



Missoula County Impact Fee Advisory Committee Meeting Minutes

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

Date:	July 30, 2025, 3:30 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:	Jim Bachand, Rick Hall, Sam Kulla, Chris Anderson
Ex-Officio Member in Attendance:	Commissioner, Josh Slotnick <i>[in attendance for the second half of the meeting]</i>
PDS Staff Representative in Attendance:	Karen Hughes, AICP Director of Planning, Development & Sustainability

I. CALL TO ORDER [Time stamp – 00:24]

Rick Hall (Rick) called the meeting to order.

II. ROLL CALL [Time stamp – 00:28]

Jill Johnson called roll. Four voting members were present. A quorum was met.

III. APPROVAL OF AGENDA

No objections were noted.

IV. APPROVAL OF MINUTES [Time stamp – 00:49]

Jim Bachand (Jim) moved, and Sam Kulla (Sam) seconded the approval of the April 14, 2025 meeting minutes, as written. The motion passed unanimously.

V. PUBLIC COMMENT ON NON-AGENDA ITEMS [Time stamp – 02:33]

There were no public comments on non-agenda items.

VI. COMMUNICATIONS [Time stamp – 02:58]

A. Program Updates

Karen Hughes (Karen) provided the following program updates:

1. Impact Fee Fund Balances [Time stamp – 03:15]

Missoula County (County) is transitioning to a new financial system, which will delay reporting on County impact fee fund balances until the October meeting.

A copy of the City of Missoula's (City) Impact Fee Fund Balance Summary for fiscal years 2024 and 2025 was provided as an example. Karen explained that the City's report is provided at each meeting of its Impact Fee Advisory Committee (IFAC) for the purpose of providing a snapshot of fund expenditures, projected revenues and fund balances.

Chris Anderson (Chris) asked about where to find more detailed information associated with the 2025 projected expenditures in the City's summary. Karen explained that the City's annual financial report provides detailed expenditure data for the projects funded with impact fees, while the regular summary reports offer a snapshot. Karen clarified that each line-item expenditure shown in the City's summary, was presented before the City's IFAC and ultimately approved by the City Council for adoption into the City's budget. The County follows a similar process, with recommendations from its IFAC going to the Board of County Commissioners (Commission) for approval.

Karen proposed adopting a similar annual reporting and summary reporting approach for the County and indicated that the detailed annual financial report is often provided in October or November. Committee members agreed this would be beneficial.

The Committee discussed distinguishing between City and County impact fee appropriation applications and acknowledged the potential for joint requests, would require approval from each respective jurisdiction. Karen noted that impact fee fund appropriation requests are approved on an individual basis. Rick emphasized the importance of equitable coordination between City and County projects and Karen cited the Open Space Bond funding as an example of a jointly administered process.

Chris asked why the County was not consulted on certain City parks and recreation fee appropriations shown in the City's summary report. Karen clarified that those were City-specific projects. Karen also noted that, beginning October 1, 2025, new legislation will prohibit collection of impact fees for parks and recreation, and general government. However, trail related fees will still be allowed under the transportation category.

Karen confirmed that the County has not disbursed any of the impact fees collected by the County at this time.

2. Coordination with the City of Missoula [Time stamp – 20:10]

Karen met with Chris Lounsbury, Dale Bickell and Eran Pehan to discuss cross-jurisdiction coordination. Discussions are on hold pending budget approval.

3. Appropriations Application Draft [Time stamp – 20:54]

For an example purposes, Karen provided copies of applications submitted to the City's IFAC in connection with the appropriation requests for the Milwaukee Trail Reconstruction at Beartracks Bridge and with the Beartracks Underbridge Playground. The City's applications incorporate a criteria checklist, eligibility requirements and funding sources as well as an appendix, which provides examples and methodologies associated with the impact fee appropriation process. Karen noted that the City's process is fairly streamlined.

Committee members agreed that they are comfortable using the City's application materials as a template to maintain consistency across jurisdictions and recommended clearly labeling the applications as City, County, or joint. Jim indicated this may help to prevent a perceived "double dipping" into impact fee funds.

Chris suggested the incorporation of the regulatory citations into the County applications for purposes of confirming the eligibility and appropriation requirements tied County's Capital Improvement Plan. Rick reminded the

members that IFAC's role remains advisory, with final decisions made by the Commission.

4. Request to Consider Adoption of Impact Fees for Lolo Sewer and Water at October Meeting [Time stamp – 31:15]

Karen informed the Committee that the County is anticipating a request to approve the adoption of impact fees to fund the expansion of the Lolo sewer and water infrastructure.

