

The public is invited to attend in-person or watch via the livestream at <https://www.idahofallsidaho.gov/429/Live-Stream>. This meeting may be cancelled or recessed to a later time in accordance with law. If you need communication aids or other physical accommodation to attend or access this meeting, please contact Emily Geisler, City Clerk, at (208) 612-8414 or Lisa Farris, ADA Coordinator, at (208) 612-8323 prior to the meeting.

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

Times listed in parentheses are only estimates.

Call to Order and Roll Call

City Council, Mayor

Discussion: Citywide updates, concerns, questions, reports (20)
Action: *Council Direction to Staff (or take other appropriate action)*

Municipal Services

Update: Annual Audit (30)
Action: *Council Direction to Staff (or take other appropriate action)*

Municipal Services, Legal, Mayor's Office, CDS

Discussion: Impact Fee Study Update, with Advisory Committee Attendance/Participation (60)
Action: *Council Direction to Staff (or take other appropriate action)*

CDS

Presentation/Discussion: Planned Unit Development (PUD) Standards, Questions, & Concerns, with Planning Commission Attendance/Participation (60)
Action: *Council Direction to Staff (or take other appropriate action)*

Mayor

Report: Announcements, Events, Calendaring, Notes and/or Minutes from Boards and Commissions (10)

Dated the 20th day of February 2026



Emily Geisler, City Clerk

LOCAL LAND USE PLANNING ACT (LLUPA)

67-6512. SPECIAL USE PERMITS, CONDITIONS, AND PROCEDURES. (a) As part of a zoning ordinance each governing board may provide by ordinance adopted, amended, or repealed in accordance with the notice and hearing procedures provided under section 67-6509, Idaho Code, for the processing of applications for special or conditional use permits. A special use permit may be granted to an applicant if the proposed use is conditionally permitted by the terms of the ordinance, subject to conditions pursuant to specific provisions of the ordinance, subject to the ability of political subdivisions, including school districts, to provide services for the proposed use, and when it is not in conflict with the plan. Denial of a special use permit or approval of a special use permit with conditions unacceptable to the landowner may be subject to the regulatory taking analysis provided for by section 67-8003, Idaho Code, consistent with requirements established thereby.

(b) Prior to granting a special use permit, at least one (1) public hearing in which interested persons shall have an opportunity to be heard shall be held. At least fifteen (15) days prior to the hearing, notice of the time and place, and a summary of the proposal shall be published in the official newspaper or paper of general circulation within the jurisdiction. Each local government is encouraged to post such notice on its official websites, if one is maintained. Notice may also be made available to other newspapers, radio and television stations serving the jurisdiction for use as a public service announcement. Notice shall be posted on the premises not less than one (1) week prior to the hearing. Notwithstanding jurisdictional boundaries, notice shall also be provided to property owners or purchasers of record within the land being considered, three hundred (300) feet of the external boundaries of the land being considered, and any additional area that may be substantially impacted by the proposed special use as determined by the commission, provided that in all cases notice shall be provided individually by mail to property owners or purchasers of record within the land being considered and within three hundred (300) feet of the external boundaries of the land being considered and provided further that where a special use permit is requested by reason of height allowance that notice shall be provided individually by mail to property owners or purchasers of record within no less than three (3) times the distance of the height of the allowed height of a structure when more than one hundred (100) feet and within no less than one (1) mile when the peak height of a structure in an unincorporated area is four hundred (400) feet or more and, when four hundred (400) feet or more, the structure's proposed location and height shall be stated in the notice. Any property owner entitled to specific notice pursuant to the provisions of this subsection shall have a right to participate in public hearings before a planning commission, planning and zoning commission or governing board.

(c) When notice is required to two hundred (200) or more property owners or purchasers of record, alternate forms of procedures which would provide adequate notice may be provided by local ordinance in lieu of mailed notice. In the absence of a locally adopted alternative notice procedure, sufficient notice shall be deemed to have been provided if the city or county provides notice through a display advertisement at least four (4) inches by two (2) columns in size in the official newspaper of the city or county at least fifteen (15) days prior to the hearing date, in addition to site posting on all external boundaries of the site.

