



BOARD MEETING MINUTES

WEDNESDAY JULY 16, 2025 4:00 P.M.

COEUR D'ALENE PUBLIC LIBRARY COMMUNITY ROOM

1. CALL TO ORDER

Chairman Hoskins called the **ignite cda** board meeting to order at 4:00 p.m.

ignite cda board members present: Jester, Mandel, Garcia, Metts, Hoskins, Evans, Armon, Meyer, Miller

ignite cda staff present: Berns **ignite cda** legal counsel present: Quade

2. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

3. PUBLIC COMMENT

No public comment was provided.

4. APPROVAL OF CONSENT CALENDAR

Being considered routine by the **ignite cda** board, these items will be enacted by one motion unless requested by a board member that one or more items be removed for later discussion.

- Approval of Board Meeting Minutes for June 18, 2025
- Approval of Payables as Submitted
- Approval of District Monthly Financial Statements

Motion by Commissioner Mandel, seconded by Commissioner Meyer, to approve the Consent Calendar. Motion carried.

5. FINANCE COMMITTEE

Fiscal Year 2025 Amended Budget: Discussion & Publication Approval

Ex. Director Berns shared an overview of the proposed amendments to the Fiscal Year 2025 (FY25) budgets with the board (summary table below).

The proposed budget amendments are necessary due to changes in district project costs and timelines. Proposed budget amendments are highlighted in red font in the following table.

The process for amended fiscal year budgets calls for the **ignite cda** board to review amended budgets at the July board meeting and authorize publication of the amended budgets prior to the August board meeting where a public hearing is held on the amended budgets.

