

JUNE 8, 1971

Pursuant to a call by the Mayor the City Council of the City of Idaho Falls met in Special Session in the Little Theatre at 601 South Holmes on the 8th day of June, 1971, at 7:30 o'clock p.m. There were present at said Meeting, Mayor S. Eddie Pedersen; Councilmen Jim Freeman, Mel Erickson, Gordon Nelson, Paul Hovey, and Dale Parish. Absent: Councilman Jack Wood. Also present: Roy C. Barnes, City Clerk; Arthur Smith, City Attorney; Joe Laird, City Engineer.

The Mayor announced that this was the time and the place for a public hearing, as advertised, to hear and consider all protests and other comments and communications, pro and con, relative to the establishment and creation of Local Improvement District #43, commonly referred to as the downtown parking lot. The Mayor welcomed all those who were present and thanked them for their interest. He explained that a decision has not yet been made to create the district in question and, other than to comply with the law, that was the main purpose of this hearing. He said it was a public forum where everyone would have an opportunity to be heard.

The Mayor announced that this was the time and place for a public hearing, as advertised, to hear and consider all protests and other comments and communications, pro and con, relative to the establishment and creation of Local Improvement District #43, commonly referred to as the downtown parking lot. The Mayor welcomed all those who were present and thanked them for their interest. He explained that a decision has not yet been made to create the district in question, and other than to comply with the law, that was the main purpose of this hearing. He said it was a public forum, where everyone would have an opportunity to be heard.

The Mayor first called upon Attorney Joe Anderson, Chairman of the Downtown Improvement Association, to give the background on this proposed project. Anderson explained that downtown planning had originated many years ago and, in the interim period, many man hours had been spent, individually and in group meetings, to determine an improvement program most beneficial to all concerned. Anderson continued by saying that, as an out growth from said man hours, it was generally agreed that preparatory to street reconstruction or a mall, parking constituted the most pressing problem. Anderson noted that planning in this direction proceeded extremely slow, due partially to lack of unanimity by the businessmen as well as past City Administrations. During the entire planning period, however, it was agreed by everyone that something must be done to keep and preserve the consumer dollar down town and also physical improvement to bolster the tax base. He said that, of the three basic problems of parking, traffic flow and comfortable surroundings, it had been generally decided that the parking problem should be attacked first. Anderson noted that the Mayor had appointed various committees and commissions who have had the benefit of several parking studies. Anderson then drew attention to the fact that the long term plan calls for one or more additional parking lots, other than the proposed lot being considered this night; also, hopefully, parking structures constructed on said lots, financed by a revenue bond issue. He said it is generally agreed that, regardless of the outcome of all future planning, it is a foregone conclusion that less and less on-street parking can be expected. Anderson concluded his remarks by noting that an informal hearing had recently been conducted and it was the general consensus at that time that the proposed parking lot being considered this night should be the first logical planning step.

The Mayor then invited City Engineer, Joe Laird, to discuss the engineering aspects of the proposed project. Laird, by use of slides, showed first, the location of the proposed parking lot;

JUNE 8, 1971

namely, the one-half block between B and C Streets immediately east and across the street from the Post Office. He said this location has been selected because it is well centered within the downtown area. Next, Laird showed a proposed design whereby the lot, with 52 parking spaces, would have convenient entrance and exists on B and C Streets and Park Avenue. The lot would be metered with limited landscaping and good lighting. Laird then showed the boundaries for purposes of determining assessments; namely, Broadway on the south, Yellowstone on the east, Memorial Drive on the west and the alley between D and E Streets on the north. Laird explained that the proposed project would cost approximately \$387,000 which would include property acquisition, demolition of existing structures, filling, surfacing, drive ways and lighting. Laird then explained the proposed method of assessment consisting of three classes. Class I would be assessed at 47¢ per square foot, involving 419,630 square feet within one block of the parking lot for a total of \$197,226; Class II, 23.5¢ per square foot, involving 643,060 square feet located beyond one block but less than two blocks away, for a total of \$151,119; Class III, 11.8¢ per square foot involving 325,611 square feet, two blocks or farther away, for a total of \$38,423.