(d) Upon the granting of a special use permit, conditions may be attached to a special use permit including, but not limited to, those:

- (1) Minimizing adverse impact on other development;
- (2) Controlling the sequence and timing of development;
- (3) Controlling the duration of development;
- (4) Assuring that development is maintained properly;
- (5) Designating the exact location and nature of development;
- (6) Requiring the provision for on-site or off-site public facilities or services;
- (7) Requiring more restrictive standards than those generally required in an ordinance;
- (8) Requiring mitigation of effects of the proposed development upon service delivery by any political subdivision, including school districts, providing services within the planning jurisdiction.

(e) Prior to granting a special use permit, studies may be required of the social, economic, fiscal, and environmental effects and any aviation hazard as defined in section 21-501(2), Idaho Code, of the proposed special use. A special use permit shall not be considered as establishing a binding precedent to grant other special use permits. A special use permit is not transferable from one (1) parcel of land to another.

(f) In addition to other processes permitted by this chapter, exceptions or waivers of standards, other than use, inclusive of the subject matter addressed by section 67-6516, Idaho Code, in a zoning ordinance may be permitted through issuance of a special use permit or by administrative process specified by ordinance, subject to such conditions as may be imposed pursuant to a local ordinance drafted to implement subsection (d) of this section.

LOCAL LAND USE PLANNING ACT (LLUPA)

67-6515. PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENTS. As part of or separate from the zoning ordinance, each governing board may provide, by ordinance adopted, amended, or repealed in accordance with the notice and hearing procedures provided under section 67-6509, Idaho Code, for the processing of applications for planned unit development permits.

A planned unit development may be defined in a local ordinance as an area of land in which a variety of residential, commercial, industrial, and other land uses are provided for under single ownership or control. Planned unit development ordinances may include, but are not limited to, requirements for minimum area, permitted uses, ownership, common open space, utilities, density, arrangements of land uses on a site, and permit processing. Planned unit developments may be permitted pursuant to the procedures for processing applications for special use permits following the notice and hearing procedures provided in section 67-6512, Idaho Code. Denial of a planned unit development permit or approval of a planned unit development permit with conditions unacceptable to the landowner may be subject to the regulatory taking analysis provided for by section 67-8003, Idaho Code, consistent with the requirements established thereby.

LOCAL LAND USE PLANNING ACT (LLUPA)

67-6535. APPROVAL OR DENIAL OF AN APPLICATION TO BE BASED UPON EXPRESS STANDARDS AND TO BE IN WRITING. (1) The approval or denial of any application required or authorized pursuant to this chapter shall be based upon standards and criteria which shall be set forth in the comprehensive plan, zoning ordinance or other appropriate ordinance or regulation of the city or county. Such approval standards and criteria shall be set forth in express terms in land use ordinances in order that permit applicants, interested residents and decision makers alike may know the express standards that must be met in order to obtain a requested permit or approval. Whenever the nature of any decision standard or criterion allows, the decision shall identify aspects of compliance or noncompliance with relevant approval standards and criteria in the written decision.

(2) The approval or denial of any application required or authorized pursuant to this chapter shall be in writing and accompanied by a reasoned statement that explains the criteria and standards considered relevant, states the relevant contested facts relied upon, and explains the rationale for the decision based on the applicable provisions of the comprehensive plan, relevant ordinance and statutory provisions, pertinent constitutional principles and factual information contained in the record.

(a) Failure to identify the nature of compliance or noncompliance with express approval standards or failure to explain compliance or noncompliance with relevant decision criteria shall be grounds for invalidation of an approved permit or site-specific authorization, or denial of same, on appeal.

(b) Any applicant or affected person seeking judicial review of compliance with the provisions of this section must first seek reconsideration of the final decision within fourteen (14) days. Such written request must identify specific deficiencies in the decision for which reconsideration is sought. Upon reconsideration, the decision may be affirmed, reversed or modified after compliance with applicable procedural standards. A written decision shall be provided to the applicant or affected person within sixty (60) days of receipt of the request for reconsideration or the request is deemed denied. A decision shall not be deemed final for purposes of judicial review unless the process required in this subsection has been followed. The twenty-eight (28) daytime frame for seeking judicial review is tolled until the date of the written decision regarding reconsideration or the expiration of the sixty (60) day reconsideration period, whichever occurs first.