Ignite CDA FY2025 Amended Budget Summary

| Line | | Amended | | Amended | | Amended | | Amended | |
|------|---|----------------|----------------|----------------|----------------|--------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| | | River District | River District | Atlas District | Atlas District | HC District | HC District | Total | Total |
| 1 | Estimated Beginning Fund Balance (10/1/24) | \$ 2,923,627 | \$ 3,215,855 | \$ 5,959,706 | \$ 6,520,453 | \$ 1,274,435 | \$ 1,262,879 | \$ 10,157,768 | \$ 10,999,187 |
| 2 | | | | | | | | | |
| 3 | Revenues | | | | | | | | |
| 4 | Estimated Tax Increment | \$ 1,706,578 | \$ 1,829,691 | \$ 394,166 | \$ 439,835 | \$ 581,039 | \$ 641,541 | \$ 2,681,783 | \$ 2,911,067 |
| 5 | Property Rental Receipts | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 6 | Int. & Misc. Funds | \$ 48,000 | \$ 40,000 | \$ 72,000 | \$ 60,000 | \$ 11,400 | \$ 11,400 | \$ 131,400 | \$ 111,400 |
| 7 | Note Draws | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 8 | Property Divestitures | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3,300,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 3,300,000 | \$ - |
| 9 | Capital Acquisition Financing | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 10 | Total | \$ 1,754,578 | \$ 1,869,691 | \$ 3,766,166 | \$ 499,835 | \$ 592,439 | \$ 652,941 | \$ 6,113,183 | \$ 3,022,467 |
| 11 | | | | | | | | | |
| 12 | Expenses | | | | | | | | |
| 13 | Administration | \$ 118,435 | \$ 118,435 | \$ 59,218 | \$ 59,218 | \$ 59,218 | \$ 59,218 | \$ 236,871 | \$ 236,871 |
| 14 | Office Expenses | \$ 4,801 | \$ 4,801 | \$ 2,401 | \$ 2,401 | \$ 2,401 | \$ 2,401 | \$ 9,603 | \$ 9,603 |
| 15 | Travel | \$ 1,750 | \$ 1,750 | \$ 875 | \$ 875 | \$ 875 | \$ 875 | \$ 3,500 | \$ 3,500 |
| 16 | Professional Services | \$ 48,000 | \$ 48,000 | \$ 80,550 | \$ 80,550 | \$ 18,650 | \$ 18,650 | \$ 147,200 | \$ 147,200 |
| 17 | Notices | \$ 1,250 | \$ 1,250 | \$ 2,000 | \$ 2,000 | \$ 150 | \$ 150 | \$ 3,400 | \$ 3,400 |
| 18 | Communications | \$ 1,500 | \$ 1,500 | \$ 750 | \$ 750 | \$ 750 | \$ 750 | \$ 3,000 | \$ 3,000 |
| 19 | Insurance | \$ 5,568 | \$ 5,568 | \$ 2,784 | \$ 2,784 | \$ 2,784 | \$ 2,784 | \$ 11,136 | \$ 11,136 |
| 20 | Meetings | \$ 2,450 | \$ 2,450 | \$ 1,225 | \$ 1,225 | \$ 1,225 | \$ 1,225 | \$ 4,900 | \$ 4,900 |
| 21 | Utilities | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 22 | Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 100 | \$ 100 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 100 | \$ 100 |
| 23 | Organization Dues | \$ 10,325 | \$ 10,325 | \$ 5,163 | \$ 5,163 | \$ 5,163 | \$ 5,163 | \$ 20,651 | \$ 20,651 |
| 24 | Miscellaneous | \$ 500 | \$ 500 | \$ 250 | \$ 250 | \$ 250 | \$ 250 | \$ 1,000 | \$ 1,000 |
| 25 | Public Art | \$ 17,066 | \$ 18,297 | \$ 3,942 | \$ 4,398 | \$ 5,810 | \$ 6,415 | \$ 26,818 | \$ 29,110 |
| 26 | Capital Acquisition Expense | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 27 | Debt: Interest (non-OPA,IRA) | \$ 12,800 | \$ 12,800 | \$ 29,403 | \$ - | \$ 3,002 | \$ - | \$ 45,205 | \$ 12,800 |
| 28 | Debt: Principal (non-OPA,IRA) | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 29 | Parking Initiatives | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 30 | Planning | \$ 25,000 | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 75,000 | \$ - |
| 31 | Agency Funded Programs | \$ 162,040 | \$ 250,040 | \$ 4,115,960 | \$ 1,268,004 | \$ 20,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,298,000 | \$ 1,518,044 |
| 32 | Partnership Agreements (OPAs, IRAs) | \$ 459,538 | \$ 459,538 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 459,538 | \$ 459,538 |
| 33 | Special Project Reserve | \$ 350,000 | \$ - | \$ 100,000 | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | \$ - | \$ 500,000 | \$ - |
| 34 | Total | \$ 1,221,023 | \$ 935,254 | \$ 4,454,621 | \$ 1,427,718 | \$ 170,278 | \$ 97,881 | \$ 5,845,922 | \$ 2,460,853 |
| 35 | | | | | | | | | |
| 36 | Estimated Ending Fund Balance (9/30/25) | \$ 3,457,182 | \$ 4,150,292 | \$ 5,271,251 | \$ 5,592,570 | \$ 1,696,596 | \$ 1,817,939 | \$ 10,425,029 | \$ 11,560,801 |

FY25 Amended District Budgets: Comments

FY25 amended budgets for the three districts capture key budget elements that are proposed for amendment. Comments by line item:

Line 1: the fairly large variance in the Atlas District updated starting value reflects the timing of project spending for the Atlas project as well as actual levy rate values.

Line 4: amended tax increment revenue receipts for the Districts are increased due to calculations using actual levy rates and updated County valuation numbers.

Line 6: amended interest and miscellaneous funds values decreased due to lower interest rates paid on district cash balances.

Line 8: Property divestitures. Atlas District amended value reflects no sale proceeds due to withholding the sales of Area 5A & Area 7 in FY25.

Line 25: Public Art: Amended values reflect more accurate calculations based on actual levy rates.

Line 30: Budgeted planning costs for the River & Atlas Districts will not be spent.

