers and are used to update the City’s impact fees.³ The plan-based calculation methodology is unchanged from the 2021 Impact Fee Report.

Updated Cost Per Vehicle Trip

Estimated updated City costs for capacity Street Improvement Plan is approximately \$82 million. Because the City has collected development impact fees for capacity street projects and has a current balance in its Streets Development Impact Fee Fund of \$6 million, the City’s share of the cost is reduced by that amount. Therefore, the total cost on which the development impact fee is based is \$76 million. This amount is divided by the projected net increase in average daily vehicle trips (ADT) of 154,428 to derive a cost per trip of \$493.59.

Figure 14. Updated Cost per Vehicle Trip for Street Improvements (Report Figure 54 [updated])

Summary of Costs	Estimated City CIP Cost (2022 Dollars)*
GRAND TOTAL STREETS	\$82,238,325
Less Current Road Impact Fee Fund Balance	(\$6,014,162)
TOTAL CITY GROWTH RELATED EXPENDITURES	\$76,224,163
Existing Average Daily Vehicle Trips (ADT)	129,908
Projected ADT (2038)*	284,336
Net Increase in ADT	154,428
Cost per Trip	\$493.59

* JUB Engineers

³ JUB Engineers, Technical Memorandum: Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Project Budget Update, City of Post Falls, October 17, 2022.

Streets Input Variables and Development Impact Fees Interim Update

With the above cost update, the Interim Streets Impact Fees are summarized in Figure 15. Total capital cost per trip is multiplied by trip rates by type of land use to derive the impact fee by land use. Also shown is a comparison with the City's current fees (fee schedule as of October 1, 2022).

Figure 15. Streets Interim Impact Fees (Report Figure 56 [updated])

Fee Component	Cost per ADT
Road Improvement Projects	\$493.59
Development Fee Study	\$0.70
TOTAL GROSS COST	\$494.29

General Fund Reduction	0%	\$0.00
Debt Service Credit		\$0.00
TOTAL NET COST		\$494.29

Residential (per unit)

Development Type	Dev. Unit	Adj. Trip per Development Unit	Proposed Fees	Current Fee [^]	Increase / Decrease
Multifamily/Other	HU	3.53	\$1,743	\$965	\$778
Single Family	HU	6.24	\$3,082	\$1,707	\$1,375

Nonresidential Development (per Development Unit)

Development Type	Dev. Unit	Adj. Trip per Development Unit	Proposed Fees (per Sq. Ft. or Room)	Current Fee [^]	Increase / Decrease
Commercial / Retail Average (820)	KSF	12.46	\$6.15	\$3.40	\$2.75
Office (710)	KSF	4.87	\$2.40	\$1.32	\$1.08
Light Industrial (110)	KSF	2.48	\$1.22	\$0.68	\$0.54
Manufacturing (140)	KSF	1.97	\$0.97	\$0.53	\$0.44
Warehousing (150)	KSF	0.87	\$0.43	\$0.23	\$0.20
Mini-Warehouse (151)	KSF	0.76	\$0.37	\$0.20	\$0.17
Elementary School (520)	KSF	6.44	\$3.18	\$1.75	\$1.43
Middle School/Junior High School (522)	KSF	6.66	\$3.29	\$1.82	\$1.47
High School (530)	KSF	4.64	\$2.29	\$1.27	\$1.02
Day Care (565)	KSF	15.71	\$7.76	\$4.30	\$3.46
Church (560)	KSF	3.48	\$1.71	\$0.95	\$0.76
Assisted Living (254)	KSF	2.10	\$1.03	\$0.57	\$0.46
Nursing Home (620)	KSF	3.32	\$1.64	\$0.88	\$0.76
Recreational Community Center (495)	KSF	14.41	\$7.12	\$3.83	\$3.29
Hotel (310)	Room	4.18	\$2,066.12	\$1,144.14	\$921.98

[^] City of Post Falls Fee Schedule as of 10/1/22.

MULTIMODAL INFRASTRUCTURE DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES INTERIM UPDATE

Multimodal infrastructure cost estimates were updated by JUB Engineers for the City of Post Falls.⁴ The interim impact fee update uses these updated cost estimates. The incremental expansion methodology is unchanged from the *2021 Impact Fee Report*.

Updated Cost Factor

The estimated updated cost to build almost 140,000 linear feet of multimodal improvements is approximately \$20 million, resulting in a cost per linear foot of \$143.83.

Figure 16. Updated Cost per Linear Feet for Multimodal Improvements (Report Figure 58 [summary updated])

Summary of Costs	Estimated City CIP Cost (2022 Dollars)*	Planned Linear Ft*	Total \$ / Lin. Ft.
MULTIMODAL CIP	\$20,097,031	139,731	\$143.83

* JUB Engineers

⁴ JUB Engineers, Technical Memorandum: Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) Project Budget Update, City of Post Falls, October 17, 2022.

