

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

The City Council of the City of Idaho Falls, County of Bonneville, State of Idaho, met in a Regular Meeting on Thursday, the 9<sup>th</sup> day of December, 1965, at the hour of 7:30 P.M. at the City Council Chambers in the City Hall in the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho, due and legal notice of said meeting having been given as required by law and the rules and ordinances of the City.

On roll call the following members, constituting a quorum, were present: Mayor S. Eddie Pedersen; Councilmen Karl Page, Philip Leahy, Jim Freeman, Gordon Nelson, Dale Parish, and Roy J. Keller. Absent: None. Also present: Roy C. Barnes, City Clerk; Arthur Smith, City Attorney; Luther Jenkins, City Controller; Don Lloyd, Public Works Director; William Fell, Electrical Engineer; Ernie Craner, Parks and Recreation Director; Robert Pollock, Police Chief.

Minutes of the last Regular Meeting, held November 18<sup>th</sup>, 1965, were read and approved.

The Mayor acknowledged all Councilmembers-elect in the Council Chambers and thanked them for their presence and their interest.

The Mayor announced that this was the time and the place for a public hearing, as advertised, for the purpose of hearing and considering protests and objections to the Assessment Roll of Local Improvement District #36. The Mayor then instructed the City Clerk to present and read aloud all written assessments, as follows:

Idaho Falls, Idaho  
December 2, 1965

To Whom It May Concern:

This is to certify that I am the widow of Edwin Petersen, deceased, and hereby apply for exemption of assessments against my property bounding Alice Avenue. These assessments are for paving, curb and gutter; also sidewalks along said Avenue.

s/ Mrs. Ed Peterson  
264 W. 15<sup>th</sup>  
City

Idaho Falls, Idaho  
December 6, 1965

City Council  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

I, James M. Madsen, object to the Assessment Roll of Local Improvement District No. 36 of the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho. I feel that the \$34.51 assessed me is a fair amount to pay but that many of my very good neighbors who are living on small pensions, and Social Security will find it a hardship to make their payments on such a heavy assessment.

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

A. K. Larsen does not desire these improvements he is the only one facing Alice Avenue except for two new apartment houses. The other homes are facing 14<sup>th</sup> , 15<sup>th</sup> and 16<sup>th</sup> Streets.

Surely there are other streets and avenues in the City which need these improvements worse than Alice Avenue.

s/ J. M. Madsen  
230 W. 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

December 3, 1965

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

Dear Sir:

I, Mary B. Ryset, 224 W. 14<sup>th</sup> Street, Idaho Falls, Idaho, do most certainly and decidedly protest and object to the City assessment of \$106.94 made to me for the paving of Alice Avenue on Assessment Roll of Local Improvement District No. 36.

This paving will in no way be of any benefit to me or anyone who might live on my property. Also the gutter and concrete sidewalk have already been placed along the frontage of the Grant Packer property since the meeting of protest we folks along Alice Avenue attended this late summer.

Why doesn't the City help the Boise Avenue people who are clamoring for pavement instead of this project whose residents are rejecting the paving? Mr. A. K. Larsen living on the right side going west on Alice Street is the only one who has frontage on Alice Street. He says he absolutely does not want any side walk along his property.

I am a widow, 68 years old, living alone, existing on a small pittance from which I make monthly payments to finish paying for my little home and lot. And this will take me four more years.

PLEASE KINDLY CONSIDER MY PROTEST.

Yours truly,  
s/Mary B. Ryset  
Lot 3, Block 2, South Lawn  
225 West 14<sup>th</sup> Street, City

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

December 7, 1965

Honorable Mayor and City Council  
of the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho  
P. O. Box 220  
Idaho Falls, Idaho 83402

Gentlemen:

Enclosed herewith is my objection to the Assessment Roll of Local Improvement District No. 36 of the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho, which is hereby filed in accordance with the Notice of Time to File Objections issued pursuant to a Resolution and Order of the City Council, made on the 9<sup>th</sup> day of November, 1965.

This objection is made for the reason that I believe the assessment placed upon me in the amount of \$70.50 is an unduly excessive amount. The proposed improvement for which this assessment is being made is the paving of a street known as Alice Avenue in Idaho Falls, Idaho. I have no property abutting this street, nor in close proximity thereto, nor do I have any benefit where Alice Avenue intersects with West 16<sup>th</sup> Street.

It is my opinion that the property owners along Alice Avenue should rightfully be assessed for its paving since they are obviously the ones who will benefit. There are four houses facing the street at the present time, and it is my understanding that plans are presently being made to construct a number of multiple dwelling units, similar to those which now exist in that area, along Alice Avenue. I feel that these property owners should be the ones to pay for this improvement.