City Attorney Smith was then invited by the Mayor to discuss the legal aspects of the proposed district. Smith noted that Mr. Anderson had listed two reasons for the slow progress of downtown planning and said that he would like to add a third; namely, until recently at least, lack of statutory authority. Smith quoted from Section 50-1712 Idaho Code, which now gives a City the statutory right to create an enlarged improvement district for construction of a parking lot, as follows:

50-1712. ENLARGED DISTRICT - Whenever any local improvement shall be of such nature and character that the special benefits resulting there from extend beyond the boundaries of the property authorized to be assessed for the costs and expenses thereof by Section 50-1717, the Council may create an enlarged local improvement district, which shall include as near as may be all the property especially benefited by such improvements. When such district is created, the property therein, lying beyond the limits of improvement districts as described in Section 50-1717, shall be assessed for a portion of the cost and expenses of such improvements, in accordance with the special benefits to such property, to be determined and fixed by the Council when the district is created, the balance of the costs and expenses of such improvements to be assessed against the property set forth in Section 50-1717, provided that in enlarged districts for off-street parking all property therein, whether private ownership, public ownership, non-profit ownership or otherwise and whether they have off-street parking of their own, shall be assessed a portion of the cost and expenses of such improvements, in accordance with the benefit to such property, said ratio of benefits to be determined

and fixed by the Council when the district is created; provided, that no property shall be included within such enlarged district situate more than twelve hundred (1200) feet from the improvements to be made.

JUNE 8, 1971

Smith pointed out that, in an enlarged district, no intersections are involved which otherwise would constitute City expense; property belonging to governmental subdivisions, except Federal, would be subject to assessment and that, generally, the method of assessment on an equitable basis is more difficult to determine. Smith then warned that, if the City were to proceed with this district, it would be the first of its kind in the State and that there has never been a test case on the issue by the State Supreme Court; therefore, certain bonding attorneys have indicated they would not give their assenting legal opinion on any bonds so issued. Smith said, be that as it may, it is a valid statute and the City would, therefore, be proceeding legally by creating such a district. Smith told those present that both Nampa and Moscow has come close but, for one reason or another had abandoned their proposed districts. Smith explained that, in the event of a test case, there would be a delay of one to one and one half years for a State Supreme Court decision and that he was reporting these things so that the public would be as informed as the City Council on these hurdles. It would be necessary for the district to actually be created before a test case could be instituted, continued Smith, and then it would be any property owner's right to bring suit to enjoin the City on this issue. Smith said it was not his intention to cast a shadow on these proceedings but that his department felt the public was entitled to know the full truth on these legal uncertainties.

The Mayor then directed the City Clerk to present and read aloud all written communications. It was explained that these consisted of written protests as well as letters of endorsement and would be presented in alphabetical order, as follows:

**PROTESTS AGAINST CREATION
OF LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 43**

We, the undersigned taxpayers and owners of real property in the downtown business district of Idaho Falls, Idaho, hereby protest the creation of Local Improvement District No. 43.

The creation of this district will create a heavy burden on the taxpayers of downtown Idaho Falls and, in our opinion, is entirely unnecessary. The parking lots now operated in Idaho Falls are not more than one-third filled at any time of the day or night and the only time they are filled with cars is from about December 1 until Christmas each year. To go to such expense for building a parking not that is only needed for two or three weeks of each year is not good sound business, and this Local Improvement District should not be created.

Ethel Blair

Redevelopment Com.
June 7, 1971

City of Idaho Falls
City Council, City Hall
Idaho Falls, Idaho

JUNE 8, 1971

Honorable Members:

The Community Redevelopment Commission is pleased to take this opportunity to offer its support and encouragement to the City Council in its proposal for creation of Local Improvement District 43 for a downtown parking facility.