(3) It is the intent of the legislature that decisions made pursuant to this chapter should be founded upon sound reason and practical application of recognized principles of law. In reviewing such decisions, the courts of the state are directed to consider the proceedings as a whole and to evaluate the adequacy of procedures and resultant decisions in light of practical considerations with an emphasis on fundamental fairness and the essentials of reasoned decision making. Only those whose challenge to a decision demonstrates actual harm or violation of fundamental rights, not the mere possibility thereof, shall be entitled to a remedy or reversal of a decision. Every final decision rendered concerning a site-specific land use request shall provide or be accompanied by notice to the applicant regarding the applicant's right to request a regulatory taking analysis pursuant to section 67-8003, Idaho Code. An applicant denied an application or aggrieved by a final decision concerning matters identified in section 67-6521(1)(a), Idaho Code, may, within twenty-eight (28) days after all remedies have been exhausted under local ordinance, seek judicial review under the procedures provided by chapter 52, title 67, Idaho Code. An appeal shall be from the final decision and not limited to issues raised in the request for reconsideration.

IDAHO FALLS CITY CODE

11-2-6 (W) Planned Unit Development (PUD).

(1) Purpose. The purpose of the Planned Unit Development (PUD) regulations is to allow for residential and limited commercial uses, or a mix of residential and limited commercial uses, in an overall site development that may vary from the requirements of this Code. The intent of the PUD regulations is also to:

- (a) Allow for flexibility from traditional zoning standards that results in development providing an improved living environment, including usable common space, amenities or services, increased landscaping, additional architectural features or standards, and compatibility with the contiguous neighborhood.
- (b) Promote flexibility and innovation of design while permitting diversification of development types in order to encourage the most suitable use of a site.
- (c) Achieve a compatible land use relationship with the surrounding area.
- (d) Promote redevelopment and reuse of previously developed property.
- (e) Encourage development of vacant properties within developed areas.
- (f) Provide usable and suitably located common space, recreation facilities or other public/ common facilities.
- (g) Facilitate functional and efficient systems of streets, pathways, utilities, and municipal services on and off site.
- (h) Promote efficient use of land with a more flexible arrangement of buildings and land uses.
- (i) Provide for master planned development that includes interconnected design elements between structures or phases, increased amounts of landscaping or natural features, connections to the surrounding neighborhood or public lands and unique architectural features.
- (j) Ensure appropriate phasing of development and amenities.
- (k) Provide for attractive streetscapes that are not dominated by parked vehicles or garage entrances.

(2) Allowed Uses.

(a) All uses allowed in the underlying zone.

(b) Limited commercial uses in mixed use developments not otherwise allowed in the base zone as set forth in Chapter 2 Land Use Regulations of when:

(i) The uses are consistent with the character of the neighborhood, mitigate impacts to the surrounding area and are sited and designed such that the activities present will not detrimentally affect residential uses.

(ii) The uses do not create a traffic or pedestrian safety hazard or generate traffic more than the capacity of the public streets serving the development or its own proposed access points to those streets.

(iii) The limited commercial uses within a residential zone do not constitute more than twenty percent (20%) of the gross land area of the PUD.

(3) General Requirements.

(a) Unified Control. The development site of a PUD shall be under unified ownership or control and shall be planned as a whole so all landscaping, off-street parking and other common areas can be properly maintained.

(b) Establishing Additional Standards. In addition to general building and development standards, additional design standards may be imposed in the approval of conditional use to satisfy the criteria for PUD development as set forth in this Section. The requirement of additional conditions to implement these standards shall be consistent with the process for approval of a conditional use permit for a PUD as set forth in Chapter 6 Administration.

(c) Applicability of Other Regulations. Unless otherwise approved through the Conditional Use Permit, a PUD shall conform to all requirements set forth elsewhere in this Code, Subdivision Regulations, Standard Specifications and Drawings, and all other applicable regulations and standards of the City of Idaho Falls.

(d) Approval Process. The application requirements, review steps and approval process for a PUD as set forth in Chapter 6 Administration.

