Missoula County
Impact Fee Advisory Committee
Meeting Minutes

Missoula County
Planning, Development & Sustainability
(406) 258-4657

Date:	April 14, 2025, 2:30 p.m.
Location:	LAC Conference Room at the Missoula County Lands and Communities Office, 127 E. Main St. Suite 2. (in person) or TEAMS (virtually)
Voting Members in Attendance:	James (Jim) Bachand, Richard (Rick) Hall, Sam Kulla, Christopher (Chris) Anderson
Ex-Officio Member in Attendance:	Commissioner, Josh Slotnick
PDS Staff Representative in Attendance:	Karen Hughes, AICP Director of Planning, Development & Sustainability

1. **CALL TO ORDER *[Time stamp – 01:55]***
   Rick Hall called the meeting to order

2. **ROLL CALL*[Time stamp – 01:58]***
   Jill Johnson called the roll. Four (4) voting members were present. A quorum was met.

3. **APPROVAL OF AGENDA *[Time stamp – 02:27]***
   Sam Kulla moved and James Bachand seconded approval of the agenda for the meeting. The motion passed by unanimous voice vote.

4. **APPROVAL OF MINUTES *[Time stamp – 02:45]***
   The minutes for the January 30, 2025, meeting did not require approval as quorum was not met. No comments were made on the January 30, 2025, minutes and the minutes will be posted for public access.

5. **PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS *[Time stamp – 03:22]***
   There were no public comments on non-agenda items.

6. **COMMUNICATIONS *[Time stamp – 03:36]***

   a. **Proposed Meeting Schedule - *[Time stamp – 03:38]***

      Karen Hughes proposed a quarterly meeting schedule. The proposed quarterly meetings would occur late January, April, July and October taking into consideration key planning and reporting schedules including (i) adjustments made to impact fees (ii) the publishing of financial reports and (iii) the budgeting timeline.

      The January, April and July meetings will focus on appropriation requests and the meeting in October will focus on the financial report and fee adjustments.

Karen provided clarification on the appropriation request process and associated format. Appropriation requests may originate from the Finance Department or other departments within Missoula County (County) and City of Missoula (City), where the City's requests will be associated parks and shared use paths in the greater urban area. Requests may be made for lump-sum funding or project-specific appropriations.

b. Financial Report *[Time stamp – 09:13]*

Karen reported that from August 1, 2024, to April 11, 2025, impact fees in an aggregate amount of $151,932 were collected. Of this amount, a total of $7,996 was collected as administrative fees, specifically for the County. The City has not yet begun to collect impact fees on behalf of the county. A breakdown of impact fees collected by category was provided in Karen's attached presentation. It was noted that a majority of the currently collected funds will be used for infrastructure projects or capital purchases.

Karen explained that the County must use collected impact fees within six (6) years. Any unused fees must be returned on a first-in, first-out basis.

Chris Anderson inquired about projecting future impact fees based on anticipated growth to better understand how to align their use with the County's future needs. Karen explained that moving forward more accurate projections can be made utilizing prior year permit data and upcoming budget requests, rather than data from the Department of Revenue, which was not as accurate.

All Committee Members agreed on the importance of having an interlocal agreement with the City to define the process for collecting and distributing impact fees for shared facilities or spaces. It was noted that impact fee boundaries are strictly defined, to ensure funds are utilized in the geographic areas where they are assessed.

For parks, funds are split between local park improvements and regional amenities, such as Fort Missoula and Big Sky Regional Park, which serve the broader community.

Highest collection periods are expected to be between April 1st and October 30th during the season when most building permits are pulled. The data presented at this meeting does not capture a full building season.

c. Program Updates *[Time stamp – 20:33]*

i. Coordination with the City of Missoula *[Time stamp – 20:37]*

Karen confirmed that she has a meeting scheduled with representatives of the City, namely, Erin Pehan and Ginny Merriam. The meeting will focus on the next steps in adopting an interlocal agreement, the City's challenges associated with increasing and collecting fees on behalf of the County, and the messaging strategy to City Council and the public. It was noted that the City currently does not collect impact fees at the maximum authorized level.

Commissioner, Josh Slotnick discussed the services provided by the County within City limits, such as emergency management, elections, and jail services, making coordinated fee collection important. Commissioner Slotnick also emphasized that rising service costs are met regardless, but it is impact fees which can reduce reliance on property taxes, so that those service costs are borne by the citizens who are incurring them.

Jim Bachand recommended communicating directly with the City's Impact Fee Advisory Committee. Coordination and education efforts should focus on the defined overlapping service areas which include the Sheriff's Office, Office of Emergency Management, Parks, Shared Use Paths and General Government.

ii. Overview of Impact Fee Appropriation Process *[Time stamp – 33:22]*

Karen discussed the eligible uses of collected impact fees which will include expenditures on public facilities, payment of principal, interest and other financing costs to finance public facilities, financing offsets, recuperation of costs of excess capacity in existing facilities and financing costs of updating the resolution. Chris provided additional clarification on how impact fees can be utilized as offsets for development projects which might require parks and open spaces.

Sam Kulla inquired about the potential for the appropriation process to be competitive. Due to the collaborative involvement of multiple departments involved with impact fees the appropriation process is expected to be more of a more coordinated effort rather than a competitive process.

The Committee Members expressed concern about being the final decision-makers in selecting specific projects and emphasized a preference for focusing on determining eligibility.

Chris suggested that appropriation requests should follow a predetermined process or be routed through department heads. Karen confirmed that, in general, requests will be submitted through department heads. Exceptions may include occasional one-off offset requests, such as those for parks or shared use paths.

It was recognized that the state statute requires the Impact Fee Advisory Committee (IFAC) to participate in the decision-making process. The Committee Members agreed that for consistency, all requests should be routed through IFAC, even if there is another governing body or board involved.

Karen proposed the following procedure for impact fee appropriation:

- Departments identify public facility projects to be funded by impact fees.
- PDS staff make a recommendation to IFAC and verifies the availability of funds.
- IFAC makes a recommendation to the Commissioners for final decision.
- The Commissioners authorizes the use of impact fees to fund capital improvements.

Karen presented a proposed structure for appropriation requests to include (i) the project information (description of the public facility, project timeline and budget) and (ii) an explanation of how the project aligns with the applicable impact fee fund category and confirmed that the request process will be coordinated with City.

7. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES *[Time stamp – 1:01:27]*

There were no committee reports.

8. OLD BUSINESS *[Time stamp – 1:01:39]*

a. Selection of Chair and Vice Chair *[Time stamp – 1:01:39]*

There are three (3) vacant seats. The group engaged in discussion about encouraging new applicants. Sam Kulla moved and Chris Anderson seconded. Rick Hall, was elected Interim Chair until vacant seats are filled.

9. NEW BUSINESS *[Time stamp - 1:10:22]*

a. Communications about Impact Fee Appropriation Process *[Time stamp - 1:10:37]*

At the January 30th meeting the group discussed engagement with various departments which may utilize the collected impact fees. Jim recommended that this topic be tabled until the next meeting and following discussions with representatives from the City.

10. ADJOURNMENT *[Time stamp – 1:11:30]*

The official meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.
Missoula Impact Fee Advisory Committee April 14, 2025 – Transcription
This transcription was produced by transcription software. There may be discrepancies between this transcription and meeting dialogue. You can view the recording of the meeting at this link: https://missoulacomt.portal.civicclerk.com/event/9700/media

Missoula County Impact Fee Advisory Meeting
April 14, 2025 Meeting Recording

0:01
We found him.

0:02
Oh, good.

0:03
Good.

0:03
Hey, you made it.

0:08
I made it.

0:09
Thank you.

0:09
Just having a little low sewer debrief.

0:17
Hey, nice to meet you.

0:20
All right, here we are.

0:30
So we had the same problem as the last time.

0:34
We don't have anyone to chair the committee unless we start with that or you just take off work, take over What you left up, I think, weren't you?

0:42
Did you chair the meetings people?

0:43
Not?

0:43
No, you didn't.

0:45
No.

0:47
Then maybe the vice chair was the vice chair.

0:49
So is it worth maybe just acknowledging that Jeff passed away?

0:55
Yeah, too bad that.

0:58
I mean, you all heard it.

0:58
It was an accident, wasn't it?

1:00
Well, this was a car accident.

1:01
Yeah, yeah, yeah.

1:03
Tragic, super tragic.