Commissioner, Josh Slotnick indicated that the new sewer and water system will make the current system more resilient and provide the community with opportunity for growth. A variety of options, including an RSID, were evaluated before coming to the solution of implementing impact fees. A draft impact fee study is being prepared for this project and is expected to be presented at the County's October IFAC meeting. Karen noted that public notice will be provided through various means prior to the meeting and that the October meeting will likely be at the Sophie Moiese room in the Courthouse.

5. Recruitment of Committee Members [Time stamp – 36:07]

The County has received four applications for three open positions and is working to fill the open seats prior to IFAC's October meeting.

VII. REPORTS FROM COMMITTEES

There were no committee reports.

VIII. OLD BUSINESS [Time stamp – 38:00]

A. Selection of Chair and Vice Chair.

Rick proposed leaving the selection of Chair and Vice Chair to the next meeting, with the hopes of having a full Committee. Committee members agreed that Rick shall serve as Interim Chair until the next meeting. Chris recommended incorporating a brief overview of IFAC into the agenda for October's meeting. Jim moved, and Sam seconded the motion to move the election of Chair and Vice Chair to the next meeting of the Committee. Karen indicated she will provide new members with a brief orientation of IFAC, its purpose and procedures.

IX. NEW BUSINESS [Time stamp – 39:14]

There was no new business.

X. ADJOURNMENT [Time stamp –40:10]

The official meeting was adjourned at 3:50 p.m.

Missoula Impact Fee Advisory Committee July 30, 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/9720/media>.

Missoula County Impact Fee Advisory Committee July 30, 2025 – Meeting Recording

0:01

Good.

0:03

Do we need Josh here for quorum?

0:05

No, Josh, she doesn't officially remember.

0:08

There we go.

0:11

Gently, I'm pushing it forward.

0:13

Who was our acting chair?

0:14

I'm the acting me.

0:16

I'm the acting chair and just acting.

0:19

Believe me, if anyone wants to step forward, we just didn't have many people last time.

0:23

So let's call the meeting to order and do a roll call.

0:28

Christopher Anderson here, Pam Kula here, James Bachand here.

0:33

Mr.

0:34

Chair, and recall here.

0:37

And Mr.

0:37

Chair, we have 4 regular members present.

0:39

Quorum has been met.

0:41

And for the record, we also have PDF staff representative Karen Hughes here.

0:46

OK, great.

0:47

Now next on the agenda is the approval of the April 14th meeting minutes.

0:52

Not much happened that wasn't even officially right.

0:57

Yeah, that one was meeting.

0:58

It was the January that was in the meeting.

1:00

OK, we have minutes to review from that.

1:03

That was in our like meeting package online.

1:07

Oh, it wasn't in the package that came to us.

1:09

Committee members.

1:11

We usually just send the agenda, but we can anything forward to that link?

1:15

But weren't there only two people in that meeting?

1:18

No, that was it was the that one there was that was the January meeting.

1:23

Do you remember?

1:23

Oh, so I missed the meeting.

1:27

No.

1:28
Yeah.

1:28
I think you were here.

1:29
You were here in April.

1:30
That's when you got appointed in a room chair.

1:32
I was going to say.

1:33
Yeah.

1:33
I didn't recall very many people being you all was here.

1:36
Yeah.

1:36
I think everyone was here.

1:37
Yeah.

1:37
I remember being here.

1:42
Yeah.

1:43
We have a new January 1 was the one that nobody showed up to.

1:46
Seen staff's ability to record minutes.

1:49
I move that we approve them in a second.

1:53
Sounds good.

1:54
All in favor, Aye, aye.

1:57

Maybe we should send out a little bit of an explanation.

2:00

Before when the impact the advisory committee met, they didn't use the civic clerk.

2:06

Got it.

2:06

Links.

2:06

So your packets all come electronically with a link to all the materials.

2:10

It'd be nice.

2:11

I don't know if it's allowed to get them as an attachment.

2:13

That would just be really great if that.

2:14

I think we can probably we can do that.

2:17

I can just send you a one day package with the Yeah, then it's just in your e-mail and you got it.

2:22

Great.

2:24

We can do that and the minutes have been approved unanimously.

2:27

Minutes from April 14th of 2025.

2:31

OK, it's time for public comment on non agenda items and I don't know if there's anybody in the room.

2:40

There isn't.

2:42

There is not and there is nobody.

2:44

There are no public members spending on the phone either.

2:50

There is my sister calling me on the phone, then no public comment.

2:58

Next with the program updates from Karen Hughes Communications, Right, so I didn't have this queued up for an online option, but let me see what I can do.

3:13

So impact fee fund balances, we have to delay this until October.

3:21

We think the county just is in the process of a financial system transition, which sounds as challenging as you might imagine.

3:32

So we haven't gotten our financial services folks to give us the updated balances for all the funds.

