The public is invited to observe City Council Work Sessions. However, to observe appropriate social distancing guidelines, as recommended by the Centers for Disease Control and Prevention (CDC), seating in the Council Chambers may be limited. All seating is available on a firstcome, first-serve basis. The public also may view this meeting via livestream on the City's website at https://www.idahofallsidaho.qov/429/Live-Stream. The agenda does not include an opportunity for public interaction.

This meeting may be cancelled or recessed to a later time in accordance with law. If you need communication aids or services or other physical accommodations to participate or access this meeting or program of the City of Idaho Falls, you may contact City Clerk Kathy Hampton at 612-8414 or the ADA Coordinator Lisa Farris at 612-8323 not less than 48 hours prior to the meeting. They can help accommodate special needs.

## CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION

Times listed in parentheses are only estimates.
Call to Order and Roll Call

| Mayor and Council: | -Acceptance and/or Receipt of Minutes |
| :--- | :--- |
|  | Action Desired: To receive recommendations from the Planning |
|  | and Zoning Commission (5) |
|  | -Calendars, Announcements, Reports, and Updates (10) |
|  | -Liaison Reports and Councilmember Concerns (10) |

Municipal Services:

Police Department:

Public Works:

Multi-departmental:

Executive Session:

DATED this $6^{\text {th }}$ day of May 2022
Action Desired: To receive recommendations from the Planning and Zoning Commission (5)-Quarterly Financial Presentation (30)
Action Desired: Council Direction to Staff
-Discussion: City-owned Property (30)
Action Desired: Council Direction to Staff
-Briefing: First Responder Chaplaincy of Idaho Activities inSupport of City of Idaho Falls' First Responders (20)
-Presentation: Holmes Avenue Road Safety Audit (30)
Action Desired: Council Direction to Staff
-Presentation/Discussion: Water Meter and Advanced Metering
Infrastructure (AMI) Vendor Selection (30)
Action Desired: Council Direction to Staff
-American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) Committee Recommendations(30)
Action Desired: Council Direction to Staff
-The Executive Session is being called pursuant to the provisions of Idaho Code Section 74-206(1)(j) to consider labor contract matters authorized under section 74-206A (1)(a) and (b), Idaho Code.


## MEMORANDUM

TO: City Council

FROM: Rebecca Casper
DATE: May 6, 2022
RE: Proclamations for January - May, 2022

Please find attached copies of official proclamations prepared and released by the Mayor's Office.

- We Love Seniors Day
- Fair Housing Month
- Workers Memorial Day
- Arbor Day

O
ดல

WHEREAS,

WHEREAS,

## PROCLAMATION


on December 28, 1970, President Richard Nixon signed into law the Occupational Safety and Health Act, which went into effect on April 28, 197I; and
despite this and other efforts to provide American workers the right to a safe workplace, tens of thousands of American workers are killed by workplace injuries and occupational diseases every year and tens of thousands more workers are permanently disabled or made ill; and
WHEREAS,
since 1989, communities have gathered on April 28 to commemorate those who have lost their lives working; and
WHEREAS, the City of Idaho Falls hopes always to engage in outreach, public awareness, and education efforts to inform employers of their responsibilities and workers of their right to a workplace where preventable injuries, illnesses, and deaths are no more; and
WHEREAS,
the City of Idaho Falls has a history of establishing and enforcing worker safety standards that meet and frequently exceed legal requirements to prevent occupational fatalities and serious injuries, and to provide a safe and healthful workplace for all; and
WHEREAS,
as Idaho Falls continues to recover from the COVID-I9 pandemic, we continue our legacy of policies that protect the health and safety of our workforce; and
WHEREAS, April 28th is a day set aside to honor Eastern Idaho's workers by observing Workers Memorial Day and remembering those victims of workplace injuries and disease.
NOW THEREFORE, I, REBECCA CASPER, MAYOR of the City of Idaho Falls, do hereby proclaim April 28,2022 , as

## WORKERS MEMORIAL DAY

in Idaho Falls in recognition of workers killed, injured, and disabled on the job and encourage all Eastern Idahoans to dedicate themselves to improving safety and health in every American workplace even as we remember and celebrate the precious lives that have been lost.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the seal of the City of Idaho Falls to be affixed on this $19^{\mathrm{d}}$ day of April, Two Thousand and Twenty-two.


## IMPACT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 3, 2021
10:00 a.m.
City Council Chambers
MEMBERS PRESENT: TJ Nottestad, Richard Stewart, Jeff Freiberg, Brent Wilson, Glen Ogden
MEMBERS ABSENT: None
ALSO PRESENT: City Engineer Kent Fugal, Colin McAweeney (consultant)
CALL TO ORDER: Meeting called to order at approx. 10:05 a.m.
CHANGES TO AGENDA: N/A
MINUTES: N/A

## ACTION ITEMS: None

## DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Impact Fee Study Overview - Workshop Presentation and Discussion

Mr. McAweeney with TischlerBise, the City's impact fee study consultant, presented an overview of impact fees in general, and specifics about requirements for impact fees in Idaho. He presented the following, with general discussion throughout and some specific questions noted:

Impact Fee Fundamentals -

- One-time payment for growth-related infrastructure, usually collected at the time buildings permits are issued
- Not a tax, similar to a contractual arrangement to build infrastructure with fee revenue, with three (3) requirements - need (system improvements), benefit (geographic, and timeframe (eight (8) years in the State of Idaho, can be 11 years for extenuating services)), and proportionate
Eligible Costs -
- Can be used for facilities/improvements required to serve new development, or excess capacity in existing facilities (growth shares)
- Cannot be used for maintenance and repairs or operating costs, or for improvements required to correct existing deficiencies (unless there is a funding plan)
Why Impact Fees -
- Infrastructure capacity is essential to accommodate new development
- New growth pays its equitable share
- Encourages disciplined capital improvement planning (earmarks money for capital improvements)
- Promotes comprehensive planning and growth management (helps ensure adequate public facilities)
- Compared to negotiated agreements, streamlines approval process with known costs (predictability)
- Anti-growth pressure can be eased

Nexus and benefit of revenues -

- Referencing the list revenue sources below, the nexus with demand for public facilities is strongest at the top of the list and weaker moving down the list to the bottom. Conversely, the demand base (existing development) bearing cost of public facilities is smallest at the top and increases going down the list.
0 area specific assessment
o impact fees
o jurisdiction-wide special assessment
o utility rates
o property tax
o sales tax
Myths and Misconceptions -
- Impact fees cover the entire cost of new facilities, negating the need for higher taxes (a "properly" designed fee may come close, other revenue still needed to cover credits, Operations and Maintenance ( $O \& M$ ) costs, etc.)
- Impact fees should be based on planning standards, without concern for deficiencies
- Nonresidential fees can be "adjusted" for economic reasons
- All developers/builders hate impact fees
- Impact fees negatively affect low/moderate income housing (credits for affordable housing can mitigate impact, fee not always passed-on in the price of the home; studies have shown that fees are often absorbed by others in the "food chain" depending on market conditions, such as land owner, developer, homebuilder, home owner)
Impact Fees in Idaho -
- Impact fee revenue must be maintained in an interest-bearing account
- Monies must be spent within eight (8) years from collection
- Community must publish an Annual Monitoring Report and have an Advisory Committee
- Comprehensive review and update every five (5) years
- All maximum allowable fee changes require an updated study
- Eligible for water, wastewater, stormwater, transportation (roads), Parks and Recreation, and public safety (law enforcement, fire, Emergency Medical Services (EMS)) capital facilities/equipment with useful life of ten (10) years or more Impact Fee Study Process -
- Determine existing development base and projected future growth
- Determine existing levels of service and capital needs due to new growth
- Determine appropriate indicators of demand
- Evaluate methodological alternatives
- Evaluate need for credits
- Calculate draft fees
- Review and input from the Advisory Committee
- Adoption process

Common Impact Fee Methods -

- Cost Recovery (past) - oversized and unique facilities and funds typically used for debt service
- Incremental Expansion (present) - formula-based approach documents level of service with both quantitative and qualitative measures
- Plan-Based (future) - common for utilities but can also be used for other public facilities with non-impact fee funding
Evaluate Need for Credits -
- Site specific (developer constructs a capital facility included in fee calculations)
- Debt service (avoid double payment due to existing or future bonds)
- Dedicated revenues (e.g., property tax, local option sales tax, gas tax)

Mr. McAweeney also reviewed the fee categories included in the Idaho Falls Impact Fee Study. Those include:

- Parks and Recreation (neighborhood parks, urban/community parks, civic parks, and indoor recreation centers)
- Transportation (arterial capacity improvements)
- Police (station and police vehicles)
- Fire (stations, vehicles \& apparatuses, and training center)

A question was asked about why Idaho Falls is looking into impact fees. Mr. Fugal responded that the City Council is interested in considering impact fees to provide a means of funding capital improvements necessitated by growth without the general taxpayer needing to subsidize that growth. A question was asked about HB389 in the context of need for impact fees. No one present had information to be able to address that question. It was noted that building construction projects are in the works for months before permits are pulled and that the contractors therefore need lead time in ramping up implementation.
2. Methodologies and Draft Results - Presentation and Discussion

Mr. McAweeney presented detail of the methodology and results of the Idaho Falls study, including the following, with general discussion throughout:

## Residential Growth -

- Based on recent growth, projecting 3,500 housing units over next then years, with almost 9,000 new residents ( $14 \%$ increase)
- Presented a table showing the increment by year, split out by housing type (single family and multifamily)

Nonresidential Growth -

- 8,900 new jobs are projected ( $16 \%$ increase), with 3.8 million square feet of new nonresidential development
- Presented a table showing the increment by year for jobs and nonresidential floor area, broken out by nonresidential development type (retail, office, industrial, and institutional)

Mr. McAweeney reviewed the analysis for each of the four impact fee categories studied (Parks \& Recreation, Transportation, Police, and Fire/EMS):

Parks \& Recreation -

- Existing level of service (LOS) calculated citywide. Demand factor is population and methodology used is Incremental Expansion
- Neighborhood Park land and improvement LOS
0.0 .26 acres and 0.33 improvements per 1,000 persons
- Urban/Community Park land and improvement LOS
o 6.28 acres and 2.30 improvements per 1,000 persons
- Civic Park land and improvement LOS
o 0.45 acres and 0.25 improvements per 1,000 persons
- Indoor Recreation Center LOS
o 0.12 acres and 1,367 building square feet per 1,000 persons
- Maximum supportable impact fee
o $\$ 1,676 /$ unit for single family residential and $\$ 1,159 /$ unit for multifamily
- Projected 10-year growth-related cost \$5,606,284

Transportation -

- Existing LOS calculated citywide. Demand factor is vehicle miles traveled (VMT) and methodology used is Incremental Expansion
- Transportation impact fee would replace the existing Bridge \& Arterial Street Fee
- Current LOS based on 400,729 miles/day existing major arterial VMT on 68.8 major arterial lane miles
- Projected 10-year growth of 59,049 major arterial VMT, requiring 9.5 new major arterial lane miles at a projected cost of $\$ 10,472,000$
- Maximum supportable impact fee
o \$1,966/unit for single family, \$872/unit per multifamily, \$2,502/1,000 square feet (ksf) for retail, $\$ 939 / \mathrm{ksf}$ for office/service, $\$ 478 / \mathrm{ksf}$ for industrial, and $\$ 1,034 / \mathrm{ksf}$ for institutional

Police -

- Existing LOS calculated citywide. Demand factors are population and nonresidential vehicle trips with calls for service data used to attribute demand from residential and nonresidential development
- Methodology used Plan-Based approach for new police station and Incremental Expansion approach for police vehicles
- $44 \%$ of total calls attributed to residential and $56 \%$ to nonresidential
- Estimated new police station cost is $\$ 36.3$ million, or $\$ 593$ per square foot
o Growth's share of station is $\$ 201 /$ person for residential and $\$ 106 /$ vehicle trip for non-residential
- Police fleet existing LOS
00.72 vehicles per 1,000 persons (residential) and 0.39 per vehicle trip (nonresidential)
- Maximum supportable impact fee
o $\$ 1,641 /$ unit for single family, $\$ 443 /$ unit per multifamily, $\$ 1,822 / \mathrm{ksf}$ for retail, $\$ 618 / \mathrm{ksf}$ for office, $\$ 315 / \mathrm{ksf}$ for industrial, and $\$ 681 / \mathrm{ksf}$ for institutional
- Projected 10-year growth-related cost \$5,606,284


## Fire/EMS -

- Methodology used Incremental Expansion approach with calls for service data used to attribute City of Idaho Falls demand and specific demand from residential and nonresidential development
- $83 \%$ of calls are to Idaho Falls (as opposed to locations outside City limits)
o Geocoded data used to calculate specific demand attributed to each development type
- Current LOS for stations found by comparing attributed floor area to current demand calls (City only), yielding 4.28 square feet per Fire/EMS call
- Current LOS for fleet found by comparing share of vehicle fleet to total Idaho Falls calls, yielding 1.88 vehicles per 1,000 EMS calls
- Training center LOS found by comparing attributed floor area to Idaho Falls calls, yielding 9.72 square feet/EMS call
- Maximum supportable impact fee
o $\$ 519 /$ unit for single family, $\$ 418 /$ unit for multifamily, $\$ 462 / \mathrm{ksf}$ for retail, $\$ 77 / \mathrm{ksf}$ for office, $\$ 37 / \mathrm{ksf}$ for industrial, and $\$ 1,669 / \mathrm{ksf}$ for institutional
- Project 10-year growth-related cost $\$ 3,483,416$

Next Meeting: Follow-up discussion via Zoom scheduled for November 10, 2021 at 2:00 p.m. Meeting adjourned at approximately 12:20 p.m.
Respectfully Submitted
Kent Fugal, City Engineer

## IMPACT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

November 10, 2021

MEMBERS PRESENT: TJ Nottestad, Richard Stewart, Brent Wilson, Glen Ogden
MEMBERS ABSENT: Jeff Freiberg
ALSO PRESENT: City Engineer Kent Fugal, Colin McAweeney (consultant)
CALL TO ORDER: Meeting called to order at approx. 2:00 p.m.
CHANGES TO AGENDA: N/A
MINUTES: N/A

## ACTION ITEMS: None

## DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Follow-up discussion to meeting of November 3, 2021

Mr. McAweeney and Mr. Fugal briefed the committee regarding the City Council work session held two days prior. The primary purpose of this meeting is to solicit any additional input from the committee now that committee members have had more time to digest the information presented on November 3. General discussion then ensued. Key discussion points included the following:

Implementation timeline -

- A committee member suggested that contractors need time to ramp up for implementation, given that projects are in the works well ahead of pulling a building permit.
- Another member indicate support for swift implementation of the fees, but with a grace period for existing projects.
Credit for land or improvements donated/constructed by developer -
- A question was raised regarding donations of land and construction of public improvements and whether or not that would result in a type of double payment to the City.
- The answer was given that donations and constructed improvements that would otherwise be realized with impact fee funds would be eligible for credits in the calculation of impact fees for permits pulled within that development.
Fairness of fees -
- A member noted concern about development paying for infrastructure that will be enjoyed by all, not just new development.
- It was pointed out that, while others enjoy those improvements, new development enjoys the benefits of improvements that have been constructed at the expense of
the general taxpayer. Basing the fees on maintaining, not exceeding, the existing levels of service resolves that concern.
Other comments -
- A committee member commented that there needs to be better definition of the level of service for the various fee categories.

Next Meeting: TBD<br>Meeting adjourned at approximately 3:00 p.m.<br>Respectfully Submitted<br>Kent Fugal, City Engineer

# IMPACT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES 

MEMBERS PRESENT: TJ Nottestad, Richard Stewart, Jeff Freiberg, Brent Wilson, Glen Ogden
MEMBERS ABSENT: None
ALSO PRESENT: City Engineer Kent Fugal, Colin McAweeney (consultant), Michael
Kirkham (Legal)
CALL TO ORDER: Meeting called to order at approx. 10:05 a.m.
CHANGES TO AGENDA: Correction to Agenda for minutes date should be November 10, 2021 instead of November 8, 2021

ACTION ITEMS: Election of Committee Chair and Vice Chair

- In the Election of Committee Chair, Jeff Freiberg nominated Brent Wilson and Richard Steward made the motion and Glen Ogden second the motion. All were in favor motion passed.
- In the Election of Committee Vice Chair Richard Stewart nominated himself, TJ Nottestad made the motion and Glen Ogden second the motion. All were in favor motion passed.
- Approval of Minutes from November 3 and November 10, 2021 Discussion with Kent Fugal regarding the discussion of meetings held on November 3 and November 10, 2021 should have been public open meetings. Moving forward with the Impact Fee Advisory Committee Meetings all future meetings should be held as Public Open Meetings. Richard Stewart motioned minutes to be accepted Glen Ogden second the motion. All were in favor motion passed.


## DISCUSSION ITEMS:

1. Meeting Law Training presented by Michael Kirkham

Requirements for the commission to obey the open meetings laws. Meetings that require Public Open Meetings is whenever a government body is going to make a decision or liberate to make a decision; when you call for a vote; making a decision directing staff. If two of the committee members meet to discuss any item regarding the public's business would be in violation of an open meeting. Regular scheduled meeting agendas need posted 48 hours in advance and special meeting agendas need to be posted 24 hours in advance. Anything that is not listed on the agenda may not be discussed. Michael Kirkham handed out pamphlet "Public Meetings Handbook" dated July, 2016.

Simple quorum is when 4 members are present, majority is 3 members; if two members are in agreement then Committee Chair will break the tie.
2. Impact Fee Study Report

Kent Fugul stated that on November $3^{\text {rd }}$ the Committee discussed the methodology of Impact Fees and after that meeting Public Works addressed the Transportation Impact Fee and noted that not all the arterial roads were included in the calculation. Colin McAweeney recalculated the arterial roads including major and minor arterial roads. On November $22^{\text {nd }}$ that was presented to the city council and council had some concerns on how high the Transportation Impact Fee increased. Public Works then addressed the percentage of federal funding that could be used to decrease the Transportation Impact Fee. Public Works identified approximate $\$ 1.5$ million in federal funding that would decrease the Transportation Impact Fee. The Parks and Recreation Impact fee has changed the value of land from $\$ 20,000 /$ acre to $\$ 30,000$ per acre. Public Works is requesting the Committee to make a recommendation on the Impact Study Fees.

Discussion between Committee members was conducted and a recommendation to accept the Impact Study and schedule an additional meeting to finalize a recommendation to be presented to staff and council.

Next Scheduled Meeting: January 24, 2022 at 10:00 a.m. Council Chambers
Meeting adjourned at approximately 12:35 p.m.

Respectfully Submitted
Kent Fugal, City Engineer

IMPACT FEE ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING MINUTES

| MEMBERS PRESENT: | TJ Nottestad, Richard Steward, Brent Wilson, Glen Ogden |
| :--- | :--- |
| MEMBERS ABSENT: | Jeff Freiberg |
| ALSO PRESENT: | City Engineer Kent Fugal, Michael Kirkham, Legal |
| CALL TO ORDER: | Meeting called to order at approximately 10:00 am |
| CHANGES TO AGENDA: | None |
| MINIUTES: | None |
|  |  |
| Public Comment: |  |

## 1. Carl Robison

I moved to Idaho Falls in May of 2021. In the early 80's worked and lived in Boise and every day it was 30 plus minute commute. I understand the need for impact fees. In the 1960's there were SOS (Save our Schools) signs which began the $3 \%$ sales tax which is now $6 \%$. I hope that the City accounts for organic growth with the streets, police and fires existing funds and that they don't co mingle the impact fees with these funds. The Impact fees need to be placed in a special fund so all can see where the funds are spent. It needs to be well defined and documented where those costs are related to non-organic growth areas. The City needs to work with existing and new businesses. It is rumored that the expansion of business in the region will employee 7000 new people and the City should work with these new businesses to cover some of the non-organic costs associated with infrastructure fees and costs.
2. Roy Ellis, Ellis Construction

I have been a builder for about 42 years, involved with the Home Builders Association, President of the State Association a couple of times and currently on Dig Line Board for the State of Idaho and Jefferson County School Board. Currently a permit for an 1800 sf home is $\$ 6000.00$, with the additional impact fees this would double the price of the permit. Impact fee could be payable at Certificate of Occupancy rather than during the building permit. It takes 8-10 months for the building process and those fees will be assessed to the builder for that time frame before the builder can collect from the buyer. Builders are already paying more for hard to find bidders, materials and those costs are continuing to increase.
3. Erin Cannon, Comfort Construction

Statistics indicate that the median price for a home in Idaho Falls is $\$ 397,500.00$. For every dollar the impact fee is assessed will impact home pricing by $\$ 1.20$. This will be passed onto the homeowner. This will increase the $8.6 \%$ of individuals who were priced out of a home to $30 \%$. This translates to 750 households being priced out of the market. Idaho is the fastest growing state in the nation and I urge you to be conservative.
4. Rick Nickelson, Copper Creek Homes

As a builder he would like to know how the fees will be implemented. Most builders have signed contracts through 2022. If you implement these fees right of way, how will this impact builders who are already in contracts?