Since its appointment in 1966, the Redevelopment Commission has expressed repeatedly its conviction that the solution of the problems of downtown Idaho Falls must be met comprehensively and cannot be solved by the restoration of the Eagle Rock area alone.

The Commission staff has worked closely these past two years with the City staff in an effort to assist the Downtown Improvement Association in the preparation of an approach to a meaningful total improvement of the central business district. The Commission regards the establishment of LID #43 as a long awaited first tangible step toward that important goal.

The Commission is presently underway with the purchase of property in the Eagle Rock Project along the south side of Broadway. In response to the demand for off-street parking space on the south side of the business district, it is the intention of the Commission to clear a significant area for the installation of a temporary parking facility. The Eagle Rock plan envisions ultimately the introduction of high quality land uses into the area which will accommodate their own parking demand. A municipally developed parking lot between Park and Shoup Streets will also contribute considerably to satisfaction of parking needs on the south side.

The Commission is also presently exploring the most effective means by which it might utilize its authority to assist the Downtown Improvement Association in the acquisition of land for additional parking space just outside the Eagle Rock Project area, north of Broadway.

The Redevelopment Commission, therefore, recognizes the importance of the proposed L.I.D. #43 as an effort to balance the accommodation of the present and anticipated parking demand by commencing land acquisition for parking on the north side of the central business district.

We look forward to the eventual placement of all downtown parking in off-street facilities to free the congested downtown streets and allow the creation of an attractive, functional shopping environment.

The Redevelopment Commission urges the creation of L.I.D. #43.

Respectfully yours,
COMMUNITY RE-
DEVELOPMENT COMM.

JUNE 8, 1971

s/ Ed Fanning
s/ Ray S. Johnson
s/ C. J. Just
s/ Milton A. Romrell

PROTESTS AGAINST CREATION
OF LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 43

We, the undersigned taxpayers and owners of real property in the downtown business district of Idaho Falls, Idaho, hereby protest the creation of Local Improvement District No. 43.

The creation of this district will create a heavy burden on the taxpayers of downtown Idaho Falls and, in our opinion, is entirely unnecessary. The parking lots now operated in Idaho Falls are not more than one-third filled at any time of the day or night and the only time they are filled with cars is from about December 1 until Christmas each year. To go to the expense of creating Local Improvement District No. 43, condemning the property, tearing down the buildings and building a parking lot is not justified from any standpoint, and is not necessary. To go to such expense for building a parking lot that is only needed for two or three weeks of each year is not good sound business, and this Local Improvement District should not be created.

s/ Prudence E. Cope

Downtown Improvement
Association
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Honorable Mayor and City Council
City of Idaho Falls
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83401

Dear Sirs:

Please be advised that the Directors of the Downtown Improvement Association have endorsed, approved and will support the proposed Local Improvement for the creation of parking facilities along Park Avenue on the eastern side thereof between "B" and "C" Streets.

We further urge continued study and action of the issue of revenue bonds for additional parking sites and construction of parking structures where feasible.

JUNE 8, 1971

Also, we think that the improvement of the downtown with the replacement of streets, curbs, gutters, sidewalks and lighting, where necessary, is very vital, and that the mall concept as submitted, or an acceptable alternate in modification of size and design should be constructed which would create the pleasant, attractive atmosphere necessary to entice and retain downtown shopping traffic.

Sincerely yours,
s/ W. Joe Anderson

Elswood Trailer Sales
S. Yellowstone Highway
Idaho Falls, Idaho
June 7, 1971

City Council
City of Idaho Falls

Gentlemen:

By this notice on this the 7th day of June, 1971, I desire to protest the establishment of Enlarged Local Improvement District #43 to the City of Idaho Falls.