I do not believe it is fair or just that I should be assessed for this improvement for the reasons stated above and on the enclosed objections. I would also like to make reference to a petition filed with the City of Idaho Falls in July 1965, signed by myself and other tax payers in this district, expressing our objections and disapproval of this assessment.

Yours very truly,  
s/ Jay Eckersley  
276 West 16<sup>th</sup> Street  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

**OBJECTION TO ASSESSMENT ROLL OF LOCAL  
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 36 OF THE  
CITY OF IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO**

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

Comes now Jay D. Eckersley, owner of the property located at 276 West 16<sup>th</sup> Street, Idaho Falls, Idaho, and objects to the Assessment Roll of Local Improvement District No. 36 of the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho and the inclusion of his property therein, on the following grounds:

1. The street to be paved, for which this assessment is made, is not in close proximity to his property.

2. There is no benefit to be gained by him or his property as a result of this improvement.

3. That he has not been permitted or allowed to vote for or against the establishment of this Local Improvement District.

s/ Jay D. Eckersley

Subscribed and sworn to before me this 6<sup>th</sup> day of December, 1965.

s/ Melva Poppy  
Notary Public

December 5, 1965

Dear Sir:

I am a property owner just off Alice Avenue. I am protesting sidewalk especially, and Don't believe payment is necessary at this time either. On our side of the street the sidewalk would be in the back of Mrs. Petersen's place and of no use whatever for it. It certainly is no advantage for me. I am a widow, but work and my wages are very small. This would be an extra burden I just couldn't handle at present. Thank you.

s/ Dorothy Norell  
244 West 15<sup>th</sup> Street, City

Idaho Falls, Idaho  
December 1, 1965

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

Dear Sirs:

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

This is a letter of objection to the Assessment of my property in Dist. #36.

We have in the past helped pay for the improvements of the street facing our property, and will not be benefited very much by this improvement.

I am a widow, 73 years old, and have no income other than Social Security. It will be very difficult for me to pay this assessment.

Yours very truly,  
s/ Mrs. Clem Page  
284 West 16<sup>th</sup> Street, City

Idaho Falls, Idaho  
December 7, 1965

Dear Sir:

Please find this letter as a protest against the assessment of \$94.18 on Improvement District No. 36. I just finished paying for my street and sidewalk last year. I don't see why I have to help pay for somebody else's street and sidewalk. I have lived here for 25 years without a paved street on Alice Avenue. So I think I can get along without it for another 25 if I live that long. Besides it looks like a frontage street to me. There are apartment houses facing it on both sides.

s/ Ellis M. Storms  
261 West 15<sup>th</sup> Street  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

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

Dear Mr. Barnes:

I do very strongly object to your L.I.D. 36 for the following reasons:

1. The State of Idaho will be taking a portion of my property in this L.I.D. and it would be unwise to put in these improvements and have the State tear them out for freeway access.

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

2. The property owners in the area are still paying on the last improvements, and this additional assessment will place an unnecessary financial burden on the people of this area. I would suggest waiting until we get the last assessment paid for.
3. The population ratio in this area does not warrant such elaborate improvements. It would seem advisable for the City to concentrate official efforts on the more desirable areas of Idaho Falls.

If you feel it advisable for me to attend your 12-9 meeting and state my view, would you please advise me. Thank you.

Respectfully yours,  
s/ Dean Pfof

Idaho Falls, Idaho  
November 28, 1965

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

Dear Sirs:

In answer to your letter I received November 26, 1965, notifying me of my share of the street assessment for Improvement District No. 36 for the amount of \$1,457.17. I shall have to offer a protest to this amount.

I believe the calculations must be in error. I have been led to believe that the cost of this work would amount to \$8.00 or \$9.00 a lineal foot or in the neighborhood of a figure around that amount. I find that your figure runs \$12.45 plus the \$1.88 per foot that I have already paid for the curb and gutter that is already in. This amounts to a total of \$14.34 per running foot. Of course the statement could be made that: We don't count that way. Whether it be buckets, bushels, inches or feet it adds to the same figure.

I further protest: I have a letter from a Mr. Peleni (or something) of Bureau of Land Management dated the middle of September 1965, that the Bureau owns this property and not myself, although I paid for it and have paid taxes since 1946.

I feel this paving should not be railroaded through under these conditions. I also have another letter from the Bureau of Land Management dated in October 1965, telling me they are generous and are going to let me buy my property in 4 easy payments at a future date when they arrive at the present day value.

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

I believe under these circumstances this bill should be submitted to Mr. Peleni of B.L.M., Boise, Idaho.

I realize that you are well aware of this situation, as the City has known of this since 1961 and possibly 1957.