## Discussion:

Brent Wilson:

- Determine if the Methodology of the Impact Fee Study is good and if the Board is able to move forward with a motion to go before Council or do we feel more discussion is needed.


## Glen Ogden

Attachment for his recommendations to take before Council with the Impact Study (Attachment A)

- Special Fund
- Gradually Implement ( $1^{\text {st }} \mathrm{yr} 50 \% ; 2^{\text {nd }} \mathrm{yr} 60 \%$ etc)
- Moratorium on already signed contracts
- Committee to meet every 5 years for review
- Additional levy on the property until fees are paid
- Allow builders to have a deferral
- $50 \%$ during permitting and $50 \%$ upon Certificate of Occupancy
- Builders and Developers receive a credit for gift of property or facilities

TJ Nottestad

- Clarify on what the Committee Recommendation

What we recommend to Council?
Accept the Impact Fee Study?
Brent Wilson

- Recommend to Council with a phase and deferral option

Richard Stewart

- Conservative with the costs
- $50 \%$ during permitting and $50 \%$ upon Certificate of Occupancy


## Glen Ogden

Motioned; Brent Wilson Second the Motion

- Accept Impact Fee Study as presented
- Recommend a Special Fund for each Departmental Impact Fee
- Credit for Gift of Properties or Facilities provided by the Developer that would be Impact Fee Eligible Improvements
- Phased In Gradual Approach Phasing in Over Time
- Property Tax Levy 5 years after closing
- $50 \%$ w/Permit $50 \%$ w/Certificate of Occupancy

Richard Stewart in favor; Brent Wilson in favor; Glen Ogden in favor; TJ Nottestad Oppose

## Motion passes

Kent Fugal

- Present to City Council during a work session
- Go over Implementation and Accounting
- Draft an Ordinance
- Public hearing before council makes a motion

Meeting Adjourned

# PARKS \& RECREATION SHADE TREE COMMITTEE MINUTES <br> <br> Tuesday, February 22, 2022 <br> <br> Tuesday, February 22, 2022 <br> Web Ex Meeting <br> 12:00 P.M. 

## MEMBERS IN ATTENDANCE:

Matt Hill, Gerry Bates, Rich Potter, Jon Russell, Lee Washburn, Ronnie Campbell, Kim Johnson, Brian Stevens, Hollie Pettingill, Randy Westergard, John Radford, Sam Ellsworth, PJ Holm, Jim Freeman, Renee Buchan

## CALL TO ORDER - MATT HILL

Matt Hill called the meeting to order at 12:05 pm.

## CITY REPORT

- PJ would like to take the issue of Emerald Ash Borer to a council meeting in the spring to educate council members, mayor and the general public about the arrival of the disease into our local tree system. What can we do to prepare to be ahead and get in front of it? He believes $40 \%$ of our city trees are Ash trees and would like to warn HOA's and citizens what can be done and inform the entire community. Kim Johnson was asked to reach out to his contacts to get more information. Matter will be put on the agenda each month.
- Renee spoke about three (3) new volunteer Adopt-a-Park opportunities. Adopt-a-Park where a person(s) would a adopt a park and come at least once a month to do a variety of maintenance. Adopt-a-Field, where a soccer, baseball, football field can be adopted and Park Steward program, where more specialized hourly volunteer work can be done with a one (1) year commitment, and they will be able to get training for some tree trimming and other larger projects.
- Heritage Park - PJ mentioned that staff are working on landscape plan. The park will be a more natural themed park, kind of like an Island Park feel with natural pole pine and rock areas for play, natural grasses and an area full of nature and spaces that highlight the river. Jon mentioned plans are being constructed for location of trees to be planted just not the species quite yet. The groundwork is not done yet but started. They are currently clearing trees by the river.
- PJ mentioned Pocatello closing an area to do environmental cleaning, mainly removing Russian Olive trees that are invasive. Do we need to look at doing something like this?


## APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- Kim Johnson moved to approve January 2022 minutes and Sam Ellsworth seconded. All in favor.


## CURRENT CITY FORESTRY STATUS

- Tree Protection Plan - Lee Washburn will be gearing it towards Heritage Plan first. Lee will email plans before next meeting.
- Finalize Arbor Day Celebration - Lee finalized the day of May 10, 2022 at Reinhart Park with Alturas Preparatory Academy and approximately 60 of the $9^{\text {th }}$ and $10^{\text {th }}$ graders will be joining. Will finalize exact time for next meeting.
- Call for Agenda Items - Sam Ellsworth is reading about Local Scapes in Utah. A method of creating a landscape that solves their challenging issues in Utah. It is a correlation with the city that suggests parking strips, landscapes and how they could be done to be more cohesive. He is working on a "Welcome to Idaho Falls" packet with Mayor that will have things like leaf pickup and what plants don't do well in specific areas such as rights-of-way. He has a meeting with her March 29 to further discuss in the a.m. and can give us more information about that later at Shade Tree meeting.


## ANNOUNCEMENTS/ADJOURNMENT

- Rich Potter motioned adjournment and Kim Johnson seconded. All in favor. Adjourned at 12:51 pm.

Next meeting will be March 29, 2022.

Meeting recorded by Hollie Pettingill


# WAR BONNET ROUNDUP RODEO ADVISORY COMMITTEE <br> Thursday, March 24, 2022 Recreation Center 11:00 a.m. 

Members in Attendance: K. Jones, K. Staten, D. Marshall, K. Searle, B. Skinner, J. Newgard, C. Horsley, D. Sorensen, C. Price, T. Kraupp

Members not in Attendance: P. Holm, B., Cranor, R. Campbell

## Call to Order

K. Jones called the meeting to order at 11:05 am.

## Approval of Minutes

K. Staten motioned to approve the February 24th minutes. K. Searle seconded. All in favor.

## Director Report - P. Holm (absent)

## Chairman/Production - K. Jones

K. Jones reported on the following:

- The committee will receive a summary from the Strategic Planning meeting from Jared.
- Committee members discussed items to fix for the upcoming rodeo. The following was a list of suggestions:
- K. Staten - Need a bigger impact for Teton Toyota and she hopes the mutton bustin qualifier will do it.
- K. Searle - Fix the grain loss and security gates.
- C. Horsley - Better communication with the mutton busters, perhaps an info booth at the front gate.
- D. Sorensen - Finance will work on making things more efficient and strive to continue having good communication between the Finance Department and the War Bonnet Committee.


## Action Items:

- Vote on the 2022 Volunteer of the Year - tabled until next meeting.
- Vote on 2023 Legends of the War Bonnet - tabled until next meeting.
- Voting on east side theme name - tabled until next meeting.
- Mini-bull contractor vote - The proposals from Casperson Mini Bulls and Flying S Mini Bulls were analyzed and compared. After discussion, J. Newgard moved to go forward with Casperson Mini-Bulls. B. Skinner Seconded. Chairman K. Jones called for a vote. The following committee members voted unanimously for Casperson: K. Staten, K. Jones, D. Marshall, B. Skinner, and J. Newgard. Motion carried. Casperson Mini-Bulls will be the contractor for 2022.


## Committee Reports

## Military Affairs/American Legion - B. Skinner

- B. Skinner is working on the Old Glory Flag Ceremony song that will be played when the flag is raised than lowered. This same song is used by the military.


## Hospitality/Sponsorships - K. Staten

## K. Staten reported on the following:

- July $30^{\text {th }}$ will be the Mutton Bustin Qualifier event at Teton Toyota from 11am to 3pm. We will buck fifteen every thirty minutes and pick up the pace if needed. Once children qualify, they will proceed to a tent to pick up their information package and sign up for their ride times at the War Bonnet. We will also have vendors, a dunk tank, and other activities at the qualifier to make it a fun family event. (B. Skinner suggested that children who do not qualify, should receive a ticket to the rodeo).
- K. Staten will be meeting with the Exchange Club to see if they plan to line the roadway again with flags this year.
- Burger Theory is going to be a rodeo sponsor and we will be using a coupon on the back of our admittance tickets for a discount their business.
- The VIP tables are now being sold.
- Conrad Bischoff raised their sponsorship amount to $15 k$.
- The board room at the arena has been remodeled and looks fantastic. She will try to sell this room space to private groups for the rodeo.
- Contestant swag is being ordered.
- Sponsor possibilities were discussed, and committee members listed possibilities for K. Staten to contact.


## Livestock Welfare - K. Searle (no updates)

## Facilities/Grounds \& Security - R. Campbell/J. Stephens (absent)

Media/Emergency Action Plan - B. Cranor (absent)
Youth Rodeo/Family Night - C. Horsley (no report)
Financial Report - D. Sorensen/C. Price (No report)

## Call for Agenda Items

- K. Staten called for ticket prices for reserved seating under the grandstands be listed on the next agenda.

Adjournment
D. Marshall moved to adjourn the meeting at 12:25 pm. B. Skinner seconded. Meeting adjourned.

Next meeting will be April 28, 2022
T. Sessions

# PARKS \& RECREATION COMMISSION MEETING <br> APRIL 4, 2022 <br> WEB <br> 12:00 Noon 

Members in Attendance: B. Combo, B. Lee, B. Nitschke, T. Hersh, C. White, J. Radford, J. Walker, P. Holm, D. Pennock, R. Campbell

Members Not in Attendance: M. Hill, R. Foote, W. Johnson, P. Lloyd

## Call to Order - B. Combo

B. Combo called the meeting to order at 12:05 pm.

## Approval of Minutes

R. Nitschke moved to approve the March 7th minutes. T. Hersh seconded. All in favor.

## Director's Report - P. Holm

P. Holm reported on the following:

- The LWCF request for the Meppen property was taken to the City Council Work Session on March $28^{\text {th }}$. This location for the proposed park was supported by City Council.
- The lease agreement between the City of Idaho Falls and Snake River BMX was approved by City Council on March $31^{\text {st }}$. This agreement will allow Snake River BMX to use the old riding arena on the southeast side of the track at Sandy Downs for their program operations. The term of this agreement will be five years. This agreement will allow revenue collection by the City of Idaho Falls from the Snake River BMX Association in the amount of one dollar (\$) per paid competitor, user, and spectator at each event.
- The Parks and Recreation Department is looking for two new War Bonnet Committee members and one new Shade Tree Committee member.
- Area tree issues were discussed. The majority of the City's tree canopy comprises of the Ash tree which is facing future annihilation from the ash borer beetle. This topic will be taken to City Council with the intent to get feedback for developing a plan to replace the threatened trees.
- The TAP grant for the expansion of the Meppen Canal Trail was approved.

The following budget priorities, needs, concerns, and wishes were discussed:

- Maintenance funds for lighting, irrigation, playgrounds, and roads.
- The Tautphaus Park Tennis Court renovation.
- TAP Grant project funding.
- Heritage Park funding.
- Purchase of an excavator for the Park's Department Landscape Superintendent.
- Funland at the Zoo Restoration.

The following department project and program updates were discussed:

- Sage Lakes and Sand Creek Golf courses have opened for the season.
- The Idaho Falls Zoo opens April $13^{\text {th }}$.
- The ice arena is closed for the season, but we may open earlier next fall to accommodate the Idaho Falls Hockey Team.
- The Aquatic Center is set to open on or before May $23^{\text {rd }}$.
- The Reinhart Park Splashpad grand opening is tentatively scheduled for June $1^{\text {st }}$ at noon.
- A landscape/construction superintendent position was created for the Parks Department.
- Our new Landscape Superintendent and team will be working with Knife River to add additional pathways at Heritage Park. The park teams are also working to clear willows, and dead trees along the river in the park.
LWCF Updates:
- The yellow book appraisals are updated and ready for the conversion process.
- P. Holm will be meeting with Kathy Muir the second week of April to discuss the Meppen conversion site.
Grant updates:
- The Pancheri Bridge TAP Grant. WE have 80K in the budget for engineering the project this year, with planned construction next year.
- The Meppen Canal Trail TAP Grant. The project was approved by City Council. Funding will be available for construction in 2024. Parks and Recreation will budget $\$ 500.000$ for the project with $\$ 465,000$ being reimbursed. The Department will need to budget for the bridge over the Idaho Canal separately.


## Golf Advisory Committee Report - T. Hersh

T. Hersh reported on the following:

- Sage Lakes Golf Course opened March $25^{\text {th }}$ and Sand Creek and Pinecrest opened March $28^{\text {th }}$.
- Golf course budget update. The golf budget is looking good due to a long fall season, increased pass sales and merchandise sales.
- The Sage Lakes and Sand Creek Pro Shops were remodeled and the restrooms at Sage Lakes are being upgraded.
- Kevin Kavran is doing a fantastic job since his promotion to head golf pro at Sage Lakes.
- Concerns amid reports of the challenges of those trying to apply for seasonal jobs when using the City of Idaho Falls Human Resource Department's new software.


## Division Updates

## Parks - R. Campbell

R. Campbell reported on the following:

- The Park's Department staff continues to work on spring cleanup projects.
- The staff is beginning to turn on the larger irrigation systems and will turn on the smaller ones once the weather warms up.
- The Parks Department is struggling to hire seasonal staff. They raised the starting salary to $\$ 12.00$ per hour in hopes this helps recruit staff.


## Zoo - D. Pennock

D. Pennock reported on the following:

- The Zoo's season opening is April $13^{\text {th }}$.
- The zoo has welcomed a new baby cotton-top tamarin. This adorable South American primate is nearing extinction due to large scale habitat destruction.


## Recreation - C. Horsley (absent)

## Commissioner Reports

## J. Walker - County Commissioner

J. Walker reported on the following:

- The low water levels at the Ririe Dam and the expectations that adequate levels of water will only last until late July. Ririe is currently at $63 \%$ and Palisades is at $37 \%$.
- The county is done grooming the back trails due to warming conditions.


## School Dist. 91 - Pat Lloyd (absent)

School Dist. 91 - W. Johnson (absent)
Shade Tree Committee - M. Hill (absent)

## Adjournment at 1:00 pm.

Next meeting will be held May 2, 2022

Recorded by:
Tracy Sessions, Clerk, Parks \& Recreation

Idaho Falls Downtown Development Board Meeting held April 5, 2022, at 9:00am in the Arts Council conference room. Those in attendance: Jake Durtschi, Kevin Cutler, Brandi Newton, Jill Hansen, Cindy Napier, Tasha Taylor, Greg Crockett, Kasi Nelson, Chip Langerak, Shanon Taylor, Emily Fitzpatrick, Lisa Farris. Staff -Mala Lyon and Juan Hernandez

Minutes of the March 1, 2022, meeting reviewed; Greg Crockett motioned to accept, Kevin Cutler seconded; board approved.

Financial report - Brandi - we are running in the red due to 2 fundraiser events being canceled; parking is in the black; we are over budget for snow removal; we are still figuring out how parking fees are going to come in. Jake said we have $\$ 27,000$ in outstanding fines that have not been paid, but notification letters are going out, collection process is in the works and the ability to tow vehicles is coming together. Greg Crockett motioned to accept; Tasha Taylor seconded; board approved.

Request from Chesbro's for the "Spring onto Broadway" event for $\$ 750$. We have supported this event in the past and $\$ 500$ was budgeted. Other merchants on Broadway participate and pay a fee to help with advertising and expenses. Brandi proposed that the extra $\$ 250$ be approved with the request that we receive a detailed after event report and with details on how the money was spent. Cindy seconded; board approved.

Lisa - we have $\$ 19,000$ in funds and the letter was received for the request of $\$ 50,000$ for the next round. They will listen to applicants in July and August and approve the amount we can use. The new business Bumble \& Bleat is working on their grant; John Page with Page Insurance needs to follow up; Ford's Bar expressed interest then has not completed the paperwork.

Park Avenue waterline - Chip - it is going well - Chip was the only one who came to the Wednesday meeting, but they are doing a great job keeping people informed. They told the Villa that they needed to turn the water off for 30 minutes and it was back on in 35 minutes. The did punch a hole in the ceiling of the basement in Tasha's building which went into a utility room. The basement extends to under the sidewalk, and they didn't realize that. There were some ADA concerns, but the city quickly addressed the problem by bringing in some plywood. The service lines to the buildings, water meters and the water main are all being installed or replaced.

We have been collecting signature for the support of placing parking meters on-street. Even if people don't want to sign there has been good communication and a better understanding of the downtown economic health concerning parking. Kevin said that I.F. Power is looking at installing EV charger meters - the cost is $\$ 500$ for one that does not require payment and the one the requires payment is $\$ 10,000$. They are wondering if we could place a pay meter next to it as a pay to park and charge meter.

Ballots were passed out to the board of directors and the following were unanimously voted in:

| Kevin Cutler | President |
| :--- | :--- |
| Chip Langerak | Vice President |
| Jill Hansen | Secretary |
| Brandi Newton | Treasurer |
| Jacob Durtschi | Past President |

Liza McGeachin - Owner \& Manager of The Celt Pub - asked when IFDDC would get back to holding events. Before covid there was talk of working with the city plan to make outdoor dining more
available, but that seems to have stalled. Jake said there has been a shift away from using the Civitan Plaza for events to the Broadway Plaza off Memorial. Krisi, our event planner, has retired and we have had some issues with some restaurants who want the events and others who do not. Chip and Liza both agreed that staffing has been a problem and doing one more thing with a smaller than normal staff was impossible. The application with the city to use the streets for an event has become very complicated with the Fire Department saying access is paramount to safety. There was a problem at Alive After 5 where a lady suffered heat stroke and the ambulance could not get to her easily, so they are not wanting to allow streets to be blocked for events. Chip said it is ok to shut down a street for 3 months to repair a water main and work around it, but not ok to shut down for 6 hours for an event? Greg said we need to look to Boise as an example of using the streets. Kasi said Jim Francis is on our side and we need to use his influence to help us work through this problem. Jake said Anas is also a resource for urban infrastructure that we need to use. Our downtown needs to focus on being pedestrian friendly that is our uniqueness the walkability. It is important we protect our downtown events like 'Taste of Downtown' and keep them downtown. Cindy asked if we will be hiring a new event planner? Yes as soon as possible. Kasi said you must get creative in filling out the city application - they like pictures and charts, but once you fill it out once it is not so bad. Alive After 5 went to PJ at Parks \& Rec and the fire chief to discuss what they wanted before they filled out the application. The city is short staffed too so things like an agreement to clean up after events is helpful. Farmer's Market requires a weekly fee and payment for electricity used that is paid to the city.

Meeting was adjourned at 9:46am
The next board meeting will be held May 3, 2022
Respectfully submitted
Jill Hansen, secretary and Mala Lyon

то: Honorable Mayor and Council

FROM: Brad Cramer, Community Development Services Director
DATE: April 20, 2022
RE: April 19, 2022, Planning Commission Action

Planning Commission took the following action during the April 19, 2022, meeting.