3:41

However, just to give you a, a snapshot of what the city does, I thought this was useful and thank you.

3:52

If you want to give back and I'll see if I can view it up for you and put us put it up in the yeah.

4:01

Can you put the document in the chat?

4:02

I was wondering if you could drop it if I can do that.

4:05

OK, this is so there's kind of like there's like kind of like every meeting and this is what they do at every meeting, kind of provide this update.

4:16

And again, this is the city's funds.

4:19

And then once a year for us, it's in October or November.

4:24

There's like a full financial report.

4:28

So in to avoid making more work for myself and trying to talk at the same time, where's the chat?

4:37

Chat is turned off for the meeting.

4:39

We probably don't.

4:40

Let's see if we can turn it back.

4:42

I might not be able to from here.

4:45

You could e-mail it to me too.

4:47

I've got my e-mail program open.

4:49

I can also share my screen right now if you want to.

4:51

If you want to send it to me, I can just share my screen.

4:53

Well, I can do that too.

4:54

I just, I don't have it up.

4:55

Let's hang tight.

4:57

Let's see if I can turn on from here.

4:58

I might not be able to, but let's see if we can give that a shot.

5:10

It's just saving.

5:14

Think that'll work for you, Karen?

5:18

SXWTPQYEN.

5:22

Does anybody know what that has a name?

5:24

It's the area Setupkin.

5:27

Oh, OK, OK, OK.

5:32
Or it's not a type?

5:32
I thought it was an acronym or something.

5:34
I don't know.

5:35
No, it's actually a Native American word, so pretty hard to say.

6:00
Connect Wi-Fi.

6:01
I've been having that trouble.

6:02
It had it's it was a little slow today coming in.

6:18
OK.

6:18
All of these park expenses, I assume those are like upgrades to facilities there.

6:24
Yeah, I mean, yeah.

6:26
So essentially hang on, let me see if I can get this to him and then I'll I didn't mean to say let's see.

6:35
OK, I can coming Rick also there.

7:08
OK, So all these expenses that are in the different the different descriptions.

7:16
So there are different projects that got approved with impact feed funding and I have a couple of examples of those applications and they, you know, they go under the category and they kind of, they essentially kind of keep track of it over time and keep a running tally going.

7:38
Just just so you know, it won't let me get that link because my e-mail is not on file with the secure link.

7:47
OK, Karen, I have it up.

7:48
Actually, do you want me to, Rick?

7:52

You can also hit download or I can share my screen.

7:58

Let's see, kind of hang on a second.

8:06

Trying to download in chat because that requires me put in an e-mail address and says I'm not authorized.

8:18

In the chatter.

8:19

There are three dots to the right of the document.

8:22

Aha, download, download there.

8:26

Yay.

8:30

Chris, what's your question?

8:31

My question is, it's really about everything on the projected, yeah, 2025 expenditures.

8:38

And I'm just curious.

8:41

I see there the approved budget, approved funding, little symbol there AF what what kind of detail exists for each one of these line items here?

8:54

Like how would one understand what the 51 thousand \$857,000 that's been allocated to for Missoula Regional Park phase three?

9:05

Like where is that money going and where's the detail associated with that?

9:10

Is that easily accessible or?

9:13

That's a good question.

9:14

I'm not sure.

9:14

I'd have to dig a little further.

9:16

I, I think you can see that detail in the annual report, like at a year, you know, at that, at that point, I'm not sure.

9:26

I don't think that they necessarily provide the, the, the impact.

9:31

The advisory committee I know gets the proposal which has the amount being requested right and what it's for and how they came up with that number and all that stuff.

9:39

So they get that information as far as how much has been.

9:46

Yeah, so so that's what the impact fee advisory committee recommends and the City Council approves and then that would go.

9:53

That'd be the number that goes into this budget essentially.

9:58

And then I think that the.

10:01

Well, I didn't finish looking at it that the annual.

10:04

Did you say what you just said one more time?

10:05

Yeah, the so the the committee gets a proposal and in it it has a request, you know the project name that matches up with that and it has the amount and what that amount was based on, whether it was a match or you know, how they came up with it.

10:25

And then that amount, once it's been approved by the City Council, it would be what goes into the adopted expenditures, right.

10:35

So there's like a there's a CIPI get that.

10:38

And where were these all approved all these individual items?

10:45

Yep.

10:46

Through the impact through these individual proposals through this.

10:49

But don't we do that?

10:50

Yeah.

10:51

Yeah.

10:51

So they I haven't what they got in here.

10:53

You this is this is the cities.

10:56

Yeah, before, before they ended up in the approved.

11:00

Each of those came before the impact, the advisory committee and the City Council at the city level, at the city level impact fees, we got you.

11:09

Similarly, it would happen here where each project would come and bring their funding proposal to you.