Sincerely,  
s/ Vernon Logan  
965 Elmore, City

Pasco, Washington  
December 1, 1965

City of Idaho Falls  
Roy C. Barnes, City Clerk

Dear Sir:

Just received your letter sent to my deceased husband, Herman. Notice of time to file objections to Assessment Roll of Local Improvement No. 36. I'm going to object to it at the present time. I had to borrow money to pay my sewer easement off, so, therefore, I'm still paying on that.

It seems to me \$1126.00 is kind of high for a widow to pay. The only way I can see out is to work it out. As we leveled out property with a shovel & wheel barrow.

Does the City consider a person working out these assessments? If so, my sons could probably help me out on the working it out. Would appreciate you letting me know as soon as possible on this matter.

Thanking you kindly,  
a/ Annie Hammon  
Box 366  
Pasco, Washington

Ogden, Utah  
December 5, 1965

Mr. Roy C. Barnes  
Office of the City Clerk

Dear Sir:

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

We are in receipt of the form in regard to paving sidewalks and curb and gutter.

This property is located at 1152 Cassia Avenue, Idaho Falls, Idaho

This property has no buildings on it whatsoever. We are not in favor of this and definitely don't want it.

We are unable to attend this meeting, so we are giving you our opinion on this matter.

Yours very truly,  
s/ Walter J. Bitton  
Inlay, Nevada

s/Nellie S. Van Why  
1483 2<sup>nd</sup> Street  
Ogden, Utah

December 9, 1965

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

This is to inform you that the assessment notice for Local Improvement No. 36 is incorrect. My assessment was computed at \$896.00 which includes thirty six feet of sidewalk which I already have, making my assessment approximately \$102.00 too high. The Engineering Department has been informed of this mistake.

s/ Jack G. Hurley  
1101 Iona Street, City

December 12, 1965

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

Gentlemen:

I received my notice of Improvement District #36 and my assessment amounts to \$624.00 which included asphalt pavement, curb and gutter and concrete sidewalks. I have my

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

concrete sidewalk in and it is at the correct grade level. There will have to be made some adjustment for the driveway. Please let one know if the sidewalk was included in \$624.00 and if it was, what would be the correct amount after deducting the sidewalk.

Yours very truly,  
s/ W. M. Simpson  
6922 Exmoor Drive  
Apache Country Club Estates  
Mesa AZ. 85201

Sharp, Anderson & Bush  
Attorneys at Law  
December 8, 1965

S. Eddie Pedersen, Mayor  
City of Idaho Falls  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Dear Mayor Pedersen:

This letter is written to you in behalf of Mrs. Thomas D. Rees, the owner of the property located at 1130 Jackson Drive, Idaho Falls. As you know, it is proposed that this property be placed in the special improvement district being created for the paving of the streets on both sides of it.

Mrs. Reese desires that I submit to you her protest to the property being included in the improvement district at this time. As you know, the Federal Government has placed a cloud upon the title to this property by contending that it lies within the riparian line of the Snake River. Obviously, this makes it impossible for Mrs. Rees to dispose of her property until this has been corrected. No one knows at this time how much will be involved in eliminating the Government claim against this property.

It has been brought to my attention that some time ago the City voluntarily gave to Mrs. Rees a tract of land located off the southeast corner of her property, which has the effect of extending her frontage on the road facing the Snake River and also the street which lies to the east of her property. This, quite naturally, greatly enlarges the front footage, and thereby increases the assessment to her property. While I am confident that the property given her by the City was arranged for the highest and best motives, it does have the effect of increasing her responsibility for paving at this time.

Having these thoughts in mind, we trust that you will give sincere consideration to the elimination of this particular property from the proposed paving district. These factors,

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

combined with the 86 years of Mrs. Rees and her limited income, make it a most distressing situation for her at the present time. Your favorable consideration of her request will be sincerely appreciated.

Very truly yours,  
Sharp, Anderson & Bush  
s/ John M. Sharp

Gentlemen:

I do not think this amount against me & my property will improve the value of 4 vacant lots that much.

A few years ago when Higbee Avenue was surfaced, they reached down College Street and assessed each lot so much money. As I remember about \$380.00 for me. They said to take the pressure off the people on the corner lots. I don't see any credit for that now.

I had some money then and paid. But now, due to failing health, I cannot afford to pay if.

Yours truly,  
Lewis J. Stoddart

Sharp, Anderson & Bush  
Attorneys at Law  
December 6, 1965

Roy C. Barnes, City Clerk  
City of Idaho Falls

Gentlemen:

You will please be advised by virtue of this letter that Mrs. Ivy B. Kugler, the owner of certain property subject to assessment under Local Improvement District No. 36, the same being your No. 230 in the name of Don F. Kugler, protests the creation of such Local Improvement District and the assessment computed on the property of the said Ivy B. Kugler, successor in interest to Don F. Kugler.