Line 31: Agency funded programs. River & Atlas District amended values pertain to the dynamics associated with the Atlas project.

Line 33: River, Atlas and Health Corridor District special project reserve accounts set to zero; i.e. no anticipated needs for those budgeted funds in FY25.

Motion by Commissioner Meyer, seconded by Commissioner Jester, to authorize the ignite cda Executive Director to publish the Amended FY25 Budget as presented in the CDA Press prior to the August 20, 2025 budget public hearing date. Motion carried.

Fiscal Year 2026 Budget: Discussion & Publication Approval

Ex. Director Berns shared an overview of the Fiscal Year 2026 (FY26) budget with the board (summary table below). Ex. Director Berns also shared that under Idaho urban renewal law, urban renewal agencies are required to prepare and finalize budgets prior to September 1st of each year. Therefore, the ignite cda board needs to review draft budgets at the July board meeting and authorize publication of the draft budgets prior to the August board meeting where a public hearing is held on the proposed budgets.

Ignite CDA FY2026 Budget Summary

| Line | | River District | Atlas District | HC District | Total |
|------|---|----------------|----------------|--------------|---------------|
| 1 | <u>Estimated</u> Beginning Fund Balance (10/1/25) | \$ 4,174,818 | \$ 5,661,181 | \$ 1,828,975 | \$ 11,664,974 |
| 2 | | | | | |
| 3 | Revenues | | | | |
| 4 | <u>Estimated</u> Tax Increment | \$ 1,948,533 | \$ 657,941 | \$ 600,024 | \$ 3,206,498 |
| 5 | Property Rental Receipts | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 6 | Int. & Misc. Funds | \$ 25,200 | \$ 42,000 | \$ 9,600 | \$ 76,800 |
| 7 | Note Draws | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 8 | Property Divestitures | \$ - | \$ 3,300,000 | \$ - | \$ 3,300,000 |
| 9 | Capital Acquisition Financing | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 10 | Total | \$ 1,973,733 | \$ 3,999,941 | \$ 609,624 | \$ 6,583,298 |
| 11 | | | | | |
| 12 | Expenses | | | | |
| 13 | Administration | \$ 121,166 | \$ 60,584 | \$ 60,584 | \$ 242,334 |
| 14 | Office Expenses | \$ 4,676 | \$ 2,338 | \$ 2,338 | \$ 9,352 |
| 15 | Travel | \$ 1,750 | \$ 875 | \$ 875 | \$ 3,500 |
| 16 | Professional Services | \$ 51,500 | \$ 52,950 | \$ 20,150 | \$ 124,600 |
| 17 | Notices | \$ 1,250 | \$ 2,000 | \$ 200 | \$ 3,450 |
| 18 | Communications | \$ 1,500 | \$ 750 | \$ 750 | \$ 3,000 |
| 19 | Insurance | \$ 5,905 | \$ 2,952 | \$ 2,952 | \$ 11,809 |
| 20 | Meetings | \$ 2,450 | \$ 1,225 | \$ 1,225 | \$ 4,900 |
| 21 | Utilities | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 22 | Property Taxes | \$ - | \$ 200 | \$ - | \$ 200 |
| 23 | Organization Dues | \$ 10,325 | \$ 5,163 | \$ 5,163 | \$ 20,650 |
| 24 | Miscellaneous | \$ 500 | \$ 250 | \$ 250 | \$ 1,000 |
| 25 | Public Art | \$ 19,485 | \$ 6,579 | \$ 6,000 | \$ 32,064 |
| 26 | Capital Acquisition Expense | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 27 | Debt: Interest (non-OPA,IRA) | \$ 12,800 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 12,800 |
| 28 | Debt: Principal (non-OPA,IRA) | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 29 | Parking Initiatives | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - |
| 30 | Planning | \$ 25,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ - | \$ 75,000 |
| 31 | Agency Funded Programs | \$ 127,500 | \$ 3,135,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 3,312,500 |
| 32 | Partnership Agreements (OPAs, IRAs) | \$ 510,903 | \$ - | \$ - | \$ 510,903 |
| 33 | Special Project Reserve | \$ 350,000 | \$ 100,000 | \$ 50,000 | \$ 500,000 |
| 34 | Total | \$ 1,246,710 | \$ 3,420,866 | \$ 200,487 | \$ 4,868,062 |
| 35 | | | | | |
| 36 | <u>Estimated</u> Ending Fund Balance (9/30/26) | \$ 4,901,840 | \$ 6,240,257 | \$ 2,238,113 | \$ 13,380,209 |