(4) Dimensional Requirements. Dimensional standards, including minimum lot size, setbacks, maximum density and height, and required parking and parking dimensional standards, if different from the regular requirements of this code shall be established for each individual PUD based upon the following criteria:

(a) PUD Size. The minimum site size for a PUD shall be two (2) acres. Smaller acreage may be considered for a PUD on land that the Council finds is redeveloping, or provides a public benefit or amenity.

(b) Lot Size. There shall be no minimum lot size.

(c) Density.

(i) The maximum density allowed in residential zones is set forth in Table 11-2-4 Maximum Residential Density:

Table 11-2-4: Maximum Residential Density Base

Base Residential Zone	Dwelling Units/Gross Acres
RE	2
RP	5
RMH	35
R1	8
R2	17
TN	17
R3	35
R3a	35

(Ord. 3452, 3-31-22)

(ii) For other base zones where residential uses are allowed, the maximum density allowed shall be thirty-five (35) dwelling units per gross acre.

(iii) The maximum number of units permissible in each individual zone shall be calculated separately, and no allowed dwelling unit density can be transferred between zones.

(d) Setbacks shall reflect the general standards of the area and character of the neighborhood in which the PUD is located.

(i) In residential PUDs, the established setbacks of residential properties contiguous to or across the street from the PUD, shall constitute the minimum setback for the perimeter area of the PUD which it is contiguous to.

(ii) Internal setbacks between buildings or internal lot lines within residential PUDs may be established as part of the PUD process.

(e) Height. The maximum structure height for a residential PUD shall be determined by the underlying base zone, except where a structure is set back from required

setback lines by at least two foot (2') for each additional one foot (1') of building height.

(5) Arrangement and Design.

- (a) A PUD shall be compatible with the surrounding neighborhood bulk, scale, structural mass, and character demonstrated by similar building types, construction, separations, and heights.
- (b) Structures and uses of lowest height and intensity shall be arranged around the boundaries of the development.
- (c) Taller structures should be located toward the interior of the site or in a location to lessen the adverse impacts of height on the surrounding neighborhood.
- (d) Structures should be oriented towards common areas. Residential uses should be separated and arranged to provide for private space, in addition to providing for common areas.
- (e) Structures should include a high quality of design and architecture as demonstrated by cohesive building styles, a range of building positions, custom architectural features, and varied building materials.

(6) Landscaping and Buffering.

- (a) All areas within the PUD not covered by buildings, parking spaces, sidewalks or driveways shall be landscaped and maintained.
- (b) Landscape plans shall be submitted as part of the PUD application.
- (c) Internal landscaping area, excluding required buffers, shall provide the following, a minimum one (1) tree per five thousand square feet (5,000 ft²). A minimum of two (2) shrubs for each required tree. The use of native vegetation which reduces water consumption is encouraged.
- (d) Alternate tree spacing can be requested as part of the PUD, but shall not reduce the total minimum number of trees required.
- (e) All PUDs that include limited commercial uses or residential uses contiguous to existing commercial uses shall provide a buffer from contiguous residential uses that are not part of the PUD development.
 - (i) The buffer shall be no less than ten feet (10') in width and shall include trees with no less than twenty foot (20') centers separating them; and

(ii) A six foot (6') opaque fence (opaque fence shall not include chain link fencing with or without slats) or a dense hedge of shrubbery which shall attain a height of at least six feet (6').

(7) Parking Lot Design and Landscaping.

(a) Parking areas more than twenty-four (24) parking spaces shall include landscaping of a minimum of ten percent (10%) of the parking area with trees and appropriate ground cover. Landscape rock alone shall not constitute appropriate ground cover.

(b) Parking lots containing twenty-four (24) or more parking spaces contiguous to public or private streets shall include within the contiguous landscape strip a berm of no less than four feet (4') in height.

(c) Interior parking lot landscaping shall be designed to incorporate pedestrian ways through the parking area and to break large parking areas into smaller bays.

(8) Streetscapes.

(a) All PUDs shall have frontage on a public or an approved private street.

(b) The development shall provide safe, inviting, and attractive streetscapes.