Cost Allocation for Multimodal Infrastructure

The City currently maintains an overall level of service for multimodal facilities of 3.89 linear feet per person and 0.80 linear feet per nonresidential vehicle trip (see Figure 17).⁵ The cost for this level of service is \$559.50 per person and \$115.06 per nonresidential trip.

Figure 17. Level of Service Standards and Updated Cost Factors Multimodal System (Report Figure 59 [updated])

Description	Linear Feet
Bike Lanes ¹	86,064
Multimodal Paths ¹	93,192
Total	179,256

Cost Allocation Factors	
Cost per Linear Foot ²	\$143.83

Level-of-Service Standards	
Existing Multimodal Paths (Linear Feet)	179,256
Residential	
Residential Share	76%
2018 Population	35,007
Linear Feet per Person	3.89
Cost per Person	\$559.50
Nonresidential	
Nonresidential Share	24%
2018 Trips	53,753
Linear Feet per Trip	0.80
Cost per Trip	\$115.06

1. City of Post Falls Public Works

2. JUB Engineers

⁵ See 2021 Impact Fee Report for detail on allocation between residential and nonresidential demand.

Multimodal Input Variables and Development Impact Fees Interim Update

With the above cost update, the updated Multimodal Impact Fees are summarized in Figure 18. Residential fees are per housing unit and nonresidential fees are per gross square foot of floor area. The fees are calculated by multiplying the service units per land use type by the net capital cost per service unit. Also shown is a comparison with the City's current fees (fee schedule as of October 1, 2022).

Figure 18. Streets Interim Impact Fees (Report Figure 61 [updated])

Fee Component	Cost per Person	Cost per Nonres. Trip
Multimodal Pathways	\$559.50	\$115.06
Consultant Cost	\$0.65	\$0.28
TOTAL GROSS COST	\$560.15	\$115.34
Debt Service Credit	\$0.00	\$0.00
TOTAL NET COST	\$560.15	\$115.34

Residential (Per Unit)

Unit Type	Persons per Housing Unit	Proposed Fees	Current Fee*	Increase (Decrease)
Multifamily/Other	1.95	\$1,092	\$731	\$361
Single Family	2.62	\$1,468	\$982	\$486

Nonresidential Development (per Development Unit)

Land Use Type (ITE Code)	Demand Unit	Avg Wkdy Veh Trip Ends (per Demand Unit)	Trip Rate Adjustment	Proposed Fees (per Sq. Ft. or Room)	Current Fee^	Increase / Decrease
Commercial / Retail Average (820)	1,000 sq. ft.	37.75	33%	\$1.44	\$0.96	\$0.48
Office (710)	1,000 sq. ft.	9.74	50%	\$0.56	\$0.37	\$0.19
Light Industrial (110)	1,000 sq. ft.	4.96	50%	\$0.29	\$0.19	\$0.10
Manufacturing (140)	1,000 sq. ft.	3.93	50%	\$0.23	\$0.15	\$0.08
Warehousing (150)	1,000 sq. ft.	1.74	50%	\$0.10	\$0.07	\$0.03
Mini-Warehouse (151)	1,000 sq. ft.	1.51	50%	\$0.09	\$0.05	\$0.04
Elementary School (520)	1,000 sq. ft.	19.52	33%	\$0.74	\$0.48	\$0.26
Middle School/Junior High School (522)	1,000 sq. ft.	20.17	33%	\$0.77	\$0.52	\$0.25
High School (530)	1,000 sq. ft.	14.07	33%	\$0.54	\$0.36	\$0.18
Day Care (565)	1,000 sq. ft.	47.62	33%	\$1.81	\$1.21	\$0.60
Church (560)	1,000 sq. ft.	6.95	50%	\$0.40	\$0.26	\$0.14
Assisted Living (254)	1,000 sq. ft.	4.19	50%	\$0.24	\$0.16	\$0.08
Nursing Home (620)	1,000 sq. ft.	6.64	50%	\$0.38	\$0.26	\$0.12
Recreational Community Center (495)	1,000 sq. ft.	28.82	50%	\$1.66	\$1.12	\$0.54
Hotel (310)	Room	8.36	50%	\$482.13	\$323.06	\$159.07

^ City of Post Falls Fee Schedule as of 10/1/22.

SUMMARY OF INTERIM UPDATED DEVELOPMENT IMPACT FEES

Based on the above findings for all impact fee categories, the following is a summary schedule of the City of Post Falls Interim Updated Impact Fees.