FY26 District Budgets: Comments

General:

Tax Increment (TI) revenue budget values derived using “old” (2024) levy rates, i.e. budgeted TI revenue values for each district may come in higher or lower than projected due to how the levy rates are set by taxing entities later this year.

River District:

- 50% G&A
- Planned Tax Increment Revenue for FY26: **\$1,948,500.**
- River District 2019 Note Draw: **\$0.** No need to borrow funds based on revenue/cost projections for River District and no need to loan funds to Atlas District.
- Arts: 1% of tax increment revenue received from County.
- Property Divestiture Income: **\$0.**

- Health Corridor District does **not** begin reimbursement in FY26 to the River District for accrued HDR master plan & legal costs or for the DOWL traffic study.
- Atlas District does **not** begin principal reimbursement to the River District in FY26 for accrued loan debt. No new funds loaned to Atlas District in FY26.
- Special Project Reserve: **\$350K**
- Atlas Project: FY26 budget contains **\$127,000** for two monument signs located at Atlas Road entrance. (Plan is to spend **\$42,500** for monument signage during the remainder of FY25).

Atlas District:

- 25% G&A
- Planned Tax Increment Revenue for FY26: **\$658,000.**
- River District Loan: **\$0.** Atlas District does not begin principal & interest reimbursement to River District for loan debt. Interest being accrued on outstanding principal balance.
- Arts: 1% of tax increment revenue received from County.
- Bank Line of Credit: **\$0** (Amend budget at a later date if decision is to engage on LOC)
- Agency's intent is to reimburse City for City acquisition costs of Atlas mill site properties located within Atlas District boundary: land cost & RR r-o-w cost reimbursements (**\$5.3M**). **No FY26 payments.**
- Agency's intent is to reimburse City for structural fill material costs for the Atlas project: 50/50 split with River District (**\$153,068**). **No FY26 payments.**
- Property Divestiture Income: **\$3,300,000** (Atlas Area 7 @ **\$1,800,000**; Atlas Area 5A @ **\$1,500,000**).
- Special Project Reserve: **\$100K.**
- Atlas Project: FY26 budget calls for **\$3.1M** of spending on Phase 3 design/infrastructure, basically rolling over most of the FY25 planned spending.

Health Corridor District (HCD):

- 25% G&A
- Planned Tax Increment Revenue for FY26: **\$600,000.**
- Revenue Plan: River District Loan: **\$0.**
- Revenue Plan: Tax Anticipation Note w/ Kootenai Health as possible guarantor: **\$0.**
- Revenue Plan: Kootenai Health PILOT contribution: **\$0.**
- Arts: 1% of tax increment revenue received from County.
- HCD does **not** begin principal & interest reimbursement payments to the River District in FY26 for loan debt associated with HDR master plan & legal costs or for the DOWL traffic study cost. Interest being accrued on outstanding principal balance.
- Special Project Reserve: **\$50K.**
- ignite partnership spending for possibly enhancing ped/bike trail mobility: **\$50K.**

Motion by Commissioner Garcia, seconded by Commissioner Metts, to authorize the ignite cda Executive Director to publish the FY26 budgets as presented in the CDA Press prior to the August 20, 2025 budget public hearing date. Motion carried.

