



Twin Falls Parks and Recreation Commission Minutes

Tuesday, June 9, 2026, 11:30 AM

City Hall Overflow Room, CH-116
203 Main Avenue East, Twin Falls, Idaho

Members: Micheal Metcalf, Chairperson; Christiana Sipe-Pauley, Vice- Chairperson; Debbie VanEngelen; Steve Hayes; Olyvia Meyer; Todd Shaw; Paul Melni; Tom Bixler; Mckenzie Redd

1) Confirmation of Quorum/Call Meeting to Order

Commissioner Metcalf called the meeting to order at 11:31 AM

A quorum was present.

Members Present: Micheal Metcalf, Paul Melni, Olyvia Meyer, Christiana Sipe-Pauley, Tom Bixler, Debbie Van Engelen, Steve Hayes, Todd Shaw, Mckenzie Redd

Staff Present: Wendy Davis, Chance Munns, Mitch Humble, Craig Hawkins, Kate Sullivan, Mable Shurtleff

2) General Public Input

Kirk Tubbs, candidate for Twin Falls County Commissioner, addressed the Commission. Mr. Tubbs stated that he wanted to introduce himself, express appreciation for the Commission's work, and become more involved in learning how the City's Parks and Recreation programs operate. He noted that although he lives just outside the county, his children have benefited from local programs.

No additional public comments were made.

3) Consent Calendar

- a) Approve minutes from the following meeting: May 12, 2026.

MOTION: Commissioner Bixler moved to approve the Consent Agenda. Commissioner Sipe-Pauley seconded the motion. Roll call vote showed all members present voted. Approved 7 to 0.

4) Items of Consideration

- a) Consider a request to remove two Elms at 256 Filmore St.

Commissioner Redd entered the meeting at 11:37am

Commissioner Van Englen entered the meeting at 11:40am.

The Commission reviewed a request to remove two elm trees located in the public right-of-way along Elm Street.

Staff presented photographs and a site assessment. Key points of discussion included:

- Both trees are elm trees located between the sidewalk and street, within the public right-of-way.

- The north tree showed some oozing/scarring near the base, but staff found solid live tissue and no evidence of significant decay at the base.
- The north tree had experienced some upper canopy dieback and a recent limb failure that reportedly damaged a nearby vehicle.
- The south tree was described as being in poorer condition, with more significant dieback and a higher risk of failure due to prior lion-tailing and canopy structure.
- Staff indicated that the south tree could be recommended for removal, while the north tree would generally be recommended for preservation.
- Commissioners discussed:
 - sidewalk lifting and cracking,
 - tree health and remaining canopy,
 - replacement tree requirements under City ordinance,
 - the homeowner's desire to remove both trees,
 - and the importance of maintaining the urban forest through replanting.

Staff also explained the Commission's role in reviewing removal requests for public trees in the right-of-way and provided background on the applicable ordinance.

MOTION: Commissioner Shaw moved to approve removal of both trees. Commissioner Melni seconded the motion. Roll call vote showed all members present voted. Approved 9 to 0.

Clarification: The approval is for removal of both trees with replacement and likely to fix the sidewalk.

- b) Consider a request from Commissioner Sipe to review the Tree Commission as it relates to the duties of the Parks and Recreation Commission.

The Commission discussed whether tree-related matters should remain under the Parks and Recreation Commission or be reassigned.

Discussion points included:

- Background was provided that the Tree Commission had been merged into the Parks and Recreation Commission around 2010 due to difficulty filling seats on multiple separate commissions.
- Concern was raised that tree removal requests and urban forestry matters consume a significant portion of Parks and Recreation Commission meeting time.
- Commissioners discussed whether:
 - a separate Tree Commission should be re-established,
 - a subcommittee could handle tree matters and return with recommendations,
 - or staff could handle routine requests administratively, with an appeal process to the Commission when needed.
- It was noted that City code assigns additional urban forestry responsibilities beyond simple approval/denial of tree removals, including ordinance updates and review of planning documents.
- Staff indicated that if changes were pursued, the process would likely require City Council direction followed by code amendments and public meeting process.