Figure 19. Summary of Interim Updated Impact Fees (Report Figure 6 [updated])

Residential Development	Development Fees per Unit					Current Fees	
Development Type	Parks and Recreation	Public Safety	Streets	Multimodal Paths	Total	Current Fee [^]	Change
Multi-Family	\$5,165	\$910	\$1,743	\$1,092	\$8,910	\$5,207	\$3,703
Single Family	\$6,939	\$1,223	\$3,082	\$1,468	\$12,712	\$7,406	\$5,306

Nonresidential Development	Development Fees per Unit					Current Fees	
Development Type	Parks and Recreation	Public Safety	Streets	Multimodal Paths*	Total	Current Fee [^]	Change
Commercial / Retail Average (820)	\$0.00	\$1.20	\$6.15	\$1.44	\$8.79	\$4.87	\$3.92
Office (710)	\$0.00	\$0.47	\$2.40	\$0.56	\$3.43	\$1.90	\$1.53
Light Industrial (110)	\$0.00	\$0.24	\$1.22	\$0.29	\$1.75	\$0.97	\$0.78
Manufacturing (140)	\$0.00	\$0.19	\$0.97	\$0.23	\$1.39	\$0.76	\$0.63
Warehousing (150)	\$0.00	\$0.08	\$0.43	\$0.10	\$0.61	\$0.33	\$0.28
Mini-Warehouse (151)	\$0.00	\$0.07	\$0.37	\$0.09	\$0.53	\$0.29	\$0.24
Elementary School (520)	\$0.00	\$0.62	\$3.18	\$0.74	\$4.54	\$2.50	\$2.04
Middle School/Junior High School (522)	\$0.00	\$0.64	\$3.29	\$0.77	\$4.70	\$2.61	\$2.09
High School (530)	\$0.00	\$0.45	\$2.29	\$0.54	\$3.28	\$1.82	\$1.46
Day Care (565)	\$0.00	\$1.52	\$7.76	\$1.81	\$11.09	\$6.15	\$4.94
Church (560)	\$0.00	\$0.34	\$1.71	\$0.40	\$2.45	\$1.36	\$1.09
Assisted Living (254)	\$0.00	\$0.20	\$1.03	\$0.24	\$1.47	\$0.81	\$0.66
Nursing Home (620)	\$0.00	\$0.32	\$1.64	\$0.38	\$2.34	\$1.28	\$1.06
Recreational Community Center (495)	\$0.00	\$1.39	\$7.12	\$1.66	\$10.17	\$5.53	\$4.64
Hotel (310) (per Room)	\$0.00	\$404.00	\$2,066.12	\$482.13	\$2,952.25	\$1,639.02	\$1,313.23

[^] City of Post Falls Fee Schedule as of 10/1/22.

City of Post Falls Development Impact Fees

1



Introduction:

- Post Falls originally adopted impact fees in 1998.
- Impact fees are one time fees established to equitably have growth pay for the impact to the City's infrastructure on an incremental basis.
- Fees may only be utilized to pay for Capital Improvements (infrastructure) and are not used to pay for maintenance, staffing, vehicles, etc.
- Fees are paid for at the time of building permit issuance.

2



Current Adjustments:

- Current impact fee adjustments are based upon inflationary cost escalations and not updated capital improvement plans.

3



Post Falls Current Impact Fee Categories:

- Public Safety
- Parks
- Streets/Transportation
- Multi-Modal

4



Determination of Fees: Public Safety

Fees Support:

- Police Station
- Ancillary Facilities
- Communication Facilities

Basis:

- Ten year growth costs (Adjusted for 2022): \$15,287,495
- Established on a per person and vehicle trip basis

5



Determination of Fees: Parks

Fees Support:

- Level 1 and Level 2 Parks
- Indoor Recreation

Basis:

- Established on a replacement based methodology
- Ten year growth costs (Adjusted for 2022): \$30,618,134
- Applied to "residential" only

6



Determination of Fees: Transportation

- Based upon the City's Transportation Master Plan. System capacity based.
- Twenty year growth costs, less other funding (Adjusted for 2022): \$76,224,153
- Applied on a per trip basis

7



Determination of Fees: Multi-Modal

Fees Support:

- Multi-use trail and bike lane facilities from the Transportation Master Plan

Basis:

- Dollar amount established on a replacement based methodology
- Ten year growth related costs (Adjusted for 2022): \$20,097,031
- Capital improvement plan project dollars set by replacement costs
- To be applied on a per person and per trip basis

8



Figure 7 – Current vs. Updated Development Impact Fees

Residential Development	Development Fees per Unit					Current Fees	
	Development Type	Parks and Recreation	Public Safety	Streets	Multimodal Paths	Total	Current Fee [^]
Multi-Family	\$5,165	\$910	\$1,743	\$1,092	\$8,910	\$5,207	\$3,703
Single Family	\$6,939	\$1,223	\$3,082	\$1,468	\$12,712	\$7,406	\$5,306

