

Re: City of Star Impact Fee Report

Comments and questions from Dave Yorgason on 2-17-2026

The following are comments or questions regarding the Development Impact Fee Analysis, Capital Improvement Plans: Parks, Pathways & Trails, and Police:

1. Page 16: Costs Associated with CIP

- Soft costs: \$75 per yard. Is this per square yard? Cubic yard?
 - i. Seems high, can you please provide examples of actual expenses
- Hard costs: \$700 per yard. Is this per square yard? Cubic yard?
 - i. We recognize city's pay more than private sector, but this could be more than double.

2. Page 18: Park & Event & Indoor Recreation Center - Level of Service

- Does the city have a plan where they will buy 117 acres of park space? Is this even feasible?
- Event: Counting the Riverhouse as a park space is aggressive and not aware this is seen in other communities, but probably allowed.
 - i. Is this facility ever used for city events and not just public use (ie a city hall is not eligible for park impact fee)?
- Indoor Rec: Leased space is not owned and cannot be counted as such. (also page 24)
 - i. Is this a lease to own or simply a rent situation?
 - ii. Does the city rent 24/7 or just part time (school gym).
 - iii. Is the Fire district space shared or exclusive with the fire district?
 - iv. This should be removed from the impact fee calculations
- Page 20 and page 22: Vehicles and Equipment:
 - i. This seems to be an aggressive approach to assume all vehicles and equipment are kept longer than 10 years. Not seen in other cities that I am aware of
 - ii. Does depreciation need to be considered?
- Page 23: Should city use "average" cost or "lowest" cost for Shuttle busses, maintenance vehicles, equipment, etc?
 - i. Does the city typically pay lowest price for these things?
- Page 26: Land price for park space
- Page 27: should residential pay 100% of park space.....Probably ok unless adjacent to commercial center

- What is the current Park Impact Fee fund balance, should this amount be deducted from future expenses to determine per home impact fee?

3. Page 29: Pathways and Trails (also noted on summary pages)

- Level of Service for Pathways and Trails:
 - i. Does the city own all approximate 22 miles of existing pathways and trails land? It appears many are in ACHD or ITD right-of-way or other private property, which would suggest these are not owned by the city.
 - ii. In my experience only pathways and trails on land owned by the city counts toward existing levels of service
- Are there any pathways over private land with public access easements?
 - i. Should a pathway or trail in a public easement on private property be included in existing Level of Service? Or should the city just require the developer to install in the new development per the City's master plan (this is current practice and similar to other cities)?
- Page 33: cost to build.. \$720K per mile. Is that what the city has paid in the past?
 - i. Reference to Boise budgeting \$1,000,000 per mile, including land.... However, Boise has made assumptions they will need to buy out some existing homes to make room for pathways. Is Star planning the same? If not, then this may not be a good comparable.
- Page 34: Bridges: What is a fair way to calculate proportionate share of bridge cost to new growth? Should bridges be a separate category since they cost more than a pathway? Seems like existing residents will use new bridges and may not be able to charge 100% of bridges to new growth
- Page 36: Proportionate share: Now that commercial is increasing as a percentage of the city, should commercial pay a percentage of the Pathway and Trails fee (especially if the pathway is near commercial use)?
 - i. What is a fair percentage split to determine commercial vs. residential users of pathways and trails?

4. Police Impact Fee

- Page 39: Are all items listed owned by the city, including all facilities?
- Page 41: Are all items listed owned, or traditionally used, for 10 years or more?

- i. Land cost per acre for police facilities, etc should be reduced if the park land is also reduced.
- Page 42: Noted that the city is proposing a new vehicle standard of 1:1 officer to vehicle ratio. Current ratio is less.
 - i. this is an aggressive approach as I have not seen vehicles included in CIP in other cities
 - ii. If vehicles are allowed to be charged for impact fees, growth should only pay for same ratio officer per vehicle and reduce the number of vehicles growth should pay for
- What is the current square feet of police training facility owned by the city per officer:
 - i. Page 45 refers to the proposal to be 520 SF / officer, what is current LOS?
- Page 47: Proportionate share is based on commercial vs. residential square footages, however, service is probably not the same for each use. Typically service is higher for commercial on a per Square Foot basis.
 - i. Does the city have any data on call volume of different uses (number of calls to residences vs. commercial)?
 - ii. If the actual ratio is similar to the split used in the report of about 10 times more residential vs. commercial, then it's ok to keep the proposed proportionate split. Then track call volume for future impact study updates.

5. Comparison:

- How do these new impact fees compare to other cities?
 - i. Police fee seems higher than any other city
 - ii. Park and pathway fees are also very high