Very truly yours,  
s/ Eugene L. Bush  
Attorney for Ivy B. Kugler

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

Sharp, Anderson & Bush  
Attorneys at Law  
December 6, 1965

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

Gentlemen:

This will advise you of the protest of J. Ed Browning and Sons, Inc. to Local Improvement District #36.

The protest of the said J. Ed Browning and Sons, Inc. is to the creation of said District and also to the assessment computed to be applicable to the said J. Ed Browning and Sons, Inc.

Very truly yours,  
Sharp, Anderson & Bush  
s/ Eugene L. Bush

E. D. Vissing Company  
1204 Jackson  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

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

Dear Mr. Barnes:

In reference to Assessment No. 177 in the amount of \$909.49, please enter my protest.

Reasons: City executives advised me that sidewalks were optional to the property owners in this locality.

Further: Permission was granted to me by the City executives, for private contractors to install our own street section, together with curbs and gutters. The curbs and gutters were staked, surveyed and supervised by the City Public Works, work completed.

Our portion of the street paving has long been let out to a private contractor, but due to the City's uncompleted water line installation, we have been unable to proceed with this project.

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

Yours truly,  
s/ E. D. Vissing

Thornton, Idaho  
December 5, 1965

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

Dear Sir:

I feel that the Assessment No. 36 in the amount of seven hundred & seventy-one dollars, (\$771.00) on my three lots on College Street is completely unreasonable.

This sounds like a terrific amount for seventy-five (75) feet of sidewalk and curbs.

This is to inform you of my opposition to such an expensive assessment.

Sincerely,  
s/ Garnet Lewis  
Thornton, Idaho

Conrad & Bischoff Inc.  
Box 106 - 1230 West Broadway  
December 3, 1965

Mr. Roy C. Barnes, City Clerk  
P. O. Box 220  
City of Idaho Falls  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Dear Mr. Barnes:

In response to the notice of Assessment of Local Improvement District #36 we hereby file objections for the following reasons:

Because of restrictive zoning it is not economically feasible to make additional investments in this piece of property.

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

A portion of our property and the lots adjoining them are zoned for commercial development, yet the remainder of the lots in question are restricted to other types of uses.

In view of these facts an assessment of \$1,720.50 on this property at this time is definitely unwarranted.

Respectfully,  
s/ Rex Bischoff  
Conrad & Bischoff Inc.

August 17, 1965

Mayor S. E. Pedersen  
and City Councilmembers  
City of Idaho Falls  
(Prepared by Mrs. Frank Bithell, 891 Maplewood Drive)

Gentlemen:

This is a letter written on behalf of Ruth Holmquist who resides at 864 First Street, in protest against an assessment for the paving of First Street. Also residing at this same address is her stepfather, Sherman Moncrief. Miss Holmquist is totally blind and Mr. Moncrief is of very advanced age. Miss Holmquist receives \$63.00 a month public assistance. In addition they will receive approximately \$1,500.00 within the next two years for sale of property on Garfield Street. Since this is their total income they feel this assessment would be a financial burden, and they are therefore asking that the City forgive them this obligation. Your consideration in this matter will be very much appreciated.

Very truly yours,  
s/ Ruth Holmquist  
s/ Sherman Moncrief

160 S. Fanning Avenue  
Idaho Falls, Idaho  
December 3, 1965

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

Dear Mr. Barnes:

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

This is to notify you in writing that I wish to voice a protest and ask questions regarding the proposed computed assessment of \$88.98 which was received November 26, 1965.

After discussing and comparing assessments received by local neighbors in nearly the same home locations as myself, I believe my assessment amounts to be excessively high.

Sincerely yours,  
s/ Eugene G. Moshberger

Idaho Falls, Idaho  
August 16, 1965

Mayor and City Council  
City of Idaho Falls, Idaho

Dear Sirs:

We, the undersigned residents and property owners of First Street, support the improvements listed in L.I.D. #36 for blacktop and sidewalks that do not already exist.

We object to and request that we be removed from paying for the renovation of the existing roadbed and blacktop for the following reasons:

1. The existing roadbed and blacktop have been paid for and should now be under the maintenance and repair program of the City.
2. The L.I.D. does not correct all of the asphalt problems along First Street but includes only the area between Fanning and Linden Drive. Certainly the same problems exist in each direction on the rest of this Street.
3. The City allowed this "patch" method of development as described by the Engineer at the hearing and should now assume maintenance and repair responsibilities for the road that exists.
4. First Street has been declared a major arterial by the City and the cost of its development should be shared by the City.

We know the listed improvements are necessary and that we have a responsibility in their costs but we do not feel we should pay for improvements already in and paid for.