1:05
Yeah.

1:06
So I went to his memorial this weekend and it was so inspiring.

1:11
See how many people this guy affected him were 180.

1:14
That was huge kids too.

1:15
I mean that.

1:16
Yeah.

1:16
I mean, he was a soccer coach for.

1:18
Right, Some ideas.

1:19
It's just shocking.

1:20
It's just so many accident.

1:22
Yeah, yeah, yeah.

1:24
So anyway, yeah, very much the speakers and the whole message left you walking away and being like, I really need to be a better person.

1:33
I guess I was more like Jeff.

1:34
Yeah, somebody who really gave us height to other people.

1:36
Yeah, for sure.

1:37
It was an inspiring message.

1:40
He was a great guy and he was a a really great part of this committee.

1:46
I mean did, did a lot of great work.

1:48
So shall we continue call to order roll call?

1:59
Do roll call.

2:00
James Bachand here, Rick Hall here, Sam Kula here, Christopher Anderson here, Josh Slotnick here, Karen Hughes.

2:14
I'm not on the board.

2:15
Well, sorry, here.

2:20
We have 4 members here and we do have 4.

2:23
We have a corner.

2:25
First item on the agenda would be approval of this agenda.

2:29
Do we have a motion to approve?

2:30
I move that we approve this agenda.

2:33
OK.

2:33
Do we need a second or second?

2:36
OK, All in favor, Aye aye.

2:41
Any approve?

2:42
Any opposed?

2:43
No approval of minutes from January 30th, 2025.

2:48
I don't think I read the minutes.

2:50
I don't.

2:50
You don't technically have to, OK.

2:52
It wasn't technically a meeting, but if anyone did read them, they went out with, I think they went out with the agenda.

2:59
If anyone read them and saw corrections, we'll, we'll still post them.

3:02
But OK.

3:03
Any corrections that anyone saw, if you saw them?

3:09
OK, then do we need a motion to approve the minutes of the non meeting?

3:14
You don't need the motion to approve.

3:16
OK.

3:17
There was no action because there wasn't no meeting.

3:19
There was.

3:20
Can we have public comment period on non agenda items?

3:23
There's anyone online or in the room?

3:32
It's like it's just us.

3:34
Yeah, it's just us.

3:36
Communication.

3:37
That's proposed meeting schedule.

3:42
Probably mostly me.

3:45
So we had talked at the last meeting about probably doing, doing quarterly meetings and seeing how that aligned with the schedule.

3:55
And I, I think it works pretty well if we do late January, late April, late July, late October.

4:04
And I can show you and I realize that we're mid-october right now, But if we from this point forward kind of make that adjustment, I can show, I can talk and do at the same time, which might be a big if.

4:27
OK, the, the kind of the scheduling pieces that affect the impact fee advisory committee.

4:41
Wow, really slow.

4:42
OK, there it is.

4:46
There's two kind of key deadlines that I think about one, three actually.

4:53
So one is the, the any adjustments that are made to impact fees like a cost of or a inflationary adjustment, those take effect July 1st when we do those.

5:09
So that's one thing to take into account.

5:11
The financial reports are published in early October.

5:19
So that's another piece of information to keep an account.

5:21
And then the budgeting process, which by July, usually we have all the information in put into the budget process for commissioners to start making decisions.

5:31
And so any impact fee appropriation requests should be kind of funneled through that process by then.

5:37
So what seemed to make sense to me was in January, you'd be considering early impacting appropriation requests, you'd be considering those in January, April, and you'd still have a chance to consider some of those in July if something needed to squeak in late.

5:58
So that would be your January and then April would mostly be focused on appropriation requests.

6:04
In July it would be those last minute requests and in October it would really be about that financial report and considering if there needs to be adjustments to the Karen.

6:13
Can you say more about what it means?

6:16
What do you mean by appropriation requests?

6:20
Describe what that looks like specifically.

6:22
Well, it will probably depend.

6:24
Some of these may come just straight through the finance department saying that fees for different kinds of categories, they'll probably just be like kind of a lump sum request sort of thing for the different categories need to be budgeted in the next budget year and those might all come through together.

6:43
But for, for example, parks, possibly French and World of Fire, they might have like specific projects that they want to bring and they, all of those are technically supposed to go through the impact fee advisory committee for a recommendation before going to the commissioners.

6:58
So this is both going to be for individual line item projects and for other budgetary requests from other departments within the county and city.

7:07
Yeah, Well, just county, but yeah, I mean, technically the city actually they're parks, for example, right?

7:13
Yeah, yeah.

7:15
OK.

7:16
And charities pass and how did those requests, in what form will those requests come?

7:21
Is it a written memorandum or is it just a give us 10 grand?

7:27
Yeah, that's what is that.

7:29
I think that it's going to be a combination of both and I have more information.

7:33
We were going to talk more about the appropriation process a little bit later.

7:37
I think they could come in two different forms.

7:39
One is kind of a, A might be more presented by the finance team saying for all, like if, if they're using the impact fees to help finance an existing project or something like that or to pay for the added capacity on a previous project, those might come through just as a, you know, we want to use impact fees for these categories to fund added capacity was built into an OEM project as an example.

8:09
They would just kind of list those out probably and it would come from finance possibly they could come from individual departments.

8:16
It could also come from finance.

8:19
It it's hard.

8:20
We we're going to figure that out.

8:22
I think more likely what you're going to see is the project specific requests and those coming from the individual departments.

8:32
And I've put together a kind of suggestion for what I think might be useful information.

8:38
And I'm interested in giving your guys's thoughts as to what you think would be useful to see.

8:45
And we have that in your business, Yeah, or yes, I think I have it in the overview of the appropriation process.

8:54
So we can wait to discuss it then or I, I just have a few more questions, but yeah, we can.

9:01
So is that, I mean, does that make sense in terms of a meeting schedule?

9:06
Yeah, yeah, sounds good to me.

9:08
Yeah.

9:09
Cool.

9:13
Should be a financial report, right?

9:15
So this is how much we've collected so far, $151,932.00 in fees, impact fees and then the administration was about $8000 and each of the, so they're broken out by category.

9:32
And on the subsequent slide, I have the breakdown for shared use paths and parks.

9:38
And as a reminder, this started on August 1st and it's as of last Friday and we're not collecting still in the city.

9:50
We're on that in a minute.

9:53
It's a chunk of change, yeah.

9:55
Yeah.

9:56
So like with French Down rural Fire, do they get a check twice a year?

10:00
No, they again, they have to go to specific appropriate projects, make requests, make requests.

10:06
So they could make requests for up to 17366.

10:12
And the way that we set it up with the finance department was to do their first financial report in October, knowing it would take some time to get some funding.

10:22
You know, most of these are going towards infrastructure projects or large purchases like a vehicle, which sure, yeah, yeah.

10:30
And Karen something.

10:32
But yeah, because you're not collecting in the city, that admin fee line out in is specific to county only admin.

10:41
That's correct.

10:42
The city, the plan has always been that for the amount that the city collects, they'll keep their admin fee.

10:49
Are there, are there rules around using this for financing debt service?

10:54
No, it can be used for that.

10:55
Yeah, I have a slide that talks about what it can be used for going ahead too.

10:59
So, OK.

11:00
Yeah, yeah, I know for sure.

11:02
That's why I'm saying that like for some things, it might be a kind of a package and not really so much a project specific.

11:08
It might be like here are some things we want to use these funds for that are more kind of financial oriented.

11:15
And then in other cases, it's going to be like a department pitching a project, I think and it just rolls over, not used.

11:25
Yeah.

11:26
And then at that six year mark, we have to start giving the money back.

11:29
If we haven't spent, the rules are first in, first out and we have.

11:38
Is there anything that could help us project future impact fees based on anticipated growth or subdivisions in review or things like that, that we could kind of slate out and say, OK, rather than just respond to specific requests as they come in and then look at it say, Oh yeah, we have enough money or we don't have enough money.

12:03
Is there any way we could say, OK, if this is a major priority of the county, let's plan for these types of fees in the future?

12:13
I guess I would just in order for us to be intelligently responding to those requests as they come in, as you've described it, it would be really good to have a big picture view of what we're trying to accomplish with these fees.

12:27
If somebody's waiting for a request or Rick waiting for an opportunity for, you know, shared use path, but the request needs to be somewhere in the 200 to $250,000 range.