11:16

You'd provide a recommendation to the commissioners?

11:18

If approved, then it goes into the budget.

11:22

Kind of That makes sense.

11:23

Yes, it makes sense.

11:24

I'm just curious where these occurred because I don't remember making any decisions on these.

11:28

Are you on the city's committee?

11:31

No, but I thought we had oversight of the funds because part of these funds are used by the city, right.

11:37

I mean, this is not yet.

11:39

We haven't allocated any to the city yet.

11:41

OK, So that would be just a single act by this body.

11:44

Here is to allocate funds to the city and then they go through their process.

11:49

No, they would if they were if they were in a request for the county to provide funds, a proposal would come to you, right?

11:58

Say, say it was the a trail that includes area in both the city and the county.

12:06

It would it would probably come both to the city and pack the advisory committee and the county and you would approve the county's allocation.

12:14

Got it.

12:15

And then, then it would go to the commissioners for their approval and then it would be put on the list, on our list.

12:20

Assume there's some of these that maybe none of them.

12:24

These are all city only, city only.

12:26

None of them request any county funds.

12:28

No, OK.

12:29

We haven't given out any money yet.

12:31

So from just looking forward in anticipation that we're going to get individual projects to review, when I look at this, I think that the city impact fee advisory committee is and the City Council themselves are approving these on an individual basis and not looking at it as a whole.

12:50

So then, yeah, my public comment that will get reprimanded later is the Parks and Rec got approval for 1.1.

13:02

And did anybody look at these to see if there's any overlapping?

13:05

Because sometimes they reference a park, sometimes they say sports court and sports courts are on all the parks.

13:12

So when we do this, we're going to have the similar kind of thing, especially when it comes to the Fort Missoula that that's I guess what threw me off as I actually was under the impression for county park, but is it transferred to the city both or it's in the city's jurisdiction managed by parks and by the city Parks and rec.

13:35

That's probably what threw me off is I yeah, gotcha.

13:38

Well, and, and not to get ahead, but I will get ahead.

13:43

The whole parking fact fee is done as of October 1st, the statute, the law changed, not allowed to charge for parks anymore.

13:53

We can still do trails because they can be considered transportation.

13:56

Got it.

13:57

But parks in the general government are no longer eligible for impact.

14:01

No further questions from that.

14:03

That makes sense.

14:03

Thank you.

14:04

OK, So there will be whatever's left in that fund as of October 1st.

14:08

We will still go through the allocation process for that, but then it's over.

14:13

Thank you.

14:17

Did you get the document?

14:20

I just emailed it.

14:21

OK.

14:21

Yeah, I, I just got, I've been getting errors on it, so.

14:26

Oh, jeez.

14:26

Rick, I just emailed it to you.

14:28

I picked the wrong day to, to to attend virtually.

14:33

So we can anticipate a county version of this in October.

14:38

Well, with, with nothing on it, with nothing on it, but you know what I mean, It's gonna have the, the hopefully the FY20 24 fund balance and the FY20 25 fund balance and no appropriations and the, the categories.

14:53

Is it possible that a project from Parks and Rec could come through asking for money that would be overlapping to one of these already in flight projects?

15:07

It's possible.

15:10

If that should occur, I think that wouldn't we want to see the project that was approved by the city impact fees?

15:19

I mean, I assume that that would come as a request for additional county funding and it would be maybe just a joint request and we would see it at the same time, right?

15:27

I would, I would assume so, but I they could do a subsequent one like they could get part way through and then make a request.

15:35

Yeah, get the project expanded or was more expensive.

15:37

I mean, in theory they could ask.

15:40

That's interesting, Chris.

15:41

I like the assumption that it would be a joint request, but nothing's on the books that says if impact fees are coming, being requested from both city and county, then it's a single joint request.

15:57

And I don't think it has to be.

15:58

I mean, I think be nice.

16:00

Yeah.

16:01

I think an applicant could go to the city and to the county separately and request funds.

16:07

I mean, bottom line is we hold the purse for the county funds and anything coming to us would require that same process.

16:17

So why wouldn't they do it as a joint application, make sure they could choose to go through the extra work.

16:22

But yeah, I, I was confused by this primarily because I, I saw things that I believed were part of the county.

16:30

So I didn't know if this had already been approved or if I missed a meeting or if like, like where did I miss these applications?

16:36

So I just wanted to clarify, no, that that makes perfect sense.

16:40

City has approved these and I think any county funds that they'd be requesting for these would come through US in a in the form of an application.

16:51

Makes sense.

16:51

Do we want to set a standard of expectation of a joint application where there's overlap?

16:56

A request for a joint request sets a good standard going forward.

17:04

Isn't the next thing on the agenda about city coordination?