(c) Except for the area occupied by a permitted driveway, a landscape strip shall be provided and maintained along the side of the property bordering any public or private street that is closest to the portion of the lot containing a structure or other development.

(i) The landscape strip contiguous to perimeter public streets shall be no less than twenty feet (20') in width and shall include trees (with no less than thirty feet (30') centers separating them) and lawn or other ground cover.

(ii) The landscape strip contiguous to internal public and private streets shall be no less than ten feet (10') in width and shall include trees (with no less than forty feet (40') centers separating them) and lawn or other ground cover.

(d) Trash enclosures and dumpsters shall not be located within setbacks or contiguous to any street.

(9) Common Space. All PUDs shall provide common space and landscape areas as follows:

(a) Not less than twenty-five percent (25%) of the gross area of a PUD shall be designated and maintained as common space for the recreational and/or common use of the occupants of the development.

(b) Common space may include an outdoor space parcel or parcels of land, an area of water, or a combination of land and water, recreational facilities, either public or private, ball courts, swimming pools, playgrounds, drainage facility developed with physical amenities, exercise rooms or similar facilities. Usable outdoor space shall include outdoor areas on the ground, deck or patio, gazebo or pavilion designed and accessible for outdoor living, recreation or park-like facilities and shall include landscaping. Usable outdoor space shall not include parking areas or communal facilities of a non-recreational nature.

(c) Common spaces shall not include areas within any road, driveway, parking area, sidewalk contiguous to a public or private street, required landscape strip or buffer, and a drainage facility that does not include additional physical amenities, as identified in this Section, beyond open space.

(10) Amenities. All PUDs shall provide amenities in addition to the common space required by this Section as follows:

(a) The number and size of amenities should increase as overall acreage and scale of the development increases. At least one (1) amenity shall be provided for the first fifty (50) residential units proposed, and one (1) additional amenity shall be provided for each fifty (50) residential units proposed thereafter.

(b) Amenities should be placed in logical areas that allow convenient access to most of the occupants of the development.

(c) PUDs shall provide at least one (1) of the following amenities:

(i) Private or public indoor or outdoor recreational facility, such as a swimming pool, hot tub, theater room, gym, ball courts, or commercial playground equipment featuring a minimum of three (3) different functions, such as slide, swing set and climbing wall.

(ii) Private or public plaza, pedestrian mall, community garden area which includes irrigation and planting beds, outdoor kitchen facilities, shade structures such as pavilions, or other similar space for social gatherings.

(iii) Public access to or additions to the greenbelt, bike lanes, neighborhood park systems or other public open space or enhanced pedestrian

connections to City pathway system, adjacent employment and shopping centers.

(iv) Trail system or pedestrian paths in addition to necessary circulation paths that would be required if the development was not a PUD.

(v) A drainage facility developed with additional permanently affixed physical amenities beyond open space.

(vi) Dog Park. Dog Parks must be completely fenced and shall include pet waste stations, trash cans, benches or picnic tables and a minimum of one of the following: wash station, grooming tables, or agility training equipment.

(vii) Similar amenities which reflect the purposes of this Section, as approved by the Council. (Ord. 3522, 06-29-23)

(11) Pedestrian system.

(a) PUDs shall provide pedestrian connections to existing or proposed schools, parks, public lands or pathways on adjacent properties.

(b) The pedestrian connections shall form a logical, safe, and convenient system for pedestrian access to all structures, project facilities and amenities, and principal off-site pedestrian destinations.

(12) Phasing. Phasing of development and associated public and private improvements is permitted, subject to an approved phasing schedule. Phased development shall be considered with the initial PUD approval process and a phasing schedule shall be approved as part of the development plan. Proposed amenities shall be constructed with the first phase or approved according to the phasing schedule, provided that a majority of the improvements occur within the first phase. Upon approval of the development plan and schedule for all phases of the PUD, each phase of the development may occur in accordance with the review and approval procedures, as specified by this Code. (Ord. 3277, 10-10-19) (Ord. 3496, 12-8-22)



Impact Fee Committee Meeting Minutes Tuesday, January 13, 2026

Impact Fee Committee of the City of Idaho Falls met on Tuesday, January 13, 2026, at the City Hall Annex Conference Room, 380 Constitution Way, 83402, Idaho Falls, Idaho at 4:00 p.m.