Nonresidential Development	Development Fees per Unit					Current Fees	
	Development Type	Parks and Recreation	Public Safety	Streets	Multimodal Paths*	Total	Current Fee [^]
Commercial / Retail Average (820)	\$0.00	\$1.20	\$6.15	\$1.44	\$8.79	\$4.87	\$3.92
Office (710)	\$0.00	\$0.47	\$2.40	\$0.56	\$3.43	\$1.90	\$1.53
Light Industrial (110)	\$0.00	\$0.24	\$1.22	\$0.29	\$1.75	\$0.97	\$0.78
Manufacturing (140)	\$0.00	\$0.19	\$0.97	\$0.23	\$1.39	\$0.76	\$0.63
Warehousing (150)	\$0.00	\$0.08	\$0.43	\$0.10	\$0.61	\$0.33	\$0.28
Mini-Warehouse (151)	\$0.00	\$0.07	\$0.37	\$0.09	\$0.53	\$0.29	\$0.24
Elementary School (520)	\$0.00	\$0.62	\$3.18	\$0.74	\$4.54	\$2.50	\$2.04
Middle School/Junior High School (522)	\$0.00	\$0.64	\$3.29	\$0.77	\$4.70	\$2.61	\$2.09
High School (530)	\$0.00	\$0.45	\$2.29	\$0.54	\$3.28	\$1.82	\$1.46
Day Care (565)	\$0.00	\$1.52	\$7.76	\$1.81	\$11.09	\$6.15	\$4.94
Church (560)	\$0.00	\$0.34	\$1.71	\$0.40	\$2.45	\$1.36	\$1.09
Assisted Living (254)	\$0.00	\$0.20	\$1.03	\$0.24	\$1.47	\$0.81	\$0.66
Nursing Home (620)	\$0.00	\$0.32	\$1.64	\$0.38	\$2.34	\$1.28	\$1.06
Recreational Community Center (495)	\$0.00	\$1.39	\$7.12	\$1.66	\$10.17	\$5.53	\$4.64
Hotel (310) (per Room)	\$0.00	\$404.00	\$2,066.12	\$482.13	\$2,952.25	\$1,639.02	\$1,313.23

[^] City of Post Falls Fee Schedule as of 10/1/22.



Next Steps:

- Hold Public Hearings
- To City Council for Fee Adoption



Carey – Yes

Jones – It could be a combination

Carey – No less than 3'

Jones – So, you could do 9' on one side if you want a big functional side yard instead of a functional rear yard. It is to have an alternating pattern in the form and function of the unit, so it doesn't flow with every single house having a 5' setback on both sides to make them all line up in a nice little row. We wanted to see variety.

Carey – 3 is the minimum right?

Jones – Yes

Carey – So you could have 2 with just 3' and only have 6' total between them?

Manley – Not on the same lot, 2 adjacent though side by side, however, there might be some building code situations regarding fire rating issues. Theoretically you could see 3 and 3 on the same opposing.

Carey – Okay. I just wanted to clarify there would be at least 6' between 2 houses.

Testimony:

In Favor - None

Neutral - None

In Opposition - None

Schlotthauer – I have a question regarding the 3' and the fire code dictated 10' and the first lot built 3' and now the 2nd lot must build 7'.

Jones – Or they can do fire rating.

Kimball – Fire allows for closer; you just have to do fire rated walls, openings, etc. It gets a little tricky but there will probably be 1 builder going through all of the plans and so they may have fire rated walls in some spots but not in others.

Davis – No question block, right Herrington?

Herrington – Nope, you can talk about it, it is a legislative item.

Motion to recommend approval to City Council with the following amendments the Single-Family lot size be reduced to 4,000 square feet from 4,800. To clarify front and side loaded garages can't exceed 360 square feet, and to clarify porches are front porches not side or rear. To emphasize the garage setback to be 20' or reference the section of city code. Allow for rear and side yard fences to be 72" high rather than 48". Kimball

2nd By: Steffensen

Vote: Steffensen – Yes; Carey – Yes; Kimball – Yes; Davis – Yes; Schlotthauer – Yes;

Hampe - Yes

Moved

- D. **Recommendation** Development Impact Fee Update – Jon Manley, Planning Manager, to present an amendment to the Development Impact Fee to accomplish: Adjust impact fees based upon inflationary cost escalations, Basis on a ten (10) to twenty (20) year growth cost depending on the Impact Fee category. The Planning and Zoning Commission serve as the Impact Fee Advisory Committee and the current impact fee adjustments are based upon inflationary costs escalation and not updates capital improvement plans. Public Process to date: on August 2nd City Council approved the financing endeavor; November 2nd Committee review of draft with consultant. November 15th Bob Seale presented to NIBCA, and November 22nd Bill Melvin coordinated informational video on the website and December 6th

an email notification was sent to the development community. Your recommendation is currently scheduled to go to City Council on January 17th. Going back into the impact fees, we have projected growth trends; public safety, parks, streets, multimodal, and they look at the proposed future growth of the community and what capital plans associated, like regional capital plans, are needed to mitigate those impacts of growth. So, impact fees are a way for growth paying for growth. We have a growth rate from 2000 to now, in 2004 we had a jump from 6.5% to 8.8% then the recession hit with a dip down to around 1.6% then in 2021 we went up to 9.2%; Post Falls' average annual growth rate is about 4.7%. This helps take in account of the ups and downs within the community. Impact fees are payment required by local governments of new development for the purpose of providing new or expanded public capital facilities required to serve the community and new developments. (Not used to pay for maintenance, staffing, vehicles, etc.).