The property included that I own on "C" Street has ample off-street parking provided at my personal expense. As a stock holder in the Off-Street Parking Inc., I do not believe that this additional parking will be of benefit to merchants on "C" Street.

Very truly yours,
s/ E. J. Elswood

Homer Koster Company
June 8, 1971

Honorable S. Eddie Pedersen, Mayor
and the Idaho Falls City Council

Idaho Falls, Idaho

Gentlemen:

We protest the proposed LID for the reason that the suggested location for parking doesn't provide parking for the following rental stores:

JUNE 8, 1971

Green's Pfaff Sewing Center, Singer Company, Karl's Shoes, Hammond Music, Fashion Fabrics, Royal Shoe Repair, Hair House, Roper's, Gallen-Kamp's and Yost's Gift Shop on Park Avenue and Penny's on Broadway and Buky's Village and Woody's on "A" Street.

Where you propose additional parking the size of the property is too small, the access is poor and there are no retail stores that need additional parking.

We also feel that something should be done to improve the streets, alleys and lighting, etc. To float an LID for just purchasing additional parking is not the answer to the downtown problem.

Yours truly,
s/John Homer,
President, Homer-Koster

Idaho Falls Off-Street
Parking Corporation
April 29, 1971

Honorable Mayor and
City Council
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Dear Sirs:

Please be advised that the Idaho Falls Off-Street Parking Corporation endorses and supports the proposed Local Improvement District of the City of Idaho Falls for the acquisition of property located adjacent to Park Avenue between "B" and "C" Streets for the purpose of clearing said properties and improving them for surface parking lots.

Our Corporation feels that this is a step towards the solution of the downtown parking problem and would urge the creation and completion of the improvement district project as soon as possible.

Sincerely yours,
Idaho Falls Off-Street
Parking Corporation
s/ Russell Fogg

JUNE 8, 1971

June 8, 1971

City of Idaho Falls
Idaho Falls, Idaho

The undersigned is the owner of Lot 10, Block 23, Railroad Addition to the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho.

The undersigned hereby protests Resolution No. 1, being a resolution of intention of the City Council to construct off-street parking to be known as "Enlarged Local Improvement District No. 43 of the City of Idaho Falls".

The undersigned further objects to establishing the local improvement district, or the making of said improvement, or any part thereof.

Very truly yours,
s/ John B. Lamprecht

May 29, 1971

To Whom It May Concern:

I feel that the tax would be unfair. Reasons: 1. Drop in business from off the street is less than 1% of total volume. So we would be paying for the other man's business who depends more than us on the walk in trade. Trades like café, jewelry, drug stores, variety stores, department stores, banks, clothing stores, sporting goods, theatres, etc.

All our trade comes from pick up at these places. They don't bring it in, but use the facilities of a parking lot for their customers. This is the main reason for being against the proposal.

Our business with the small 1% volume being dropped off would be excessively taxed compared to the businesses that have to have drop in trade and depend on it 100%.

Please let me know if and when you receive this notice. Call 522-0694. Thank you.

Sincerely,
s/ Henry Martin

C. W. Mulhall
June 4, 1971

JUNE 8, 1971

Mr. Roy C. Barnes
City Clerk
City of Idaho Falls, Idaho

Dear Mr. Barnes:

I have your letter of Notice to Establish Local Improvement District No. 43, Idaho Falls.

Since my property (Block 27, Railroad Addition) is two blocks distant from the proposed parking lot, any benefit received thereon would be doubtful.

I therefore, hereby wish to file my protest and objection the proposed LID No. 43.

Yours truly,
s/ C. W. Mulhall, Jr.

3416 Land Park Drive
Sacramento, California
June 4, 1971

STATEMENT REGARDING ENLARGED LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 43

"I have received the notice regarding the formation of the "Enlarged Local Improvement District No. 43" whose purpose is to establish additional parking in the downtown area of Idaho Falls."