12:39
But in the meantime, all of these individual requests are coming in that just keep depleting that fund continually.

12:46
We we should have a bigger yeah plan in place as to how we wanna spend these and, and, and hear from the organizations, right.

12:57
I mean, obviously we're not the ones that are gonna be doing the planning, but it's really more responding to the needs and the long term plans of the county.

13:04
Yeah.

13:04
Does that make sense?

13:05
Yeah.

13:05
No, it totally does.

13:06
We did a revenue projection last year based on, we didn't do it based on permits because we have to pull permits from the city and the county, which was more than we could stomach at the moment.

13:19
And we had to do it in less than a week.

13:21
So we did it based on some data out of the Department of Revenue.

13:25
It's really far from where we ended up.

13:27
And so we're gonna and we're using it for one more year while we go back and see if we can come up with a better way to project revenue because we have the same question.

13:36
And for budgeting purposes, we do have to do a projected budget to try and figure out what that looks like.

13:42
I think that we can probably pull the permit data, which is probably a better estimate of of what we're going to see and just probably use last year's data.

13:54
That's probably the best we can.

13:56
But the fees are paid at the time the permit is pulled, right?

13:59
Yes.

14:00
But we can use the whole totality of last year's data to estimate what we might see based on growth trends that we're seeing in the broader community.

14:10
Right.

14:11
OK.

14:12
That's what we tried to do using DLR data and it's off by like a factor of 1,000,000.

14:20
Can you just grab the central Missoula because we, we don't have an interlocal with the city yet.

14:25
We don't, but we set up the, but the Central Missoula district for parks and charities pass covers an area that's greater than the than the bigger than city.

14:37
They're in the cigarette.

14:38
Thank you.

14:38
So central Missoula is bigger than city.

14:41
It's it's outside of city center.

14:42
It's like the urban area.

14:46
The the doughnut.

14:48
Yeah.

14:55
Should just always have this up.

14:57
No, not that one.

14:58
The cities impact these.

15:04
So yeah, so it's you know, it goes out into target range and there is here, let me grab the nap.

15:11
Hang on, let me get there.

15:46
OK, sure.

15:51
Maybe just a quick question while you're pulling that up.

15:53
So you showed the numbers for the shared use paths and the different districts that we have there.

16:01
How rigid are those boundaries for the use of these impact fees?

16:06
I would assume they're pretty rigid because the individuals who had paid the impact fees within that district, right?

16:14
We can't borrow from one and pay it back later type thing, right?

16:18
OK.

16:18
Yeah, it's big.

16:27
So they're fairly rigid.

16:28
Yeah, we did have to adjust fairly rigid or rigid.

16:32
Rigid.

16:32
They're rigid other than we can.

16:36
Yeah, they're rigid.

16:37
They we did, we had to make some adjustments to those that were in the study area because there was some misalignment.

16:45
There was, I think we ended up fixing the line between Lolo and French Town, for example, I think it dipped and it didn't make any logical sense because anyone with the side is going to be Lolo, that side's going to be French Town and it there was also some weird alignment.

17:06
I think part of the French Town rural fire district was out of the French Towns parks and trail service area.

17:13
So we we made some minor tweaks, but once it's set up, then yes, they should.

17:19
The one difference is if you have a park or a trail that crosses over the boundaries, then there's probably some room, some flexibility.

17:26
Also for parks, a portion of the parks impact fee is for the local parks, but a portion that for the improvements in the local parks.

17:39
Portion of it is for Fort Missoula Regional Park and Big Sky Park regional parks.

17:44
Everyone is assessed for Fort Missoula and Big Sky Park because they're considered regional parks, but not.

17:54
But if you if you have parks in your district, then only only those within your district.

18:01
For example, Frenchtown doesn't have any local parks.

18:04
They only are assessed for the regional parks.

18:12
All right, stop sharing that.

18:22
So when we start collecting in the city, that was the other thing is that a portion of the city, Missoula, I think, dipped out of the central Hilaria.

18:31
And so we had to bring it in.

18:35
Yeah, We didn't want that.

18:39
Yeah.

18:41
Do you want me to go back to.

18:43
OK, hang on talking and doing at the same time?

18:48
Not easy for me for some reason today.

18:59
I could this is all stashed in one presentation other than the maps so I can we can flip back and forth when as we move forward.

19:07
Remind me again Karen.

19:09
Yeah sorry but the the impact fees collected as of April 11th that was Friday great quality data very up to date.

19:21
Thank you.

19:23
That goes back to August 1st, August 1st.

19:28
So we're roughly looking at about 6:00-ish, eight ish months of yeah of data here.

19:35
OK.

19:37
And I would expect that the period where collections are going to be highest is gonna be in that.

19:45
Between call it April 1st and October 30th.

19:50
Yeah, something like that where 8090% of our fees are going to be collected during that time.

19:55
That's great.

19:56
OK.

19:56
So we really haven't even gone through a building season.

19:59
Yeah, right.

20:00
We're, we're not, this isn't capturing a full building season yet.

20:03
So it's about to happen and which is part of the reason to hold the financial report until we made it through .1 over here.

20:11
OK.

20:11
Yeah, OK.

20:12
And to make the finance people happy that we weren't interrupting their work at other important times of the year.

20:18
Yeah.

20:20
Thank you.

20:21
Yeah.

20:24
Oh, on there.

20:29
Oh no, I did OK, financial report.

20:32
OK, so then program updates.

20:34
So this is the financial report then City of Missoula.

20:38
I do have a meeting set up with a couple folks at the city this week to start back into figuring out how to coordinate with them on getting the city to adopt or to adopt the urge to improve the interlocal so we can move forward with collection.

20:55
Their challenge right now is A collecting more fees and B collecting more fees on behalf of the county.

21:03
These are both, those are both big challenges.

21:06
Do we have do we have champions on City Council?

21:09
I don't know that yet.

21:11
We're gonna start with Erin Pan and Jenny Miriam to talk about what their, what they think, their messaging, what I think our messaging problems are and the people.

21:22
And I think Jenny Miriam's pretty tuned in to not just the external publics, that's what's been mostly mentioned, but the internal publics, the City Council members.

21:31
And part of the challenge is that they are going through, they've just gone through a fee study to change their fee structure.

21:39
They're also doing an impact fee study update.

21:42
One thing I did not know is the city doesn't collect impact fees at the maximum level.

21:47
They to a tee, I think, collect less than they're authorized to under their study.

21:53
So our fees just look disproportionately large by comparison.

21:59
So that's kind of interesting.

22:02
So there's no IGA in place.

22:04
There's no IGA in place.

22:05
What's that intergovernmental agreement?

22:08
Interlocal.

22:09
Interlocal.

22:10
It's a different yeah, federal.

22:14
No, we, we we can't get them to when we we've been trying since last year, the intergovernmental agreement and.

22:20
And they can't until they they essentially have to get permission from this.

22:26
I think a big piece of this would be convincing or demonstrating to folks in the City Council that county provides services to people inside the city limits, just such specific services.

22:36
And I wouldn't be surprised if there are a bunch of folks on City Council that don't literally just don't know that.

22:41
It's just not in their head.

22:42
They believe Emergency Management just just happens.

22:47
The elections just happen.

22:49
The jail just happens.

22:51
They're not adding up that they actually use these things but don't pay for them, right?

22:55
I think also that there is understandably some confusion.

23:01
They have parks impact fees and we have parks impact fees.

23:04
Easy confusion, be clear about how that's not double dipping and how it how the collection in the Central Central District can benefit city.

23:14
Yeah, residents also, they have a category, I can't remember it off the top of my head.

23:20
It's a very general category.

23:21
It's like community services or something like that.

23:23
And and that like making sure that there that there isn't a perception of double dipping between that and our general administration, which is, yeah, there's a big informational hurdle here.

23:34
Yes, we'll be back to talk.

23:37
And is that is that the challenge of getting the agreement in place?

23:41
Absolutely.

23:42
Just an education thing.

23:43
And once everybody's educated, everybody.

23:45
Yep.

23:45
It's only I think that this is just my prediction.

23:48
But I think that there's folks on City Council who are on the the pretty far left who will say anything that could add a penny to a cost of a house in these terrible housing crisis times we can't do.

23:58
And then there'll be folks on the far right say anything that brings another penny to government is a bad idea.

24:04
And people are being taxed out of their houses.

24:06
So we got to say no.

