

MINUTES  
**HOUSE LOCAL GOVERNMENT COMMITTEE**

**DATE:** Monday, February 10, 2014

**TIME:** 1:30 P.M.

**PLACE:** Room EW05

**MEMBERS:** Chairman Barrett, Vice Chairman Sims, Representative(s) Barbieri, Luker, Perry, Clow, Hancey, Harris, Holtzclaw, Horman, Malek, Chew, Kloc, Meline

**ABSENT/  
EXCUSED:** Representative Perry

**GUESTS:** Amber Pence, City of Boise; Raeleen Welton, RMP; Teresa Molitor, LCDC/JURA; Russell Westerberg, CCDC; Tony Smith, Benton Ellis

**Chairman Barrett** called the meeting to order at 1:40 p.m.

**MOTION:** **Rep. Meline** made a motion to approve the minutes of February 6, 2014. **Motion carried by voice vote.**

**RS 22783C2:** **Rep. Youngblood** presented **RS 22783C2**. He said the intent of urban renewal is to provide an economic development tool for local governments. In current law, there are different approaches urban renewal agencies might take to spur development. Monies collected and used in a project area are intended to be an investment that will pay the community back, generally through a higher taxable base of private commercial development which will contribute to more municipal funding and a lower tax rate for residents and businesses. When urban renewal funding is used to build single purpose public buildings that are not taxable, the benefit to economic development is not as desired. **RS 22783C2** considers a structure for public approval of these projects.

Responding to questions, **Rep. Youngblood** cited various projects undertaken by his community that have not provided any economic development. He said he believes the public has a right to vote on these projects.

**Rep. Kloc** declared Rule 38, saying he sits on the Board of Directors for an auditorium district.

In response to questions, **Rep. Youngblood** said an administrative building is used by public employees, for example, a city hall. He clarified that projects within city limits would be voted on by cities, and projects outside city limits would be voted on by counties. This would not prohibit infrastructure development. Only items specifically listed would be affected. If a project is to finance buildings being used by the public, a time element might not be significant.

**Rep. Sims** stated she lives in a community that spends thirty million dollars to make a park into a park, so she supports this legislation.

**Rep. Clow** pointed out language in the RS that discusses "municipalities" which he believes would not include buildings in counties, only in cities. During discussion, **Rep. Youngblood** said a great deal of work has been done to the language and he is not sure he wants to make further changes.

**Rep. Luker** said the language could probably be easily changed.

**Rep. Malek** cited Section 50-2903 which defines "municipality" to include counties.

**MOTION:** **Rep. Sims** made a motion to introduce **RS 22783C2**.

**Rep. Clow** said he supports the motion, however he believes some language needs to be changed. He would like to see more definitions included.

**VOTE ON  
MOTION:**

**Chairman Barrett** called for a vote on the motion to introduce **RS 22783C2**.  
**Motion carried by voice vote.**

**ADJOURN:**

There being no further business to come before the committee, the meeting was adjourned at 2:02 p.m.

---

Representative Barrett  
Chair

---

Mary Tipps  
Secretary