- Commissioners emphasized the value of public education so homeowners better understand that right-of-way trees are public trees and subject to City review.

No formal action was taken on this item.

- c) Continue discussion of proposed hydro wave project at Auger Falls Heritage Park
The Commission discussed follow-up materials related to the Hydrowave project.
Key discussion points included:

- Staff had email distributed a packet of responses addressing Commission questions.
- Commissioners were asked to review the materials and identify any remaining gaps or concerns.
- Discussion included:
 - whether the concept fits within the City's recreation goals and master planning,
 - the role of a possible feasibility study,
 - infrastructure, maintenance, operations, and safety considerations,
 - accessibility, trails, viewing platforms, and public use,
 - and whether the City's role would involve support, partnership, or other involvement.
- Commissioners generally indicated interest in learning more, but no formal action was taken at this stage.

- d) Continue discussion of proposed archery range at Auger Falls, including response to Commission request for more information
Discussion Summary

- Open Space Supervisor Sullivan presented and noted that Magic Valley Bow Hunters (MVBH) is preparing responses for upcoming meetings.
- Commissioner Hayes stated that archery may be a better investment for a private party use, but is not likely a strong fit for the public sector.
- Commissioner Melni noted that safety is a major factor and may be difficult to adequately secure at a public used space.

Key Takeaways

- Additional information from MVBH is expected before the next meetings.
- There are concerns about whether the investment is appropriate for public-sector use.
- Safety and security remain significant considerations.

- e) Continue discussion of Parks and Recreation Master Plan and park project priorities.
Director Davis continued the discussion from the previous meeting regarding potential park project locations and related funding considerations.

She presented three potential project areas for Commission consideration: Morning Sun,

Pheasant Meadow Project, and Kenny Poe.

Regarding the Pheasant Meadow Project, Director Davis stated that development of the site may take additional time due to funding needs.

Regarding Kenny Poe, she stated that the site is less developed and that only approximately one-half of the property would need to be developed, as the remaining half serves as a retention pond.

Director Davis asked the Commissioners to review the identified locations and consider whether park in-lieu funds should be used for these projects, as well as how these projects should be prioritized in comparison to other park projects.

Commissioner Shaw asked about the subdivision associated with the area and the allocation of funding for that development. Superintendent Munns responded that some funding is available for the area; however, the amount would not necessarily cover the full cost of developing the site.

Director Davis stated that a link or document containing information on the listed potential projects would be provided to the Commissioners.

Commissioner Metcalf requested that sketches for the three projects be included in the materials sent to the Commissioners.

Deputy City Manager Humble displayed a map for the Commission to clarify the location of the Pheasant Meadow Project area.

Commissioner Hayes asked about the demographics of the surrounding area in order to make a more informed decision regarding the type of park that would best serve the neighborhood.

Follow-Up:

- Director Davis will provide the Commissioners with a link or document containing information on the potential projects.
- Sketches for the three projects will be included with the materials provided.
- Demographic information for the area should be provided to assist the Commission in evaluating future park development options if available.

5) Department Updates

- a) June Department Updates
No further discussion.

6) Adjournment

The following topic requests were made to be added to next month's agenda:

- Commissioner Metcalf noted a need to pick a new chairperson.
- Commissioner Melni asked about lifeguards at Dierkes Lake.

- Continue discussion regarding Hyrdowave Project after Commission identify additional gaps and comments from the answer document.
- Continue with Auger Falls Heritage Park discussion.
- Continue discussion regarding Parks and Recreation Master Plan/Park Project Priorities.

The meeting adjourned at 01:02 PM

Mable Shurtleff

Mable Shurtleff, Project Coordinator
Parks and Recreation Department