1. ANNX22-004: ANNEXATION/INITIAL ZONING of R3, Multiple Residential Dwelling for 26.9 acres in the North $1 / 2$ of the Northwest $1 / 4$ of Section 32, Township 3 North, Range 39 East. Generally located north of E 49th N, east of N 5th E, south of E 65th N, west of US Hwy 20. On April 19, 2022, the Planning \& Zoning Commission recommended approval of the annexation with the initial zoning of R3 on the west portion of the property, R1 of the east portion and the Limited Development Approach Surface Airport Overlay Zone of the property to the Mayor and City Council with a vote of 3-1.
2. ANNX22-005: ANNEXATION/INITIAL ZONING of HC, Highway Commercial and LC, Limited Commercial for 44.6 acres in the East $\mathbf{1 / 2}$ of the Southeast $\mathbf{1 / 4}$ of Section 7, Township 2 North, Range 38 East. Generally located north of E Anderson St, east of Boge Ave, s of E 29th N, west of N Holmes Ave. On April 19, 2022, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted to recommend approval of the annexation with an initial zoning of LC to the Mayor and City Council with a vote of 3-1.
3. ANNX22-006: ANNEXATION/INITIAL ZONING of HC, Highway Commercial for $\mathbf{2 . 5}$ acres in the Southwest $\mathbf{1 / 4}$ of Section 26, Township 2 North, Township 2 North. Generally located north of W Sunnyside Rd, east of I15, south of Barberry Ln, west of Pioneer Dr. On April 19, 2022, the Planning and Zoning Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the annexation and initial zoning of HC to the Mayor and City Council as presented.
4. PLAT22-002: FINAL PLAT. Wasatch Apple Subdivision. Generally located north of E 25th E, east of S Holmes Ave, south of E 17th St, west of Craig Ave. On April 19, 2022, the Planning and Zoning Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the final plat as presented.
5. PLAT22-007: FINAL PLAT. CCW Express Broadway Subdivision. Generally located north of Riverwalk Dr, east of Houston Cir, south of Broadway, west of the Snake River. On April 19, 2022, the Planning Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval to of the final plat as presented.
6. PUD22-002: PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT for Falcon Crest Estates, Part of the NE 1/4 of Section 31, T 3N, R 38E. Generally located north of Saddle Rock Ln, east of N 5th W, south of W 65th N, west of N 5th E. On April 19, 2022, the Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval of the PUD with the condition that the developer install a fence along the existing properties along 5th E and the additional information be clarify parking to the Mayor and City Council.

## Building Department

Office (208) 612-8270
Fax (208) 612-8520
RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION: To receive recommendation(s) from the Planning and Zoning Commission pursuant to the Local Land Use Planning Act (LLUPA).

то: Honorable Mayor and Council

FROM: Brad Cramer, Community Development Services Director
DATE: May 4, 2022
RE: May 3, 2022, Planning Commission Action

Planning Commission took the following action during the May 3, 2022, meeting.

1. PLAT22-008: FINAL PLAT. Bombardier Industrial Park for $\mathbf{7 . 8 7 8}$ acres for part of the East $1 / 2$ of the East $1 / 2$ of Section 35, Township 2 North, Range 37 East. Generally located north of W $65^{\text {th }}$ S, east of S Yellowstone Ave, south of Pedersen St, west of Bombardier Ave. On May 3, 2022, the Planning and Zoning Commission unanimously voted to recommend approval of the final plat to the Mayor and City Council as presented.
2. PLAT22-010: PRELIMINARY PLAT. Fairway Estates Subdivision for part of East $1 / 2$ of Section 31, Township 3 North, Range 38 East. Generally located north of Pevero Dr, east of $\mathbf{N}$ $5^{\text {th }} \mathbf{E}$, south of E $65^{\text {th }} \mathbf{N}$, west of Eaglewood Dr. On May 3, 2022, the Planning and Zoning Commission voted to approve the preliminary plat with a vote of 3 to 1 .
3. PLAT22-011: FINAL PLAT. Fairway Estates Division 30 for the West $1 / 2$ of Section 31, Township 3 North, Range 38 East. Generally located north of Sage Lakes Blvd, east of $N 5^{\text {th }}$ E, south of E $65^{\text {th }} \mathbf{N}$, west of Eaglewood Dr. On May 3, 2022, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval to the Mayor and City Council as presented with staff recommendations that bridge is to be built or bonded, and that CO are to be held until the bridge is complete.
4. RZON22-003: REZONE from Planned Transition Zone (PT) with no underlying zone district to LC, Limited Commercial and R2, Mixed Residential Zones for the properties located at 535 E 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 587$ E 17 $7^{\text {th }}, 925$ E 17 $7^{\text {th }}, 985$ E 17 $7^{\text {th }}$ and 1354 E 16 ${ }^{\text {th }}$. On May 3, 2022, the Planning Commission unanimously recommended approval of the rezone from the PT, Planned Transition zone with no underlying zones to LC, Limited Commercial and R2, Mixed Residential to the Mayor and City Council.

RECOMMENDED COUNCIL ACTION: To receive recommendation(s) from the Planning and Zoning Commission pursuant to the Local Land Use Planning Act (LLUPA).

City of Idaho Falls

City Property Discussion
600 S. Boulevard
Monday, May 9, 2022




- Since acquired, approximately $\$ 92,000$ in repairs and upgrades, included ADA compliance upgrades for \$53,000 in 2013

Public Works Placeholder Slide

## Summary of Issues and Proposed Solution

- City has two properties (former Serenity Hall building and Parking Lot) that are not used for city business or plan to be used for city business for the foreseeable future
- Structural analysis conducted in February noted significant structural corrections, upgrades and/or replacements and ADA compliance upgrades are needed.
- Estimated costs to renovate and/or update property exceeds the available financial resources to maintain the building long-term and exceeds the appraisal value of the property.
- Request council direction and approval to either:
- Demolish the structure to provide right-of-way to improve intersection.
- Auction city-owned property (building and parking lot) for a minimum bid of \$84,000 and deposit the proceeds from the sale to the city's building maintenance budget to fund city-owned and citystaff occupied properties in need of maintenance, repair and/or upgrades.


## Questions



# Boam \& Associates REAL ESTATE APPRAISALS <br> 1820 E 17th Street Suite 230 <br> Idaho Falls, ID 83404 <br> Phone (208) 528-9200 Fax (208) 528-9204 <br> Email: valuationfinder@gmail.com 

$r \mathrm{rt}$
ert $\quad \mathrm{e} \quad \mathrm{e}$ er ppr er
October 08, 2021
Pam Anderson
City of Idaho Falls
Idaho Falls, ID 83402

RE: 600 S Boulevard<br>Serenity Hall<br>Idaho Falls, ID 83402

Dear Ms. Anderson,

As requested, I have completed the appraisal on the above referenced property. A personal inspection was made of the property by me.

I have analyzed the various factors that influence value for the purpose of estimating a supportable indication and appraisal of the market value of the subject properties in its present condition and based on its highest and best use.

This is an appraisal report.
As a result of my inspection, investigation, and analysis, I have concluded the following opinion of the market value of the subject property. The estimate market value of the subject property as of September 10, 2021 is $\$ 84,000$.

Sincerely,


Curtis J. Boam
Appraiser, CGA-51
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## OVERVIEW:

| Property Type | Commercial Property |
| :--- | :--- |
| Real Estate Appraised | 600 S Boulevard - Serenity Hall |
| County | Bonneville |
| Client | City of Idaho Falls |
| Borrower(s) | City of Idaho Falls |
| Intended User | Estimate Market Value |
| Intended Use | $09 / 10 / 2021$ |
| Effective Value Date <br> (point in time that the value <br> applies) | $10 / 08 / 2021$ |
| Report Date <br> (date the report is transmitted to <br> client) | (A) |

## Appraisal Report Standard:

My analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, to conform to the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice (USPAP) and Federal Financial Institutions Regulatory Agencies (FFIRAs) and Related Bodies that were in effect at the time this report was prepared.

## OVERVIEW CONTINUED:

## Property Rights Appraised:

The real property is appraised as a fee simple interest. No personal property was included in the appraisal report.

## Ownership and Recent History:

Recorded County Records indicate that the property is currently owned by the City of Idaho Falls.
Building and land purchased in 1963. Parking lot purchased in 1974.

## Sales History:

No sales history was available or obtained in the preparation of this appraisal report for the last three years.

## SCOPE OF WORK:

The scope of work for this appraisal is defined by the complexity of this appraisal assignment and the reporting requirements of this appraisal report form, including the following definition of market value, statement of assumptions and limiting conditions, and certifications. The appraiser must, at a minimum: (1) perform a complete visual inspection of the interior and exterior areas of the subject property, (2) inspect the neighborhood, (3) inspect each of the comparable sales from at least the street, (4) research, verify, and analyze data from reliable public and/or private sources, and (5) report his or her analysis, opinions, and conclusions in this appraisal report.
The report is to be used only by the client for their purpose. The report does not allow for any other use or purpose.

Development upon the intended use, intended users, and agreements between the appraiser and the client, the appraisal development process may include several, but not necessarily all of the following tasks:

- Observation of the property appraised
- Research for appropriate market data
- Data verification
- Consideration of influential market area, physical, economic, and governmental factors
- Determination of the subjects highest and best use(s), if appropriate
- Development of one or more applicable approaches to value
- Reconciliation of value indications
- Preparation of this report

Extent of Services Provided:

| Number of Final Value Opinions Developed | 1 |
| :--- | :--- |
| Value Opinion(s) Reflect the Worth of the <br> Property Appraised | As-Is |
| Extent of Report Preparation | A Summary Appraisal Report |
| Other Report of Preparation | Report Complies with FIRREA |
| Data Sources | Local MLS; Public Records |
| Documents Considered | County Records and local MLS data |
| Data Verification | Direct and Indirect Materials |
| Extent of Subject Observation by Appraiser | Adequate Interior and Exterior Inspections |

## AREA DATA:

The subject property is located in the central portion of the City of Idaho Falls which is in central Bonneville County. Idaho Falls is the county seat and has a population of approximately 63.543 people. Idaho Falls is located in southeastern Idaho and is a major trade center. The county population is approximately 121,680 people.

Idaho Falls is an agricultural community with the main crop being potatoes. There is also grain, livestock, and other commodities grown here, but the main industry is potatoes.

Other major industries and employers in the area are the Idaho National Laboratory and related contractors with that facility, manufacturing businesses, various retail stores, various construction companies, school districts, and medical facilities. Also providing employment are various other service industries. There are numerous marketing and manufacturing firms in and around the area.

Idaho Falls is the home of College of Eastern Idaho, which is a state-owned educational institution. The ISU/UI Center for Higher Education and University Place which are affiliated with Idaho State University and the University of Idaho are located here.

Idaho Falls is in the heart of summer and winter recreation areas such as Island Park and West Yellowstone. There are two national parks and a national monument located in the area. There is also fishing, boating, camping, snowmobiling, skiing, and other recreational features located throughout the region.

The area is served by numerous financial organizations. They include banks, credit unions, mortgage companies, and etc.

Transportation for the area is provided by major airlines in Idaho Falls. It is also serviced by a bus line. Union Pacific Railroad runs through the area. Interstate Highway 15, State Highways 26 and 91 also run throughout the area. Numerous trucking companies are located in the area. There is both city and county government.

There is an annual precipitation of approximately 9 inches. Winter temperatures average from $10-30$ degrees and summer temperatures ranging from 50-90 degrees for an average. The elevation is approximately 4700 feet.

## AREA DATA CONTINUED:

Health care is mainly provided by Eastern Idaho Regional Medical Center and Mountain View Hospital. There are also nursing homes and living centers, surgical centers, and numerous physicians and surgeons in the area.

Basic services such as grocery stores, eating establishments, service stations, and various other service and convenience businesses are found in the area.

The greater Idaho Falls area has two school districts serving all grades kindergarten through 12th grade. There are several church and religious denominations in the area.

Several parks are located throughout the city. There is an aquatic center, park, museum, and zoo in the center of town. There are four 18 hole golf courses in the area.

Because Idaho Falls is a main route to the national parks and other points of interest in the area, there is some tourism. There are motel/hotel facilities scattered throughout.

In addition to Idaho Falls being a major trade center in the area, it is also a major employment center which provides additional employment to the people who live in surrounding communities.

AREA MAP

| Borrower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Propenty Address | 600 S BOULEVARD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| City | IDAHO FALLS | County | Bonneville | Stat | ID | Inp Code | 83402 |



## NEIGHBORHOOD DESCRIPTION:

The neighborhood is the central portion of Idaho Falls, east of the down town core area. It is north of 17th street, south of 1st street, east of North Yellowstone, and west of North Holmes. The neighborhood is mainly residential. Commercial properties are located along the major roads. Minor neighborhood conveniences include convenient stores, offices and small retail. Idaho Falls High School is in the area. The neighborhood is fully developed. Some residential property is being replaced. Railroad runs through the area as well as State Highway 20. There is access by city streets. Neighborhood land mix appears compatible. No apparent adverse condition.

Neighborhood Map

| Borrower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Propenty Address | 600 S BOULEVARD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cay | IDAHO FALLS | County | Bonneville | State | ID | 2ip Cote | 83402 |
| Lender Client |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Definitions Used in this Appraisal:

Market Value: The most probable price which a property should bring in a competitive and open market under all conditions requisite to a fair sale, the buyer and seller each acting prudently and knowledgeable, and assuming the price is not affected by undue stimulus. Implicit in this definition is the consummation of a sale as of a specified date and the passing of title from seller to buyer under conditions where by:

- Buyer and seller are typically motivated;
- Both parties are well informed or well advised, and acting in what they consider their best interests;
- A reasonable time is allowed for exposure in the open market;
- Payment is made in terms of cash in United States dollars or in terms of financial arrangements comparable thereto; and
- The price represents the normal consideration for the property sold unaffected by special or creative financing or sales concessions granted by anyone associated with the sale. (USPAP 2018-2019 Addition page 153)
Highest and Best Use: The reasonably probable use of property that results in the highest value and best use must meet legal permissibility, physical possibility, financial feasibility, and maximum productivity.

The use of an asset that maximizes its potential and that is possible, legally permissible, and financially feasible. The highest and best use may be for continuation of an asset/'s existing use or for some alternative use. This is determined by the use that a market participant would have in mind for the asset when formulating the price that it would be willing to bid. (IVS)

The highest and most profitable use for which the property is adaptable and needed or likely to be needed in the reasonably near future. (Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions) (Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal 6th Addition page 109)

Improvements: Buildings or other relatively permanent structures or infrastructure (e.g., sewer lines, water lines, and roads) located on, or attached to land. (Dictionary of Real Estate Appraisal 6th Addition page 114) Other improvements may be but are not limited to cleaning of debris, landscaping, etc.

Appraisal is also subject to lender's definitions. See attached engagement letter.

## SUBJECT PROPERTY SPECS:

## Legal Description:

Parcel \#RPA1740031006A -W 1⁄2 LOT 6, BLOCK 31 - Building Parcel \#RPA1740031007A -LOTS 7-10, BLOCK 31 - Parking Lot

## Zoning:

The properties are subject to zoning ordinances of Idaho Falls City classified as TN/ Traditional Neighborhood and Park and Rec Open Space.

## Assessed Value and Taxes:

According to the Bonneville county Treasurer the property is tax exempt. There is no current assessed value or taxes.

Assessor's Parcel \#RPA1740031006A - Building
And \#RPA1740031007A - Parking Lot
Flood Hazard:

Flood Hazard Zone C. Map \# 1600290005B. Map Date October 15. 1982

Building Sketch

| Borrower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Propenty Adtress | 600 S BOULEVARD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cay | IDAHO FALLS | County | Bonneville | Stape | ID | Le Code | 83402 |
| Lender Client |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## PROPERTY DESCRIPTION:

The subject property contains two parcels. The first parcel is $10,014 \mathrm{sq}$. ft . It's triangular shaped, and has street parking on the south and east sides, and an alley on the west. Part of the property is where the building sits. The other portion is a landscaped grass area with trees and shrubs. There is curb, gutter and sidewalk. The second parcel is currently used as a parking lot. It contains $3,498 \mathrm{sq}$. ft . This parcel is rectangular shaped. It has a corner location with street frontage on the west and south sides. It's gravel covered. There are city utilities available to both properties.

Subject building was originally built as a church/ house of worship. It's approximately 90 years old. It has been remodeled and updated numerous times over the past several years. It was converted to its current use in 1963. Building was remodeled for ADA accessibility in 2013. Building is block and frame construction with stucco exterior. Roof covering is composition.

There is an upper and lower level. Entry steps are on the front and side of building. Windows are casement. Heating is forced air electric and services the entire building. Main/upper level has a large meeting room, two restrooms, kitchenette and storage. Floor coverings are hardwood and vinyl. Interior walls are drywall, panel and plaster. Lower level also has a meeting room, mechanical room, storage room, rec room and a restroom. Floor finish is vinyl and concrete. Wall furnishings are similar to the upper level.

Building is in fair condition and is currently occupied.

Remaining economic life is estimated at less than 10 years. Without major remodel and updating, the building is approaching the end of its remaining economic life.

## HIGHEST AND BEST USE:

The highest and best use definition is indicated in the Definition Section of this report. The characteristics of the land such as size, shape, location, and topography have been considered. In addition, the analysis has included the surrounding developments, existing zoning, access, utilities, current market trends, and demand for property of this type in the market area.

The land value is based on the premise of the highest and best use "as though vacant". There are four tests which are taken into consideration in developing an opinion of highest and best use. These four tests include an examination of those uses that are physically possible, legally permissible, financially feasible, and maximally productive. Each criterion is considered cumulatively and provides the best analysis for the highest and best use of the land.

The improvements on the subject property conform to zoning. Current use as a neighborhood fire station which is allowed by zoning.

Neighborhood trends appear stable.

Considering the subject property's characteristics and the above four tests, the uses of the property allowed by their current zoning of Traditional Neighborhood \& Parks and Rec Open Space in its highest and best use currently. It is likely that the property would have to be rezoned for any use other than T1/ Traditional Neighborhood \& Parks and Rec Open Space.
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## APPROACHES TO VALUE:

Three approaches to value are generally considered in arriving at an estimate of value of Real Estate. These are called Cost, Income, and Sales Comparison Approaches.

In the Cost Approach, a value is estimated by computing the present replacement cost of the improvements and then applying an appropriate depreciation rate to arrive at a depreciated value, found by comparison in the market, to arrive at a value for the property. This approach is based on the assumption that the replacement cost is the upper limit of value. This approach is best used when the improvements are new or near new and are proper. As improvements increase in age and depreciation accumulates, the validity of this approach lessens.

The Income Approach is a process of developing the gross income from a property into an indication of value. This is accomplished by analyzing the relationship of net incomes from similar properties based on economic rent to their selling prices in the market. The relationship between net income and selling price is called the capitalization rate. This rate is divided into the indicated net income for the subject property, other units of comparison were also considered.

The application of the Sales Comparison Approach produces an estimate of value by comparing it with similar properties of the same type and class that have sold or are currently offered for sale, is this considered the most reliable approach for the subject property. Prices of those properties deemed most comparable tend to set the range in which the value of the subject property will fall. When properly applied, this approach generally allows for decrease or increase in value.

## COST APPROACH:

| t ppr |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Sale | Location | Sale Date | Sale Price | Property Size <br> $(3,485 \mathrm{sq} \mathrm{ft})$ | Sale Price Per Acre |
| 1 | 250 E 19th St <br> Idaho Falls | $01 / 2020$ | $\$ 26,000$ | 6,098 | $\$ 4.26$ |
| 2 | 491 W 19th St <br> Idaho Falls | $01 / 2021$ | $\$ 39.000$ | 5,227 | $\$ 7.46$ |
| 3 | TBD May St <br> Idaho Falls | $032 / 2021$ | $\$ 74,000$ | 10,019 | $\$ 7.39$ |
| 4 | 286 Hill Rd <br> Idaho Falls | $03 / 2021$ | $\$ 25,000$ | 3,485 | $\$ 7.17$ |
| 5 | TBD Bingham Ave <br> Idaho Falls | $09 / 2020$ | $\$ 40.000$ | 10,454 | $\$ 3.83$ |
| 6 | 375 E Anderson <br> Idaho Falls | $03 / 2021$ | $\$ 180,000$ | 42.689 | $\$ 4.23$ |

The above land sales are included to value the separate parcel that is the parking lot. This parcel contains 3,485 square feet and is estimated at $\$ 4.50$ per square foot, or $\$ 15,700$. This parcel is included in the overall price of the total property.

## INCOME APPROACH:

The subject property is currently occupied by the City of Idaho Falls, and the Income Approach is not applicable.

## SALES COMPARISON APPROACH:

In arriving at an estimated value by this approach, the market has been investigated for sales of similar properties in the area. Recent sales of similar, comparable properties are limited.