Fiscal Year 2025 Audit: Hoover CPA Engagement

Hoover CPA (Scott Hoover) has provided an engagement letter to the Agency to perform the fiscal year 2025 audit. The Hoover CPA proposed audit fee for fiscal year 2025 is \$12,500.

Motion by Commissioner Metts, seconded by Commissioner Jester, to accept the Fiscal Year 2025 audit engagement proposal from Hoover CPA in the amount of \$12,500. Motion carried.

6. EXECUTIVE DIRECTOR'S REPORT

Atlas Project: Adhoc Committee: GGLO Architects / Heartland Real Estate Consultants / Welch Comer Engineers Phase 3 Attainable Home Ownership Master Planning Initiative

Ignite cda board commissioners Miller, Jester and Meyer are members of the Atlas Project Phase 3 Adhoc Committee. The Adhoc Committee recently spent time with Mark Sindell of GGLO Architects, along with representatives of Welch Comer Engineers and Heartland, discussing the value proposition of a master planning initiative pertaining to attainable home ownership on the Atlas Project Phase 3 site. The master planning proposal is contained in the Welch Comer memo below.



Atlas Phase 3 – Attainable Housing Master Planning & Feasibility Tasks

Purpose

To support the Ignite CDA Board and its Ad Hoc Committee in developing a practical and well-supported attainable home ownership housing plan for the Atlas Phase 3 site. This includes site layouts, estimated construction costs and affordability estimates.

Task 1: Housing Mix and Site Layout Options

Task 1.1: Housing Mix Review

- Develop a graphic summarizing Kootenai County housing needs by employment type (GGLO)

- Recommend a mix of housing types—stacked flats, townhomes, twin homes, and detached homes—across AMI targets of 100% and 120%. This will be an initial “stab” but iterative based on Task 2 Builder Feedback (GGLO).
- Consider different housing sizes to meet AMI objectives (Heartland, GGLO, WC).

Task 1.2: Site Layout Concepts

- Prepare **two draft layout options** that vary in:
 - Housing type and quantity in a massing model style (Heartland)
 - Public street and private access (e.g. condominium plat) (WC)
 - Water, sewer, storm, power, gas infrastructure layout (WC).
 - Estimate infrastructure and development costs. (WC)
 - Relationship to existing Atlas development (GGLO, WC)

Ad Hoc Committee Meeting #1

- Review housing mix assumptions and initial site layout concepts.
- Review AMI targets.
- Revise layouts and product mix based on committee feedback.

Deliverables

- Housing mix summary with estimated product costs and AMI targets.
- Two draft site massing model layout concepts.
- Housing needs graphics.
- Opinion of project development costs.
- Ad hoc Committee minutes.

Task 2: Builder Feedback and Affordability Feasibility

Task 2.1: Builder Interviews

- Interview 3–5 regional builders experienced in delivering housing for the target income ranges and product types and review conceptual layouts. (Heartland)
- Collect input on construction costs, housing product preferences, and interest in responding to a future RFP (Heartland).

Task 2.2: Construction Cost Estimates and AMI Pricing

- Revise concept layouts based on builder input (Heartland, GGLO WC)
- Update construction costs for each housing type (Heartland)
- Update estimated infrastructure and development costs (WC).
- Analyze affordability based on current financing assumptions (e.g., 10% down, 30-year fixed mortgage, prevailing interest rates) (Heartland)
- Identify if land write-downs are sufficient or if additional funding is necessary to fill the gap to achieve the desired AMI ranges. (Heartland)

Ad Hoc Committee Meeting #2

- Review builder input and draft affordability findings.
- Assist the committee with developing a recommended option for Board consideration.

Deliverables:

- Builder interview summary.
- Updated Housing mix summary with estimated product costs and AMI targets.

- Updated opinions of project development costs.
- Draft financial model summary.
- Revised site layout based on Ad hoc committee recommendations.

Ignite CDA Board Workshop

- Present Task 1 and 2 findings.
- Summarize Ad Hoc Committee input.
- Discuss preferred direction for master plan refinements.