17:08

It is, yeah.

17:08

It's not really about that part, but we can the, the coordination really had to do with starting the having the city collect impact fees on behalf of the county, like the county's impact fees.

17:30

I think it's, I tend to agree that it's really important that we share both ways.

17:35

Yeah, I do think we will get to the point of talking about and what the applications look like.

17:43

I brought the city's applications so it filled out one so you could see what they look like with specific projects.

17:50

And what you will see is that they talk about like where the funding comes from.

17:55

So if they're going to use multiple sources of funding, they often, you know have that included in the application.

18:02

So if they we're going to ask for city impact fees and county impact fees, that should be articulated.

18:09

Yeah, I mean when we do this through the open space bond, which is the kind of closest similar arrangement where this where we the county in that case administers the whole open space bond.

18:21

And so when the city requests funding, we kind of do a concurrence mode, but those all come through.

18:28

But sometimes there are joint applications for portion of the city bond and portion of portion of the city's allocation of portion of the county's allocation.

18:37

And they do a joint essentially kind of a joint application for that, which makes sense, making it easy, just adopting what the city is doing.

18:48

And yeah, that's kind of where I was headed.

18:50

We can kind of review the applications and if there's something we don't like, then we can refine it from there.

18:54

But yeah, yeah, no need to reinvent that mail, OK.

18:59

Otherwise for like simple financial accounting, does this kind of make sense like A1 pager and Rick, have you managed to take a look at that?

19:11

I've managed to look at all of them.

19:12

I think they look great.

19:14

All right.

19:18

Well, sorry, can we back a second?

19:21

So starting October 1st, impact fees get assessed without Parks and Rec.

19:29

There will be no Parks and Rec impact fees.

19:30

There will be no general government impact fees and there will be no administrative fee.

19:37

Those are all things the Legislature changed in the last session.

19:42

I got to say that that bear tracks, Underbridge Playgrounds.

19:45

One of the best descriptions I've seen in a long time.

19:49

These guys haven't seen it yet.

19:51

You're getting ahead.

19:52

Oh, oh, I'm sorry.

19:53

I'm jumping ahead.

19:54

Is it gonna be a full a full under bridge again like the Madison one, or is it just the park gonna be the bridge?

19:59

Oh, it's done.

20:00

But I hit oh, just the little ping pong tables and stuff.

20:03

I brought you the applications.

20:04

This exam I saw under bridge.

20:05

I was anticipating under bridge.

20:08

So let me get there.

20:10

The coordination or do we are we done with the funding?

20:13

OK, good.

20:14

Thanks.

20:14

Coordination with City of Missoula.

20:17

Chris Lansbury, Dale, myself and Pan and other people met after our last meeting to talk about coordination with the City of Missoula.

20:32

We are still at a bit of an impasse.

20:35

Dale has asked us to hold off further discussion until after the budget has been adopted.

20:42

And so that's what we're doing.

20:46

So hopefully I'll have a more substantive update by the next appropriation application drafts.

20:55

So this I didn't get a blank one, but there's two different kinds, two different filled out applications, one's for a trail and one's for a park.

21:05

So we can see how those get filled out by the city staff.

21:15

There's more about being here.

21:17

I'm sorry.

21:17

I thought you had everything.

21:18

I'll hang on.

21:36

I think it's it's it's pretty simple.

21:38

I think it's it gives enough of an idea of what's proposed.

21:42

And as you can see, the parks is much more did maybe a little better job articulating than the rail one, but you know, more or less they have an eligibility piece and then the determination of a a proportionate share, you know, explain how they came up with the amount, what it.

22:11

And that's where often I've seen in some of the others where they explain other funding sources.

22:18

And then it's got these appendices, which are for the staff to they are for the reviewers.

22:22

This is a reminder that, you know, some of these have service areas and that there's, you know, methodologies to impact these studies.

22:33

And then also some examples of and some of the definitions.

22:40

Again, this is all the city stuff, so would be adjusted to reflect the county, but really it means like reviewing the two page application, which seems to be all they do.

22:56

That seemed like a reasonable approach.

23:00

Just great.

23:01

Yeah, and I've seen, I've seen Agevas where they will do the impact.

23:06

The advisory committee will do like 10 of these in one meeting.

23:10

Boom.

23:10

It looks like we can keep it above font 5 using a global PDF.

23:19

Yeah.

23:19

We'll work on trying to make sure that it Parks and Rec didn't paste it.

23:23

And this is city staff putting this together.

23:26

City staff in this case, putting it together.

23:28

Yeah.

23:30

Everything that I saw, most of it's done by Public works and mobility for parks staff.

23:37

There's that's what most like Linda McCarthy down at Downtown Healthy.

23:43

This one.

