Twin Falls Archway Project
Ad Hoc Citizens Advisory Committee
Minutes

Friday, August 4, 2017, 8:30 AM

Special Meeting
City Council Chambers
305 3rd Ave E Twin Falls, ID 83301

Members: Greg Middlekauff, Jeanette Roe, John Kapeleris, Leonard Anderson, Micah Campbell, Nikki Boyd, Paula Brown Sinclair, Rex Lytle, Tony Prater, Ruth Pierce, Melissa Crane
Facilitator: Kathy Markus
Staff: Mitch Humble, Lisa Strickland

1) **Confirmation of Quorum/Call Meeting to Order**
   Facilitator Markus called the meeting to order and confirmed a quorum.

2) **Consent Calendar**

   a) Approval of Minutes: July 07, 2017
      Motion:
      Member Kapeleris made a motion to approve the minutes, as presented. Member Pierce seconded the motion.
      Unanimously Approved

3) **Items for Discussion**

a) Travis will be available for questions regarding fees and policies.
Facilitator Markus introduce City Manager Rothweiler and explained that he is here to discuss fees, along with policies and procedures.

City Manager Rothweiler explained that his understanding is that there have been questions about fees, what they will be, who will have to pay and what the procedure is for approving fees. All fees created by a local government institution have to be approved by City Council in a resolution. All fees that result in a 5% increase and any new fees not only require approval by City Council but also requires a public hearing. The fee would be determined by the City Council through a public hearing process in a resolution.

Currently the City charges as a standard policy, a uniform fee. The fee is assessed to every individual regardless of whether or not they are a non-profit or public institution. Individuals do have the opportunity to request a waiver, because of a larger public purpose they are serving. Fee waivers are therefore made at the City Council level, as staff it is much easier to follow a uniform policy and not be left in the place of picking and choosing winners and losers. The request is heard at a public meeting and the City Council makes the ultimate determination. The City Council historically, for example, has waived fees for the Senior Center, Habitat for Humanity, Boys and Girls Club, County Buildings and the School District. So when the question is asked who is going to pay the fee, the answer is everyone, unless something is set by the resolution. Regardless of IRS designation, the business, organization, or local government entity will be receiving a level of service equal to everyone else, therefore it will be an equal fee for everyone.

One thing to remember is that if you waive a fee for governmental institutions and every non profit at some point in time you're no longer collecting a fee. As for content, the City of Twin Falls does not allow its vehicles to be used for private advertisement, we have made that distinction from the very beginning because we have to take the hard line and say no. When we say yes to one it is very difficult to say no to anyone else later. The City has been approached by multiple people asking to advertise on the City's website, with an explanation as to how it connects to the strategic plan. While there may be a connection to the strategic plan of what the City is doing, it is easier for us to say, this is our service, our website and what we do, the website is not there for advertising.

The other issue is that when you look at non-profit definitions the qualifications are interesting. There are some very large employers in the community that are designated as non-profit organizations. There are also churches, and the span of non-profit designations is huge. It makes it very difficult for staff to distinguish the difference. So all fees will be approved by the City Council, the determination for waiving fees will be made by the City Council and at the staff level a uniform fee will be charged.

In terms of content we need to be very careful because if at some point it is opened up for some form of advertising, it will become difficult to stop. The City Council is not intending the reader board to be a rolling billboard of goods and services and sales occurring throughout the community. Their intent for the board was to provide communication about community

b) Update report on County: Location & Donation, Engineering, Lawn Signs
City Manager Rothweiler also explained that location has become a recent topic of discussion. He stated there are plans in the future to expand the jail, which is why the relocation of the sign from the north end to the south end of the block was proposed. It is very nice of the County to allow this sign to be placed on their property along this block of Shoshone Street. However, the concern is that the sign if moved closer to 4th Avenue it will then obscure the Historic Courthouse. The proposed location may cause some political unrest; former Judge Smith would probably be one of the individuals that would raise this concern in a public meeting. He would recommend that the Committee possible take a tour of the location, consider the exact location, and possibly have it staked out for a visual aid. Keeping in mind that we don’t want the sign to obscure the Historic Courthouse and we don’t want the sign to be in the way of the future jail expansion.