24:08
And those two forces will align and together it kind of almost equals the not crazy people.

24:13
And that's going to be a tough, a tough bow, tough political.

24:21
The folks in the middle are much more open to education and listening than the folks on either of the distant polls.

24:29
It seems like a something that's within reach though, right?

24:33
I mean, I, I agree.

24:34
So how do we meet with the right people?

24:35
And yeah, the city's had impact fees, sure, but they under they should understand the logic, though the folks on City Council may not know what their impact fees are all about.

24:45
Don't understand.

24:47
The one way to approach this, I think is to talk about the effect on property taxes.

24:50
If we don't have these things that these costs are met regardless, but they're borne by everyone instead of the folks who are actually incurring the costs.

24:58
And so this is an actual property tax reduction tool.

25:01
This is a way to focus those costs on people who are benefiting them from them in much the way an RSID or an Sid works.

25:08
And it's a one, one time payment.

25:09
It's not a for everything like a tax.

25:11
And I think the folks in the middle when hearing that and understanding that the this money goes to address services that people in the city use, even if they don't depend on county government for everything, I think that that could be a compelling message.

25:24
But it has to be made clearly.

25:26
And it's not just about collecting money and it's not a tax.

25:31
It's to avoid it being becomes exactly taxes every year.

25:35
This is a one shot deal.

25:37
I also think you can, you know, approach those like perceived oppositions on the left and right by just highlighting something else.

25:44
Like if you're talking to people on the left, look at all the cool social benefits that this would produce talking to people on the right, you know, look at how much this would help public safety and potentially use taxes.

25:54
Yeah, sure.

25:55
That too.

25:56
Yeah.

25:56
So it'd be great if they got to speak to people's interests.

26:00
Jim Ezzard Oh, I'm sorry, Jim, I'm sorry.

26:02
I I was thinking before we try and hit up any of the City Council folks, I'm wondering if there's value of just going to the city's impact, the advisory committee and making sure that that advisory committee understands interagency agreement and understands where there why there isn't double dipping, Because I'm not sure that some of those advisory committee members understand this.

26:27
That's a good idea.

26:28
Yeah.

26:31
And then I think for the people on the left, Josh, that you may be referencing the socialists, helping them understand the emergency services and how that supports the need to deal with the houseless crisis.

26:53
Correct.

26:56
I will be meeting with Jenny and Erin tomorrow and get some initial information from them.

27:04
I'll talk with, I'll talk with Erin about thoughts about the maybe a joint meeting or at least a couple of us going to the impact, the advisory committee meeting with the city.

27:16
We should also get an assessment and to some extent I think there's a Dale Chris Lansbury conversation that's that probably has to have to can we point to a development and show how those impact be good, good the community we can try we should be able to yes.

27:43
I don't know if there have been any large enough that.

27:45
Yeah, see, that's the problem.

27:46
Challenge is that most of the county's larger developments are well outside the area.

27:54
Even even if they are, we're outside the area, let's say, my God, the ones out by the Y that are in conversation right now where we're talking about hundreds of houses, it's going to cost us money to provide emergency services to those hundreds of houses, Right.

28:07
OK.

28:07
And the cost of providing those services is not 100% borne by the people who live in those houses and pay those taxes.

28:13
The difference between actual costs and what those residents pay is made-up by everybody else, whether you live in the city or in the county.

28:20
And this is a way to take a dent out, take a chunk out of that and really reduce everybody who is in the county's property tax burden by a little bit.

28:29
So in the example you just gave, that's a county project, it would be assessed this county tax.

28:34
So how does that have to do with anything really with the city's collection of it's it's and we brought up a development.

28:41
This is an example of how impact these help the city too, because the cities in the county, you could do the same thing and say if there was a giant new subdivision, let's say the Aspire subdivision, that's supposed to happen out at East Missoula, which is hundreds of houses.

28:55
Admittedly, it's not a done deal.

28:57
We don't know if it's going to happen, but just the benefit of this argument, let's say 340 some odd houses actually happened there that's inside city limits.

29:05
If those folks pay impact fees to the county that helps reduce every other city resident's portion of county taxes that go to OEM and to and to elections, but OEM for sure, right?

29:20
And is there any scenario that would develop where the city would benefit from the infrastructure development of the region in which they have designated?

29:32
If you go back to the map, I mean, to me, we've got the central region that comprises most of the city of Missoula city limits, right, If you go back to that map.

29:43
So in my mind, why wouldn't it be the public works director going to City Council and saying why aren't we collecting these fees?

29:50
Because we're not collecting these fees now, we're not able to add to our budget to be able to provide some of these infrastructure needs that are developing these areas.

30:04
By the way, it's only on new builds.

30:06
It's only on.

30:06
I mean, there are so many things that that public work director, public works director could tell City Council, they wouldn't be much more willing to listen to that person than to any of us, I think.

30:18
So I guess my point is, why wouldn't we just kind of getting back to that larger plan agenda, go to Jeremy, say, Jeremy, what would you do if you had this money?

30:33
Here are some subdivisions that are coming through the pipeline that are going to be in the city limits in this area.

30:39
They're going to be collecting impact fees.

30:41
Maybe if we can get this interlocal agency agreement in place, go pitch it to City Council, get him to sign it.

30:50
And by the way, all these other services also are being everybody in the city is benefiting from them as well.

30:56
But maybe make the push.

30:58
This is all in the name of infrastructure anyway.

31:00
This this impact fee, right?

31:04
That's how it was designed and that's ultimately how it is being sold.

31:08
So why wouldn't the individual leading that effort be the one to take it to City Council?

31:14
I think that's good.

31:15
I think the one challenge with it is that none of ours are Jeremy's infrastructure, with the exception of shared use.

31:21
They're it's the Sheriff's Office, Emergency Management, parks, shared use paths and general government.
31:27
So those things that do where there's clear overlap, general government, like the Ingham building, you know, the general governments include elections.

31:37
Yeah.

31:37
So maybe it's not Jeremy, but maybe it's Donna.

31:39
Right.

31:40
I mean, yeah, parks and shared use paths fall directly, right.

31:44
I'm just suggesting somebody within the city.

31:47
Yeah.

31:47
Yeah.

31:47
That should carry this to City Council.

31:51
It's it makes a whole lot more sense for them to be making that request than somebody sitting on an impact Fiat advisory committee.

31:58
Yeah, they're gonna, they're gonna believe they're on.

32:00
Yeah, more than we have to convince whether it be Jeremy or Don or somebody there to say, hey, look, we can augment your budget if we have this tool at our disposal and you can sell all the other aspects of it to boot.

32:17
Here's how you do it.

32:18
And then just let them run.

32:19
That's, Yeah, one thought.

32:21
But I think more money for parks, especially even to people in the city, parks outside the city that are hereby is valuable.
32:32
It's appealing.

32:33
You know, people who live here, they don't just go to parks right here.

32:36
They like to go, sure, you know, to Blackfoot or wherever.

32:44
Should we move on to?

32:45
Yeah.

32:47
So you're going to have a chat with Ginny and Aaron in the near future and tomorrow.

32:51
Yeah.

32:52
And then could you, do you want to just report back to send a note out how that feels, what they think we can begin to make a strategy for this along.

33:03
You have a, you know, joint impact fee Advisory Board, pizza party or something.

33:07
So I'm like that might be, I mean making it a little more light hearted would be good.

33:14
Really.

33:17
All right, so, so impact the appropriation process back to some of your guys's questions about that, unless there's other things we need to talk about, see what that looks like.

33:39
Yeah, I, I kind of had to back it up to remind myself.

33:42
So you're going to have to suffer through my slide show.

33:46
We can move forward as fast as you'd like it to.

33:49
OK, So this is just kind of a reminder what the eligible use of funds are.

33:58
So it's the obvious expenditures and public facilities as outlined in the study.
34:03
Then there's the payment on principals, interest and other financing costs.

34:07
Those are the kinds of things that may come through as a specific pitch, but they could be something that the finance department kind of packages together.

34:17
There is the possibility of financing offsets.

34:20
Crap.

34:20
I didn't bring the study with me.

34:24
Financing offsets.

34:25
Don't ask me what that means at the moment.

34:29
Yeah.

34:31
And then there's that idea of recuperating costs of excess capacity in the existing facility.

34:36
So if if, if a facility has been developed oversized to assume assuming growth, we can essentially give give money back out of the impact fees that have been collected to to cover the cost of the additional capacity.