Hampe – So, no snowplows.

Manley – That would be equipment.

Herrington – There are some provisions for large equipment like fire trucks etc. but that is specifically delineated in the impact fee.

Hampe – So, it is specific then.

Herrington – Anything with a useful life over 10 years.

Manley - The different sections, public services departments, Parks and Rec, Police, Transportation/Streets, and multimodal, this graph shows the service area is city wide with the fee components and cost allocations. The fees support, Police Stations, Ancillary Facilities, and Communication Facilities for the Public Safety. They base this off a 10-year growth costs (Adjusted for 2022): \$15,287,495 and is established on a per person and vehicle trip basis. Parks base the fees on Level 1 and 2 parks as well as indoor recreation; the basis is established on a replacement methodology; 10-year growth costs (Adjusted for 2022): \$30,618,134 and applied to “residential” only. For the Transportation is based on the City’s Transportation Master Plan has a numerous Capital Facilities expenditures and Capital Plans within the Transportation Plan and once again those were not modified or updated just the cost escalation to complete those capital projects. And is applied on a per trip basis. The Multi-Modal supports those trails and bike lane facilities in the Transportation Master Plan with a 10-year growth cost. These changes brought the Multi-Family Impact Fee total from \$5,207 to \$8,910 and the Single-Family from \$7,406 to \$12,712. The non-residential development also sees increases. I want to reiterate this is dealing with the cost of materials and the cost escalations exceeded what we typically modify based off the ENR Index, we were seeing it wasn’t doing the impact fee service and escalated beyond what the ENR Index would control.

Hampe – When did we last update this?

Manley – We just recently did it.

Kimball – 2 years ago right.

Manley – 2 years ago was the major update.

Hampe – So, 2 years ago it would have been for a single-family 7,400?

Manley – Slightly less because it was escalated 1 time but now it is, yes.

Hampe – So, with the 12,700 where does that compare to the City of Coeur d’Alene or Hayden? Out of curiosity I am wondering.

Schlotthauer – More

Hampe – We are more, okay.

Kimball – Allot more.

Manley – With the 7,406 we are relative to other jurisdictions. Coeur d’Alene was a little lower than us this will make us slightly more expensive than some of the other communities. I don’t have the totals right now.

Hampe – Okay, I was asking for a general range, and it sounds like we are ahead of the pack.

Manley – That is good input, I will add that slide for Council.

Schlotthauer – How are we going to spend 20 million on bike paths in the next 10 years? Most paths, the developers would have to put them in, right?

Manley – Melvin is the one that coordinates the Transportation Master Plan, and that component is within that plan.

Melvin – Tischler took our multimodal components, doesn’t include every sidewalk or multi-use trail and bike lane that’s in the community, they took the majority of our multimodal Centennial Trail and some other major facilities. They divided it on a linear foot or square foot per population that we had and then project that out over 10-years. So, it’s a replacement base to keep up with the growth and to keep the same amount of multi-use system that we have per population. That is how they established those numbers. We have some rail lines that are going away and will be replaced with trails and some other major facilities.

Manley – Like the Prairie Trail.

Melvin – Yes.

Hampe – So that is just replacement?

Melvin - It’s not repair, it’s keeping the same amount per population.

Hampe – I see what you are saying.

Schlotthauer – Where will we be in 10 Years?

Manley – 2032 about 65,000

Schlotthauer – Vs?

Manley – about 44,004 in the beginning of 2022.

Kimball – So, about 20,000 more.

Schlotthauer – So, about 50% growth and your numbers are about 4.7 per year.

Manley – 4.7 - 4.8 per year.

Kimball – Am I to understand that Capital Improvement project list didn’t change.

Manley – Correct for any of the sectors.

Kimball – So, inflation’s 14%, or the Engineering News Record stated that construction costs went up 14% this year. The highest it has been in many years. We just did this 2 years ago and now we are increasing the Impact Fees overall by 71%? We were either way off before or the cost estimates we are basing these off are way off base, that is too big of a gap.

Manley – Hence why we had Tischler do it and not go by the ENR because we acknowledged that because what we were seeing for quotes wasn’t cutting it.

Kimball – So, we either screwed up last time or we didn’t get it right either time.

Manley – That is assuming the ENR Index is Gospel.

Kimball – It isn’t 50% off, the difference between 14% and 71% is huge.

Hampe – Do you think it will tend to slow growth, out of curiosity? Or discourage it in Post Falls and encourage it in other places?

Manley – The data I have seen is when Impact Fees go up it doesn’t necessarily discourage growth.

Hampe – But it is passed along to those people the consumer.

Schlotthauer – It ends up going to the tenant or the homeowner, everyone has to pay that sooner or later.