I am fully aware of the importance of downtown parking, but after carefully reading your notice, certain questions occur to me. I have listed them below:

1. Is the site selected for this parking the best location and most economical available? As I recall the area involved, several substantial buildings are located there.

2. The building owned by my sister, Mrs. Margaret Cantley, and myself is located about two blocks from the proposed parking facility and we would not be greatly benefited. However, we would have to pay an undetermined part of the cost. How would our assessment be determined?

3. When would this amount have to be paid? Would a lump sum be required? If deferred payments are possible would interest be charged? If so, how much?

Because these questions are not discussed in the notice, I must ask you to consider this letter as a Protest until further information is available.

JUNE 8, 1971

Sincerely yours,
s/ Mrs. Afton Dill Nance

June 3, 1971

Mayor Eddie Pedersen
City Building
308 "C" Street
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Honorable Mayor and City Council:

I have been doing some serious thinking on your proposal of the removal of our building at 540 Park Avenue. After many contacts on the cost of replacing this fire proof structure, we find that the cost today is almost prohibited - at least four times the cost as it was, when built.

We have had no commitment from the City Council of their intentions regarding the price or relocation of it. In the last five months, we have purchased the Einer Pedersen Tailoring Business. It is imperative that we are in this location, so we can be reached by the clothing stores in minutes, from the downtown shopping area. The main part of our business now is rush and drop in, and must be out in a hurry. I must say that I cannot understand why the City of Idaho Falls would want to eliminate one of the few fire proof buildings in the City when there are so many old structures that need to be taken down.

Therefore, I do seriously object to your proposal.

s/ Virlow C. Peterson

1855 Laird Avenue
Salt Lake City, Utah
June 5, 1971

Mr. Roy C. Barnes
City Clerk
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Dear Mr. Barnes:

I wish to acknowledge your letter of May 13, 1971, concerning improved parking facilities in Idaho Falls. Since the cost to individual property owners in the planned areas as set up were not stated in the letter I felt it necessary to make a trip to Idaho Falls to get this information. This I did on June 2.

JUNE 8, 1971

I also had the opportunity to talk with several property owners. The consensus, as I expected, was that more downtown parking was needed. There was however considerable questions as to the cost and location of the proposed site.

Since the cost and expense would be assessed against the property owners who are subject to existing long term leases, there is no chance in the foreseeable future to increase the rents to help cover the assessment. In our case, we have signed two leases within the past ten months for a 5 year period.

So I have mixed feelings about this proposition. I trust the outcome will be for mutual benefit. I would appreciate being advised on the matter.

Very truly yours,
s/ Mrs. Afton O. Rigby

227 Salisbury Building
Idaho Falls, Idaho
June 4, 1971

The City Council of Idaho Falls
P.O. Box 220
Idaho Falls, Idaho

RE: LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 43 - RESOLUTION 1

Gentlemen:

While it is difficult to take exception to a project with the motives and objectives of this one - the welfare and improvement of downtown Idaho Falls - we have reluctantly concluded that we must do so in this case. We therefore now make objections to the project as proposed, and ask that it be disapproved. Let us make these further comments and observations:

1) We have, and continue to be, in favor of any economically justified additions and improvements to parking in downtown Idaho Falls, and have given financial support to the Off-street Parking Corporation. However, we do not believe the project now proposed would return reasonable value for cost, for the following reasons:

a) The Barton, Stoddard, Milhollin & Higgins firm (BSMH) in its feasibility study, says (para. 5.4.2) that construction of structures B and C (B being the location now under consideration) "should be deferred, because they are not now shown to be economically feasible".

JUNE 8, 1971

b) If structure B cannot now be justified, as we agree, then the test is whether the location can stand on its merits as ground-level-only parking. This it does not do because, as the BSMH report shows, it has the highest per-square-foot cost of the several locations discussed. As we understand the figures, this location would cost about \$6000 per stall for ground level parking; and even in a larger City than Idaho Falls any per-stall cost over \$3000 would be suspect. (Part of the problem, of course, is that the plot of land under consideration does not have sufficient width for most efficient ground level parking).

c) To put it more concisely, if this particular location cannot be justified for immediate full development (the parking structure), or for interim ground level parking at a reasonable cost, then it is the wrong place to begin the program.