23:43

I know.

23:44

Yeah.

23:45

Yeah.

23:47

Photos.

23:47

Yeah.

23:48
Cool.

23:48
Good.

23:50
Like the parkour icon.

23:53
I was doing a little big trip there, Alex.

23:58
Did you too, Rick?

23:59
And I think just adding a header on this so that it's a we don't get confused between city and county or, or if it is a joint application, maybe scenarios where it's only gonna be county or only gonna be city or be both.

24:21
And I assume that, I mean, all of the references to the municipal code would be right.

24:28
They'd be TARS.

24:29
Yeah.

24:35
Is there anything right?

24:36
Just doesn't seem burdensome for the people applying.

24:39
Seems like easy or for the committee.

24:41
Yeah.

24:41
Having to go through a bunch of them, anything from a public perspective that could be added to demonstrate that we're not double dipping.

24:52
And there's this, you know, ongoing narrative between the two impact fees.

24:57
And I don't know how you do that in here besides, I think one of the easiest things.

25:04

Hi.

25:15

I think that one of the ways you're under application.

25:24

Love to hear that Number two, what number?

25:28

I don't know what number city.

25:31

Oh, after budget maybe maybe that's a good synopsis.

25:38

Yeah.

25:38

So we talked about the using this key Josh as a template or our obviously ours is not.

25:48

This is the city's version for like your regular meetings to have one of these that presented everything so you can keep track of funding as it goes along.

25:57

Starting ours is going to be very simple to start because we don't have any of these projects.

26:05

And then we were just talking about the appropriations application draft, which you have two examples of city projects just to get a sense of how onerous it is to fill out the application and for for review.

26:18

When I've looked at agendas, there's been like one proposal or 10 proposals on the agenda.

26:24

It's a 2 essentially A2 page form that just is a synopsis of the request.

26:31

And then it identifies that it's eligible and how they calculated the appropriate amount.

26:38

And then the rest of it is, is kind of more information about kind of reminders of how you might do those calculations, things like that.

26:47

And Jim had just asked, is there something that could make it more clear to the public about that there's not double dipping?

26:55

Yeah, that's good.

26:56

But we also are just proposing that we keep our applications simple and keep it identical to what the city does, but maybe 3 apps where 1 is a joint app.

27:05

So it going to both the city and the county impact fee One that's city only, one that's county only so that there's real clarity around that's the way we do it.

27:14

But if on the joint one there is both asking for both, how do we create clarity in the app?

27:21

I don't maybe that's just for stack.

27:23

That's a yeah for them to the applicant to demonstrate.

27:30

Are we certain that these eligibility requirements are the same?

27:34

Well, I'll go through and make sure that they are the same.

27:37

Yeah, yeah.

27:38

That I think all that stuff will have to be tailored to ours.

27:41

I've I've started going through it and generally it's right.

27:46

I wanted to go through it and more fine tooth against our resolution to make sure that it was.

27:51

I just look at like the CIP or adopted facility plan, for example, like the CIP is our study that it defines itself as the CIP and and in order to be eligible for impact fees, it has to be adopted into the CIP or the facility plan.

28:12

I believe so or I think it can may be able to meet the definition of capital improvements in public facilities and not be specified in there and still be eligible.

28:24

But that's why I did want to go back and double check.

28:26

I understood that correctly.

28:28

So they do the capital improvements plan based on intend, intended or, you know, anticipated projects.

28:35

But there can be other in the same category that may not have been, you know, listed that would still qualify because they could, they are considered public facilities.

28:46

And in that category.

28:47

I believe that I believe both can work.

28:50

But I did want to go back and double check that.

28:57

I mean, without getting down into a lot of the details of this, it looks good to me.

29:02

Yeah.

29:02

And I'm sure that as we get applications in the future or when you have like the final version of the application, even just sending it out, Yeah, to the members of this committee beforehand to review it.

29:14

I think that'd be great.

29:17

I always like to see, I mean, I'm on a few other boards where we have things similar to this.

29:22

And I always like to tie the eligibility requirements back to some codified description, you know, a specific reference so that we're not just making **** up.

29:35

I'm sorry.

29:35

I mean, it's, it's sometimes that happens.

29:37

It happens a lot, actually.

29:38

And so I think there's and it'd be great to make this as streamlined as possible and not not add additional requirements that are superfluous to the pool.

29:54

So you can steal some language from that resolution that created that.

30:04

Yeah, the Advisory Board something like that.

30:06

Yeah.

30:07

Yeah, I think the study resolution probably study as the exists nugget to to Yeah, that's where that's our CIP essentially for this, right.

30:19

Yeah, I like it.

30:22

All right.

30:22

We don't have any actionable item.

30:24

This is just kind of an FYI.