Member Prater asked if the proposed turn lanes for this section of Shoshone will have an impact on the location of the sign.

City Manager Rothweiler explained that in the original location the turn lanes were not an issue, however moving the sign generally south that may be something to review. He also explained that the location may be something that could be negotiated with the County. The county does not want to approve something and then find out during the construction of the jail expansion have to make changes to their agreement with regards to the sign, or to have unintended consequences because the location was not addressed.

Questions:

Member Prater asked if another location has been considered, it seemed to make sense to be in this location however have other sites been considered.

City Manger Rothweiler explained this location was prime, but location has become a recent issue. He just wants to make sure a move further to the south does not obscure the courthouse. He wanted to make the committee aware of the current concerns with regard to the sign. He thanked the committee for their time and their hard work.

Facilitator Markus explained that she will set up a meeting for everyone to do a site visit.

Member Pierce asked if we could verify the foot print of the sign and if there are any setback requirements for the proposed jail expansion.
Facilitator Markus explained that she thinks there is somewhere along the block that will work.

Member Roe explained they probably don't want something in the way of construction or cause damage to the sign if it is installed prior to the expansion. She understands we all want this instantaneously, but the longer it takes and the better the plan the fewer the obstacles will be to overcome.

c) Correspondence

Facilitator Markus reported that Deputy City Manager has spoken with County Commissioner Hall about a contribution from the county towards the sign. He stated that Commissioner Hall is fairly certain the county will contribute to the project however it will not be a match to what the City is contributing. He also explained that engineering verification for the structure can move forward by using some of the money that the City is donating to the project. Once the location of the sign has been determined it may be possible to post signs as to where the sign will be located. Once the determination is made for the location and the county approves the request things can move forward. He also requested that the archway design with the logo be presented to City Council, the original presentation did not include logos on the sign.

Member Lytle recommended that the monument sign should probably be presented to the City Council as well, because it has not been discussed at City Council and the signs will include business logos.

d) Member updates on fundraising.
Member Kapelaris explained that CapEd will donate 500.00 towards the project.
Member Pierce asked if there could be an accounting of what has been pledged not who is donating and what they are donating but a total would be beneficial.
Member Lytle explained he has spoken to Magic Valley Mall and is waiting to hear back from them on a donation.
Member Prater also asked if an organizational chart or task list could be put together so the committee is aware of what steps need to be taken to get the project complete, a timeline for how things have to proceed and who is responsible for what piece. All the pieces have an order of completion.
Member Pierce asked if there could be a fee recommended.
Member Roe explained the explanation for the fee should be that it will be nominal.
Member Lytle explained that by the end of 10 years there should be approximately 75,000 set aside. A nominal fee in his opinion would be $100. The other thing to consider is the for example in Boise, the electronic bulletins which are static message, have been limited to 5 advertisements at any given time and rotate every 45 seconds. A static message allows for the entire message to be posted in one frame, which would need a bigger sign. The sign proposed will have a message that is presented in several frames. He would guess that there would not be more than 5 advertisements at a time over a weeks period, which is 4 more than what a street banner provides.
Member Sinclair explained that the entire cost of replacement and maintenance should not be all on the backs of the non-profit organizations. The City is going to use the message board quite often. She also recommended that we need to possibly get input from someone at First Federal and how they manage their messages, it seems they are doing something similar to what this board will do.
Facilitator Markus asked how the committee would like to proceed with the draft resolution.
Member Sinclair explained that she would like the draft resolution to begin with the committee and it should address things like process, deadlines, qualifications, and content. Everyone seems to have a different opinion on the details and everyone needs to think about it and provide a list of things to be included in the resolution. The recommendations can then be taken to the City Attorney for his review.

e) Plan of action
Continue to work on the fundraising, and set up a meeting to visit the proposed site.

4) General Input/Announcements - Public/Staff
None

5) Upcoming Meeting(s)
Member Pierce stated that the next meeting is scheduled for the Friday before Labor Day and she would recommend that the meeting be moved backwards or forwards a week.
The committee decided to hold the next regular meeting on August 25, 2017 at 8:30 am. A special meeting will be held August 11, 2017 for a tour of the site.

6) Adjournment

Facilitator Markus adjourned the meeting at 9:30 am.

Lisa A. Strickland, Administrative Assistant