The comparable sales considered were as representative of the subject as possible. They were located in the subject and competing neighborhoods within the market area. They also varied in size, design, condition, and use. They were the most current available. Data obtained from local MLS, public records, local real estate agents, and associate appraisers.

Marketing time for commercial property in the subjects' market area is estimated in excess of 180 days. A quicker marketing time could be obtained depending on buyer and sellers' motivation reflected in asking prices and offers made and accepted. Exposure time is estimated similar to market time.

Value appears to be related to a particular property with considerations given to size. Also, improvements have some limited value depending on their condition and overall contribution. Quite often in purchases of this type, property sales do not reflect a firm pattern but more desire or needs of an individual and are often affected by the sellers and or buyers' motivation and supply and demand.

Commercial construction has been limited in the neighborhood over the past several years. The subject is fully developed. Any new construction would include remodeling of existing buildings or the removal of existing buildings for redevelopment. Currently supply and demand appears in balance for property similar to the subject.

5 improved sales were considered to establish a value for the subject property.

A summary of these sales is on the next four pages with complete sale data located in the sale data section of the report. Data is retained in the appraiser's file.

SALES COMPARISON APPROACH CONTINUED:

| Sale (Subject) | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Location | $538 \mathrm{~W} 21 \mathrm{st} \mathrm{St}$ Idaho Falls | 375 <br> Castlerock <br> Lane <br> Idaho Falls | 762 Vassar Way Idaho Falls | 690 <br> Cambridge <br> Dr <br> Idaho Falls | 1409 <br> Benton St <br> Idaho Falls |
| Sale Date | 10/2019 | 12/2019 | 02/2020 | 03/2020 | 02/2021 |
| Sales Price | \$151.500 | \$150,000 | \$200,000 | \$160,000 | \$156,000 |
| $\begin{aligned} & \text { Land Size } \\ & (13,503 \mathrm{sq} . \mathrm{ft} .) \end{aligned}$ | 9,583 | 30,083 | 10,019 | 10,019 | 9,583 |
| Building Size $(2,102 \text { sq. ft. })$ | 4,538 | 2,053 | 2,584 | 2,700 | 1.863 |
| Sale Price Per sq.ft. Of <br> Building | \$33.38 | \$73.06 | \$77.40 | \$59.26 | \$83.74 |
| Adjustments: <br> Land <br> Building Size <br> Condition | $\begin{aligned} & +15,700 \\ & +25 \\ & - \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & -66,300 \\ & - \\ & -20 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +14,000 \\ & - \\ & -20 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +13,900 \\ & +10 \% \\ & -20 \% \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & +15,700 \\ & - \\ & -20 \% \end{aligned}$ |
| Indicated <br> Adjusted <br> Value/per unit | \$45.19 | \$37.07 | \$67.34 | \$57.30 | \$58.56 |

## SALES COMPARISON APPROACH CONTINUED:

Comparable 1: Located in Idaho Falls. Remodeled home built in 1960 and has two shops on property. The building is currently used for office/warehouse space. Block construction.
Potential use is industrial, manufacturing, office and warehouse use. On site and street parking available. This building is larger and the lot is smaller than the subject. Adjustments were made for both. This comparable was considered due to age, location and overall condition.

Comparable 2: Located in Idaho Falls on a corner lot. Previous use was a seminary building. Potential use is office and presentation space. Building was built in 1992. Classroom/conference room is set up for media presentations. Frame construction with brick exterior. On site and street parking available. The building is larger and condition is superior to subject. Adjustments were made for both. This is a special use property similar to the subject. It's newer in age and located in residential condition.

Comparable 3: Located on West Side of Idaho Falls close to a busy street. Previous use was service business/daycare and was recently closed. This is a special use property similar to the subject. Potential use is also a daycare facility. Building was built in 1980. Frame construction with metal exterior. Onsite parking available for multiple vehicles. Fully fenced and secure playground. The building is smaller and superior to subject. Adjustments were made for both.

Comparable 4: Located in Idaho Falls. Previous use was office space. Potential use is office and service business space. Building built in 1961. Frame construction with brick exterior. Onsite parking. The building is smaller than the subject, has a smaller land size and is superior to the subject. Adjustments were made for all three.

Comparable 5: Located in Idaho falls. Prior use was daycare. Potential uses are multiple office spaces or service buildings, with multi-unit possibilities. Building built in 1956. Frame construction with brick and vinyl exterior. Entire lot out front is paved, with some fenced off. Onsite and street parking available. The building is smaller than the subject and superior to subject. Adjustments were made for both.

## SALES COMPARISON APPROACH CONTINUED:

Adjustments were made for site size, GBA and condition. No additional adjustment beyond main level GBA for basement area. No time adjustment was indicated for comparables over 12 months old. Based on the indicated adjusted values, I estimate the subject value at $\$ 40.00$ per sq. ft of building area. This includes land and all associated improvements.

Comparables 2, 4 and 5 were most similar in GBA. Comparable 1 is most similar in condition. Comparable 1, 3, 4 and 5 were most similar in site size. Based on the data available, and considering the subjects uses and condition, I estimate the value at $\$ 40.00$ / square foot. This includes building and land. The parking lot is included in this estimate. Therefore, the subject's 2.102 square foot at $\$ 40.00$ equals $\$ 84,080$ called $\$ 84,000$.

$$
2,102 \text { sq. ft. at } \$ 40.00 / \text { sq. } \mathrm{ft} .=\$ 84.000
$$