34:54
So if you built, if you overbuilt a Rd.

34:59
maybe it's not the best example.

35:00
If you overbuilt a sewer system, if we did sewer impact fees, you could pay essentially pay back that amount that that was overbuilt, kind of recuperate.

35:13
That's that's how they can be used.

35:15
And then you can also finance the cost of updating the resolution.

35:18
So in a few years when we need to do a new study, you can pay for that.

35:23
I think that the two most likely ones we're going to see are the specific projects, facilities projects, so parks improvements or shared use path or something like that.

35:35
And then occasionally we may see this, you know, there's a bigger package put together to do like the radio system for emergency services and impact fees are a piece of the financing, but other things are going to be as well sort of thing.

35:52
Do we have any forecasts at all of the volume of requests for appropriations we may get?

35:57
Like is this going to be competitive or are we just, is every, well, it's really only for these specific categories of fees and each department that was involved in those knows what kind of went into the study or kind of planning for the future, so to speak.

36:17
So there are like we know the Ingham building for general government is in the mix.

36:22
We know the radio system for emergency services, Sheriff's Office is a little more wide open, I'd say.

36:32
But I think that they've had, I think they're doing the facility upgrade now.

36:36
So like these funds might go into matching up with that.

36:43
Parks and trails are probably gonna be the ones.

36:44
So they're like little specific projects that are gonna come through and they're the ones that probably are gonna look at kind of how how to piece stuff together.

36:53
And they'll probably use it a lot as grant match would be my guess, because they'll, they'll have some other funding and be able to put this to as a nonfederal match to whatever they're proposing.

37:06
If there are federal funds ever again, the fine the offsets are.

37:13
I'm trying to remember how that works.

37:16
Oh, I didn't mind setting with me.

37:20
Offsets are when people are proposing to.

37:26
So best example, which doesn't technically work, but out in the O'Keefe Creek, O'Keefe Creek Ranch Estates, a subdivision out at the Y, there's a public park as part of that subdivision where they're doing improvements that they were required to do as part of subdivision approval.

37:45
If so, they're putting in play fields and playground equipment, basketball courts and all that stuff.

37:53
So they could ask to offset, they could ask for offsets to cover some of the costs if those improvements were considered part of the impact fee study.

38:04
Essentially, they are, because they are parks improvements.

38:08
They're in a public park, they're in an area.

38:11
The one unique thing about them being out in that area is that the French Town parks impact fees were only for Fort Missoula Regional Park and Big Sky Park there.

38:22
There are no other public parks in the whole French Town area, so they weren't really intended for the regional parks.

38:29
But that's the concept behind offsets, helping fund offsets.

38:33
So if I'm a developer and I have a preliminary plat that has a requirement to build a 2 acre park as part of my condition of approval, I'm saying, and let's say I'm gonna, the subdivision has 100 lots and of those hundred lots, it's gonna generate a certain amount of revenue, let's call it $150,000 in impact fees that would go towards parks for those hundred lots I can elect or this body can approve the application of those $150,000 before they're even spent as an offset.

39:18
So that the essentially, yeah, so that the developer and those subsequently purchasing those lots would not have to pay that money, right?

39:29
Developer would just front it, right?

39:31
Put the extra $150,000 into the park because that's ultimately what we want.

39:36
And then all of those impact fees are reduced by X.

39:40
They're pro rata share.

39:42
Yeah, that's the basic concept.

39:44
Thank you for that.

39:45
That's good.

39:45
That's good.

39:45
And that was a really much better example than I provided.

39:48
Thanks.

39:49
But who, who would apply for that?

39:51
Would that be the developer that would apply for that or would that be?

39:55
Yeah, yeah.

39:57
I would say in most cases it's probably the.

40:00
So the developer would potentially apply for that, but it would be maybe planning.

40:05
That would let them know that because they're not going to know.

40:08
That's right thing.

40:09
Yeah.

40:09
It's letting you know the interesting overlap here because they'd hear from planning.

40:12
You guys got to make a park.

40:14
But they.

40:15
I don't know if it's would they necessarily hear from planning.

40:18
Oh, and you.

40:18
And here's a way to get some money to begin to do this work.

40:22
Yeah.

40:23
You're subject to these impact fees.

40:25
You have 100 lots.

40:27
Those impact fees will generate this much money for your park.

40:30
This much money is available and offsets for your park.

40:32
Yeah, I think when the the way that works best is because the, you know, the land piece was taken out of the parks impact fee study because of the way subdivision works.

40:44
So in most cases when people propose a park, they don't propose improvements to parks or very limited improvements.

40:50
But this is a way to get more improvements in a that you 6 the land piece isn't included, right.

40:57
And really, the only thing you can fund with the impact fees for parks is playground equipment, stuck trails.

41:02
Yeah, right.

41:04
So we'll get nicer parks.

41:06
Yeah.

41:06
Most people don't get nice parks.

41:07
They get limited.

41:10
It gets place.

41:11
And sometimes they get some modest improvements, but occasionally space they can, you know, this might be a way to actually get get some development done instead of just getting a blank slate piece of grass, right.

41:24
The drainage system.

41:33
This group would need to assess whether or not we would want to pay money out of the fund that exists, but we couldn't borrow.

41:43
Obviously, we can't go negative in our balance at any point.

41:46
So if we had the $150,000 in the parks fund at the time, we could then allocate that affords that and then expect that it would be replenished through the sale of those lots after the subdivision is approved.

42:02
Yeah, yeah.

42:03
That that's kind of how that works.

42:04
Basically I am OK.

42:06
But either way we could probably only approve up to the amount that we have available to us.

42:12
Yeah, say we can't we can't say oh go in and do this right without some plan is to recoup that or not pay for it upfront.

42:21
And it would probably be in consultation with the in this case that with the parks departments to yeah, because there will be competing uses and ultimately it's the county commissioners that make that decision.

42:35
We are simply recommending that funds be used for yeah, AB and C, right according to the right applicable.

42:46
OK, Yeah.

42:50
So the not that important.

42:52
It's it's also important.

42:54
It's it's it looks like it could be important.

42:57
Some of them could I think as there's competing interests and I think also for new programs getting broad based.

43:04
I know the commissioners always appreciate a good sounding board and.

43:08
Sure.

43:09
Yeah.

43:09
And, and the idea was we put together this board of folks who work in this area and it would bring us really good recommendations because the the other two aren't in on these conversations and they're gonna be people.

43:21
Oh, look, on the agenda, I guess we're doing an impact fee for a park.

43:23
What's that?

43:24
Yeah, right.

43:25
And they're gonna say, oh, these folks put it together.

43:28
They've done their job.

43:30
Yeah.

43:31
And the only way it wouldn't be like, OK, Stamp and we move on is if somebody shows up to the meeting saying, I hate this, this is terrible.

43:39
And then we'll come a little more involved we and the and the I'm just curious how much competition there's gonna be for the fees.
43:46
Like that's a good question.

43:47
Like, you know, that's what kind of what my previous question was like are we anticipating more asks than we have funding in any of these categories?

43:55
I don't, I don't know the answer to that.

43:57
I don't need.

43:57
I just, yeah, it's a good question.

44:00
I mean, personally, I would prefer not to be in that position as a group to trying to be making picking winners or losers.

44:08
Yeah, I don't think that's our job.

44:10
I think our job is to make sure that the funds are being appropriately, like it's a governance thing, right?

44:17
It's, it's, I would defer to the people who are running their programs on a daily basis, the county public works director, the, you know, county parks directors, you know, those are the people that if they come to us with the request and say I want to use this money for this purpose, it's here.

44:39
I think it's our job as a governing body or an advisory governing body to say, yes, that fits the needs and the description and the purpose and intent of this money.

44:50
Go for it.

44:51
I, I don't feel super comfortable being an arbitration or some type of a grantor.

44:57
Yeah, Yeah.

44:59
Like I'm, I'm making the recommendation because I know this person and they're nice.

45:04
And you know what I mean, governance rather than being a grantor.

45:08
And that's right, that's right.

45:13
That's that's where I was getting back to.

45:14
I would I would feel really good about as the requests come in that those requests are following a predetermined plan or process or they're going through a department head.

45:32
And maybe that all funnels through you, Karen, to say, you know what, these individuals who ultimately have the planning authority or the the responsibility as employees of the county to make these requests.