Sincerely yours,

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

s/ Jerry Jacobsen - 991 First St.  
s/ Mrs. F. W. Call - 1005 First St.  
s/ Jack Maquire - 981 First St.  
s/ Kenneth Tracy - 1060 First St.  
s/ Leland Staten - 995 First St.  
s/ Grant M. Tate - 905 First St.  
s/ Robert A. Casey - 960 First St.

December 7, 1965

Roy C. Barnes  
City Clerk  
City of Idaho Falls

Reference: Notice of time to file objections to Assessment Roll of Local Improvement District No. 36 of the City of Idaho Falls.

Dear Sir:

I am the owner of property described as follows: 1 Acre north side east of Creek in NW ¼ NE ¼, Sec. 20, TP 2N, R 38 EBM. I wish to formally register my objections to the Assessment assigned to me by the referred notice. My objections are the following:

1. I am not of the opinion that the published reasons for establishment of L.I.D. #36 are valid. I do not consider this work to be done, necessary at this time.
2. I do not feel that sidewalks are required nor do I feel they would be useful, because as a resident, I know there is very little pedestrian travel on this street. The shopping areas and points of pedestrian usage are too distant for walking to be convenient. I would like to know how the decision was reached to place sidewalks, if they are necessary, only on the south side of First Street, rather than on both sides of the street. This decision obviously increases the financial burden of those residents on the south side of the Street and represents a question of equity.
3. I most strenuously object to the removal of the pavement now in place on First Street. It is in good condition and serves the public adequately. If the City deems the removal of this pavement to be absolutely necessary, I believe the City should bear the cost of the removal and replacement rather than expecting the property owners to bear this unnecessary financial burden.
4. It appears to me to be completely illogical for the City to expect property owners to shoulder the financial burden of the far reaching improvements outlined in the projects

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

of L.I.D. No. 36, while fully realizing that it would be inevitably necessary to tear up this new installation in order to install the various types of under surface utility lines, which are not completed at this time. These utilities should precede the undertaking of the projects of L.I.D. No. 36.

Sincerely yours,  
s/ Kenneth Tracy  
1060 First Street

Holden, Holden & Kidwell  
Idaho Falls, Idaho  
December 9, 1965

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

Gentlemen:

We have been requested by Mrs. Olga Wages Nickerson to file her objections to the inclusion of the following described real property in Local Improvement District No. 36:

Beginning at a point 41½ feet North and 660 feet East of the Southwest corner of the East half of the Southwest Quarter (E ½ SW ½ ) of Section Seventeen (17), Township Two (2) North, Range Thirty-eight (38) E. B. M., and running thence North at right angles, a distance of 660 feet, thence East at right angles a distance of 330 feet, thence South at right angles a distance of 60 feet, thence West at right angles a distance of 330 feet, to the point of beginning, situate in Bonneville County, Idaho.

and also her objections to the Assessment Roll.

Yours truly,  
Olga Wages Nickerson, by  
Holden, Holden & Kidwell

Donald M. Ellsworth  
Civil Engineering Consultant  
Idaho Falls, Idaho  
December 9, 1965

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

Honorable Mayor and City Council  
City Hall  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Gentlemen:

This letter is written in protest to the amount proposed for assessment against the property of Mr. James Enke at 120 Linden Drive. This property is included in L.I.D. No. 36.

The method of distribution of "end costs" for this block has resulted in this property paying 95% of these end costs. This seems quite unreasonable in that most of the adjacent properties on First Street are being assessed nothing for a share of end costs.

This problem is compounded with the fact that a small piece of park land was vacated to this owner from the City because the tract was too small to maintain. The owner had removed several large trees and filled in a ditch on this tract and has landscaped this area and a small adjacent lot to the rear to make the area into one large lot. Under the L.I.D. theory of assessment, the street area adjoining this tract would be considered an end cost and the adjoining corner lot would only pay a portion of the assessment, but with the method employed for this district this property pays for nearly the entire costs.

When this assessment protest is being considered, we would appreciate being notified to add further discussion to this problem. You will note in your records that this property protested the proposed method of assessments at your first hearing on this L.I.D.

Very truly yours,  
s/ Don Ellsworth  
Civil Engineering Engineer

Donald M. Ellsworth, P.E.  
Civil Engineering Consultant  
Idaho Falls, Idaho  
December 9, 1965

Honorable Mayor and City Council  
City Hall  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Gentlemen:

This letter is written in protest to the amount proposed for assessment in L.I.D. No. 36 against the property of Mr. E. M. Laughlin at 125 Linden Drive.

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

The method of distribution of "end costs" for this block has resulted in the entire value of the end costs being assessed against this one lot. This proposed method of assessment was also protested at the first hearing on this L.I.D.