# RECONCILIATION AND CONCLUSION: 

COST APPROACH N/A<br>INCOME APPROACH<br>SALES COMPARISON APPROACH $\$ 84.000$

The Cost Approach is the least reliable of the approaches to value due to age of building.

```
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```

The Sales Comparison Approach is based on similar sales of property like the subject. They have similar uses and were considered equal in location. Adjustments were made for land, building e t

The Sales Comparison Approach was given the most weight and reflects the current value of the subject in the market. The estimate market value of the subject property at 600 S . Boulevard as of September 10,2021 is $\$, 000$. The above value represents the value of the land and building improvements only and does not include any personal property.

## STATEMENT OF ASSUMPTIONS \& LIMITING CONDITIONS:

1. The appraiser will not be responsible for matters of a legal nature that affect either the property being appraised or the title to it. The appraiser assumes that the title is good and marketable and, therefore, will not render any opinions about the title. The property is appraised on the basis of it being under responsible ownership. The future operation of the property assumes skilled and adequate management but are not represented to be historically based.
2. The appraiser may have provided a sketch in the appraisal report to show approximate dimensions of the improvements, and any such sketch is included only to assist the reader of the report in visualizing the property and understanding the appraiser's determination of its size. Unless otherwise indicated, a Land Survey was not performed.
3. If so indicated, the appraiser has examined the available flood maps that are provided by the Federal Emergency Management Agency (or other data sources) and has noted in the appraisal report whether the subject site is located in an identified Special Flood Hazard Area. Because the appraiser is not a surveyor, he or she makes no guarantees, expressed or implied, regarding this determination. 4. The appraiser will not give testimony or appear in court because he or she made an appraisal of the property in question, unless specific arrangements to do so have been made beforehand.
4. If the cost approach is included in this appraisal, the appraiser has estimated the value of the land in the cost approach at its highest and best use, and the improvements at their contributory value. These separate valuations of the land and improvements must not be used in conjunction with any other appraisal and are invalid if they are so used. Unless otherwise specifically indicated, the cost approach value is not an insurance value, and should not be used as such.
5. The appraiser has noted in the appraisal report any adverse conditions (including, but not limited to, needed repairs, depreciation, the presence of hazardous wastes, toxic substances, etc.) observed during the inspection of the subject property, or that he or she became aware of during the normal research involved in performing the appraisal. Unless otherwise stated in the appraisal report, the appraiser has no knowledge of any hidden or unapparent conditions of the property, or adverse environmental conditions (including, but not limited to, the presence of hazardous wastes, toxic substances, etc.) that would make the property more or less valuable, and has assumed that there are no such conditions and makes no guarantees or warranties, expressed or implied, regarding the condition of the property. The appraiser will not be responsible for any such conditions that do exist or for any engineering or testing that might be required to discover whether such conditions exist. Because the appraiser is not an expert in the field of environmental hazards, the appraisal report must not be considered as an environmental assessment of the property.
6. The appraiser obtained the information, estimates, and opinions that were expressed in the appraisal report from sources that he or she considers to be reliable and believes them to be true and correct. The appraiser does not assume responsibility for the accuracy of such items that were furnished by other parties. All information furnished regarding rental rates, lease terms, or projections of income and expense is from sources deemed reliable. No warranty or representation is made as to the accuracy thereof.
7. The appraiser will not disclose the contents of the appraisal report except as provided for in the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice, and any applicable federal, state, or local laws. The information contained in this report is specific to the needs of the client and for the intended use stated in this report. The appraiser is not responsible for any unauthorized use of this report.
8. If this appraisal is indicated as subject to satisfactory completion, repairs, or alterations, the appraiser has based his or her appraisal report and valuation conclusion on the assumption that completion of the improvements will be performed in a workmanlike manner.
9. An appraiser's client is the party (or parties) who engage an appraiser in a specific assignment. Any other party acquiring this report from the client does not become a party to the appraiser-client relationship. Any persons receiving this appraisal report because of disclosure requirements applicable to the appraiser's client do not become intended users of this report unless specifically identified by the client at the time of the assignment.
10. The appraiser's written consent and approval must be obtained before this appraisal report can be conveyed by anyone to the public, through advertising, public relations, news, sales, or by means of any other media, or by its inclusion in a private or public database.
11. An appraisal of real property is not a 'property inspection' and should not be construed as such. As part of the valuation process, the appraiser performs a non-invasive visual inventory that is not intended to reveal defects or detrimental conditions that are not readily apparent. The presence of such conditions or defects could adversely affect the appraiser's opinion of value. Clients with concerns about such potential negative factors are encouraged to engage the appropriate type of expert to investigate.
12. Values for various components of the subject parcel and improvements or the value derived by one or two approaches to value as contained within this report are valid only when making a summation or final opinion of value and are not to be used independently for any purpose and must be considered invalid if so used. A separate report on only a part of a whole property, particularly if the reported value exceeds the value that would be derived if the property were considered separately as a whole, must be stated as a fractional report. 14. Forecasts of effective demand for the highest and best use or the best fitting and most appropriate use were based on the best available data concerning the market and are subject to conditions of economic uncertainty about the future.

## APPRAISER'S CERTIFICATION:

I certify that, to the best of my knowledge and belief:

1. The statements of fact contained in this report are true and correct.
2. The credibility of this report, for the stated use by the stated user(s), of the reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions are limited only by the reported assumptions and limiting conditions, and are my personal, impartial, and unbiased professional analyses, opinions, and conclusions.
3. I have no present or prospective interest in the property that is the subject of this report and no personal interest with respect to the parties involved.
4. I have no bias with respect to the property that is the subject of this report or to the parties involved with this assignment.
5. My engagement in this assignment was not contingent upon developing or reporting predetermined results.
6. My compensation for completing this assignment is not contingent upon the development or reporting of a predetermined value or direction in value that favors the cause of the client, the amount of the value opinion, the attainment of a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event directly related to the intended use of this appraisal.
7. My analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, in conformity with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice that were in effect at the time this report was prepared.
8. I did not base, either partially or completely, my analysis and/or the opinion of value in the appraisal report on the race, color, religion, sex, handicap, familial status, or national origin of either the prospective owners or occupants of the subject property, or of the present owners or occupants of the properties in the vicinity of the subject property.
9. Unless otherwise indicated, I have made a personal inspection of the property that is the subject of this report.
10. Unless otherwise indicated, no one provided significant real property appraisal assistance to the person(s) signing this certification.
11. All conclusions and opinions concerning the real estate that are set forth in this report were prepared by the Appraiser(s), whose signature(s) appears on this report. No change of any item in this report shall be made by anyone other than the Appraiser, and the Appraiser shall have no responsibility for any such unauthorized change.

In compliance with the 2014-2015 Revisions to the USPAP Ethics Rule, unless otherwise noted I have performed no prior service, as an appraiser, regarding the property that is the subject of this report within the three year period immediately preceding acceptance of this assignment.

SUPERVISORY APPRAISER'S CERTIFICATION: If a supervisory appraiser signed the appraisal report, he or she certifies and agrees that: I directly supervised the appraiser who prepared the appraisal report, have reviewed the appraisal report, agree with the statements and conclusions of the appraiser, agree to be bound by the appraiser's certifications numbered 3 through 8 above, and am taking full responsibility for the appraisal and the appraisal report.

## ADDRESS OF PROPERTY APPRAISED: 00 S . e r

## APPRAISER:

Signature:


SUPERVISORY APPRAISER (if required):
Signature: $\qquad$
Name:
Date Signed:
State Certification \#: $\qquad$
or State License \#: $\qquad$
State:
Expiration Date of Certification or License: $\qquad$

## HAZARDOUS SUBSTANCES STATEMENT

Unless otherwise noted in this report, the existence of hazardous substances, including without limitation asbestos, polychlorinated biphenyls, petroleum leakage or agricultural chemicals, which may or may not be present on the property, or other environmental conditions, were not called to the attention of nor did the appraiser become aware of such during the appraiser's inspection. The appraiser has no knowledge of the existence of such materials on or in the property unless otherwise stated. The appraiser, however, is not qualified to test such substances or conditions. If the presence of such substances. such as asbestos, urea formaldehyde foam insulation, or other hazardous substances or environmental conditions affect the value of the property, the value estimate is predicated on the assumption that there is no such condition on or in the property or in such proximity thereto that it would cause a loss in value. No responsibility is assumed for any such conditions, or for any expertise or engineering knowledge required to discover them.

## Boam \& Associates <br> REAL ESTATE APPRAISALS

1820 E 17th Street Suite 230
Idaho Falls, ID 83404
Phone (208) 528-9200
Fax (208) 528-9204
Email: valuationfinder@gmail.com

# QUALIFICATIONS OF THE APPRAISER 

## Curtis J. Boam

Idaho State Certified Appraiser, \#CGA-51

## Appraisal Experience

Curtis J. Boam \& Associates, Owner/Appraiser- march 88 to Present;
Eastern Idaho Appraisal Service, Associate/Appraiser- May 88 to December 92;
England, Boam \& Associates, Partner/Appraiser- June 84 to March 88;
Bingham county assessor's office, Staff Appraiser- Sept 80 to May 90;
VA, FHA, HUD Certified
Residential, Agricultural, Commercial and Industrial Properties

## Education

Education Requirements have been met each year starting with 1988 through 2020. Most recent courses in the past 5 years include:

Relocation Appraisal and the New ERC Form- August 2014, The Nuts and Bolts of Green Building for Appraisers (With Audio and Video)- September 2014, Appraisal for Self- Storage Facilities- October 2014, Appraisal of Assisted Living Facilities- March 2015, The New FHA Handbook 4000.1- July 2015, Code of Ethics (Teton Board of Realtors)- October 2015, Online Business Practices and Ethics- October 2015, Various other mapping, appraisal and financial seminars, 2016-2017 7 hour National USPAP Update Course- October 2016, Understanding Residential Construction- May 2016, Th Nuts and Bolts of Green Building and Appraisers (With Audio and Video)- September 2017, Supporting Your Adjustments: Methods for Residential Appraisers- December 2017, Land and Site Valuation- march 2018, Manufactured Home Appraisal- January 2020, The Fundamentals of Appraising Luxury Homes- January 2020, 7 Hour National USPAP Update Course- May 2020.

## MAJOR CLIENTS

Heartland Real Estate, Way Out West Realty, Blackfoot Real Estate, A Dream Away Realty, Robie Real Estate, Veterans Administration, HUD/FHA, Fannie Mae, Mountain West Realty, Bank of Commerce, US Bank, Bank of Idaho, Wells Fargo bank, USDA, Farm Credit Services, Rels, Valuation, ValueNet, Ireland Bank, Summit National Bank. Connections Credit Union and various institutions.


#### Abstract

AFFILIATIONS Snake River Regional MLS (Idaho Falls/Blackfoot), Upper Valley Board of Realtors. Pocatello Board of Realtors and MLS, Teton Board of Realtors, and MLS (Jackson, WY), Eastern Idaho Chapter of Farm Managers and Rural Appraisers, National Association of Real Estate Appraisers, C.R.E.A, C.C.R.A and C.V.C. Destination's, Practicing Affiliate of the Appraisal Institute, Salmon River Board of Realtors.


## REFERENCES

| Clayton Case | $208-244-8987$ | Bank |
| :--- | :---: | :--- |
| Karen Cameron | $208-558-7354$ | Realtor |
| Greg Kelley | $208-529-5058$ | Appraiser |

## LIMITING CONDITIONS

1- The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) became effective January 26, 1992. I have not made a specific compliance survey and analysis of this property to determine whether or not the subject property is in conformity with the various detailed requirements of the ADA. It is possible that a compliance survey of the property together with a detailed analysis of the requirements of the ADA could reveal that the property is not in compliance with one or more of the requirements of the act. If so, this fact could have a negative effect upon the value of the property. Since I have no direct evidence relating to this issue, I did not consider possible noncompliance with the requirements of ADA in estimating the value of the property.

2- By this notice, all persons, companies, or corporations using or relying on this report in any manner bind themselves to accept these Contingent and Limiting conditions, and all other contingent and limiting conditions contained elsewhere in this report. Do not use any portion of this report unless you fully accept all Contingent and Limiting conditions contained throughout this document.

3- The "Subject" of "Subject Property" refers to the real property that is the subject of this report. An Appraiser is defined as an individual person who is licensed to prepare real estate appraisal-related services in the State of Idaho and affixes his signature to this document

4- These contingent and Limiting Conditions are an integral part of this report along with all certifications, definitions, descriptions, facts, statements, assumptions, disclosures, hypotheses, analyses and opinions.

5- All contents of this report are prepared solely for the explicitly identified client and other explicitly identified intended users. The liability of the Appraiser is limited solely to the client. There is no accountability, obligation, or liability to any other third party. Other intended users may read but not reply on this report. The Appraiser's maximum liability relating to services rendered under this engagement (regardless of form of action, whether in contract, negligence or otherwise) is limited to the fee paid to Boam and Associates Appraisal Company for that portion of their services, or work product giving rise to liability. In no event shall the Appraiser b liable for consequential, special, incidental or punitive loss, damages or expense (including without limitation, lost profits, opportunity costs, etc.) even if advised of their possible existence. If this report is placed in the hands of anyone other than the client, the client shall make such party aware of all contingent and limiting conditions, assumptions, and disclosures. Use of this report by third parties shall be solely at the risk of the third party.

6- This document communicates the results of an appraisal assignment. This communication is not an inspection, engineering, construction, legal, or architectural report. It is not an examination or survey of any kind. Expertise in these areas is not implied. The Appraiser is not responsible for any costs incurred to discover, or correct any deficiency in the property.

7- As part of this appraisal, information was gathered and analyzed to form opinion(s) that pertain solely to one or more explicitly identified effective value dates. The effective value date is the only point in time that the value applies. Information about the subject property, neighborhood, comparables, or other topics discussed in this report was obtained from sensible sources. In accordance with the extent of research all information cited herein was examined for accuracy, is believed to be reliable, and is assumed reasonably accurate. However, no guaranties or warranties are made for this information. No liability or responsibility is assumed for any inaccuracy which is outside the control of the Appraiser, beyond the scope of work, or outside reasonable due diligence of the Appraiser.

8- Real estate values are affected by many changing factors. Therefore, any value opinion expressed herein is considered credible only on the effective value date. Every day that passes thereafter, the degree of credibility wanes as the subject changes physically. the economy changes, or market conditions change. The Appraiser reserves the right to amend these analyses and/or value opinion(s) contained within this appraisal report if erroneous, or more factual-information is subsequently discovered. No guarantee is made for the accuracy of estimates or opinions furnished by others, and relied upon in this request.

9- In the case of limited partnerships, syndication offerings, or stock offerings in the real estate, the client agrees that in case of lawsuit (brought by the lender, partner, or part owner in any form of ownership, tenant, or any other party ), the client will hold Boam and Associates Appraisal Company completely harmless. Acceptance of, and/or use of this report by the client, or any third party is prima facie evidence that the user understands and agrees to all these conditions.

10- Unless specifically stated otherwise herein, the Appraiser is unaware of any engineering study made to determine the bearing capacity of the subject land or nearby lands. Improvements in the vicinity, if any, appear to be structurally sound. It is assumed soil and subsoil conditions are stable and features that cause supernormal costs to arise. It is also assumed existing soil conditions of the subject land have proper load bearing qualities to support the existing improvements, or proposed improvements appropriate for the site. No investigation for potential seismic hazards were made. This appraisal assumes there are no conditions of the site, subsoil, or structures, whether latent, patent, or concealed that would render the subject property less valuable. Unless specifically stated otherwise in this document, no earthquake compliance report, engineering report, flood zone analysis, hazardous substance determination, or analysis of these unfavorable attributes was made, or ordered in conjunction with this appraisal report. The client is strongly urged to retain experts in these fields, if so desired.

11- If this appraisal values the subject as though construction, repairs, alterations, remodeling, renovation, or rehabilitation will be completed in the future, then it is assumed such work will be completed work is assumed completed in substantial conformance with plans, specifications, descriptions, or attachments made referred to herein. It is also assumed all planned, in-progress, or recently completed construction complies with the zoning ordinance, and all applicable building codes. A prospective value opinion has an effective value date that is beyond or in the future relative to this report's preparation date. If this appraisal includes a prospective valuation, it is understood and agreed the Appraiser is not responsible for an unfavorable value effect caused by unforeseeable events that occur before completion of the project.

12- Electric, heating, cooling, plumbing, water supply, sewer or septic, mechanical equipment, and other property systems were not tested. No determination was made regarding the operability, capacity, or remaining physical life of any component in, on, or under the real estate appraised. All building components are assumed adequate and in good working order unless stated otherwise. Private water wells and private septic systems are assumed sufficient to comply with federal, state, or local health safety standards. No liability is assumed for the soundness of structural members since structural elements were not tested or studied to determine their structural integrity. The rood cover for all structures is assumed water tight unless otherwise noted. This document is not an inspection, engineering or architectural report. If the client has a concern regarding structural, mechanical, or protective components of the improvements, or the adequacy or quality of sewer, water or other utilities, the client should hire an expert in the appropriate discipline before relying upon this report. No warranties or guarantees of any kind are expressed or implied regarding the current or future physical condition or operability of any property component.

13- The allocation of value between the subjects land and improvements, if any, represents our judgment only under the existing use of the property. A re-evaluation should be made if the improvements are removed, substantially altered, or the land is utilized for another purpose.

14- The Client and all intended users agree to all the following (A) This appraisal does not serve as a warranty on the physical condition or operability of the property appraised. (B) All users of this report should take all necessary precautions before making any significant financial commitments to or for the subject. (C) Any estimate for repair or alterations is a non-warranted opinion of the Appraiser.

15- No liability is assumed for matters of legal nature that affect the value of the subject property. Unless a clear statement to the contrary is made in this report, value opinions) formed herein are predicated upon the following assumptions. (A) The real property is appraised as though, and assumed free from all value impairments including yet not limited to title defects, liens, encumbrances, title claims, boundary discrepancies, encroachments, adverse easements, environmental hazards, pest infestation, leases, and atypical physical deficiencies. (B) All real estate taxes and assessments, of any type are assumed fully paid. (C0 It is assumed ownership of the property appraised is lawful. (D) It is also assumed the subject property is operated under competent and prudent management. (E) The subject property was appraised as though and assumed free of indebtedness. (F) The subject real estate is assumed fully compliant with all applicable federal, state, and local environmental regulations and laws. (G) The subject is assumed fully compliant with all applicable zoning ordinances, building codes, use regulations, and restrictions of all types. (H) All licenses, consents, permits, or other documentation required by any relevant legislative or governmental authority, private entity, or organization have been obtained, or can be easily obtained or renewed for a nominal fee.

ADDENDUM



| Borrower |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Property Address | 600 S BOULEVARD |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cify | IDAHO FALLS | Courty | Bonneville | State | ID | 2ip Code | 83402 |
| Lender Client |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |



## Comparable 1

[^0]Comparable 2
375 Castlerock Lane
Prox to Subject
Sale Price
Gross Living Area
Total Rooms
Total Bedrooms
Total Bathrooms
Location
View
Site
Quality
Age

Comparable 3
762 Vassar Way
Prox. to Subject
Sale Price
Gross Living Area
Total Rooms
Total Bedrooms
Total Bathrooms
Location
View
Site
Quality
Age

## Comparable Photo Page

| Borrower |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Property Address | 600 S BOULEVARD |  |  |  |  |
| Cay | IDAHO FALLS | Courty | Bonneville | State | ID |
| Lender Client |  |  |  | IpCode | 83402 |



## Comparable 4

690 CAMBRIDGE DR
Prox. to Subject
Sale Price
Gross Living Area
Total Rooms
Total Bedrooms
Total Bathrooms
Location
View
Site
Quality
Age


Comparable 5
1409 BENTON ST
Prox to Subject
Sale Price
Gross Living Area
Total Rooms
Total Bedrooms
Total Bathrooms
Location
View
Site
Quality
Age

## Comparable 6

Prox. to Subject
Sale Price
Gross Living Area
Total Rooms
Total Bedrooms
Total Bathrooms
Location
View
Site
Quality
Age


Telephone: (208) 523-6918

# G \& S Structural Engineers 

505 Lindsay Boulevard<br>Idaho Falls, ID 83402

E-mail: gs@gsengineers.net
Fax: (208) 523-6922
February 23, 2022
\#22031
Mr. Alan Muir
Building Maintenance Superintendent
City of Idaho Falls Building Maintenance Division
PO Box 50220
Idaho Falls, ID 83405
Re: 600 S Boulevard
Idaho Falls, Idaho
Dear Mr. Muir,