45:48
And they're not just coming out of left field from, you know, some planner one position.

45:55
They're like, hey, I got AI got an idea for a park.

45:58
I'm just going to go ask the advisory committee to see if we can get it on agenda.

46:02
I just think that that all needs to come from.

46:06
Yeah, someone else.

46:08
I think for the most part they will probably come through department heads or through departments.

46:13
Yeah, I think the, the one off will be offset requests potentially.

46:18
And, and I think those will mostly only happen in the case of parks and possibly shared use paths.

46:26
I think, you know, in the case of general government or OEM or Sheriff's Office, no one else is going to ask for those except for those departments.

46:34
That's right, right.

46:35
They're, they're not going to come from a developer who's doing part of a radio system or whatever.

46:42
But even in the event that it comes from a developer, it's going to go to a planner, right that determines the benefits that could come if we did choose to use these funds.

46:55
And I would expect that planner to make a presentation to this group and say, here's why we think these funds need to be applied to this development, right.

47:05
So it's really more of us saying again, yes, it meets the purpose and intent of this money and and we've collected it for these purposes.

47:15
And provided we don't have, you know, any opposition from the planning office, we could recommend that to count Commission to make a decision.

47:25
But I think it's also, Chris, where there is a conflict.

47:28
Exactly, exactly.

47:30
That's what I was hoping.

47:31
Sorry, go ahead, Jim.

47:33
I was where there is a conflict, it would be nice to know.

47:36
So if staff picks their own project over a developers for whatever reason to demonstrate highest best use, like how does this fit in strategic priority over what a developer says they should get for an offset?

47:57
I don't want to be in the decision making mode, but I want to be able to provide the commissioners with the data for them to pick one over the other.

48:09
Now, I mean, you hit it on the head, Jim.

48:10
That's exactly where I don't really want to be in a decision making authority where people are like lobbying me, right for, you know, deciding one way or another, me trying to convince everybody else on the Advisory Board to make a recommendation to county for for approval.

48:28
That's not our job.

48:29
I think our job as an advisory committee is to kind of oversee this as non government people.

48:36
We are not, we don't work for the government.

48:38
We are sit tax paying citizens of the county that have been asked to be advisors to make sure that this A, that we are setting this up with the right intent and B, that the the funds are being used in a wise and judicious manner, right.

48:54
And and that's our governance here.

48:57
And it ends ends at that point.

48:59
But I just picking winners and losers is not something I want to be engaging in.

49:09
Does that sound fair?

49:10
Yeah, totally.

49:11
Yeah.

49:11
You can pick the winners.

49:12
Yeah.

49:13
So if they don't like you, they don't have to vote.

49:15
A lot of these things keep the qualifications.

49:17
Yeah.

49:17
You pick which one?

49:18
Sure.

49:19
Yeah.

49:19
You see, makes decision, right?

49:21
Yeah.

49:23
So this is generally the outline of the process.

49:26
A county, a department of district.

49:28
It could technically be a developer says that they have a project to be funded.

49:33
It comes through PDS.

49:36
If it's a department or, or is probably going to go, it's going to be a very superficial run through PDS.

49:45
It comes to the to the committee and the commissioner.

49:48
Then it goes to the commissioners for a decision.

49:50
There is a provision that there are times when a request can go straight to the commissioners.

49:57
Where I think that that might be warranted is for the fire district the since it has to go through their board, should it go through the impact the advisory committee as well or should it goes go from fire boards trick to the commissioners.

50:14
That is one thought that I've had.

50:17
If I could just offer a thought as I, as I kind of think through this, I think that whole middle tier could just be eliminated, frankly, our advisory committee making a recommendation, I don't think we need to make a recommendation.

50:32
It has to, it has to come through somehow.

50:35
Well, all right, the recommendation would come from PDS staff and I think our job would be to review the use of these funds even post mortem.

50:46
I mean, I, I, I don't even see that.

50:49
I mean, if we're getting a recommendation from staff to use these funds for this purpose and we're just going to turn around and make that recommendation to this to the commissioners, what are we doing really?

51:01
I, I could see us taking that four step process.

51:05
What's that might be the staff, the PDS staff that I mean, I, I think of that really more as a gatekeeping, just making sure that they're we're getting the stuff to you less on the recommendation.

51:16
I mean, probably the way it is, is the the yellow line is what actually is very light in color.

51:23
It's just we just make sure that they get the request to you and then you you provide the recommendation.

51:29
I'm just suggesting that they could make that recommendation just as easily as we could.

51:35
I think we're required to, Chris.

51:36
We're required to, Yeah.

51:38
**** I think that's just looking for a way to make my job easier.

51:43
Right.

51:43
So I am not necessarily part of this.

51:48
And is that that's written into the process, The process just like it's the advisory committee has to make a recommendation for use of the study.

51:59
This is like the planning board.

52:01
Yeah.

52:01
You're required to to provide.

52:04
Yeah, Jim's right.

52:06
Looking at the statute, we're, we're required to be bureaucratic.

52:13
That was my point, Jim.

52:14
I was wondering if there was a way to get through the red tape, Wear the red tape.

52:21
Yeah.

52:22
Well, if there was a way, and I, I understand what you're saying, Karen, and it may be written into the process that this committee has to exist to meet statute.

52:34
But that's what I hear.

52:35
That's what I'm hearing you say, right?

52:37
And we know that that's true, that we have to exist as a body to approve or to make recommendations to the commissioners for the use of these funds.

52:48
Well, we can rubber stamp things, I guess is what I I mean, or we can consider them and and I mean, I'm guessing that the staff is going to make sure that minimally this is done just right.

52:59
Yeah.

53:00
And I like your message around governance.

53:02
We look at it a little more broadly in a yeah, more in depth way.

53:06
Yeah.

53:06
Is there is this a public meeting with the whole public process and public comment?

53:11
Yeah, just like a planning for sure.

53:14
Yeah.

53:15
So that's required by the same public meeting law supply, right.

53:18
So public meeting law apply.

53:20
So yeah, we have to have those common.

53:26
It's noticed their notes.

53:28
Yep.

53:29
Fair enough.

53:29
Thank you for that.

53:31
Just indulging me walking down the path of extinction.

53:35
Just a moment.

53:36
That's right.

53:37
We're trying to send this home for a while.

53:40
I mean, I think just waiting for the next committee, the next study to be done.

53:45
Well, I, I understood this committee to be formed in the first place to determine and make a recommendation whether impact fees were appropriate.

53:52
That was, that's what I signed up for in the beginning and then it kind of became a follow on assignment after that.

54:02
So I see this is kind of the second part to that.

54:05
And I didn't know that that was required by statute to have a committee that exists to advise the county commissioners on whether or not to approve in an act piece.

54:17
I think, Chris, the the way that we might get around it and we'd want Chris to weigh in on this.

54:24
We, the committee must have the opportunity to advise, but we don't necessarily have to make a recommendation.

54:37
We can say no comment on this one, right?

54:39
We can, we can say we have no concerns or something and then it throws to the commissioners.

54:45
But Chris might want to weigh in it from a legal perspective.

54:48
But the way I'm reading this, we just, it has to come to us for an opportunity to make statement.

54:53
But we don't have to make a statement.

54:58
We don't have to recommend.

54:59
We could just say we have no issues or concerns with this.

55:06
We can do that.

55:07
I could think they want to weigh in a little bit.

55:09
I mean you could say this meets all the requirements and is a suitable candidate.

55:15
And then it sounds for LMP it's eligible for impact fee maybe screen free or all eligible.

55:21
And you gotta, I think determining eligibility is a great place to live on this committee.

55:29
So one category of impact fees which we have, like I said are the French town, Royal Fire District ones.

55:34
And there is a way to to send them straight to the commissioners.
55:39
And this might be the one where I'd say that where there is another advisory or another governance body involved.

55:45
Do you want them to come through the impact the advisory committee?

55:48
It's totally within your your jurisdiction, or would you say that those going straight, you know, being heard by their fire district and board and going to the commissioners?

55:58
We just need to make sure that the if it just went, what's the difference?

56:02
I mean, if it just went to French on rural fire and then directly to the commissioners, we'd want to make sure that French on rural fire knew the rules on impact fees and they can say, oh, we're going to use impact fees to send everybody to a training.

56:13
Well, no, we, they have to come.

56:15
They still, we, I'm still a gatekeeper for them.

56:17
Great.