30:26

It's more just a look at it examples not Karen.

30:36

Yeah, it's Rick online.

30:37

So are we, are we at still functioning as an Advisory Board?

30:42

We're we're sending this to the commissioners to approve, correct.

30:46

OK.

30:52

But at this point we have nothing to recommend do it.

30:55

Do the commissioners have to approve the application process?

30:58

Yeah, it's just an administrative right.

31:02

I bet it's helpful for me to have you guys weigh in on it.

31:09

So let's see.

31:10

The next item on my update is I just want to give you a heads up that we anticipate a request for adoption of new impact fees for Lolo sewer and water.

31:25

They we have a draft impacted study that they are adjusting to make it more in line with our existing impact fee study.

31:35

They hadn't split out residential from commercial industrial and that seemed like a big mess.

31:39

So they were going to go back and adjust that.

31:42

But this is to do the expansion of the sewer and water facilities to fund the expansion of the sewer and water facilities.

31:49

What would be different about that is that whereas most of our impact fees are incremental, you know, based on the idea of incremental expansion and in one case it's a specific project, the radio system, radio system for Emergency Management, we'll assume water is going to be a little more complicated because it's a cost recovery when you build an expansion and you have to kind of pay it back.

32:13

So these would go to pay it back essentially.

32:19

I mean, they could be collected to fund the a future development, but more, more than likely it would be kind of a combination.

32:26

So it's a little bit different.

32:28

And this was this happened after a whole lot of debate on should we create a new RSID?

32:34

Should we create a special district?

32:36

How do we do this?

32:37

And a whole lot of interaction with the residents and low, low 20 years, 10 years, 20 years.

32:48

It seems like a elegant solution.

32:50

The residents flow load don't are not bad about this.

32:54

Yeah.

32:55

That's helpful.

32:56

It is really helpful.

32:57

Yeah.

32:59

So we anticipate that to be at your October meeting.

33:03

Great.

33:03

And before that we'll be running it through the, you know, notice to folks in the Lolo area, Missoula County boys page blah de blah de blah.

33:13

Kind of a mini version of what you did with the original.

33:15

Are you expecting a lot of public comment then it's really hard to know.

33:20

Just wondering.

33:21

I don't.

33:22

OK.

33:22

So maybe, I mean, we went through so much public engagement with the folks in Lolo and they like this, which means probably very few people will come out and they like this because they're not paying for it.

33:35

Yeah, new construction is paying for it.

33:37

And I'd be surprised if we as an advisory committee got public comment.

33:42

You're gonna more likely.

33:42

Yeah, yeah, yeah.

33:43

That's commissioning.

33:44

You're right.

33:45

Yeah, That's you're you're totally right.

33:46

And we're so new that we're not on the.

33:47

No reason.

33:48

Yeah, you're, you're totally right.

33:50

Assuming that we do have that meeting, we will move it to Sophie Moeys to the commissioner meeting room in case there is public comment.

33:57

We don't have a measure.

33:58

That would be a mess.

33:59

Will we see that request prior to the meeting?

34:01

Yes.

34:01

OK.

34:02

Yeah.

34:02

We thought we'd have the study done.

34:06

It's a lot.

34:06

And I just got behind this.

34:07

Before we bring Shane's staff out of retirement.

34:09

Let's do it.

34:10

Let's do it.

34:11

Be hard.

34:12

So, you know, it's beat to it better than anybody.

34:15

Yeah.

34:15

OK.

34:17

OK.

34:17

Yeah, Commissioner, I had a quick question.

34:21

Sure.

34:21

Does the public avoid budgeting things like the plague or do they show up for them?

34:26

They don't show up.

34:27

And I think it's mostly because it's complicated and people don't pay that close attention, right.

34:33

That's kind of.

34:34

I wish that they did.

34:34

Your budget, your values.

34:37

Yeah.

34:40

Most people don't even read the value the jail and and this from this from these impact fees will allow the bringing bringing the low, low sewer system up to stop build in redundancy which is sorely needed and sets us up for growth, which is really important.

35:02

We're in a good spot with this.

35:03

Nice.

35:04

Yeah, I'm really excited about it.

35:05

Like where we had such pushback before.

35:08

Yeah.

35:09

Are they having any issues with the EPA or anything at this point?

35:12

Or, or or water quality?

35:15

We had the DEQ reminding us that we needed to make a better sewer system, but they never said shut you down on Thursday.

35:21

But they did remind us that this isn't this isn't good enough.

35:25

The problem is that they're missing redundancy, though.

35:28

If if one water lines broke, the whole thing's going down.

35:33

This one is on.

35:34

That was on now wells.

35:35

Well, yeah, that was CFC in China limit.

35:38

It was on wells.