A site inspection of this property reveals that the owner could have completed the unfinished portion of this street for approximately one-half the value of the proposed assessment. He had delayed doing this himself under the theory that end costs are distributed over a series of lots and the cost is not born entirely by the corner lot. Using the theory used in L.I.D. No. 28 for end cost assessments, this property would be assessed only about one-third of the present figure.

We would appreciate being notified when this particular protest is considered to add further evidence to this problem.

Very truly yours,  
s/Don Ellsworth, P.E.  
Civil Engineer Consultant

December 9, 1965  
The Calvary Baptist Church  
785 First Street  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Protest:

The church does not feel they are receiving value of the \$2,745.60 assessment. The church does not plan to sell as we are only involved in religion.

The church is unable to pay the assessment in our present financial condition. We would like to be exempted so the church can operate.

s/Lloyd A. Tatum  
Chairman of the Trustees

The Mayor then invited verbal protests and other comments from the floor of the Council Chambers. The City Clerk reported that two parties had registered verbal protests against inclusion in the district in absentia, as follows: Agnes Tullett, Route #5, Box 362, but a property owner in the Highland Park Addition, who would be out of the City this night, and E. L. Peterson, 848 Shelley, who was in attendance before the meeting but became ill.

Mr. A. C. Kartchner, 1020 Latah, appeared before the Council and drew attention to the written protest of Mr. Dee Vissing and said he was asking to be excluded from the district for the same reason.

He drew attention to the fact that his sidewalk, curb, and gutter were already constructed and that his assessment seemed exorbitant if it represented only paving costs.

Mr. Acy Vest, 490 West 17<sup>th</sup>, appeared and noted that he owned property across from the Big G Drive Inn. He acknowledged the need and the benefit of the proposed street improvement but said he was a disabled war veteran living on a small pension and social security and could not afford the proposed assessment.

Mr. Ed Reynolds, 962 First Street, appeared and protested his assessment on the grounds that it was too high, especially in view of the fact that part of the roadway was already paved. He said he had only recently moved to this address and that he would not have purchased the property had he known of this assessment. He asked how far out on First Street the improvement was planned and was told it would extend to Linden Drive.

Mr. Cecil Perez, Jr., appeared and said he was representing Mrs. Zola Denning, 1296 Boise, a widow who cannot afford the assessment. He noted that she was still paying on a previous Local Improvement District for a sewer improvement.

Mr. J. M. Madsen, 230 W. 15<sup>th</sup>, appeared and noted that he had submitted a written protest. He said it was his understanding that assessments were only for those with frontage on a street to be improved. Yet, he noted further, he was being assessed with no frontage in this category; another neighbor on another street about the same distance away from Alice Avenue, the street to be improved, did not get assessed. It was explained to Mr. Madsen that his assessment was entirely derived from end costs. Mr. Madsen then noted several widows being assessed and voiced an opinion that they should be exempt.

Mr. A. K. Larson, 1525 Alice Avenue, appeared and reminded the Council that he was the only resident on his street in a position to benefit from the improvement and that, in his opinion, the street should be excluded from the district. He said that, from memory only, he believes there should be an agreement on record between the City and the apartment house developer, whereby said developer had agreed to improve the street. He said the street needs to be filled prior to paving and that this is not the time for it. He asked why or by whose request the street is included in the district. The answer to this question wasn't known by any City officials present. He was invited into the Engineering Department and was assured that the files would reveal the answer to this question. He was reminded that the sidewalk on the east side of Alice Avenue had been deleted from the proposed improvement.

Mr. Elmo Anderson, 347 South Boulevard, but a property owner on Cassia Avenue appeared and noted that he was representing himself and two other Cassia Avenue property owners, Messrs. Minor Hawkins and William Billman, drawing to the attention of the Council the fact that the proposed Cassia Avenue improvement passed through a lava area and that the assessment is too high in relation to the benefits. He asked for additional time to submit a protest petition of other affected property owners on this street.

Mr. Warren Nyer, 896 First Street, protesting their assessment on the grounds that the method of computation as pertains to First Street was inequitable. He felt the City as a whole should participate to some extent. He also argues against a sidewalk on the grounds that it would not get sufficient use to warrant its existence.