56:19
To make sure that they meet the eligibility.

56:20
So I'm confused though on the yeah purpose of this group it it shouldn't apply to like one set of funds and not another set of funds within the thing either either everything gets routed through us and we determine the eligibility of it as a group or none of it should.

56:41
I am of the opinion that none of it should I, I actually don't I I see our job here as being superfluous to that that's already taking place.

56:51
It's it's redundant in a lot of ways.

56:53
And if we need that redundancy because of a statute, so be it.

56:57
But I don't understand how this could like Frenchtown rural fire department could be a carve out to this understand like their job would be to make the ask yes, they would make the it's not up to the Fire Chief.

57:08
It's well it's usually the Fire Chief that does like we like like a department head does they push it through their board.

57:14
Exactly.

57:15
He's gotta go through their board, right.

57:17
He works for that.

57:18
But then they also then they will come to the impact fee advisory committee.

57:21
Sure.

57:21
Yeah, OK, OK, great.

57:30
So in thinking about the information that you want to receive, I mean, there's just like the basic project information, you know, description of what it is, its location, the service area for the need and demand for the facility, the capacity, added timeline, budget, proposed amount of impact fee funds.

57:52
And specifically to call out how the project meets the impact fee fund category for which the fund for which the funds are requested.

58:02
Those are the things that I thought of that we would want to be covered.

58:05
I don't want to give people a very specific application and find with them making their own pitch as long as they cover the basics.

58:11
Is there other information that the green one's the most important one?

58:15
Me.

58:16
Yeah, the, the project, the amount and the and the green one are probably the most important things on that must be less than 100 words.

58:27
Keep it short, less than 100 words.

58:31
We'll make sure that that's on there.

58:33
I'm kidding, I think.

58:34
Karen, have you reached out to the city and see what criteria they use or what questions they ask?

58:40
It's fairly similar.

58:41
Since our resolutions are fairly similar.

58:44
I will, before I finalize stuff, go back through with them and just double check and if there's a application form or something like that, can we have an opportunity to see what?

58:57
Yeah, absolutely.

59:01
Has a similar project like this been submitted to the city?

59:03
I mean, if we I've gone through their online files, I can never find project information.

59:13
I can only find their financial reports.

59:15
So I need to get back in and talk to the staff again.

59:20
It's just not easily available.

59:22
Yeah.

59:22
What I was getting at it was trying to ask a question in a way that helps demonstrate that we're not double dipping.

59:28
Yeah, between the city and county.

59:30
Just not sure how to write that question, I guess.

59:34
What other funds are you using for the project?
59:39
Yeah, real quick.

59:42
Yeah.

59:48
Would that not be included in the project budget?

59:50
So when we say project budget, we're talking about the total project budget and then the amount of impact fee funds that are being, yes, proposed as part of that.

1:00:00
So we probably get to see.

1:00:03
So in the case of like a Fort Missoula Regional Park, there could be city and county impact fees.

1:00:08
Both parks impact fees could go towards the projects, maybe two, maybe being really specific on that one and having 2 lines, county impact fee, city impact fee.

1:00:21
So they have to put zero or a dollar amount in each and then if they put a dollar amount in each.

1:00:28
Explain Just trying to help City Council wrap their head around this, right?

1:00:42
Thank Cherry Berman.

1:00:45
I think that that's all I Oh no, I didn't.

1:00:50
OK, I need a 5 minute break.

1:00:53
So I'm probably the oldest person in the room Again.

1:00:59
We can take a quick break.

1:01:05
Not done, aren't we?

1:01:06
We're almost done, aren't we?

1:01:08
Yeah, we're almost done.

1:01:13
I'm sorry I was late.

1:01:14
I don't think we met before.

1:01:15
It's all right.

1:01:18
You're holding on.

1:01:19
You're described that well.

1:01:21
I've been in plenty of contacts where I hear someone speaking.

1:01:24
It's good.

1:01:25
OK.

1:01:26
Thank you.

1:01:26
So are we report from committees or you?

1:01:29
Yeah, I think so.

1:01:31
We don't have any.

1:01:31
All right, Pretty quick.

1:01:33
Any committees?

1:01:34
So you know your reports, they owned a whole business selection of chair and vice chair.

1:01:41
We have any people that want to be nominated.

1:01:45
Can I nominate you for chair?
1:01:47
Yeah, I'm sharing a lot of stuff.

1:01:52
If you don't want to be nominated, I won't.

1:01:55
If there's anyone else, I'd prefer it.

1:01:57
I don't mind staying.

1:01:58
Vice chair.

1:02:00
Who?

1:02:00
Who's on our committee right now?

1:02:02
All right, you're sorry I have not attended a meeting in a while.

1:02:06
We had one meeting in a while.

1:02:08
Well, then there you go.

1:02:09
I've attended all the recent meetings.

1:02:11
We have those.

1:02:11
It's on our committee right now.

1:02:14
We have 7 people, right?

1:02:16
Well, we don't have all seats filled, so we have Kim, Rick, Sam, Jim.

1:02:25
You Rick?

1:02:27
Yeah, yeah.

1:02:29
And then we have 3 vacant seats.
1:02:31
04, yeah, 333 vacant seats.

1:02:35
And then Josh is ex officio.

1:02:39
Say that again in vacant seats.

1:02:40
How many #3 have there been any application?

1:02:45
I don't know.

1:02:45
We had.

1:02:46
We had two right now we have 3 with Jeff, right.

1:02:50
So we need to do a little push there.

1:02:53
Yeah, Yeah, we have recently pushed and this is where we're at.

1:03:01
I mean there has been, we did early on.

1:03:04
Jim, I think you and I talked a little bit about this as to whether there needed to be two impact, the advisory committees, one each for the city and the county, or if that should be if there would ever be an interest in because they also don't meet very often except for when they're doing the study.

1:03:17
And if there's any benefit.

1:03:21
Just trying to think of ways to consolidate boards.

1:03:25
The other option would be to to use the land use board.

1:03:30
But yeah, it's just you give it a grunt.

1:03:33
What does that mean?

1:03:34
Well, I was just thinking about how we would how we would pull that off.
1:03:39
It's kind of the same way you did the consolidation.

1:03:43
So I'm talking about flicked and I think we would just have to be thoughtful about it.

1:03:47
So we had all all interests represented.

1:03:51
Yeah, I think we need to get them on board 1st with just the joint agreement.

1:03:59
Well, that would be a good start.

1:04:00
That'd be a really good start.

1:04:01
So if there was an interagency local agreement, we believe sounds like you would have no problem with it being a single.

1:04:11
Yeah, we're making those decisions.

1:04:13
I I wouldn't have less of a problem for sure yeah, if we had a good intervocal yeah, I mean because then we're all the room we're all kind of working together.

1:04:20
How many do they have on their board?

1:04:21
I don't know, can look at that 7.

1:04:31
I would feel uncomfortable trying to select A chair and a vice chair with three vacancies in the in the group right now.

1:04:39
And frankly, I think, you know, Rick's serving as the vice chair for the time being in this meeting.

1:04:45
So it's probably of my being A10 upper 10.

1:04:49
Yeah, exactly.

1:04:50
That's kind of what I'm thinking is, is we can continue to function that way until we fill the other vacancies and then we have 10 elect seats.
1:04:57
Yeah, exactly.

1:04:59
And even push for maybe a consolidated effort if we can get to the interlocal green.

1:05:06
Yeah.

1:05:08
So here's their board.

1:05:10
Dwight Easton.

1:05:11
Who's that guy?

1:05:13
We're tired.

1:05:16
Dwight and Peter Walker Kelliver are City Council appointees.

1:05:21
And yeah, you know.

1:05:24
Yeah, I know.

1:05:25
And then they're not going to serve on the same board as Peter.

1:05:28
The mayor's appointees are Robert Erickson, John Freer, Nick Kaufman and Henry Trotter.

1:05:38
I don't even know.

1:05:39
That's an interesting blend.

1:05:41
Say those one more time.

1:05:42
Hank Trotter and Nick Kaufman are really different people.

1:05:45
Yeah.

1:05:46
You know the name Nick.
1:05:47
Nice ways.

1:05:49
Yeah.

1:05:50
They're both smart people, for sure.

1:05:51
It's really different.

1:05:52
Yeah.

1:05:52
I I think it'd be a good, lively conversation.