In Attendance:

Richard Stewart, Impact Fee Committee Chair
Julie Anglesey, Impact Fee Committee Member
TJ Nottestad, Impact Fee Committee Member
Nick Terry, Impact Fee Committee Member
Zach Jones, City Attorney
Jacob Beck, Assistant City Attorney
Wade Sanner, Director of Community Development Services
Margaret Wimborne, Chief of Staff (Virtually)
Catherine McClure, Economic Development Administrator

Absent:

Pamela Alexander, Impact Fee Administrator
Jeff Freiberg, Impact Fee Committee Vice-Chair
Cristina Hanson, Impact Fee Secretary

Also Present:

Ann Peterson, CDS Secretary; Marc Dance, citizen

The meeting was called to order by Chair Richard Stewart at 4:02 p.m.

Action Items:

- Review and approve meeting minutes from November 18, 2025. Julie Anglesey moved to accept minutes, TJ Nottestad seconded the motion, the motion passed unanimously.
- Annual Chair and Vice Chair Appointments (2026): Julie nominated TJ Nottestad for Chair and Nick Terry for Vice Chair. The motion passed unanimously.
- The committee discussed updates to the Impact Fee Study, focusing mainly on methodology changes and whether the study still reflects what's actually happening in Idaho Falls. The discussion centered on what had changed since the earlier draft and how fees—especially industrial and residential—were calculated. Colin explained that industrial impact fees are generally lower because industrial uses generate fewer vehicle trips and jobs per square foot than retail or office, even though the buildings themselves are much larger. Trip generation rates come from national ITE standards, but employment and square footage assumptions are tailored to Idaho Falls. Committee members asked whether the study relied too heavily on national data and were reassured that local demographic estimates were used. A significant part of the conversation focused on how growth projections compare to reality. The original study projected about 350 units per year, but recent construction has been closer to double that. Staff shared permit data from 2025 showing heavy multifamily activity and more modest single-family numbers, though everyone acknowledged the lag between permitting and completion. The committee agreed it would be useful to formally compare actual permits and impact fees



Impact Fee Committee Meeting Minutes Tuesday, January 13, 2026

collected over the past three years against what the original study projected, to see how accurate the assumptions were.

- Parks impact fees raised a lot of questions. Members questioned how large dollar figures tied to park projects—particularly at Sandy Downs—were developed and whether they truly represent growth-related costs or broader system upgrades. While Colin explained that the study maintains the city's current level of service and converts it into dollar terms, there were still questions with how abstract the park costs felt compared to fire, police, or transportation projects. The group agreed it would be helpful to bring the Parks and Recreation Director to a future meeting to walk through the park assumptions and projects in more detail.
- The biggest concern centered on the move from per-door residential impact fees to a square-footage model, especially the inclusion of unfinished basements. Several members felt this disproportionately increases costs for certain homes, particularly first-time buyers and more affordable single-family housing. Even though data show that most new homes eventually finish their basements, there was concern about fairness, enforcement, and whether unfinished space truly drives additional city services. Members also raised practical issues with square-footage calculations, such as defining common areas in multifamily projects and the potential for inconsistent or manipulated measurements.
- There was also discussion about how Idaho Falls' commercial impact fees compare to other cities. Some concern was raised that higher fees could discourage business development, though it was noted that new commercial space is still leasing successfully despite higher costs. Colin shared that while square-footage-based fees are becoming more common statewide—especially to distinguish large luxury homes from smaller workforce housing—they are not universal, and many communities still use per-unit approaches.
- Affordable housing waivers were briefly discussed. Waived impact fees must be reimbursed by the city, typically from the General Fund, which has made the program difficult to sustain. Very few waivers have been granted to date, and council is still weighing whether the program is effective without a dedicated funding source or a clear definition of affordability.
- By the end of the meeting, there was general agreement that more information is needed before making a recommendation to city council. Staff will compile updated data comparing projections to actual permits and fees collected, and the committee plans to meet again—ideally with Parks and Recreation present—to continue refining its position.