Mr. John Homer, 180 Marjacq, appeared and reminded the Council that nearby side streets to First Street had been improved and paid for by the developer and were not financed by a Local Improvement District. He also voiced an opinion that the improved center portion of First Street should not be taken out and reconstructed. He asked how the assessments were computed. He was answered by Bud Evans of the Engineering Department who also answered all other questions of a technical nature throughout the hearing, to the effect that street improvement was figured on a square foot basis, curb, gutter and sidewalk were figured on a lineal foot basis and that, beyond that, there were, in certain instances end costs permitted by legislation, which permits the City to assess side streets on a percentage basis, determined by their location and proximity to the street which is actually being improved. Specially with regard to First Street, Mr. Evans continued, credit was given for properly constructed paving between the curb and the old county road. Mr. Evans explained that the center strip of First Street, otherwise known as the old county road, must be torn out and reconstructed, inasmuch as its quality nor grade does not come up to City specifications.

Mr. E. D. Vissing, 1204 Jackson Drive, and one who had submitted a written protest, asked that said protest be again read aloud. He protested inclusion in the district on the grounds that he had previously agreed with the City to construct his own paving by a private contractor at a lesser cost than that for which he was being assessed, but that he was unable to proceed, only because the City had caused a delay in the installation of a water line.

Mr. Jack Wurston, 2190 Calkins but land owner in the Highland Park Addition, appeared and reminded the Council that he apparently does not have clear title to his property due to the Government's title search on certain riparian land. He proposed that none of these lands in question be included in the district until this matter was settled and the title cloud lifted.

Mr. Eugene Moshberger, 160 South Fanning, appeared and protested his First Street assessment on the grounds that there was no correlation between the assessment and that of nearby neighbors.

Mr. Jesse Quinton, 1285 Boise, appeared and asked whether or not his assessment was based upon all of his seven lots. He said he was in the process of selling a portion of these. Evans answered to the effect that the assessment was based on all seven, inasmuch as the sale had not progressed to the point that title had changed hands.

Mr. John Maquire, 981 First Street, appeared and reminded the Council that he had previously constructed his own sidewalk, curb and gutter. He asked if this had been reflected in his assessment. Evans answered in the affirmative but said he would recheck and advise. Maquire then noted that he had intended to construct his own street and asked if so doing, now, he could be excluded from the district. Evans explained that this could not be permitted, now that the district was created. Maquire protested this on the grounds that it could have been done cheaper by a private contractor. Evans admitted that this type of improvement, when financed through a local improvement district, usually costs more due to other expenses such as engineering, administration, legal, etc. Maquire then asked if First Street was to become a four lane arterial and was answered in the negative, within the predictable future.

Mr. Leland Staten, 995 First Street, appeared and said he had not received a notice of this hearing but that he felt similarly to Maquire and wished to register protest accordingly.

Mr. Melvin Strong, 1033 Canyon, appeared and asked to be excluded from the district on the grounds that he was disabled, living on a small pension, and could not afford the assessment.

In the absence of further protests or comments, the Mayor announced that no decision would be made this night but that, instead, all protests would be carefully studied and analyzed to determine their merit.

Councilman Nelson introduced the following resolution in writing and moved its adoption:

**RESOLUTION (Resolution No. 1965-29)**

RESOLUTION TO FURTHER CONSIDER AND TAKE  
UNDER ADVISEMENT ASSESSMENT ROLL OF LOCAL  
IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 36.

“WHEREAS, the City Engineer and Committee on Streets have heretofore made out and certified to the City Council as provided by law an Assessment Roll of Local Improvement District No. 36, and

WHEREAS, on November 9, 1965, the City Council fixed the time and place when and where objections to Assessment Roll by the property owners of said District would be heard, to-wit: Thursday, December 9, 1965, at 7:30 o'clock of said day at the Council Chambers in the City Building at Idaho Falls, Idaho, and

WHEREAS, notice was duly and regularly given, as provided by law, by the Clerk of the time to file objections to said Assessment Roll, and

WHEREAS, several objections were filed or made to said Assessment Roll, and

WHEREAS, the City Council has decided to further consider and take under advisement said Assessment Roll,

NOW THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the consideration and examination of said Assessment Roll be continued until another meeting of the City Council.”

Councilman Page seconded the adoption of said Resolution, and the same, on being put to a vote, was unanimously carried by the affirmative vote of all Councilmen present, the vote being as follows: Councilmen Page, Leahy, Freeman, Nelson, Parish and Keller. “Nay”, none. Whereupon, the Mayor declared the motion carried.

The Mayor announced that this was the time and the place for the reconvening of a recessed portion of a public hearing covering rezoning of certain lands on 17<sup>th</sup> Street, part of which has recently been developed by construction of a Bee Line Service Station. In this connection the City Clerk read the following:

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

City of Idaho Falls  
Office of the City Clerk  
December 9, 1965

To The Honorable Mayor and City Council  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Gentlemen:

Please be advised that the rezoning proposal on the property scheduled for rezoning consideration this night was originally initiated by the Planning Commission, not the property owner.