2) While it is difficult to assess its total effect, we should note here that when and if the structure at location B is built, with the upper levels being built partly across the street as proposed, there may be damage to the value of our Earl Building property which fronts on that location, in that the present Park Avenue exposure and view have value to the tenants in the building, and thus to the property.

3) It appears to us that BSMH have developed some quite sophisticated multi-level parking schemes, and compliment them on their layouts. However, we have real reservations on the question of whether Idaho Falls is ready for multi-level parking. Parking rates are low, as they have to be; and when it is necessary to postulate higher rates (as BSMH does) to show that a project might be self-sustaining, the economics become a bit treacherous. All in all, it seems to us that for some time the emphasis in Idaho Falls should be on surface parking, with careful attention being given to square-foot costs of land. Some time and patience may be required to acquire locations at figures which can be justified for parking use.

4) The whole parking question is a difficult one for any downtown area, and there does not seem to be any easy solution - or for that matter any general agreement as to (a) how much parking is needed and (b) whether a City Government should either supply or sponsor off-street parking. In this regard, we do wish to acknowledge both the initiative and courage required for the City to step into the breach, so to speak, and are sorry we have to oppose this first move.

We compliment the City on having this recent parking study made, as well as the other related studies it has sponsored in recent years, in planning and land utilization, traffic, etc. And we agree, of course, with BSMH statement, "Preserving the vitality of the core area should be a major community goal". We hope the City will continue to take an active interest in its downtown area.

Very truly yours,
s/ Eugene West-Vice Pres.

JUNE 8, 1971

June 3, 1971

Mayor and City Council
c/o City Clerk
Idaho Falls, Idaho

RE: PROTEST - LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 43

Gentlemen:

Pursuant to your notice dated May 13, 1971, Atlantic Richfield Company files this protest against establishment of the local improvement district above mentioned, and the making of the improvement and more specially the assessment of part of the costs of the parking facilities against our service station, as apparently contemplated.

This company feels that its service station property at Broadway and Capitol in Idaho Falls will not be specially benefited by the parking facilities in question. It is our feeling that the potential users of the parking facilities and businesses with whom such users might trade after parking their vehicles, might benefit from such parking facilities. If so, they should bear the costs. Our service station would not so benefit, and we feel that it would be quite unfair and improper to assess the substantial charge proposed to be assessed against our service station property at Broadway and Capitol.

While we certainly would not want to oppose any program for community betterment, we feel that those who benefit should pay for it, and we protest assessing the cost in the manner proposed.

We very much appreciate your favorable consideration of our protest.

Very truly yours,
s/ S. Stanworth
Region Manager

Tandy and Wood Co.

June 7, 1971

City of Idaho Falls
Office of the City Clerk
P.O. Box 220
Idaho Falls, Idaho

RE: L.I.D. #43

JUNE 8, 1971

Gentlemen:

Your notice of intention to establish Enlarged Local Improvement District No. 43 of the City of Idaho Falls, addressed to Mr. F. O. Simonson pertaining to the ownership of property located on Lot 9, Block 25, Railroad Addition, has been referred to we the undersigned as contract purchasers of the property. As downtown property owners and businessmen we are interested in the improvement of our City; however we object to the establishment of the above mentioned Improvement District for the following reasons:

1. The location of the proposed parking, due to limited area and difficulty of entry and exit.
2. The anticipated cost of the improvement.