Schedule future meeting:

- Next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, February 10, 2026, at the City Hall 2nd Floor Conference Room, 308 Constitution Way, 83402, Idaho Falls, Idaho at 4:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 5:19 p.m.


Ann Peterson – Secretary

for
Ann


TJ Nottestad - Chair



Impact Fee Committee Meeting Minutes Tuesday, October 14, 2025

Impact Fee Committee of the City of Idaho Falls met on Tuesday, October 14, 2025, at the City Hall 2nd Floor Conference Room, 308 Constitution Way, 83402, Idaho Falls, Idaho at 4:00 p.m.

In Attendance:

Richard Stewart, Impact Fee Committee Chair
Jeff Freiberg; Impact Fee Committee Vice-Chair (Virtually)
Julie Anglesey, Impact Fee Committee Member
TJ Nottestad; Impact Fee Committee Member
Nick Terry; TOK Commercial Real Estate
Pamela Alexander, Impact Fee Administrator
Cristina Hanson, Impact Fee Secretary
Zach Jones, City Attorney
Wade Sanner, Director of Community Development Services
Colin McAweeney, TishlerBise (Virtually)
Margaret Wimborne, Chief of Staff (Virtually)
Catherine McClure, Economic Development Administrator (Virtually)

Absent:

(all present or virtual)

The meeting was called to order by Chair Richard Stewart at 4:00 p.m.

Action Items:

- Review and approve meeting minutes from May 20, 2025. All approved.
- Pam presented the Impact Fee Activity Report for March 1-July 3rd. Next report will be for July 4-September 30th.
- Collin displayed slides to review the updated Impact Fee Study and Capital Improvement Plan. Changes included expanding fees to include 500 sq ft instead of 1000 sq ft; basements will be included in square footage, but garages will not; and reducing plan projects for Parks and Transportation. Council opted to keep Police vehicles in the plan. Vehicles will be tracked for the 10-year requirement; if wrecked, the salvage amount will be added back into the fund.
- Richard suggested including graphs in the future for a better understanding of the study visually. Pam mentioned that an appendix will be added by category for summaries and descriptions.
- Zach spoke about the new ordinance. Biggest changes included affordable housing being taken out, definitions were updated, and square footage will now determine the impact fee amount.
- The updated information will be presented to Council at the next work session, October 20th. It will then be presented to the Planning and Zoning Committee at their next meeting on November 5th. (This will be a public hearing) The Planning and Zoning Committee will then take their recommendations to Council Thursday, December 11th.
- Impact Fee Committee would like to prepare a recommendation for more time to process the large amount of new information as well as gather feedback from the building community before implementing. (Pam will resend the link)





**Impact Fee Committee Meeting Minutes
Tuesday, October 14, 2025**

Schedule future meeting:

- Next meeting is scheduled for Tuesday, November 18, 2025, at the City Hall 2nd Floor Conference Room, 308 Constitution Way, 83402, Idaho Falls, Idaho at 4:00 p.m.

The meeting adjourned at 4:58 p.m.


Cristina Hanson – Secretary


Richard Stewart - Chair



Board of Directors Meeting Minutes

January 13th, 2026, | 9:00am | Willard Arts Center

Board of Directors Attendees: Chip Langerak, Matt Jacobson, Kevin Cutler, Mark Cornelison, Justin Morris, | **IFDDC Staff:** Kerry Hammon, Juan Hernandez, Geetika Gupta
City of Idaho Falls: Caitlin Long, Catherine McClure | **Guests:** Larry Fisher, Jed Campbell and Jayce Howell

Topics Discussed:

- Chip Langerak: Welcome & introductions
- Chip Langerak: Reviewed December 9th, 2025, minutes. All the board members approved. No one opposed.
- Brandi Newton: Reviewed November financials. No expenditure is outside the financial budget. Chip made a motion to approve, and Kevin seconded. No one opposed.