Melvin – The ENR we've adjusted it by, historically it has been in that 3, 4, 5% range I think the very last year what we did with an adjustment in the budget was 8%, that was the national range. These dollars are the 2018 dollars, even though it seems like we just adopted it. We had a local consultant, JUB, to do the cost escalations and those dollars were given to Tischler. Applied these new costs to the methodology, they didn't exaggerate the costs, they said here is what you have today.

Kimball – I am going to need to disagree with you a little, they have Right-of-Way in JUB's study at \$300,000/acre; that is \$6.87/square foot. I appreciate that they are looking at projects and trying to estimate a project cost based on no plans and just using a broad scope. I agree on increasing, so 2018 dollars now let increase to the 202 dollars, do the proper increase to the math. But that still doesn't get 71% in 1 year that is a huge pill.

Seale – Additionally, if you look at the cost that parks and police were adding you know those were adjusted, the parks department was adjusted based on land value obviously that has gone up tremendously. The police department had an error or omission within their original set of plans, so that had been fixed with this round. When you look at those 2 cost increases that may lead to the 71% increase. The re-evaluation for the parks department was more than what we had anticipated.

Hampe – Is that to acquire more land?

Seale – Yes, with the parks department the idea is we have x number of acres per person so therefore as we're growing, we want to maintain that ratio of the Level 1 and 2 parks.

Schlotthauer – What can we buy for \$30million in the next 10-years for parks?

Seale – We recently bought \$1million worth of land for parks and public works. Some of it will go towards improvements to the parks.

Schlotthauer – It would be great to have all this money to spend on all the wish list items. Businesses and developers have their pick of where they want to be and if the fees are twice as high in the City of Post Falls as they are down the road, it will discourage the growth here. I recently drove through some depressed areas of Washington; you think of towns growing but not all of the are many are decaying. People have to want to invest in the area and I think that the upfront fees I've seen personally evaluating a commercial project and the fees are a big factor and for the good of the town I hate to see businesses and residents discouraged from improving and building. I don't think we should lose sight of how important it is to incentivize the fact that we are improving, much of Post Falls is being improved and people will look at the Impact Fees, those are really just an upfront tax.

Seale – We do recognize this is a dramatic increase the costs the purpose behind it to follow the plan of making growth pay for itself. We didn't change the plan; projects were not added, and we didn't change anything from the original plan. We did, however, adjust the cost of what we anticipate having to spend on the projects that are developed and built due to the influx of growth. The other route is to have deficient services due to the growth or it gets paid through a different route. We are trying to accommodate for what you have today you still have in 10-years.

Hampe – That is certainly what we have heard from people over and over is to have development pay for itself. I believe there is a lot to be said for that.

Seale – We do plan to look at the Impact Fee Plan within the next couple of years in order to address some of it and potentially doing different zones within the Impact Fee. For the building in areas that are causing more of an impact on those services and networks versus areas that already have those services available. For example, downtown versus the Prairie Ave. Area, downtown already has parks, sidewalks, the infrastructure so there is potentially less of an impact building in the downtown area then if you were building north of Prairie. So,

the impact fee would be higher in the Prairie area versus development impact fees in the downtown area. This could incentivize those businesses within areas that are looking for redevelopment. We are looking at the methodology in the next round of doing the update, there wasn't time for a complete update, the last one took a couple of years. We are currently reacting to a current development of a roundabout up at Prairie and Zorros and the CIP quoted it to be around \$722,000 however, the estimate came back at approximately \$2.1 million. The question came up, if we are only collecting \$722,000 how are we going to build the \$2.1 million project.

Schlotthauer – I think it is important to not overshoot it though. The construction industry is making a major correction right now, residential as well as municipal and as the residential market is slowing those contractors are moving into the public market. You will see decreases in costs like lift stations and roads in my opinion. We do have some high costs; however, things are coming down in price and everything will follow, and we just don't want to overshoot right now.

Manley – From my understanding this is a balancing correction, Melvin acknowledged you have the 2018 base for the transportation elements and Seale brought up the Parkland element. I know the previous 2020 was a little deficient probably in the estimated cost. We all know what the land costs have done in recent times, and I think all of it corrects it, so it is current now. I asked Melvin if he has ever seen a negative percentage in the ENR Index, which was a no so odds are we will not see a minus 2% in the ENR Index, we could, but odds are we won't there is generally an increase.

Kimball – There was one in 2007, -1.6%.

Manley – If we adjusted our Impact Fees accordingly, we would adjust from that.

Kimball – My point is, we should probably continue to use an established index and with such a jump in fees, I am speaking from experience, in a down market when fees double or go up at such a high increment the push back from the development community is to file a lawsuit. When I got into the weeds of this and saw JUB used an estimate of \$27 for a linear foot of curb and I just completed an estimate a couple weeks ago and it was \$17. When I see the costs being such a huge jump, if this goes through a judicial review it will not pass. I don't feel comfortable recommending it.

Manley – There is a balance.

Kimball – The land prices are dropping.

Manley – In the Capital Plan of &780,000 project bid comes in \$2.1 million who picks up the difference? If the Impact Fees are not covering the cost of the Capital Plans.