We believe there are more desirable locations that will offer more area, easier entry and exit, and possibly less cost.

s/ Ervin S. Hill
s/ Thomas R. Heath

The City Clerk then presented this letter with the explanation that it had an indirect bearing on the proposed parking lot, inasmuch as the City Council wanted written confirmation on the Off-Street Parking Corporation's intentions relative to the B Street parking lot before a final decision was made on this parking lot district:

April 22, 1971

City of Idaho Falls
Idaho Falls, Idaho

ATTN: Mr. Norris Gesas

Dear Norris:

In connection with the request by the City of Idaho Falls for a statement from the Off-Street Parking Corporation regarding the B Street property and the Off-Street Parking Corporation's intention to enlarge this, the following is a motion passed in the Board of Directors meeting this date, April 22, 1971.

A motion was made by Mr. Russell Fogg and seconded by Karl Page that the Off-Street Parking Corporation proceed as rapidly as possible to expand the B Street property on its own.

JUNE 8, 1971

If there is any further information needed, please advise.

Very truly yours,
s/ V. C. Nelson
Secretary-Off-Street
Parking Corporation

The Mayor then invited Councilman Nelson, as Chairman of the Public Works Committee, to officiate during the next portion of this hearing for the receipt and recording of any and all oral presentations. Councilman Nelson then invited oral protests and other comments from the floor, asking those who wished to speak to come forward to the microphone so that their presentations might be properly recorded on tape.

Mr. Don Jensen of Jensen's Jewelers, 380 B Street, appeared before the Council. He presented and read aloud these two letters:

Hudson's
June 7, 1971

Honorable Mayor and
City Councilmen
City of Idaho Falls
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Gentlemen:

We have operated a business in Idaho Falls for many years, so we are well aware of the critical situation as regards to parking and the gradual deterioration of the downtown area. This has been of great concern to us, so we are happy to learn that the City has passed a resolution of intent to create a local improvement district to increase the off-street parking in the downtown area.

We feel that this increase in parking in this proposed location will certainly benefit the entire City and we will approve and support the adoption of the proposed local improvement district.

Sincerely yours,
s/ T. V. Hudson
Hudson Shoe Stores, Inc.

Jensen Jewelers
June 8, 1971

JUNE 8, 1971

Honorable Mayor and
City Councilmen
City of Idaho Falls
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Gentlemen:

We are operating two retail jewelry stores in Idaho Falls, one located at 380 B Street and the other at the Country Club Center. It is my understanding that our downtown location could be eliminated because of the proposed new parking area under consideration. I would like to speak both as the owner of an affected business and as a concerned citizen.

One of the reasons we purchased Kuglers Jewelers three years ago was to gain the benefit of a location identified with jewelry shopping. If we have to move from there we lose the benefit of many years of jewelry traffic at 380 B Street.

Since opening our new store in the Center we find that many of our former downtown customers are now trading with us there. When questioned they invariably mention the convenience of parking as one of the reasons for changing their shopping habits.

I am aware of the serious traffic and parking problems that exist in downtown Idaho Falls. Unless something is done to correct these problems I would give serious consideration to the advisability of renewing my lease when it expires 2½ years from now.

From my experience as a member of the Twin Falls Urban Renewal Commission I can appreciate the issues you face in improving your downtown area. I firmly believe, however, that the time, effort, and money you spend on improving the downtown will be repaid many times over through increased taxes and a healthy business district. For the good of the City I am in favor of the formation of the improvement district and will cooperate in this endeavor regardless of the personal problems it will create.

Respectfully yours,
s/ Don Jensen

Attorney Robert Sinclair appeared before the Council representing the following downtown property owners:

<u>NAME</u>	<u>PROPERTY</u>
Salisbury Corporation	Earl Building, 523 Park Avenue Salisbury Building, 428 Park Avenue

JUNE 8, 1971

Brunt Investment	Building at Park and "D" Street, including Milner Apartments
Franklin Fink	Building that houses the Gallen Kamp Shoe Store and the Yost Card Shop
Arden and Jennie Lee and Virginia Questa	Building just east of the old First Security Bank on "A" Street
Bona Villa Club	344 Park Avenue
Hasbrook Building	368 Park Avenue
Davis and Losch Property	Portion of the old Woolsworth Store building
Land Title Co.	470 "B" Street