1:05:54
Robert Erickson, John Freer, Nick Kaufman, Henry Trotter.

1:05:58
I don't know those first.

1:05:59
I don't know first two.

1:06:00
I don't either.

1:06:04
So is there, is there a sector missing?

1:06:07
I mean, do we want somebody from, I don't know, what other sector would you want on this, Josh that we could go after?

1:06:17
That's a good question.

1:06:18
They can always make an ask to MBIA.

1:06:22
Yeah.

1:06:22
I mean, those folks are really affected.

1:06:24
It'd be good to have them involved.

1:06:27
It'd also be it'd be great to have people involved who are interested in sort of housing advocates.

1:06:33
Yeah, we could have on that property or housing any great.

1:06:38
I mean we have a a great small but very vibrant community of nonprofit housing developers here.

1:06:44
Totally true.

1:06:45
Having somebody from Homework or NMCDC or the Housing Authority yeah, would be great.

1:06:52
Yeah.

1:06:52
I can reach out through our housing specialist.

1:06:54
Yeah, thanks.

1:06:56
I'm gonna I'm gonna see him in minutes, 10 minutes.

1:06:59
All right, yeah.

1:07:03
Any other sectors or areas, geographic areas?

1:07:11
I mean, somebody from a more rural area might be a good idea.

1:07:15
So French town, sure.

1:07:18
Yeah.

1:07:18
I mean, there's so much work that's happening.

1:07:20
It's going to be happening out in that area.

1:07:22
That's good.

1:07:22
Does Juan know anybody up in the Potomac or Seeley area that would be Oh, no, we could come up with somebody there, but I like the idea of thinking about someone in Frenchtown or towards the Y but that area specifically is going to see somebody like activity barring global economic collapse.

1:07:38
It's not.

1:07:38
We'll see a lot, which is on the table, but not as it feels like it's on the table.

1:07:42
Not likely.

1:07:42
Yeah.

1:07:44
There's a lot of Walt mural.

1:07:46
It's a Walt.

1:07:47
Yeah.

1:07:48
I don't know if he would do it, but it's related to the Morales.

1:07:51
He is.

1:07:51
He is.

1:07:53
He's a good guy, very much someone who's into what's going on in that part of the I guess the few people I asked about this since our last non meeting meeting.

1:08:05
It's really hard to make anybody feel remotely interested in applying.

1:08:08
Like what is this?

1:08:09
You know, I I would explain it like, yeah, no, yeah, you know.

1:08:13
So, you know, I think I like the idea of the housing people, though.

1:08:22
It's hard to ask people to be part of a committee where you have no decision making authority and you don't.

1:08:31
I mean, you're you're advisory in nature.

1:08:33
I mean, it's a it's a tall ask somebody that.

1:08:37
Yeah.

1:08:39
I think I joined because I wanted to be part of the initial process.

1:08:42
Yeah.

1:08:43
Yeah.

1:08:43
I mean, I pitched it as like an opportunity for, you know, exposure to the, you know, you get to learn to the workings of government.

1:08:49
You get to inside baseball for sure.

1:08:51
Yeah.

1:08:51
And it's hard for me to imagine a situation that where the recommendations for the even descriptions of availability or or appropriateness wouldn't be honored.

1:09:02
They're gonna.

1:09:02
Yeah.

1:09:03
It doesn't seem contentious.

1:09:04
It's not.

1:09:05
It's not an argumentative thing.

1:09:06
It's a let's look at this, you know?

1:09:08
Yeah, feel like there's people that would want to do it, anyone from the development finance world.

1:09:15
Is there any chance that oh, that's interesting, would be interested.

1:09:18
I don't know, banker, yeah, some maybe somebody who does construction loans or finances developers.

1:09:27
Do you know if that's done often done locally on a large scale or is that not done locally?

1:09:31
Yeah, yeah, probably finance the FTC, is that a yes, yes, done locally again, first security first, OK, Stockman Bank, inverse security, both would have people I guess it's selection of chair and vice chair.

1:09:49
Getting back to that, where I'm going to go so I can make this 4:00.

1:09:52
It's nice to see you and you send a note to Mike.

1:09:57
Yes, I'm working on that right now.

1:09:59
Glad that can happen.

1:10:00
So we're going to I'm going to be Pro Tem.

1:10:04
I'll move that we can use you Pro Tem until we have a full committee and we can, you know, selectable officers.

1:10:11
Is there a second I can second that All in favor.

1:10:16
Aye, aye.

1:10:18
OK.

1:10:18
Approve any opposed.

1:10:21
Next is new business.

1:10:24
Oh, and we we've made we have decided that we're going to reach out to try to fill our board, correct.

1:10:29
Yeah, yeah.

1:10:30
I like that communication about impact.

1:10:36
Yep.

1:10:36
Did we already cover that or well, so at the end of the last meeting, I think it was maybe Jim who talked about like maybe needing to reach out to the departments that might use impact fees for projects to talk about how much has been collected, what the process looks like.

1:10:54
I have it in my notes and it was in, I noticed it was in the minutes as well.

1:10:57
Is that, that was a specific suggestion?

1:11:01
Is that still something?

1:11:02
And we we will need to do that as we kind of get the process refined.

1:11:07
But I guess what I would suggest we why don't we table this to the next meeting until you have your conversation with city and hear feedback on city and been able to do interagency agreement, inter government agreement.

1:11:20
It really sounds like you're doing that right now.

1:11:22
So yeah, Yep.

1:11:26
All right.

1:11:27
I like it.

1:11:28
And we are ready to adjourn.

1:11:30
Do we have a motion?

1:11:31
Motion.

1:11:31
Adjourn.

1:11:32
No move.

1:11:33
All right, everyone.

1:11:36
Thanks.

1:11:37
Thanks, everyone.

1:11:38
See you.

1:11:40
Bye, Jim.

1:11:40
See you, Jim.

1:11:41
Bye.

1:11:41
Thanks, everybody.

1:11:42
Yeah, here at the bottom, real time.

Impact Fee Advisory Committee

April 14, 2025

Recommended IFAC meeting schedule

Late January

Review impact fee appropriation requests

Consider recommendations for inflation adjustment (take effect July 1)

Late April

Review impact fee appropriation requests

Late July

Review impact fee appropriation requests

Late October

Review financial report (published early October)

Impact Fees Financial Report

IMPACT FEES COLLECTED AS OF APRIL 11, 2025

General Government	$15,213
Sheriff	$20,736
Emergency Management	$28,777
Parks	$33,913
Shared Use Paths	$35,927
Frenchtown Rural Fire	$17,366
Total Impact Fees	$151,932
Admin fees	$7,996

Impact Fees Financial Report

IMPACT FEES COLLECTED AS OF APRIL 11 – PARKS AND SHARED USE PATHS

Parks Total		$33,913
	Central Missoula	$8,896
	Seeley Lake	$6,882
	Bonner	$11,091
	Frenchtown	$2,924
	Lolo	$4,120
Shared Use Paths Total		$35,927
	Central Missoula	$13,126
	Seeley Lake	$4,250
	Bonner	$6,130
	Frenchtown	$6,494
	Lolo	$5,927

Impact Fee Appropriation

Eligible use of funds

- Expenditures on public facilities as outlined in the study
- Payment of principal, interest, other financing costs to finance public facilities
- Financing offsets
- Recuperation of costs of excess capacity in existing facilities in anticipation of new development
- Financing costs of updating the resolution

Impact Fee Appropriation

Additional restrictions on use of funds

- Used on the facilities for which they were collected
- Used within 6 years of the beginning fiscal year succeeding the date of collection

Procedure for impact fee appropriation

County/Dept/District -identifies public facilities projects to be funded with impact fees

PDS Staff makes a recommendation to impact fee advisory committee (IFAC) and verifies availability of funds

IFAC makes a recommendation to BCC

BCC makes decision

BCC may also authorize use of impact fees to fund capital improvements at other times

For Frenchtown Rural Fire District

Recommended adjustments

FRFD process to identify and approve projects to submit to the county for review and approval

Consider FRFD projects going directly to BCC without IFAC recommendation, because they have FRFD board approval

Information needed for requests for appropriation

Needed project information

- Description of the public facility (or other category of request)
  - Nature, location, service area
  - Need/demand for the facility
  - Capacity added by the project
- Project timeline
- Project budget, including proposed amount of impact fee funds

Explanation of how the project fits the impact fee fund category for which funds are requested