Kimball – That is also a JUB estimate. With all due respect to JUB they are a great engineering company and I understand where they are coming from. They never want to be the low bidder, when doing an estimate, they want to be high that is how it should be. 2.1 is an overshoot for that as well; the reality of the construction world right now is the prices are dropping.

Schlotthauer – Prices are dropping, and the competitiveness is going up substantially. The price point you are looking at is a pinnacle and I would hate to see us adopt it based on the pinnacle and prevent development from happening because the fees are so extreme compared to our neighbors.

Steffensen – I had said before, I think we are always behind on the 8-ball on these. If we looked at them in 2020 using 2018 numbers, we are behind there and I know full reviews take time however, if it is in another 5 years we might be behind again. Just looking at the growth in 2021 it was over 9% growth and then inflation and I think we are in an exceptional time, and I don't like this increase by any means I don't want anything to slow down our

economy however, maybe this is a correction. Time will tell; have we had a change this much in the past or have we always used that index?

Manley – For the most part we have used the index, the major changes that occurred has been in our updates and staff takes a long time looking at our projects and we try to cost balance them. We try to be responsible in creating our Capital project lists based on what is necessary.

Steffensen – I don't necessarily think we are overshooting.

Melvin – Our Transportation Master Plan for example, we have a 20-year plan that we are trying to maintain a certain level of service requirements. When we developed it, we have a list of Capital Projects, we have not said we're going to fund them completely we use grants, some we get and some we do not get, however, we do apply for them. We also look at partnering opportunities when we can. The last time I was before the North Idaho Building Contractors, they had said they don't like the jump in Impact Fees however, they said if you don't have good park systems, roads, or police facilities and you're not maintaining them then you are not an attractive community to build in.

Hampe – 2018 is when the suggested numbers but they were not approved until 2020. So, it took 2 years, or are we working backwards?

Melvin – The Transportation Plan was adopted in 2018, it took a couple years to do that. If Parks does a new master plan, they will move the impact fees forward and adjust those fees. Same thing with both the Transportation Master plan and the Police Department.

Hampe – Okay, thank you!

****Commission continued the discussion regarding the information already provided above; all agreed to continue the discussion at a later time with more information per department with increases****

Kimball - Motion to move to Jan. 10th (Table) all in favor...
Moved

- **ADMINISTRATIVE / STAFF REPORTS**

None

- **COMMISSION COMMENT**

HAPPY HOLIDAYS/MERRY CHRISTMAS!

- **ADJOURNMENT 8:17PM**

Questions concerning items appearing on this Agenda should be addressed to the Community Development Department – Planning Division at 408 Spokane Street or call 208-773-8708.

The City Hall building is handicapped accessible. If any person needs special equipment to accommodate their disability, please notify the City Media Center at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting date. The Media Center telephone number is 208-457-3341.

Chair: Ryan Davis Vice Chair: Ray Kimball
Members: Vjcky Jo Cary, Nancy Hampe, Ross Schlotthauer, James Steffensen, Kevin Ward

Amber Blanchette

From: jonie@postfallshd.com
Sent: Monday, December 5, 2022 11:56 AM
To: Amber Blanchette
Subject: RE: Impact Fee Update

WARNING: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

PFHD has no comment.

Jonie Anderson
Administrative Assistant
Post Falls Highway District
p 208.765.3717
f 208.765.0493
contactus@postfallshd.com