Director's Report:

- Beautification: Due to increased beautification expenses, IFDDC will reduce the number of flowers that are planted in the planters on Broadway in the fall and winter by half, reducing the budget by \$5,000.
- Catherine McClure confirmed that the check for \$92,200 for parking is being processed. The 1st Quarter BID payment will be released to IFDDC once the new BID Management Agreement is approved by City Council.
- Both the 2026 Parking MOU and the 2026 BID Management Agreement have been updated by both the City Attorney and the IFDDC Board of Directors. The agreements will now go before City Council for approval and signatures.
- Brandi suggested approaching Commissioner Michelle Mallard at Bonneville County regarding downtown beautification campaign on Constitution Way.

- Kerry asked the Board whether it would be acceptable to approach businesses outside the BID for sponsorships. The Board discussed and determined that outside sponsorships will be permitted on a case-by-case basis. IFDDC will approach those inside the BID first as they have first right of refusal. If needed, she will then approach other businesses outside of the district.
- The City of Idaho Falls Engineering Division informed Kerry that two parking spaces on S. Capital, in front of the courthouse, will be removed due to a citizen voicing concerns about not being able to see oncoming traffic when pulling out of the courthouse parking lot. Catherine will schedule a meeting with the Public Works Director, Catherine, Kerry, and engineering to discuss the process for evaluating projects that impact downtown before the project is scheduled. They will also discuss options for correcting the conflict without removing parking spaces.
- The deadline for Board members to review and edit the BID Survey, BID Resource Document, and the BID Renewal Timeline is January 20, 2026.
- Brad Cramer has stepped forward to assist with the BID renewal process, and Jayce Howell has also volunteered to help with the process. Kerry and Chip will meet with Brad this week to discuss the scope of Brad's contract with IFDDC.

Merchant Association Update:

Terri Ireland was unable to attend the Board meeting. In her absence, Kerry announced that the regular schedule for the Merchant Association meetings will be the 1st Wednesday of each month from 10-11AM in the conference room at 447 Park Ave (next to Marcellar's). Kerry presented on the BID and answered questions at their January meeting.

City of Idaho Falls Update:

- Catherine McClure: reported that Lisa Burtenshaw is the new Mayor and Brandon Lee is new to the Idaho Falls City Council. All other Council members retained their existing positions. Mayor Lisa Burtenshaw is focused on increasing customer service, communication and engagement with community members.
- Single family homes were approved near Sage Lake Golf Course.

The meeting was adjourned at 10:00 a.m. The next board meeting will be on Tuesday February 10, 2026, at 9:00 AM.

Kerry Hammon, Executive Director, IFDDC, submitted minutes to the Idaho Falls City Clerk via email on February 10, 2026.



**PARKS & RECREATION
SHADE TREE COMMITTEE MINUTES
Tuesday, October 28, 2025
Activity Center
12:00 P.M.**

MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Matt Hill, Mara Hill, Duston Edwards, Ed Phillips, Rich Potter, Lee Washburn, Josh Stephens, Morgan Sperry, Brian Stevens

CALL TO ORDER

Matt Hill called the meeting to order at 11:59 a.m.

ACTION ITEM(S)

- Review and Approve September 2025 Minutes:
 - Ed Phillips moved to approve September minutes. Rich Potter seconded. All in favor.

OTHER (NO ACTION)

- Shade Tree Members Reappointment:
 - No members are coming up for reappointment.
 - Morgan Sperry had applied to become a member and we are waiting on Pj's approval.
 - Still two spots open.
- Power Update
 - Brandon Lerwill was absent, so no update.
- Tree Topping/ Tree Care:
 - Working towards an ordinance change to try and prevent companies from topping trees.
 - Brian Stevens will look into plans to help come up with a potential solution to the Hitt road incident.
- Arboretum
 - It is going to take time.

- Best potential spot is Gem Lake because of room to grow.
 - Starting point should be to make signs and post on current trees so that when an arboretum is built we can just move the signs.
 - Sponsorship for signs as a possible way to help cover some costs.
- General Tree Discussion
 - None of the discussed memorial trees will be planted this year but next spring.
- Items Members Would Like on Upcoming Agendas
 - Tree topping/tree care.
 - Signs for arboretum.

Rich Potter moved to adjourn meeting. Mara Hill seconded. All were in favor.

Next meeting will be January 27, 2026.

Meeting recorded by Duston Edwards