I had the opportunity to meet with you at the above referenced building on February 22, 2022. The purpose of the meeting was to visually observe the structure of the building with respect to its structural integrity. The following is a brief report of my observations and conclusions.

I had previously reviewed this building in August of 2012 per the request of Mr. Reginald Fuller, the building official for the Idaho Falls Building Department. The report is enclosed for your reference. This second visit provided the opportunity to visually observe the building again to determine if the previous report is still valid. It was found that in regards to the structure, the previous report is still valid as no repairs or structural alterations have occurred since that report. The only exception being the addition of an independent exterior ramp to access the main level and an interior overbuild ramp to access one of the main level restrooms. Other exceptions are areas of increased damage; those are as follows:

- The southern and eastern basement walls are showing signs of deterioration and water leakage that were not observed in 2012. The basement may need to be waterproofed as some signs of water flooding/damage had also been noted in 2012. But the overall appearance of the potential damage has increased.
- The ceiling in the main central room on the main level consists of fibrous type tiles attached directly to the original ceiling. These tiles are starting to sag, tear and separate from each other and the original ceiling. The condition of the original ceiling was not verified but is anticipated to be heavily cracked due to the age of the plaster and it having been covered sometime in the distant past.
- The main level windows on the south wall shows signs of water leakage under the window sill and down the interior face of the wall. The wall below the window could have internal deterioration/rot from this water intrusion.
- There were extensive ice dams on the northern side of the roof. This is a result of heating a building with an uninsulated roof. The heat loss melts the snow and it then refreezes at the cold overhangs. Ice dams tend to destroy roofing materials (shingles) and promotes water to leak into the attic space, eaves and supporting exterior walls.

The building as a whole has not structurally changed. The recommendations from the 2012 report remains and a few new ones can be added:

- Most importantly, no insulation should be added to the attic without first reinforcing the roof. Reinforcing the roof will not be an easy nor inexpensive task.
- The main level ceiling needs to be totally redone. This would occur along with the roof framing reinforcing as all of the ceiling would ultimately be removed to accomplish reinforcing the roof properly.
- Correct/repair the below grade windows that have been improperly abandoned and partially buried.
- Correct/repair the deteriorating/leaking concrete basement foundation walls.
- Correct/repair the main level leaking windows.
- Correct/repair the broken-out window in the alley. During our visit this window was found and felt to be freshly broken. From "Google Maps; Street View" the window can be seen to be broken in August of 2021 and appears to be covered with cardboard. As a result of this photo, it is felt that the cardboard, that was being used to block the window, was most likely just replaced with new cardboard. There were however, signs of recent trespassers. Recent cosmetic damage inside the building was also observed.
- The roof shingles should be evaluated as their remaining long term life expectancy is suspect.
- Investigate/evaluate the potential water damage to the exterior walls due to the leaking windows and roof ice dams.

Once all the structural corrections are completed the building will be structurally sound but the building will still be in poor architectural condition for any commercial business. The floor plan layout and the multiple levels across the main floor level makes it difficult to have any fully ADA compliant building. The basement is only accessible via stairs and there are multiple levels within the basement space as well. To make this building fully ADA compliant, repair the structure, upgrade/replace the electrical, upgrade/replace the mechanical and replace the plumbing will prove to be cost prohibitive and/or unfeasible given the overall size and location of the property. To make this building compliant for
residential use will still have all the same requirements/issues, except for the ADA concerns. Should also be noted that considering the buildings age, the existence of asbestos somewhere, is likely.

The visit consisted of visual observations only made solely to look at the structure of the building to determine the buildings overall structural condition and compare it against the previous observations from my 2012 report. Neither the visit nor this report is intended to warrant the structure of the building, nor is it intended to formally review or comment on any other aspects of the building including electrical, mechanical or plumbing. Properly licensed people or firms should be consulted for opinions on items beyond the structure. Due to limited access through the wall and ceiling finishes some assumptions were made regarding the construction and the respective condition of the components. Due to the limited involvement of G\&S Structural Engineers and the lack of control over the necessary repairs, G\&S Structural Engineers is limiting their liability to fees rendered.

If you have any questions, or if I can be of further assistance, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Sincerely,


Mark D. Andrus, PE
Encl.: 2012 Serenity Hall report


Telephone: (208) 523-6918

G \& S Structural Engineers
1600 John Adams Parkway
Suite 200
Idaho Falls, ID 83401
E-mail: gs@gsengineers.net
Fax: (208) 523-6922

Mr. Reginald Fuller<br>City of Idaho Falls Building Department<br>680 Park Ave<br>Idaho Falls, ID 83405

Re: Serenity Hall
Idaho Falls, Idaho
Dear Mr. Fuller,
On the $16^{\text {th }}$ of August I had the opportunity to visit the above reference building. The purpose of my visit was to visually look at the overall condition of the structure to determine the building's current structural integrity. The following is a brief report of my observations and conclusions.

The building measures roughly 32 feet by approximately 68 feet and is constructed of wood stud walls, a wood framed roof, a wood framed floor and a concrete basement foundation. The building consists of an original section and an addition expanding the space towards the west. The original building was reported to have been constructed in 1916 and was originally used as a church. It is unknown when the addition was added.

The overall structural condition of the building appears to be decent when observing the exterior finishes and the wall and ceiling finishes in the main and the basement levels. There are cracks in the finishes around the exterior and within the building but the number and magnitude of cracks would not be considered excessive for a building that is almost 100 years old.

The basement walls appear to be performing as intended without much deterioration. There are signs of water flooding sometime in the past but the basement was dry at the time of my visit. The basement windows and sills do need some attention. The windows have been either totally covered or partially covered so that visual observation of their total condition can not be made. The exterior grade around the building was covered with concrete and during the process the bottom of the windows and sills were covered with concrete as well. The concrete being directly against the glass and wood sills will promote rot and water leaks.

The main level floor framing system in the addition area could not be determined due to the
basement being fully finished. The main level floor framing system in the original construction is $2 \times 12$ wood joists spaced at 16 " centers bearing on the exterior walls and two beam and column lines. The live load capacity of the original floor joists is approximately 100 psf . The actual size and construction of the beams supporting the joists could not be accurately verified but with some assumptions of the beam construction, the live load capacity is estimated at 65 psf. This loading is equivalent to today's standard for an office building. I would expect the addition area to have a similar capacity, but as stated the actual framing could not be verified.

The roof framing over the addition could not be adequately accessed to determine the roof framing and thus the roof's snow load capacity but from observations in and out of the building, the roof over the addition appears to be performing as intended.

The roof framing over the original construction consists of site built wood trusses. The capacity of the members ( $2 \times 6$ 's) used to construct the trusses are sized such that their snow load capacity is $89 \%$ of the minimum 30 psf required, resulting in a capacity of approximately 27 psf . The capacity of the connections between the individual members is the weak link of the truss. The connections all consist of a single bolt through the overlapping members; however, the different connections within the truss must resist differing magnitude of force. As a result some connections can support approximately $80 \%$ of the required snow load where others can only support the weight of the truss itself.

There was limited visual verification of the trusses. The trusses that could be seen were next to the addition that was added to the west end and appear to be in very good condition. The center and east portions of the building can be noted to have the same truss construction but the condition of the individual trusses could not be seen due to the limited access. From observing the roof from the exterior of the building a slight sag in the ridge line and a "belly" can be seen in the roof towards the east end. This may simply be the result of both drifting snow and shading of the roof from a pine tree located at the south east corner.

The attic space contains no insulation which has helped to keep the snow accumulation down. The trusses are most likely performing as well as they are due to this lack of snow accumulation and through load sharing of the truss members to connections with more strength. The roof has also had OSB sheathing added in the past helping the trusses act together and creating a diaphragm to help resist the potential seismic and wind loads.

The overall structural condition of the building appears to performing as intended and has a good history of performance but numerically the roof does have areas that are insufficient. It should be noted however that this is generally the case when evaluating an older building. Due the nature of the construction some retrofitting of the structure could be accomplished to increase the capacity of the roof if desired. The easiest retrofit of additional structure would be to add two beams at the ceiling of the original building spanning east to west. No additional insulation should be added to the building without some structural upgrades.

The visit consisted of visual observations only made solely to look at the structure of the building to determine the buildings overall structural condition. Only limited load capacity calculations or member design verifications were done. Neither the visit nor this report is intended to warrant the structure of the building; nor is it intended to cover any other aspects of the building including electrical, mechanical or architectural features. Due to limited access through the wall and ceiling finishes some assumptions were made regarding the construction and the respective condition of the structure. Due to the limited involvement of G\&S Structural Engineers and the lack of control regarding the use, repair and maintenance of the building, G\&S Structural Engineers is limiting their liability equal to the fees rendered.

If you have any questions or if I can be of further assistance please do not hesitate to contact me.
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## I. Introduction

## Project Location

Holmes Avenue is designated as a principal arterial, running north and south through the City of Idaho Falls and through Bonneville County. The road continues south of the city limits as a principal arterial into Bonneville County at which point it becomes known as $5^{\text {th }}$ East. Though not part of this project, the road also continues north of Northgate Mile as part of the US-20 Business Loop. The road continues north of US-20 into Bonneville County and again becomes known as $5^{\text {th }}$ East (Lewisville Hwy). The limits of this project are from $65^{\text {th }}$ South to Northgate Mile (US 26).

From $65^{\text {th }}$ South to Sunnyside Road, the roadway has rural characteristics, with two $14^{\prime}$ lanes, one northbound and one southbound, with no shoulders and no subsurface drainage or pedestrian facilities. Although rural, several residential developments have been built adjacent to the roadway, and as required, upgraded Holmes with curb and gutter, drainage facilities, and sidewalks or shared use pathways.

The section from Sunnyside Road to Northgate Mile is urban and consists of either 3, 4, or 5 travel lanes. There is no on-street parking except for short-term parking in front of Idaho Falls High School. The southern end of this urban section has received more recent roadway improvements than the northern section, including shared-use paths, and wider lanes; however, improvements could be made to both sections to improve safety and mobility.
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Figure 1 shows the limits of the project and the major cross streets.


Figure 1 - Holmes Ave., 65th South to Northgate Mile.

## Annual Average Daily Traffic

Figure 2 shows the Annual Average Daily Traffic (AADT) of Holmes Avenue and the major crossing streets. The roadway handles traffic volumes between 2000 and 13,500 vehicles per day.

The volumes in the southern rural half of the project are relatively low and are handled using a simple two-lane roadway, with stopcontrolled intersections.

The volumes in the northern urban half of the project are considerably higher and are accommodated by three, four, or five lanes of travel and signalized intersections.

An in-depth study of the traffic volumes, specifically looking at hourly counts, weekday/weekend traffic, and seasonal change, may reveal the varying use of each section.


Figure 2 - Annual Average Daily Traffic for Holmes Avenue and Major Cross Streets

## Crash Data

Figure 3 contains a map showing the crash data with an underlying heat map. The color of each crash represents the severity of the crash. This data represents 5 years from 2015 through 2019 and consists of 73 injury crashes and 124 Property-Damage-Only crashes. For a total of 197 crashes. Although there were no fatal crashes within this time frame, a crash occurred in October of 2020, resulting in the death of three individuals.

The types of crashes that occurred were mostly multi-vehicle in nature, with 90 Rear-end, 72 Angle, and 12 Sideswipe. Only 6 crashes involved pedestrians or bicycles, however these types of crashes usually result in significant injury.

Of the 197 total crashes on Holmes Avenue, $27 \%$ of the crashes resulted in injury with $4 \%$ resulting in severe injury. $78 \%$ of the crashes occurred during the daytime, and $78 \%$ of the crashes occurred on dry surface conditions.

The intersection crash rates range from 0.27 crashes per million vehicles entering (MVE) at $1^{\text {st }}$ Street, to 1.66 crashes per million vehicles entering at $49^{\text {th }}$. Except for 49 th , all the crash rates were below 1.00 MVE.


Figure 3 - Crash Data from 2015-2019

The crash data is included in Appendix A.

## Access Points

Many of the crashes that involve multiple vehicles occur at intersection conflict points. A typical four-legged intersection contains 32 conflict points with 16 crossing, 8 diverging, and 8 merging conflicts. Proper access control and planning can significantly affect the exposure to both motorist and pedestrians by limiting the number of conflict points on a corridor.

Figure 4 shows all the access points with an underlying heat map of the density. The color of each access point represents the type of access, ranging from residential, commercial, farm field, public, or alley.

On Holmes Avenue, there are a total of 220 access points, however, 129 of those access points are from $17^{\text {th }}$ Street to Northgate Mile. Thus, from $65^{\text {th }}$ South to $17^{\text {th }}$ Street, the access density is about 15 access points per mile per side, and the average spacing is approximately 355'. The access density from $17^{\text {th }}$ Street to Northgate Mile is about 40 access per mile per side, and an average spacing of 130 '.


Figure 4 - Access points

## II. Road Safety Audit

## RSA Team

The Road Safety Audit Team was organized from a number of industry professionals with various levels of expertise. A special mention of gratitude to the local agencies and their employees that allowed these team members to participate in this Road Safety Audit. Without them, many of the ideas and solutions would not have been recognized.

The team members that were able to participate are below:
Ben Burke, Horrocks
Mike McKee, Horrocks
DaNiel Jose, BMPO
Dave Walrath, Jefferson County
Tracy Bono, City of Ammon
Bruce Scholes, Idaho Falls Power
Amanda LaMott, LHTAC
Rachel Telford, ITD


Figure 5-RSA Team at Holmes and 49th

## Kickoff Meeting

Horrocks Engineers hosted a kick-off meeting prior to the field review to acquaint the team with the corridor. In attendance, along with the field review team, were Chris Canfield from the City of Idaho Falls and Lance Bates from Bonneville County. Also attending virtually via MS Teams from the City of Idaho Falls were Kent Fugal, Syeda Aziz, and Bruce Lawrence.
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Horrocks provided the traffic volume data, crash data, and access points to the team members. Some minor analysis was completed, and specific areas of concern were discussed. Chris Canfield explained the reasons why the city is concerned about this route and why they chose to complete this Road Safety Audit. Some of these reasons include the severe crashes at 49th South, High School Students crossing Holmes to the seminary building, and the increase in traffic volumes.

## Field Review

The Road Safety Audit (RSA) field review was conducted on Wednesday September 29 ${ }^{\text {th }}, 2021$. The team began at 10:00 AM at the intersection on $65^{\text {th }}$ South and continued north toward $49^{\text {th }}$ South and Sunnyside Road. After reviewing the intersection of Sunnyside Road, the Team broke for lunch and returned in the afternoon, to finish the field review from Sunnyside Road to Northgate Mile. Before returning for the day, the team split up into two sections to review the school zones for Taylorview Middle school between 49 th South and Sunnyside Road, and Idaho Falls High School between $17^{\text {th }}$ Street and $1^{\text {st }}$ Street. This allowed the team to observe the exodus of the students, parents, and busses.

After the day review, the team returned at 7:30 PM to review the corridor after sunset. The team drove both northbound and southbound through the corridor to observe the nighttime conditions.

After the field review, all the comments, photos, ideas, and concerns were gathered from the team for preparation of the report out meeting to the city and county and for the final report.

## Report Out Meeting

On Thursday, September 30 th , the team re-assembled at 10:00 AM to review the draft prestation and then the presented to the City and County Staff at 11:00 AM. See Appendix 1 to see the presentation slides.

## III. General Recommendations

## What is working

The team observe many aspects of the corridor that were performing well. These included:

- Pavement Markings
- Signal Timing
- Lighting in the Urban Area
- Flashing Stop and Stop Ahead Signs
- Pavement Conditions
- Sunnyside Intersection
- Completed Pathways


## Overall Concerns

Many of the overall concerns revolved around ADA and Pedestrian Facilities, Intersection Sight Distance, and Clear Zone.

## Pedestrian Facilities and ADA Compliance

The newest sidewalks and pathways were for the most part ADA compliant; however, the older or dated sidewalks were narrow, and were lacking some of the basic ADA features such as Landings, Detectible Domes, and Ramp Slopes. Also, some of the existing sidewalks have shifted, causing tripping hazards. The older sidewalks were also not adjusted for the driveway curb cuts, and only tipped towards the road to allow vehicle access. Figures $6-8$ show a few of the non-compliant pedestrian facilities.


Figure 6 - Pedestrian Ramp at May St


Figure 7-Driveway Curb Cut near Elva St.


Figure 8 - Pedestrian Ramp at 25th St.

## Intersection Sight Distance

Sight Distance for the public road intersections and some of the subdivision entrances were limited by objects or vegetation. Although the existing sight distances may exceed the minimum standard for a stop or yield controlled intersections, additional vegetation clearing, or object removal/relocation would increase the ability to see approaching vehicles, pedestrians, and bicycles. Figures 9-11 show examples of limited sight distance.


Figure 9-65th South looking East


Figure 10-La Paloma Dr. looking South


Figure 11 - Countryside Lane looking South

## Clear Zone

The roadside areas are convenient locations for canals, ditches, and utility infrastructure; however, they can become a hazard to an errant vehicle. Also, if neglected, vegetation can become more mature and less forgiving to a vehicle that may leave the roadway. Trees, utility poles, and irrigation canals are some of the hazards that the team observed to be not traversable or crash worthy.

Removing or relocating some of these features would be the preferred option to reduce the exposure to the motorist. If removing or relocating the obstacle is not possible, then redesigning the obstacle to be more crash worthy or redirecting errant vehicles using barrier would reduce the severity of the crash. If none of those options are feasible, then adding delineation to the obstruction might be the only counter measure available.

## IV. Site Specific Recommendations

As the team reviewed the corridor, it became clear to organize our recommendations by major intersection and by segments between the intersections. The intersections chosen for specific recommendations were based on the traffic volume of the cross street and intersection type control. Some of the suggestions and recommendations for the lower volume intersections will located within the individual segment. The Specific Site Recommendations will be identified using the nomenclature of Intersection (I) or Segment (S) followed by the intersection or segment number. The following intersections and segments are identified as follows:

## Intersections:

$11-65^{\text {th }}$ South and Holmes
$12-49^{\text {th }}$ South and Holmes
13 - Sunnyside Road and Holmes
$14-17^{\text {th }}$ Street and Holmes
I5 - Northgate Mile and Holmes

## Segments

S1 $-65^{\text {th }}$ South to $49^{\text {th }}$ South
S2 $-49^{\text {th }}$ South to Sunnyside Road
S3 - Sunnyside Road to $17^{\text {th }}$ Street
S4-17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street to Northgate Mile

## Each recommendation will be numbered sequentially for each intersection or segment.

The recommendations that derived from the team also fell into one of three tiers. Tier 1 improvements would include short-term, low-cost tasks that could be accomplished with city or county crews and would require little to no impact to the community. Tier 2 improvements would include moderate cost and time constraints to develop design plans and require advertising and bidding to acquire a contractor to complete the work. Tier 3 improvements would require extensive Right-of-Way acquisition and/or environmental evaluation to proceed to construction and would have a significant impact to public and adjacent landowners.

## Intersection of 65th and Holmes Avenue

This intersection is All-Way Stopped Control and is rural in nature. There are no pedestrian facilities at this intersection or leading up to the intersection. The posted speed limits approaching the intersection from the East is $45 \mathrm{MPH}, 35 \mathrm{MPH}$ from the North, and 50 MPH from the West and South.

## Tier 1 Projects (0-6 Months)

The team observed several small or short-term fixes that could be implemented to improve the safety. They include:

- (I1-1) Replacing all the supplemental "All-Way" plaques that are faded. See Figure 12.
- (I1-2) Replace the missing Speed Limit Sign South of the intersection.


Figure 14-65th South looking East

Tier 2 Projects (6 Months - 3 Years)
The team developed some mid-term projects that could be implemented to increase the safety and mobility of the intersection. They include:

- (I1-4) Adding Right Turn Lanes. See Figure 15.
- (I1-5) Relocating irrigation and telecommunication facilities away from the roadway edge. See Figure 14.
- (I1-6) Flattening the side slopes on the northwest corner of the intersection.
- (I1-7) Adding roadway lighting for the intersection.
- (I1-8) Work with landowners to remove any redundant approaches.


Figure 15-Typical Right Turn Lane

Tier 3 Projects (3+ Years)

As traffic volumes increase, a traffic signal or roundabout could be installed to better control the traffic movements and reduce the intersection related crashes, as shown in Figure 16.

Per the Crash Modification Clearinghouse, the crash reduction factor for installing a roundabout in a rural area suggests a 60\% reduction in crashes.

The team suggests that crash data

Figure 16 - Typical Rural Roundabout
 and Level-of-service calculations be evaluated every few years to determine when the intersection operates below acceptable levels. (I1-9)

Holmes Avenue, $49^{\text {th }}$ to $65^{\text {th }}$