From: Amber Blanchette <amberb@postfalls.gov>
Sent: Tuesday, November 22, 2022 10:57 AM
To: Ali Marienau <AMarienau@kmpo.net>; Andy Obermueller <aobermueller@cdapress.com>; audie.neuson@williams.com; Avista <c01_Real_Estate@avistacorp.com>; Bill Melvin <bmelvin@postfalls.gov>; Bill Roberson <william.roberson@itd.idaho.gov>; Brittany Stottlemire <brittany.stottlemire@avistacorp.com>; CDA GARBAGE <jennifer@cdagarbage.com>; CDA Press <BBLITZ@cdapress.com>; Chad Polak <Chad.M.Polak@p66.com>; Charles Lane <Charles.Lane@charter.com>; CHARTER <DLwest-pnw-construction@charter.com>; Chris Riedeman <criedeman@kec.com>; Dan Ryan <danr@kootenaifire.com>; Dan Selden <danselden@hotmail.com>; Dana Marsh <dana.marsh@tdstelecom.com>; David Callahan <dcallahan@kcgov.us>; David Fair <dfair@postfalls.gov>; David Sauer (ZiPLY) <david.sauer@ziPLY.com>; Dena Naccarato <dnaccarato@273.com>; Devin Weeks <dweeks@cdapress.com>; Dewey, Kristina <kristina.a.dewey@usps.gov>; Diane URA <dianepfura@gmail.com>; Dylan Owens <dylan.owens@tdstelecom.com>; Erik Ketner <eketner@phd1.idaho.gov>; Erin Butler <ebutler@sd273.com>; Ethan Porter <eport@postfalls.gov>; Field Herrington <fherrington@postfalls.gov>; Heidi <heidig@inlander.com>; Heidi Varney <hvarney@postfallsidaho.org>; J Mcmillin <jmcmillin@postfallspolice.com>; Jacob Bell <jacob.bell@tdstelecom.com>; Jame Davis <jame.davis@intermaxteam.com>; Jason Faulkner <jfaulkner@postfallsidaho.org>; Jason Kimberling <jason.kimberling@itd.idaho.gov>; Jennifer Poindexter <jcresci@postfallsidaho.org>; Jeryl Archer <jeryla@kootenaifire.com>; jhofer@kec.com; JHolderman@KEC.com; Kelly Russell <jmeyer@postfallsidaho.org>; John Beacham <jbeacham@postfallsidaho.org>; Jonathon Manley <jmanley@postfalls.gov>; Judah Lopez <judah_lopez@tranacanaca.com>; Justin Miller <jmiller@postfallsidaho.org>; Keeler <keeler.white@twcable.com>; Kevin Linville <kevin.linville@tdstelecom.com>; Kirk <Kirk.Hobson@charter.com>; Kirk Hobson <kirk.hobson@twcable.com>; KMPO <Gmiles@kmpo.net>; Kootenai Electric <mblyton@kec.com>; Kootenai Electric <mnewcomer@kec.com>; Kristen Rondo <krondo@phd1.idaho.gov>; Kristie McEnroe <kristie.mcenroe@deq.idaho.gov>; Laura Jones <ljon@postfalls.gov>; lauriep@kootenaifire.com; Lynn Sandsor,

AECOM <lynn.sandsor@aecom.com>; Martina <martina@eastgreenacres.org>; Marvin Fenn <marvin.fenn@itd.idaho.gov>; Matthew Jones, BNSF <matthew.jones@bnsf.com>; Media <media@postfallsidaho.org>; Michael Allen <MAllen@postfallspolice.com>; Michael Thomas, P.E. <mthomas@kec.com>; Monica Miller <momiller@quantatelcom.com>; Naomi Tierney <ntierney@postfalls.gov>; Pat Knight <pknight@postfallspolice.com>; PFHD <contactus@postfallshd.com>; PFPD <admin@postfallspolice.com>; Phillip Evander <PEvander@kec.com>; Post Falls Chamber <pam@postfallschamber.com>; Preston Hill <phill@postfallsidaho.org>; Rob Palus <rpalus@postfalls.gov>; Robert Seale <rseale@postfalls.gov>; Rod CDA Garbage <Rod@cdagarbage.com>; Ross Point Water <rosspointwater@frontier.com>; Scott Davis <sdavis@kec.com>; Shannon Howard <showard@postfalls.gov>; Shelly Enderud <senderud@postfalls.gov>; Stacy Simkins <stacy.simkins@itd.idaho.gov>; Stephanie Herman <speugh@postfallsidaho.org>; Steven Kjergaard <skjergaard@kcgov.us>; Teresa Benner <tbenner@postfalls.gov>; Thomas Gwin <thomas.gwin@twcable.com>; Tisha Gallop <tgallop@postfalls.gov>; Towry, Kristie <kmtowry@bpa.gov>; Wade Meyer <wmeyer@postfalls.gov>; Warren M <warrenm@kootenaifire.com>; Warren Wilson <wwilson@postfallsidaho.org>; Wilson, Ron <Ron@eastgreenacres.org>; James Steffensen <james.steffensen@bannerbank.com>; Kevin Ward (gatheredfamilyrestaurant@gmail.com) <gatheredfamilyrestaurant@gmail.com>; Nancy Hampe <nancyradiantlake@gmail.com>; Ray Kimball <rkimball@whipplece.com>; Ross Schlotthauer <ross@burlyproducts.com>; Ryan Davis <rlDavis208@gmail.com>; Vicky Jo Carey <vjcarey@aol.com>

Subject: Impact Fee Update

Good morning,

Attached is the notice to jurisdiction for the Impact Fee Update for the Planning & Zoning meeting on December 13th. The draft staff report will be on the city's website shortly.

Please Note my new email address is amberb@postfalls.gov

Thank you,

Amber Blanchette
Planning Specialist
Phone: 208-457-3338
Email: amberb@postfalls.gov



Fear is an illusion, ready to be overcome...

The City of Post Falls has changed our domain to POSTFALLS.GOV. Please adjust your contacts/links.

Privileged / confidential information may be contained in this message. If you are not the addressee indicated in this message (or responsible for delivery of the message to such person), you may not copy or send this message to anyone. In such case, you should destroy this message and kindly notify the sender by reply e-mail. Although this email has been scanned for the possible presence of computer viruses prior to dispatch, we cannot be held responsible for any viruses or other material transmitted with, or as part of, this email without our knowledge.