35:39

This might be getting ahead, but will there be any improvements to the river access there at that water treatment plant?

35:44

A lot.

35:44

Not that I know of.

35:47

Isn't the parks folks, aren't they waiting for the system the the place to feed that stick with?

35:54

Not that I know of.

35:55

It could be have.

35:56

It's a cool spot.

35:57

I'm just curious because they're doing something right there.

35:59

I haven't.

35:59

I haven't since I wished that for our last agenda item.

36:02

Yeah.

36:06

All right.

36:07

Recruitment of committee members.

36:09

They.

36:09

We have 4 applicants for three open positions.

36:12

So hopefully in October you will have a formal committee.

36:16

4 souls.

36:17

Oh, what?

36:18

Anybody famous?

36:19

Yeah.

36:20

Anybody.

36:20

We.

36:22

I want to know if anybody that I sent here actually followed through.

36:25

Do you remember names?

36:26

I do remember names.

36:27

I have all the names.

36:31

Alexander Marsh, John Rhodes, Tasha Saltbine, John Rhodes.

36:40

OK, who's John Rhodes?

36:41

He's involved in housing.

36:44

And Bert Caldwell.

36:45

Everyone knows Bert Caldwell.

36:46

He knows Bert Albert.

36:50

Tell Bert the Bonner.

36:51

But the Bonner continue this fall.

36:57

Everyone is kind of in the business realm that looks like, with the exception of John Rhodes, who's more of a housing person.

37:04

He's got a great radio show doesn't hurt.

37:10

Yeah.

37:12

OK, so by the October meeting, those individual, three of those 4 individuals, that's a commissioner decision, right?

37:21

We just FYI for us.

37:23

So then part of the agenda would be to name a chairperson at that meeting because we would.

37:28

Well, it can be on this meeting or you can wait until the next meeting is on the.

37:33

We'll have a, we'll have a application make something so that the folks on low, low or the public works will have something to fill out.

37:42

They will, they don't have to.

37:44

They're not doing appropriation.

37:45

They are just bringing the study forward.

37:49

We'll have a study to bring forward and then a draft like some sort of staff report and draft recommendation.

37:58

How would everybody feel with just leaving the selection of chair and vice chair until next time and I can continue Pro Tem just for one more meeting because we'll have them fully staffed, hopefully board.

38:16

I was going to suggest the same thing.

38:18

Honestly, I think probably what we'd want to consider adding to the agenda is, is a brief overview of this committee.

38:26

I mean, it's going to have to be a 5 minute onboarding for all these people if they're not familiar with what we've done over the last two years.

38:31

Is that only good to hear?

38:34

You feel like the interview process is kind of an onboarding as well, to be honest.

38:37

That's true.

38:38

Yeah.

38:38

But yeah, I don't remember these folks, but that doesn't mean anything.

38:42

Yeah.

38:43

You've interviewed 2 and you've got two more interviews coming.

38:46

Well, and by you, I mean the royal you.

38:48

So you might you personally you might have been there.

38:51

Rick, do you need a motion to to table the old business item a or Yeah, I think we do.

38:58

I I moved to table the selection of chair and vice chair to the October 2nd that all in favor aye.

39:11

So that's good.

39:11

We will wait until the next time any new business, any additional agenda items other than the overview of the committee and the onboarding and I will try and meet with each of them, each of the new members before, especially since there might be a proposal for new impact fees.

39:26

They probably need a little bit more of a Karen.

39:33

Are the applicants kind of a good cross section of the county?

39:36

Do we have anyone from Bitterroot Bonner, the other directions?

39:43

That is a very good question.

39:46

Seeley Laker would be great.

39:48

Yes, absolutely.

39:50

Fire Missoula.

39:52

Missoula.

39:56

No, no.

39:57

OK.

39:59

Well, you get we can wish.

40:03

It's better than what we've had.

40:04

So yeah, we're going to get these.

40:06

Absolutely.

40:08

OK.

40:08

I think the next item is a motion to adjourn.

40:16

And, Commissioner, I will see you in a couple hours.

40:18

Right.

40:19

Not going to be at that event, but even Juan will be OK.

40:26

I had you down as being there, so I'm sorry.

40:29

I wish I could make it, but I can't.

40:31

That's OK.

40:33

I'll eat a burger for you.

40:34

Please do.

40:35

Please do.

40:35

Thank you.

40:36

Looks like I have a real thank you.

40:39

Everyone doing something.

40:41

And it's big.

40:41

Thanks, Rick.

40:42

It's big much.

40:42

Yeah.

40:43

It facilitates growth and helps remedy a long standing problem.

40:48

Yeah, I told it's a real.

40:49

It's a big thing.

40:50

Christy, have 5 minutes.

40:51

Yep.