Deliverable:

- Workshop slide deck

Potential Future Tasks

- Infrastructure Design
- Design Guidelines
- Detailed site rendering
- Entitlement Strategy
- Partner Entity to Manage Long-term Deed Restrictions
- RFP Framework and Scoring

We propose to do the work on an hourly basis with an estimated fee range of \$60,000 to not to exceed \$75,000. The fee will vary depending on whether the committee desires to fully evaluate two site layout options through all the tasks and depending on additional tasks the committee may request.

Ignite cda Board Members on the Ad hoc committee (Commissioners Meyer, Miller and Jester) had an opportunity to review the scope and provided good feedback. The scope of work is structured in a manner that will allow the Attainable Housing Ad hoc Committee to guide the process and correspondingly the consulting fees, which is why we provided a fee range. It's possible a preferred option will be identified early in the process, for a variety of reasons such as topography or housing types, so the fees will be on the lower end of the range. However, if the committee desires to evaluate two options through all the tasks, then the fees will be on the upper end of the range. At the end of the process, the objective is to have a well-vetted concept, with an understanding of what level of attainable housing the agency can achieve.

Phil Boyd (Welch Comer Engineers) shared an overview of the proposal with the board. Board members asked clarifying questions re. the master planning proposal including:

- Commissioner Metts: asked for more background re. the need for construction cost estimates in the proposal?
 - Mr. Boyd shared that the consultant team felt this information would be important in the analysis to help to understand how to achieve the targeted Area Median Income (AMI) demographics. Engaging local developers/builders will help to provide realistic \$/square foot values that are applicable to different types of housing products. In other words, mining data from experienced local developers / builders to assist in road testing potential development scenarios.

- Commissioner Mandel shared that she liked the proposed two site layout concept approach. She asked how and when will the go / no go decision be made on pursuing one layout versus two layouts?
 - Mr. Boyd shared that he thinks the Adhoc Committee will be able to decide on a recommendation re. the go / no go approach on one versus two layouts early on in the master planning process. He feels that the decision might become clear based on how the topography of the Phase 3 site impacts possible development strategies.
- Commissioner Meyer shared that one of the key takeaways from the Adhoc Committee's discussion with Mr. Sindell was that the Agency needs to thoroughly understand the local regulatory environment that governs development rules on the Phase 3 site, addressing issues that will be critical to the goal of creating attainable home ownership product on the Phase 3 site.

Motion by Commissioner Metts, seconded by Commissioner Mandel, to approve the GGLO / Welch Comer / Heartland Phase 3 attainable home ownership master planning proposal in an amount not to exceed \$75,000. Motion carried.

Atlas Project: Update

Mr. Boyd shared the following project update with the board:

The Atlas project team is working with the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) and N. A. Degerstrom (contractor) on importing structural fill material from the I90 project into the Phase 3 site. Efforts are underway with the contractor on developing the needed contract to govern material deliveries. Additional efforts are underway working with ITD to ensure the site meets ITD standards for material deliveries.

7. BOARD COMMISSIONER COMMENTS:

Commissioner Garcia thanked the Adhoc Committee for all of their work to date on the Phase 3 site attainable housing initiative, and for their most recent efforts re. the Phase 3 site master planning initiative.

Commissioner Miller shared two comments:

- The July 2025 HomeShare Kootenai County Feasibility Assessment is complete and will be available for review at www.housingni.org by the end of July. She indicated that this may be a good resource for the GGLO team to review as they pursue their Phase 3 master planning efforts.
- A copy of the Housing Solutions Partnership Report Card is now available online at www.housingni.org, summarizing launched projects,

ongoing projects and upcoming projects relevant to housing issues in Kootenai County.

8. **ADJOURN: Motion by Commissioner Meyer, seconded by Commissioner Garcia, to adjourn. Motion carried.**

The **ignite cda** board meeting adjourned at 4:37 p.m. Minutes prepared and submitted by Ex. Director Berns.