This section of Holmes Avenue is very much a transitional type of roadway, containing variable cross sections between rural and urban areas. Near the southern end, there are two isolated subdivisions with a single access onto Holmes Avenue. Hallmark Estates on the west is relatively new and the development planted grass between the edge of the roadway and the vinyl fence as shown in Figure 17.


Figure 17 - Hallmark Estates looking North

Countryside Lane on the east side has older homes and more established vegetation that encroaches into the roadway Right-of-Way, and at times hangs over the northbound lanes. See Figure 11.


Figure 18 - Belmont Estates (right) and Avalon (left)

Near the north end of this section, two new subdivisions have been developed and provide a wide roadway, with curb, gutter, sidewalks, pathways, planter strips and vegetation. These subivisions are
located inside the City of Idaho Falls and the power poles on the west side have been set back behind the pathway. See Figure 18.

Belmont Estates on the east side has two seperatate accesses to Holmes Avenue. The main entrance is located at La Paloma Drive, with the second located to the north at Sterling Drive. On the west side, La Paloma Drive serves as the only entrance to Avalon subdivision from Holmes Avenue.

## Tier 1 Projects (0-6 Months)

The team drove through the southern section and then exited the vehicle to walk the northern section up to $49^{\text {th }}$ South. They observed some short-term improvements that could increase the safety. They included:

- (S1-1) Trimming vegetation to improve sight distance for those entering the roadway. See Figure 19.
- (S1-2) Relocating or removing the large monument at the entrance to Belmont Estates located at the entrance to La Paloma Drive. Not only does it block the sight distance for vehicles but it also blocks the view of pedestrians and bicyclist crossing north and south on Holmes. It is also a hazard to any errant vehicle. See Figure 20.
- (S1-3) Stop Lines and possible cross walk lines could be installed to prevent encroachment into the crosswalk area.
- (S1-4) The raised island into Bemont Estates at La Paloma Drive and Sterling Drive could be delineated with surface mounted tubular


Figure 19 - Hallmark Estates markers to assist with snow removal and improve the visibility of the raised curbing. See Figure 20 and 21.

- (S1-5) On the northern section trees have been planted between the back of the curb and the sidewalk, and could grow and become a sight distance issue for those turning onto Holmes Avenue. The team suggests that the vegitation should be monitored every few years by trimming the lower branches to ensure the most sight distance possible.


Figure 20 - Median Monument at Belmont Estates


Figure 21 - Median at Sterling Drive

Tier 3 Projects (3+ Years)
The team really liked the sidewalks and pathway near the Belmont Estates and the Avalon Subdivision; however, they end abruptly. See Figure 23 and 24 . The team suggested that the pathway on the west side could be extended south of the Cornerstone Church in front of the farms, homes, and in the vegetated frontage to Hallmark Estates. This would greatly improve the pedestrian access to both subdivisions, the church, and any other subdivision planned along that stretch.


Figure 22 - Belmont Estates (right) and Avalon (left) Subdivisions
Along with the pathway improvement, relocating the power poles on the west side away from the roadway would remove the clear zone hazard that they present.
(S1-6) The team determined that a long-range project could be implemented to extended curb, gutter, and sidewalk south from Belmont Estates and the Avalon Subdivision to Hallmark Estates and Countryside Lane.
(S1-7) The team also suggested that as traffic volumes increase, the built-out section of roadway


Figure 23 - South End of Belmont Estates, looking South could be restriped to five lanes, thus reducing the right-side lateral clearance.
(S1-8) Extending the TwoWay Left Turn Lane through the rest of the section would also provide left turn vehicles a refuge to wait for an appropriate gap. Left turn lanes would help prevent rear-end


Figure 24 - North End of Belmont Estates, looking North crashes.

Along with extending the curb, gutter, and sidewalk to the south, extending it to the north up to $49^{\text {th }}$ South could also improve pedestrian connection to other subdivisions north of 49 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ South. This small section should be included in the intersection build-out project to ensure that a small gap of rural roadway is not left in place.

## Intersection of 49 th and Holmes Avenue

On an early Sunday morning in October 2020, a two-vehicle angle collision occurred at this intersection causing the death of both drivers and one passenger. Law Enforcement determined that a vehicle traveling westbound failed to yield to a southbound vehicle and collided. The two southbound occupants were ejected from the vehicle and the driver of the westbound vehicle was found in his vehicle upside down in the adjacent canal.

At the time of this crash, only the eastbound and westbound vehicles were required to stop. Since the crash, the county has changed the control of the intersection to an All-Way Stop and has installed blinking stop signs and stop ahead signs for this intersection. See Figure 25.

Although the county has made some minor improvements to increase the safety of the intersection, the team has identified a few other counter measures that could help both the


Figure 25 - Blinking Stop Sign at 49th South safety of vehicles and pedestrians.

Tier 1 Projects (0-6 Months)
Some of the short-term improvements that the team mentioned include:

- (I2-1) Adding stop lines for all legs of the intersection.
- (12-2) Trim trees to the east that hinder and limit sight distance. See Figure 26.
- (I2-3) The westbound Stop Ahead Sign was missing and should be replaced.

Tier 3 Projects (3+ Years)


Figure 26-49th South looking Southeast

The team listed a few long-range projects that could be implemented to improve the safety and mobility of the intersection. They include:

- (12-4) Installing a Roundabout or a Traffic Signal. A roundabout could reduce all crashes at the intersection and a traffic signal could reduce angle type crashes. Both should include adding facilities such as sidewalks, pathways, and ADA curb ramps for pedestrians.
- (I2-5) Installing intersection lighting.
- (I2-6) Installing left and right turn lanes.


Figure 27 - Southeast Corner of 49th and Holmes

- (12-7) Work with the landowners to remove redundant access points or better define unrestricted access along the roadway frontage, as shown in Figure 27.


## Holmes Avenue, 49 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ to Sunnyside Road

This segment of Holmes Avenue traverses through mostly developed residential areas with only a few open farms or pastures. However, the roadway cross-section is a rural twolane roadway with no pedestrian facilities. Centered in the middle of this segment is Taylorview Middle School, which does have an active RRFB and crosswalk markings to cross Holmes Avenue to Castlerock Lane. See Figure 28.

The team did observe several vehicles queued up on Castlerock Lane after the schools released in the afternoon; however, it was cleared within 15 minutes. Only 10-15 students used the crosswalk and RRFB to access the east side of the roadway. See Figure


Figure 28 - Taylorview Middle School
29.


Figure 29 - School Crosswalk with RRFB at Taylorview Middle School

Tier 1 Projects (0-6 Months)
The Team noticed several short-term projects that could be implemented by city maintenance crews. They include:

- (S2-1) Tree and Shrub removal and trimming to improve intersection sight distance and to improve visibility of the stop signs. See Figure 30.
- (S2-2) Adding Stop Lines to the approaches from Castlerock Lane.
- (S2-3) Providing ADA curb ramps and other ADA features. See Figures 31 and 32.

During the afternoon school release, the team noticed that motorists rarely complied with the reduced speed limit, even to the point that the team members had to check to ensure that they were working correctly. The team understands that they were installed per the standard, thus they suggested that increased speed enforcement or police presence may be the only option


Figure 30 - Stop Sign Obscured by Tree. to achieve better compliance. (S2-4)


Figure 31 - East RRFB Push Button Location


Figure 32 - West RRFB Push Button Location
Tier 2 Projects (6 Months -3 Years)

During the nighttime field review, the team identified that the intersection near Castlerock Lane was not very visible. Depending on the time of the year or the activities at the school, there is a potential that pedestrians would be using the marked crosswalk at night. The team suggest that adding intersection lighting would, not only increase safety for pedestrians and motorist at night but increase driver and pedestrian comfort when traversing through the intersection. (S2-5) See Figure 33


Figure 33-Castlerock Lane looking West

Tier 3 Projects (3+ Years)


Figure 34 - Power Poles Near Travel Way


Figure 35 - Holmes Ave looking South from Sunnyside Road

With the future build-out of this roadway, the team identified that it should include the relocation of the overhead power lines and conversion of the open irrigation ditch to a pipe system on the west side of the roadway. (S2-6) This will reduce these roadside hazards. See Figure 34 and 35 .

## Intersection of Sunnyside Road and Holmes Avenue

Overall, the team felt that this intersection operates very well, and they only expressed a few improvements that could be implemented to improve safety and mobility. Overall, the intersection lighting was adequate, and the pedestian facilities were present.

Tier 1 Projects (0-6 Months)
The team identified a few short-term projects that could be tasked to city crews to improve safety. They included:

- (I3-1) Refreshing the stop lines and crosswalk markings.
- (I3-2) Relocating the overhead fiber optic cable that hangs in front of the signal faces. See Figure 37.
- (I3-3) Adding a stop sign to the access point just south of the intersection.


Figure 36 - Sunnyside Road and Holmes Avenue


Figure 37 - Fiber Optic Cable in front of Signal Head
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Tier 2 Projects (6 Months - 3 Years)

The team suggested a mid-term project could be programed to reconfigure the ADA ramps so that each corner has two perpendicular ramps oriented closer toward the crosswalk area. (I3-4) The project could also include adding APS push buttons separated by the required distance or use the specific word messages. (I3-5)

## Tier 3 Projects (3+ Years)

The only long-range project that the team identified was to add right turn lanes on all four approaches. (13-6) Right turn lanes would help with the operations of the coordinated signal progression by allowing turning traffic to remove themselves from the platoon. Right turn lanes also proved a safety improvement by reducing rear-end crashes. The CMF Clearing House contains crash reduction factors showing a decrease in rear-end crash between $5 \%$ and $30 \%$.

However, this project would require right-of-way acquisition and reconstruction of the traffic signal. The team suggested that they city continue to monitor the intersection with respect to crashes and traffic operations to identify any further issues or needs as traffic volumes increase and traffic patterns change.

## Holmes Avenue, Sunnyside Road to $17^{\text {th }}$ Street

This segment of Holmes Avenue is five lanes wide with curb, gutter, and sidewalk. Although, this roadway segment is the newest urban roadway section, the RSA team still found areas for improvement.

## Tier 1 Projects (0-6 Months)

The team suggest that the city evaluate the vehicle clearance time for the signal change intervals to ensure they meet the industry standards for perception/reaction times. (S3-1) The pedestrian clearance times should also be evaluated to ensure they meet the correct or MUTCD walking speed

## Tier 2 Projects (6 Months - 3 Years)

The team identified that some of the sidewalk panels or curbing were worn or chipped, specifically near the panel joints. This could cause tripping hazards or make the sidewalk nontraversable by a motorized wheelchair, strollers, or skateboards. The teams suggest that the city research some inexpensive ways to level concrete panels, repair any chips in concrete, grind any protruding panel corners, or replace any panels that otherwise cannot be repaired. (S3-2)

Tier 3 Projects (3+ Years)

The team identified one long-range project that may be included in a future development of the farm field between Sam's Club/Home Depot and $25^{\text {th }}$ Street. When this field is developed, the team suggested that the business access on Holmes Avenue could be restricted to a $3 / 4$ Intersection or Right-In/Right-Out only. (S3-4) Also, when the development occurs, any curb cuts should be removed or upgraded to be ADA Compliant. (S3-3) See Figure 38.


Figure 38 - Driveway Curb Cut

## Intersection of $17^{\text {th }}$ Street and Holmes Avenue

This signalized intersection handles a high volume of motorists, such that the City has programmed the signal controller with some unique phasing to improve operations and decrease delay. This intersection was also evaluated by a previous RSA and many of those recommendations have been implemented or are planned to be implemented over the new few years. These include adding some median curbing to restrict access points to right turns only and upgrading some signal heads with back plates to be more visible at night. Some of the projects listed here may be duplicates. Just this year, a shared-use path was constructed from this intersection to $25^{\text {th }}$ Street along the canal bank on the west side of Holmes Ave.

Tier 1 Projects (0-6 Months)
Below are some of the short-term tasks or projects that could help with the safety and operation of the intersection:

- (14-1) Provide signing for users of the shareduse path to connect to the existing pathway on $16^{\text {th }}$ Street. See Figure 39.
- (14-2) Omit the permissive phase from the left turn (Flashing Yellow) when the conflicting pedestrian call is activated.


Figure 39 - Shared Use Pathway Finding

The team suggested two mid-range projects. The first project would be to add lighting to the top of the existing signal poles to improve nighttime travel for both motorists and pedestrians. (14-3) The second project is to replace some ADA ramps that were damaged or lacked proper landings or slope specifications. (14-4) See Figure 40.


Figure 40 - Signal Mast Arm with No Overhead Lighting

## Tier 3 Projects (3+ Years)

The team identified a long-term project that could include upgrading several geometric features or deficiencies that were observed by the RSA team. Some of these upgrades would be challenging due to the limited Right-of-Way and the presence of the Idaho Canal. The team suggested that this intersection could benefit by adding right turn lanes and adding dual left turn lanes. The team noticed that the southbound thru traffic often blocks motorist from reaching the left turn lanes, such that motorists will drive into the oncoming northbound lane to reach the left turn bays.

One such feature that may not impact right-of-way includes removal of the free-right turn on the northeast corner of the intersection. See Figure 41. These types of turn lanes have shown to have higher frequency of rear-end crashes or collisions with pedestrians trying to reach the refuge island to cross the intersection. By including this turning maneuver into the signalized intersection, pedestrians would not have to cross from the sidewalk to the refuge island.

One final item that the team noticed was that the southbound traffic entering the intersection is required to make a 5-7' shift in the intersection to match into the proper receiving lane. Shifting the lanes over would be difficult with the right-of-way constraints; however, a properly aligned intersection would reduce the occurrences of side-swipe type crashes.


Figure 41-17th and Holmes

## Holmes Avenue, $17^{\text {th }}$ to Northgate Mile

This segment of Holmes Avenue is urban in nature, with curb, gutter, and sidewalk; however, most of these features were constructed before the implementation of proper ADA or without the use of the latest roadway design standards. The distance between the face of gutters is only 44-48 feet, leaving only a few feet on either side for curb, gutter, and sidewalk. Per the city, the Right-of-Way is limited to 60' total width throughout most of this segment.

Idaho Falls High School is located on the east side of Holmes Avenue between $7^{\text {th }}$ Street and $5^{\text {th }}$ Street and many students cross Holmes to get to and from the LDS seminary located on the west side of Holmes Avenue. Central Park and Pinecrest Golf Course are also located on the east side of Holmes Avenue, with the rest of the land use consisting of older residential homes or businesses.

The cross streets of this segment of Holmes Avenue also vary or alternate between oneway and two-way direction and some of the cross streets are purposely offset to discourage east/west travel through the neighborhoods.

In 2010, the city determined that there would be a safety and operational benefit to perform a road diet on this route, reducing the lanes from four to three. At the time, the demand for thru traffic was not as high, and thru motorists benefited by having wider lanes, and a center left turn lane. Pedestrians also benefited by only having to cross three lanes of traffic instead of four. See figure 42.

However, in recent years, traffic volumes have increased, and operation levels have decreased to unacceptable levels.


Figure 42 - Holmes Avenue in 2010

## Tier 1 Projects (0-6 Months)

The team experienced the heavy traffic volumes as they walked from $17^{\text {th }}$ Street up to Lomax, and they specifically observed the intersections near Idaho Falls High School as students were let out for the day. They observed the following short-term solutions that may help with operations and safety:

- (S4-1) Refreshing pavement markings. See Figure 43.
- (S4-2) Replacing signs that no longer have adequate retro-reflectivity.
- (S4-3) Recalculating the signal timing and verifying that the pedestrian clearance times are adequate.
- (S4-4) Re-evaluating the high school bus and student pickup circulation. See Figure 44.
- (S4-5) Adding pedestrian railing along the bus loading area to identify bus limits and prevent jaywalking.


Figure 43 - Faded Pavement Markings


Figure 44 - Idaho Falls High School Bus Loading Zone

## Tier 2 Projects (6 Months -3 Years)

Some of the mid-term projects that the team identified include:

- (S4-6) Replacing aged or broken curb, gutter, and sidewalk.
- (S4-7) Removing any redundant or unused and/or reducing the width of driveway approaches. See Figure 45.
- (S4-8) Replacing the span-wire


Figure 45 - Business That Has Two Approaches signals with new mast-arm poles, proper ADA facilities, and adding left turn phasing. See Figure 46.

- (S4-9) Adding road and pedestrian lighting in front of the High School Bus Loading area.


Figure 46 - Span Wire Signal at John Adams Parkway

Tier 3 Projects (3+ Years)

The team developed several long-range projects that could improve safety and mobility; however, these projects would significantly impact the community and require substantial right-of-way acquisition. These projects also need further analysis to determine their viability.

One suggestion includes closing $7^{\text {th }}$ Street and installing a Cul-de-sac. Many students park in the parking lot south of $7^{\text {th }}$ Street and walk across the roadway to the High School located on the north side of $7^{\text {th }}$ Street. (S4-10) See Figure 47.


Figure 47 - Possible 7th Street Closure


Figure 48-6th Street Intersection
The team also noticed during the afternoon school release that there were several students that crossed at the unsignalized intersection at $6^{\text {th }}$ Street. 6th Street is a T intersection with Holmes Avenue; however, $6^{\text {th }}$ Street lines up directly across from the main entrance into the High School. Although the intersection has painted crosswalks and school crossing signs, the team determined that a HAWK signal or RRFB could be installed at this location. (S4-11) Also, the distance to cross the roadway could be shortened by install sidewalk bulbouts. (S4-12) See Figure 48.

Another idea mentioned by the team was to change Holmes Avenue into a one-way street for northbound traffic and create a couplet roadway network with Higbee Aveune as the one-way for southbound traffic. (S4-13) The complexitites to implementing this plan is extensive, but this has been accomplished in other communities. See Figure 49.

The team also suggested converting Holmes back to a 4-lane roadway with no center turn lane. (S4-14) This suggestion needs to be significantly analyized to ensure the the benefits of the road diet in 2010 are not lost. The conversion of the roadway from a 4-lane section to a 3-lane, substantially reduced crashes, improved mobility, and enhance driver/pedestirain comfort. To maintian these benefits and to meet the existing and future operational needs, restrictions on leftturning or crossing traffic might be required. Traffic Signals may also have to be split phased to allow left turning movments without hindering the through movment.


Figure 50 - Holmes Avenue looking South


Figure 49 - Possible Couplet Configuration

The final major project that the team developed was to acquire the right-of-way to properly construct a 5 -lane facility with wide sidewalks and turn lanes. (S4-15) This, of course, would require a significant right-of-way cost to purchase the needed area. Many of the homes and businesses could be historically significant, or could be considered low-income or minority housing, making it more difficult to acquire. Encroachment onto the park, school, and golf course could also prove to be challenging.

## Intersection of Northgate Mile and Holmes

Northgate Mile is officially named both US-26 and US-20 Business Loop. This intersection of Holmes Avenue is heavily skewed as shown in Figure 51. The intersection was recently upgraded to include new traffic signal cabinets, polarized vehicle heads, and pedestrian indications with push buttons. Along with the signal upgrades, ADA ramps were added or replaced to current standard. The polarized vehicle heads helped by narrowing the viewing angle and the pedestrian facilities now provide proper signal timing to cross both Holmes and Northgate Mile.

Since three of the four legs of this intersection are on the State Highway System, coordination with ITD would be required for any safety improvements or changes to its operations. Thus, the suggestions provided by the RSA Team are to be further evaluated and analyzed to ensure they provide the desired benefits.


Figure 51 - Yellowstone Highway and Holmes Avenue

## Tier 1 Projects (0-6 Months)

The team determined that a short-term project would be to refresh the pavement markings or upgrade the pavement marking to thermoplastic to increase the life span. (15-1)

Because of the width and skew of the intersection, the team suggested that the left turn lanes have dotted line extensions added through the intersection to help motorists as they turn left. (15-2)

Tier 3 Projects (3+ Years)
The team did not develop any mid-term type projects but suggested that some long-term projects could be implemented to improve the operations and safety.

Currently the east/west phasing of the signal is split due to the opposing left turn movements, which conflict with each other. This seems to work fine for the exiting traffic volumes; however, the team suggest that both the City and ITD continue to monitor the intersection's operation. If Level of Service becomes unacceptable, widening this intersection and/or providing left turn lanes that do not overlap could be implemented to remove the need for the split phasing.

Also, because of the skew, left turns for northbound and southbound are prohibited. Currently, there is little demand from motorists for this maneuver as there are much better alternative routes. However, if there are changes to driver behavior or land use, more vehicles may try to make these movements. The team suggest that both ITD and the City continue to monitor this intersection for any changes in vehicle movements or crash rates. If unacceptable behavior develops in the future, the team suggest that enhancing signing or pavement markings could be reconfigured. (15-3) See Figure 52.


Figure 52- Yellowstone Highway looking North
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V. Response to Audit Recommendations

Segment Code: 0004130 Milepost Range: : 0 to 4.60 Counties:Bonneville, Butte,Clark, Custer, Fremonterson,Lemhi, Teton,Madison, Cities:ALL - In City And Rura,
Segment Code Milepost Listing Report

| Acciden | Segment code | mile | Venicte Type | Driver ation | Lane Direction | Unit Trave | Most Harmut vent | Event Relation to ounction | Event Relation To Roal | Contributing cirumstance 1 | Contributing | Contributing | Weather | Surfac | light | \|niuries | Oay | Hour | Serial Number | Accidentioate fit | faunitur | Severity | bated | ${ }_{\text {cturude }}$ | S. |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | ${ }^{4130}$ |  | ${ }_{0}^{0.138 \mathrm{car}}$ | Soingstriaght | Descending |  | Other Post. Pole or Sup | Noojuction | Ripht shulder | $\mathrm{s}^{\text {sick }}$ Seod Too ast for Conditions |  | None |  | $\frac{\text { ory }}{\text { Snow }}$ | Oay |  | ${ }_{\text {l }}^{1 \text { friday }}$ Thussav |  | 1178488390 | (1017720071 |  | ${ }_{1}^{18}$ cinimur Acciident |  | ${ }_{\text {a }}^{4.44107677}$ | -112.0238577 <br> $-11202377^{2}$ |
| ${ }^{2}$ | ${ }_{4}^{430}$ |  | 0.638 Pipkup | Going stright | Dessending |  | Other fied object | $\frac{\text { In intersection }}{\text { In }}$ | Off foadway-loation | Speed Too fast for Conditions | None | None |  | snow | ory |  | $1{ }^{1 \text { Thussay }}$ |  | ${ }^{16648049}$ |  |  | 1 B inury Acadent |  | ${ }^{43,4833222} 4$ | ${ }_{\text {- }}^{-112.0237075}$ |