Mr. St. Clair said he was registering protests against the creation of LID #43 for these various reasons: The proposed parking lot is premature, at least until it can be determined what effect, if any, the urban redevelopment program south of Broadway will have on business activity north of Broadway; Construction of the proposed parking lot will be too expensive, especially for the limited number of parking spaces that will result; This is not the best location for a parking lot as evidenced by the fact that it was the second location choice in the Barton, Stoddard, Melhollin & Higgins (BSMH) parking feasibility study; No decision should be made on this project until a decision is first made on a mall; Too close to the existing parking lot on "B" Street; This location not conducive for a structure, as cost of extending out over the street and alley would be prohibitive; Why destroy two good buildings, such as Kugler and Petersen Buildings, when there are so many other within the downtown area in a deteriorated condition.

Mr. St. Clair then itemized several approximate assessments which his clients would be charged and questioned them on the grounds of benefits, particularly those of the Brunt Building and the Land Title Company. Mr. St. Clair further protested the proposed district in the interest of his clients on the grounds as indicated in the BSMH study and quoted several passages, to-wit: Page 17. "The downtown area of Idaho Falls is expected to soon undergo extensive revitalization which is expected to increase the frequency and the duration of parking in the core area, also, parking demand will vary according to the overall desirability of the downtown area. For these reasons, an exact projection of future parking demand cannot be expected and must be recalculated periodically." Page 18. "The location at "B" Street would optimize vehicle access, location at "A" Street is recommended because of reduced walking distance to the center of the mall area." Page 20. "The proposed location of parking structures is shown by Figure 5.1. Location was based primarily on availability of suitable land in the downtown core area. Use of locations further from the core area

JUNE 8, 1971

(such as the proposed parking lot in question) would be less acceptable to the motorists and would not meet the parking requirements in the core area."

St. Clair then turned to Page 60 in the BSMH report and charged that, from the statistics as shown, there is no assurance that parking income as predicted, will materialize within the predictable future.

Councilman Nelson then asked St. Clair if all his clients had an opportunity to study these matters by conferring personally with the City Engineer and was answered in the affirmative, in most instances.

Mr. Robert McClellan, a Texaco representative from Butte, Montana in charge of land sales and rentals in this area, appeared before the Council and said he was unaware of this proposed district, having not received notice, until it was brought to his attention by the local distributor. He drew attention to the fact that his company has a service station within the area designated for the parking lot and that it had been profitably operating there since 1925. He said, because of this location and others, his company had created employment in Idaho Falls and has contributed in no small degree to the local economy. Mr. McClellan said his company does not intend to give up the unique downtown location in Idaho Falls. He respectfully asked that, in the event the district is created, the Council give every consideration to a comparable downtown location.

Mr. Paul DeMordaunt, representing the D & D Enterprises, appeared before the Council. He drew attention to the fact that his company owns and operates the Rio and Center Theatres, the latter being affected and subject to assessment by this proposed district. Mr. DeMordaunt drew attention to the fact that, by the very nature of their business, off-street parking facilities are needed by them less than probably any other downtown business as the majority of their patrons may use on-street parking in the evening. However, he went on record, in the interests of his company, as endorsing the project.

In the absence of further comment or communication, Councilman Nelson thanked all of those for their participating interest and turned the hearing back to the Mayor.

The Mayor concurred with Councilman Nelson's remarks and confirmed the fact that there were no others who wished to be heard. It was, therefore, moved by Councilman Nelson, seconded

by Freeman, that all protests and other communications and comments be taken under advisement and the hearing adjourn at 9:00 P.M. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 5; No, none; carried.

ATTEST: s/ Roy C. Barnes
CITY CLERK

s/ S. Eddie Pedersen
MAYOR