| ${ }^{3}$ | ${ }_{4}^{430}$ |  | 0.939 car | $\frac{\text { Goins staiaht }}{\text { Coingstaight }}$ | ${ }_{\text {A }}^{\text {Acending }}$ | v | Ange | in inersection | On Rooaway | None | None | None |  |  | Jark, No streetight |  | ,ihussay |  | 18.1850067 | (10/82018 |  | ${ }^{1}$ Properaty Om g Reoort |  | ${ }^{4.4 .453599737}$ | $\frac{-1120.23642828}{-1202628}$ |
|  | ${ }_{4}^{430}$ |  | 0.993 Prickup | Goingstraigh | Ascending |  |  |  |  | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | fropery ${ }^{\text {a mg }}$ |  |  | - |
| 4 | ${ }_{4}^{130}$ |  | 0.995 suv/crossover | Going striaht | stend |  | Angle | In intersection | On Roadway | failed to ober Stop Sign | None | one | ${ }^{\text {clear }}$ | ory | Dav |  | Tuesday |  | 15 C398853 | $5 / 5$ |  | Vomg |  |  |  |
|  | ${ }^{4130}$ |  | 0.995 Van - 1088 seats |  |  | s |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5/5/2015 |  | port |  | 3.45358301 | 6928 |
| 5 | ${ }_{4}^{430}$ |  | 0.995 Prickup | Straight | ding | E |  | tersection | On Roadway | None |  | vone | ${ }_{\text {clear }}$ | ory | Day |  | 2 |  | 15cau3712 |  |  |  |  | 3,45861168 | -112.0238838 |
|  | 4130 |  | 0.995 Pickup | Straibt | ending | ${ }^{\sim}$ | Angle | In intersect |  | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{15 c}$ ca3712 | 87/2015 |  | Accient |  |  |  |
|  | 4130 |  | 0.995 Pickup | in Trafic | Ascending | w | Angle |  | On Roadway | None |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156403712 | 8/72015 |  | Iniur Acident |  | ${ }_{43,45661168}$ | ${ }^{-112.02}$ |
| 6 | ${ }_{4}^{4130}$ |  | 0.995 Pedalcycle | WalkR Ride with Trafic No Bike 1 | Ascending | N | Pealatrcle | In intersection | On Roadway | Failed to vield | None | None | clear | ory | Day |  | 1 Saturday |  | 116434383 | 8/20/2016 |  | C Iniur Accident |  | ${ }^{43,45358962}$ | ${ }^{-112.0236646}$ |
|  | ${ }^{4130}$ |  | 0.995 Van - 1088 seats | Going stright | Ascending | E | Pealacrce | In intersection |  | Failed to vield | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 16643383 | 8/20/2016 |  | 2 Cl ijur A Acident |  | ${ }^{43.45358962}$ | 112.02364 |
| 7 | ${ }^{4130}$ |  | 0.995 Pickup | Goingstright | Ascending |  | Ange | In intersection | On Roadway | Other | None | None | sow | ce | Day |  | 1 Monay |  | 116 ca4240 | ${ }^{11 / 28 / 2016}$ |  | 18.1 mur Accident |  | ${ }^{43,45362078}$ | ${ }^{-112.0236324}$ |
|  | ${ }_{4}^{430}$ |  | 0.995 Suv/Crossover | 6oing striegh | Ascending | N | Angle | In intersection |  | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 116642470 | 11/28/2016 |  | 2 B iniur Accisent |  | ${ }^{43,45362078}$ | -112.0233232 |
| 8 | ${ }_{4}^{430}$ |  | 1 Car | Turning Eight | Ascending | w | Non-Contat Unit | In intersection | On Roadway | Failed to veid | None | None | clear | ory | Day |  | Tuestay |  | 116C22512 | 6/14/2016 |  | 1 Proenty Omg Report |  | ${ }^{43,4535285}$ | ${ }^{-112.0236599}$ |
|  | ${ }^{4330}$ |  | 1 Suv/Crossoler | 6 Ging strieght | Ascending | N | Packnifed | Noniunction | On Roadway | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 116429512 | 611420216 |  | 2 Proenty 0 mg Report | N | ${ }^{43,45352885}$ | $\frac{-112.023699}{-11202659}$ |
| 9 | ${ }^{4130}$ |  | 1 car | 6oing striegh | Ascending |  | Angle | In interesection | On Roadway | Failed to yeid |  | None | Clouy | wet | Dark, No Street Light |  | Monday |  | 1166437804 | 103/22016 |  | 1 Property 0 mg Report |  | ${ }^{43,435359126}$ | -112023597 |
|  | ${ }_{4}^{430}$ |  | 1 Van -1088 seats | Ens Straibht | ending | ${ }^{N}$ | Angle | intersection Realaed |  | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }^{101 / 32016}$ |  | 2 Property |  | ${ }^{43,43535926}$ | -112023697 |
| 10 | 4130 |  | 1 Suv/Crossover | Estright | ending |  |  | In intersection | On Roadway | failed to ober Stop Sign | None | None | clouy | vet | ay |  | Saturday | ${ }^{16} 1$ | ITCas | 1/21/2017 |  | $1{ }^{1}$ cinur |  | 5643 | ${ }^{-112.0236575}$ |
|  | 4130 |  | 1 1Pickup | Going stright | Eending | ${ }^{N}$ | Angle | In intersection |  | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2 Clnjur Accient |  | 3,43356432 | ${ }^{-112.0236575}$ |
| 11 | ${ }^{4130}$ |  | 1 suv/crossover | Soing Straight | Ascending | ${ }^{\sim}$ | Ange | nineresection | On Roadway | Failed to Y Yield | None | None | clear | ory | Day |  | mo | ${ }_{15} 12$ | 117462687 | 7/31/2017 |  | 1 Proenty mmg Reoort |  | 8855 | -112.023889 |
|  | 4130 |  | 1 suv/crosover | Going Stright | Ascending | ${ }^{N}$ | Angle | section | On Roadway | Failed tovered | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{127462687}$ | 7/31/2017 |  | 2 Proenty Omg Report |  | ${ }^{43,43588555}$ | ${ }^{-112.0236897}$ |
| ${ }^{12}$ | ${ }^{4130}$ |  | 1 1pickup | 6oing striegh | emang | w | Ange | intesection |  | Faied to veid | None | None | ${ }^{\text {clear }}$ | ory | Jark, No Street Lighs |  | 1 Tuestay |  | 117474792 | ${ }^{12 / 29 / 2 / 2017}$ |  | 1.1 nuir Accient |  | ${ }^{43,45356708}$ | -112023679 |
|  | 4130 |  | 1 car | coing straight | Ascending | N | Ange | In intessection | On Roadway | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{127474792}$ | 12/19/2017 |  | 2 Climuraccident |  | ${ }^{43,43566708}$ | ${ }^{-112023679}$ |
| ${ }^{13}$ | ${ }^{4130}$ |  | 1 suv/crosover | Going straight | Ascending | w | Ange | In intersection | On Roadway | Failed to veid | ${ }^{\text {natatention }}$ | None | clear | ory | Dark, No Street Light |  | Thussay |  | 1189776988 | 1/1/2/2018 |  | 1 Property Omg Report |  | ${ }^{43.45358911}$ | ${ }^{-112.0236522}$ |
|  | 4130 |  | 1 Pickup | Going stright | Ascending | ${ }^{N}$ | Ange | In intersection |  | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18847698 | 1/11/2018 |  | 2 Proeery Omg Report |  | ${ }^{43.45358911}$ | -112.023652] |
| 14 | 4130 |  | 1 Pickup | Going straight | Ascending | E | Ange | In intersection | On Roadway | None | None | None | sow | ssow | Day |  | Thussay | 101 | 118688594 | 2/15/2018 |  | 1 Proentry mg Report |  | ${ }^{43,43535558}$ | ${ }^{-112.023679}$ |
|  | ${ }_{4}^{430}$ |  | 1 Car | Going Stright | Ascending | ${ }^{\text {N }}$ | Angle | In intersection | On Roadway | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 188688594 | 2/15/2018 |  | 2 Proenty Omg Report |  | ${ }^{43,45357558}$ | ${ }^{-112.0236799}$ |
|  | ${ }^{4130}$ |  | 1 Pickup | eing staight | Ascending | w | Ange | Intersection Reala |  | None | None | Nor |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 184885 | 2/15/20018 |  | 3 Proenty Ong Re |  | 3,45357588 | -112.0236799 |
| 15 | 4130 |  | 1 Pickup | Sing staight | eending |  |  | In intersection | On Roadway | Failed to V Yeld |  | None | clar | ory | Day |  | Sat |  |  |  |  | frep |  | ${ }^{43.45358301}$ | ${ }^{-112.0236901}$ |
|  | ${ }^{4130}$ |  |  | Going Stright | ding | ${ }^{\sim}$ | Angle | Itesection |  | None | one | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1186887018 | 5/12/2018 |  | 2 Proeety Omg Report | N | ${ }^{43.45388301}$ |  |
| 16 | 4130 |  | 1 Car | Soing straight | Ascending |  | Ange | In intersection |  | Failed to ober Stop Sign | None | None | clear | ory | Dark, No street Lighs |  | 2Thursay | ${ }^{22}$ |  | 8/9/2018 |  | 18.1 niur Accident |  | ${ }^{43} 4.4539461$ | ${ }^{-112.0236736}$ |
|  | 4130 |  | 1 Suv/rossover | Soing Strieht | Ascending | ${ }^{N}$ | Ange | ntersection | On Roadway | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | ${ }_{18 \text { 18c9a432 }}$ | 89/20018 |  | 2 Bmjur Accident |  | ${ }^{43,45359461}$ | ${ }^{-112.0236736}$ |
| ${ }^{17}$ | 4130 |  | 1 Van- 1088 seats | Going straigh | cending | N | nge | Intesection |  | ,one | None | None | clear | ary | Day |  | Wednestar |  | 188c98831 | 9/19/2018 |  | 1 Proeerty Ong Report |  | ${ }^{43,43356983}$ | -112.0236763 |
|  | 4130 |  | 1 car | Going staight | Ascending | \% | Ange | In intessection | On Roadway | None | None | failed tober | Stop SEn |  |  |  |  |  | 188998831 | 9/19/2018 |  | 2 Proenty mmg Report |  | ${ }^{43,43565983}$ | ${ }^{112.023673}$ |
| 18 | 4130 |  | 1 car | coong straght | Ascending | E | Ange | In intersection | On Roadway | matention | Failed torerd | None | clear | ory | Day |  | Saturay | ${ }_{15}$ | 118 c99985 | 9/29/2018 |  | 1 Proentry Omg Report |  | ${ }^{4.435358799}$ | -112023679 |
|  | ${ }_{4}^{4130}$ |  | 1 Car | Soing strieht | Ascending | ${ }^{N}$ | Ange | In intersection |  | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 1899985 | 9/29/2018 |  | 2 Proeety Omg Report |  | ${ }^{4.435388749}$ | -112023679 |
|  | 4130 |  | 1 Car | Stopeed in Trafic | Ascending | w |  | In intersection | On Roadway | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 18 18999885 | 9/29/2018 |  | 3 Proeery Omg Report |  | ${ }^{43.45388749}$ | -11202367 |
| 19 | 4130 |  | 1 Car | Soing Strieht | Ascending | E | Angle | In intersection | On Roadway | None | None | None | Rain | wet | Dark, No street Lights |  | Tuestay | 19 12 | 118 coorl5 | 109920018 |  | 1.1 Iniur Accident |  | ${ }^{43,45360012}$ | -112.0236709 |
|  | 4130 |  | 1 Car | Going Stright | ending | N |  | In intersection |  | None |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 188500215 | 1099/2018 |  | 2 Cl miur Accident | , | ${ }^{43,45360012}$ | - 112.20236709 |
|  | 4130 |  | 1.031 Prickp | Soing Strieht | Dessending | s | Uutily Light support | Nomiunction | Reight shoulder | ${ }^{\text {Improper Overaking }}$ | None | None |  | or | Day |  | 1 Monay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 21 | ${ }_{4}^{430}$ |  | 1.032 Suv/Crossover | 6oing stright | Descending |  |  | Noniunction | Prive Peroperty | Speed Too fast for Condtions | None | None | cear |  | Dar, Street Lghts off |  | Nedinssar |  | ${ }^{156441714}$ | 12/1620015 |  | ICmuraccident |  | ${ }^{43,45411876}$ | -112.0239972 |
| 22 | 4130 |  | 1.097 Car | Going Stright | Ascending | N | Side swipe | Noniunction |  | None | None | None | clear | ory | Day |  | Saturday |  | 188996591 | 9/8/2018 |  | 1 Property Ong Report |  | S5497181 | ${ }^{-112.0237031}$ |
|  | 4130 |  | 1.097 Prickup | U-Turn | ending | N | sides swipe Same | netion | On Roadway | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 188999591 | 9/8/2018 |  | 2 Proenty Omg Report |  | ${ }^{43,45997181}$ | ${ }^{112.0237031}$ |
| ${ }^{23}$ | ${ }^{438}$ |  | ${ }_{1.433 \mathrm{car}}$ | Going straigh | Dessending |  | Angeie urning | Inimesesetion |  | None | None | None | cear | $\mathrm{or}^{\text {a }}$ | Day |  | 1 saturay |  | (15c39749 | 5992015 |  | 1 Al mur Accicaent |  | 43.45993 | -112.0238554 |
|  | 430 |  | 1.433 Prockp |  | Dessending | E | Angel turning | In intersection | On Roadway | faied to ober Stop Sign | Improper Tur | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15.537749 | 5/9/2015 |  | $2 A$ Inury Accient |  | ${ }^{43.45993}$ | -112.023854 |
| ${ }^{24}$ | 4130 |  | 1.527 Prickp |  | Dessending | N |  | Noriunction | On Roadway |  | None | None | clear | ory | Day |  | Saturay |  | 116 ca28516 | 6/4/2016 |  | 1 Property Omg Report |  | ${ }^{43.46125618}$ | -112.023875 |
|  | 4130 |  | 1.527 suv/crossover | Soing strieht | Dessending |  | Struck by FalinigS Shitin | Noniunction | On Rodway | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 166428516 | 6/4/2016 |  | 2 Proeety Omg Report | N | ${ }^{43.46125618}$ | -112.023875 |
| ${ }^{25}$ | ${ }^{4130}$ |  | ${ }_{1.766 ~ C a r ~}^{\text {a }}$ | Going Straight | Dessending | s | Other Non-Collision | Other | Other | None | None | None | clear | ory | Dawn or ousk |  | Thussar |  | 1189888724 | 6/72018 |  | 1 Proentry mg Report |  | ${ }^{43,4641144}$ | -112.0238662 |
| ${ }^{26}$ | ${ }^{430}$ |  | 1.813 Car | Going stright | Descending | s | Rear- nd | Intersection Realed | On Roadway | Following Too Cose | ${ }^{\text {natatention }}$ | None | Coualy | ory | Day |  | Thursay | 11 | 15638413 | 5/28/2015 |  | 1 Propert Omg Report | N | ${ }_{3}^{43.45540911}$ | ${ }^{-112.0238888}$ |
|  | 4130 |  | 1.813 Suv/crossover | Stoped in Tafic | Descending | s | Rear End | Intersection Realed |  | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 15 c39843 | 5/28/2015 |  | 2 Proeety mmg Report |  | ${ }^{43.46540911}$ | ${ }^{112.0238888}$ |
| ${ }^{27}$ | 4130 |  | 2.01 Peckup | Turring Right | Dessending | s | Rear-End | Noriunction | On Roadway | nartenion | Following Too | None | clear | ory | Day |  | Thursay | 151 | 156 c38946 | 6/4/2015 |  | 1 Property 0 mg Report | N | ${ }^{43,4688224}$ | $\frac{-112.0238312}{-112028312}$ |
|  |  |  |  | Stopeed in Trafic | Dessending |  |  | Noniunction |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Sc388 |  |  | roperty Omg Report |  | ${ }^{43,4688224}$ | -112.0238312 |
| 28 | 4130 |  | 2.01 suv/crossoer | Turning Lett | Dessending |  | Angeie Turning | In intersection | On Roadway | Failed to veid | None | None | clouy | wet | Day |  | Thursay |  | 16647744 | 519192016 |  | 1 Property Omg Report |  |  | -112.0288312 |
|  | ${ }^{4130}$ |  | $2.011^{2}$ Pickup | Turning elet | Dessending | s | Angel turning | In intersection |  | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | $16 \mathrm{Caz744}$ | 5/19/2016 |  | 2 Proenty Ong Report |  | ${ }^{43.4688224}$ | ${ }^{112.0238312}$ |
| 29 | ${ }^{430}$ |  | 2.01 car | Going straight | Dessending | 5 | Ange | tiesection | On Roadway | None | None | None | cear | or | Dar, No Street Lighs |  | MMonay |  | 117452669 | 3/3/20017 |  | 1 Property mm R Report |  | ${ }^{43.46827072}$ | ${ }^{-112.0238258}$ |
|  | 438 |  | 2.01 Suv/Crossover | 6oing striegh | Dessending | w | Ange | In intersection | On Roadway | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 11 Cas2669 | 3/13/2017 |  | 2 Proenty Ong Report |  | ${ }^{43.4682702}$ | -112.0238258 |
| ${ }^{30}$ | 4130 |  | 2.01 car | Turning Lett | Ascending | 5 | Ange | In intersection | On Roadwa | Failed to y eid | None | None | clear | ory | Day |  | 1 Thussay | ${ }_{13}$ | 1188685745 | 4/26/2018 |  | 1.1 Injur Accident | N | ${ }^{43.46878851}$ | -112.023823 |
|  | 4130 |  | 2.01 Van -1088 seats | Going Straight | Ascending | N | Ange | In intesection |  | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1 18cas574 | 4/26/2018 |  | 2 Cl miur Accident |  | ${ }^{43.46878551}$ | ${ }_{112.023832}$ |
| ${ }^{31}$ | 4130 |  | 2.01 Suv/Crossover | Turring Right | Ascending | NE | Peadalcyle | In intersection | On Roadway | None | None | None | ${ }^{\text {clear }}$ | or | Day |  | Thursay |  | 11868585756 | 4/26/2018 |  | $1{ }^{1 / 2}$ Cliur Accident | N | ${ }^{43.46888829}$ | ${ }^{112.0238312}$ |
|  | ${ }^{433}$ |  | ${ }^{2} .201$ Peadatcrcle | Crosing at inesesectio, Cros | Ascending | E | Peadacyle | Other |  | None | None | None | clar |  | Orstaetmer |  |  |  | ${ }^{186485756}$ | 4/26/2018 |  | $2{ }^{\text {c In inur Accident }}$ | N |  |  |
|  | 4130 <br> 4130 |  | ${ }_{2}^{20.15 \text { Suv/ Cososover }}$ | Tourin left | Descending | N | ${ }_{\text {Ange ele turing }}^{\text {Angie }}$ | In intersection |  | None | None | ${ }_{\text {None }}$ |  |  | Jark, Street Light on |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | N | ${ }^{43.46827139} 4$ | ${ }^{-11120.23828295}$ |
| ${ }^{33}$ | ${ }_{430}$ |  | 2.018 Car | Strai | Stending | s | Rear-End | Intersection Rel | On Roadway | matention | Following 7 oo | Jone | ${ }^{\text {clear }}$ | or | Day |  | day | ${ }^{1615}$ | 1554 | 8/19/2015 |  | Iniur Accident | N | ${ }^{43.46889291}$ | 28839 |
|  | 4130 |  | 2.018 suv/Crosover | Stoped in Tafic | Sending |  | ar-End | tersection Reataed | On Roadway | None | None | 崖 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156005011 |  |  | Iniur Accident |  | 3.48842991 | ${ }_{112.0238379}$ |
|  | 4130 |  | 2.018 Van -1088 seats | stopedi i Traic | Descending | s | ar.End | Intersection Reatad |  | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 156405011 | 8/19/2/215 |  | 3 Bljiur Acident | N | 43.46842991 |  |
| ${ }^{34}$ | 4130 |  | 2.25 suv/crossover | Going Striagh | Dessending | E | Angle | ,tersection | On Roadway | Failed to Y Yeld | None | None | Cloudy | ory | Dark, Street ights on |  | Monday |  | 118 c50240 | 10/29/2018 |  | 18 Iniur Accident | N | ${ }^{4.47176992}$ |  |
|  | ${ }_{4}^{430}$ |  | 2.25 Prickup | Going stright | Dessening |  | Ange | In intessection |  | None | None | None |  |  |  |  |  |  | 188502450 | 10/29/2018 |  | 2 Blmiur Accident | N | ${ }^{4.4 .4717692}$ | ${ }^{1120239071}$ |
| ${ }^{35}$ | 4130 |  | ${ }^{2,326 \mathrm{Car}}$ | Avoiding obsacale | Dessending | s | Rear-End | Noniunction | On Roadway | None | None | None | clouy | ory | Day |  | Monay | 101 | 117453 | 3/272017 |  | 18.1 miur Accient | N | ${ }^{43.472888876}$ | ${ }^{112.202889}$ |
|  | 4130 |  | ${ }^{2} .326 \mathrm{Car}$ | Going Stright | Descending | s | Rear- nd | Noriunction |  | Following Too Close | Distrated N O |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 177455888 | 3/27/2017 |  | 2 P I miur Accident | N | ${ }^{43,47288876}$ | -112023891 |







Holmes Road Safety Audit
September 29 \& 30, 2021 等
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## DAHOFALES

## Objectives

- Reduce the risk and severity of crashes by identifying and addressing existing and potential road safety issues.
- Identify conflicting road messages from the road user's viewpoint.
- Improve awareness of safe maintenance practices.

DAHO FALES

## Why Holmes Ave?

- Traffic Volumes
- Crashes
- Access Points
- Land Uses
- Developments
- Growth
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## DAHO FALES

## Report-Out Format

- Divide Corridor into 3 separate Sections
$-65^{\text {th }}$ to Sunnyside
- Sunnyside to $17^{\text {th }}$,
$-17^{\text {th }}$ to Yellowstone
- Identify Safety Issues
- Recommendations
- Tier 1 (0-6 months)
- Tier 2 (6 months -2 years)
- Tier 3 (2-5 Years)
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New Path is Great!
DAHO FALES
Sunnyside Road to $17^{\text {th }}$ Street

- Tier 2 Improvements (6 Months - 2 Years)
- Replace worn or chipped sidewalk and curbs
- ADA Ramps \& Curb Cut ADA Fix
- Extend Curb Separator beyond Dollar Tree
- Create a RIRO or $3 / 4$ Intersection at Road to Sam's
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## DAHO FALES <br> 17 ${ }^{\text {th }}$ Street to Yellowstone Hwy

- Tier 1 Improvements (0-6 Months)
- Pavement Markings
- Replace some Signs
- Signal Timing
- Check Ped Clearances

- Re-evaluate School Circulation
- Railing to prevent Jay Walking between Busses
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WORK SESSION

MAY 9, 2022

## WATER METER AND AMI VENDOR SELECTION DISCUSSION



## Presentation Outline

- Project Background
- Project Means \& Methods
- Preliminary Results \& Composite Scores
- Vendor Presentations
- Next Steps


## Project Background

- The City solicited a request for professional services for a water meter \& AMI evaluation - Keller Associates was selected in February 2021
- City has been implementing a metered billing system for commercial and industrial users over the past few years
- Approximately 640 meters are installed with nearly 2,000 nonmetered commercial accounts to still convert
- City prefers to stay with one meter manufacturer moving forward to minimize communication issues and maximize benefits


## AMI - Advanced Metering Infrastructure maho falls KELLER

- An AMI network consists of 'smart' meters that provide consistent communication between the meter and City
- Communication can be via cellular network or a dedicated radio network
- Cellular connection uses existing cellular infrastructure while radio option requires installation and maintenance of radio towers and collectors
- Major benefits of an AMI network include robust analytics, reduced City labor, leak detection, tamper monitoring, and customer portals


## Project Background

- Before transitioning to AMI, the Water Division independently worked with Keller to evaluate common offerings from six of the most widely recognized meter/AMI manufacturers in the industry:
- Neptune Technology Group
- Kamstrup A/S
- Sensus (Xylem) Metering
- Honeywell (Elster) International
- Badger Meter, Inc.
- Master Meter, Inc.



## Project Means \& Methods

- The same information was requested from each vendor
- City was not identified in the information request
- Water Division assigned an Importance Factor to each evaluation category

| Scoring Category | Importance <br> Factor |
| :--- | :---: |
| Meter Capital Cost | 1 |
| Meter Reliability | 3 |
| Meter Accuracy | 4 |
| Meter O\&M Cost | 3 |
| Meter Rep. Location \& Responsiveness | 5 |
| Meter Serviceability | 2 |
| AMI Capital Cost | 3 |
| AMI Annual Cost | 3 |
| AMI Endpoint Programming Ease | 4 |
| AMI Infrastructure/Equipment Required | 3 |
| AMI Functionality with Cayenta Billing Software | 3 |
| AMI Analytics Software Capability | 4 |
| AMI Software Updates \& Maintenance | 3 |
| AMI Software is User-friendly \& Intuitive | 4 |
| No Third-Party Software Required | 5 |
| Customer Portal Options | 4 |
| Communication Options | 2 |
| Reference Recommendations (3) | 4 |
| Expected System Lifespan | 5 |

## Project Means \& Methods

- Keller Associates contacted system references and compiled responses
- Keller reviewed over 1,000 total pages of information received from the six manufacturers
- Keller compiled all data into a final package, removed manufacturer identities, and submitted to Water Division for scoring


## Preliminary Results \& Composite Scores DAHO FALLS KELLER

- 4 City staff and Keller

Associates participated in scoring each of the 15 categories

- Individual scores were

| Manufacturer | Individual Reviewer Scores |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Score 1 | Score 2 | Score 3 | Score 4 | Score 5 | 2 |
| \#1 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 2 | 3 |
| $\# 2$ | 4 | 3 | 4 | 4 | 3 | 3.6 |
| $\# 3$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1.0 |
| $\# 4$ | 3 | 4 | 3 | 3 | 4 | 3.4 |
| $\# 5$ | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5 | 5.0 |
| $\# 6$ | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6 | 6.0 | composited and used in a final scoring matrix

## Preliminary Results \& Composite Scores DAHO FALLS KELLER

| City of Idaho Falls - Water Meter and AMI Evaluation Matrix |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Parameter |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score | Rank | Score |
| Meter Capital Cost | 1 | 2.0 | 2.0 | 3.6 | 3.6 | 1.0 | 1.0 | 3.4 | 3.4 | 5.0 | 5.0 | 6.0 | 6.0 |
| Meter Reliability | 3 | 3.0 | 9.0 | 3.8 | 11.4 | 4.4 | 13.2 | 4.0 | 12.0 | 5.2 | 15.6 | 1.0 | 3.0 |
| Meter Accuracy | 4 | 3.0 | 12.0 | 3.8 | 15.2 | 4.4 | 17.6 | 4.0 | 16.0 | 5.2 | 20.8 | 1.0 | 4.0 |
| Meter O\&M Cost | 3 | 4.4 | 13.2 | 2.6 | 7.8 | 3.2 | 9.6 | 4.2 | 12.6 | 6.0 | 18.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 |
| Meter Rep. Location \& Responsiveness | 5 | 4.4 | 22.0 | 5.4 | 27.0 | 3.4 | 17.0 | 4.2 | 21.0 | 3.0 | 15.0 | 2.8 | 14.0 |
| Meter Serviceability | 2 | 4.4 | 8.8 | 2.6 | 5.2 | 3.2 | 6.4 | 4.2 | 8.4 | 6.0 | 12.0 | 1.0 | 2.0 |
| AMI Capital Cost | 3 | 3.4 | 10.2 | 5.0 | 15.0 | 1.6 | 4.8 | 2.4 | 7.2 | 6.0 | 18.0 | 3.2 | 9.6 |
| AMI Annual Cost | 3 | 2.0 | 6.0 | 3.0 | 9.0 | 4.0 | 12.0 | 1.0 | 3.0 | 5.2 | 15.6 | 5.8 | 17.4 |
| AMI Endpoint Programming Ease | 4 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 3.0 | 12.0 |
| AMI Infrastructure/Equipment Required | 3 | 4.2 | 12.6 | 5.0 | 15.0 | 3.6 | 10.8 | 4.2 | 12.6 | 5.0 | 15.0 | 5.0 | 15.0 |
| AMI Functionality with Cayenta | 3 | 6.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 18.0 |
| AMI Analytics Software Capability | 4 | 4.8 | 19.2 | 4.8 | 19.2 | 4.8 | 19.2 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 4.8 | 19.2 | 4.8 | 19.2 |
| AMI Software Updates \& Maintenance | 3 | 6.0 | 18.0 | 6.0 | 18.0 | 3.8 | 11.4 | 6.0 | 18.0 | 3.6 | 10.8 | 3.8 | 11.4 |
| AMI Software is User-friendly \& Intuitive | 4 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 3.0 | 12.0 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 6.0 | 24.0 |
| No Third Party Software Required | 5 | 6.0 | 30.0 | 6.0 | 30.0 | 6.0 | 30.0 | 5.4 | 27.0 | 6.0 | 30.0 | 5.4 | 27.0 |
| Customer Portal Options | 4 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 3.4 | 13.6 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 3.4 | 13.6 |
| Communication Options | 2 | 3.2 | 6.4 | 6.0 | 12.0 | 3.2 | 6.4 | 3.2 | 6.4 | 4.6 | 9.2 | 6.0 | 12.0 |
| Reference Recommendations (3) | 4 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 4.6 | 18.4 | 3.0 | 12.0 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 6.0 | 24.0 | 4.6 | 18.4 |
| Expected System Lifespan | 5 | 6.0 | 30.0 | 6.0 | 30.0 | 6.0 | 30.0 | 6.0 | 30.0 | 3.8 | 19.0 | 6.0 | 30.0 |
|  | Total: | 313.4 |  | 326.8 |  | 279.4 |  | 305.2 |  | 337.2 |  | 259.6 |  |
| Final Rank: |  | 3 |  | 2 |  | 5 |  | 4 |  | 1 |  | 6 |  |

- Manufacturers:
- 1-Sensus
- 2 - Neptune
- 3 - Master Meter
- 4 - Kamstrup
- 5 - Badger
- 6 - Honeywell


## Vendor Presentations

- Water Division chose to receive vendor presentations from the top 3 scoring vendors
- Badger - 337.2
- Neptune - 326.8
- Sensus - 313.4
- Other City Staff (Public Works, IT, \& Utility Billing) and Public Works City Council Liaisons participated in the presentations
- After the presentations were completed, Badger Meter, Inc. was identified as the preferred vendor


## Badger Water Meters

- Badger consistently ranked high during initial scoring
- Cellular AMI system offers the most flexibility
- Able to serve wide-spread commercial accounts without needing a dedicated radio network
- Add future connections without expanding radio network
- Water Division is familiar with Badger Meters
- Reputable meter manufacturer, used worldwide
- Multiple nearby installations available for support, if needed


## Next Steps



- Based on the evaluation and presentation results, Keller Associates and the Water Division recommend moving forward with Badger Meter, Inc. to develop the City's metering \& AMI system
- City can also develop a public procurement bid set and solicit bids from metering suppliers, but
 it may be difficult because of the AMI communication differences - Radio vs. Cellular


## Questions?



Badger E-Series Ultrasonic Meter for Commercial \& Industrial Applications


[^0]:    538 W 21st St
    Prox. to Subject
    Sale Price
    Gross Living Area
    Total Rooms
    Total Bedrooms
    Total Bathrooms
    Location
    View
    Site
    Quality
    Age