The Chairman of the Planning Commission, Mr. Harold Noble, called today and respectfully requested that this rezoning be recessed until December 21<sup>st</sup>. In the interim period this will again be reviewed by the Planning Commission.

Respectfully submitted,  
s/ Roy C. Barnes  
City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Nelson, seconded by Page, that the request be honored and this rezoning be further recessed as requested. Roll call as follows; Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

Messrs. Allen Hansen and Jim Brady, KID & KIFI representatives, respectively, appeared before the Council urging the Council to consider and pass this night the ordinance, presented at the previous Council Meeting, which would grant a franchise to the Snake River Cable Company to reconstruct a community antenna television system in the City of Idaho Falls. Councilman Nelson drew attention to the fact that, in the interim period, another local party had indicated an interest, verbally, in such a franchise and had been invited by the Mayor and Council to confer accordingly. Mr. Brady drew attention to the fact that he and Mr. Jensen represented the two locally established TV companies in the immediate area, that they would be the ones to suffer if this franchise is not granted in their favor, that any other prospect would have only his initial investment at stake, whereas they would have, not only said initial investment but their existing businesses as well. Councilman Parish voiced an opinion that inasmuch as the other interested party had been invited in, he should have a reasonable time to submit a written proposal for purposes of comparison. City Attorney Smith, in answer to a question said that in his opinion, the City Council has the right to grant a franchise on an operation of the nature in question. Jensen and Brady reluctantly agreed that time was not sufficiently of the essence but what a Council decision could be tabled until the next Council Meeting. It was moved by Councilman Nelson, seconded by Freeman that all other interested parties be given until December 16<sup>th</sup>, 1965 to submit a written proposal so that these could be studied and a decision reached by the next Council Meeting on December 21, 1965. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

DECEMBER 9, 1965

The Mayor presented a certificate of appreciation to Councilman Philip Leahy from the Idaho Municipal League as Chairman of the Legislative Committee. In answer to a question by the Mayor, Councilman-Elect Jack Wood, from his knowledge and experience as a State Senator, acknowledged the fact that proposed bills, as presented by the League were appreciated by the legislators for their clearness, conciseness and completeness and, Wood commented further, in the great majority of instances, were acted upon favorably.

Bills for the month of November, having been properly audited by the Fiscal Committee, were presented as follows, in caption form, to-wit:

<u>FUND</u>	<u>GROSS PAYROLL</u>	<u>SERVICES &amp; MATERIALS</u>	<u>TOTAL EXPENDITURES</u>
General Fund	\$100,695.37	\$78,320.42	\$179,015.79
Fire Bonds	30,390.85	3,819.21	34,210.06
Water & Sewer Fund	9,461.20	68,271.84	77,733.04
Electric Light Fund	27,372.81	112,232.27	139,605.18
Recreation Fund	476.01	867.99	1,344.00
Police Retirement Fund	<u>2,234.42</u>	<u>.00</u>	<u>2,234.42</u>
<u>TOTAL FUNDS</u>	<u>\$170,630.66</u>	<u>\$263,511.83</u>	<u>\$434,142.49</u>

It was moved by Councilman Parish, seconded by Page, that the bills be allowed and the Controller be authorized to issue warrants on the respective funds for their payment. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

Reports from Division and Department Heads were presented for the month of November, 1965, and there being no objection, were ordered placed on file in the office of the City Clerk.

License applications for RESTAURANT, previously approved by the City Sanitation, Westbank Coffee Shop & Lounge, Willard Wood; GROCERY STORE, previously approved by the City Sanitarian, Village Market, Don F. Jones, Russ's Super Market, J. Russell Brown, Skyline Market, Fay Marler, Corner Grocery, E. J. Guderjohn, Matson's Service, Oscar Matson, Minit Market, Frank Hartwell, Murphy's Marker, John R. Christensen; JOURNEYMAN ELECTRICIAN, previously approved by the Electrical Inspector, Don W. Meppen with H. L. Electric; CLASS D APPRENTICE GAS FITTER, previously approved by the Heating Inspector, Don Frisby with Wally's Plumbing; CLASS D APPRENTICE REFRIGERATION, previously approved by the Heating Inspector, Carl L. England with Scott's Refrigeration; CLASS D JOURNEYMAN WARM AIR HEATING, previously approved by the Heating Inspector, Ronald B. Williams; JOURNEYMAN GAS FITTER, previously approved by the Heating Inspector, Cyril B. Lempke; BEER, previously approved by the Police Chief, canned and bottled, not to be consumed on the premises, George See for Wise Buy Inc., J. Russell Brown for Russ's Super Market, Gerald Robbins for United Blue Ribbon Food Service, John R. Christensen for Murphy's Market, Frank Hartwell for Minit Marker, E. J. Guderjohn for Corner Grocery, Jerold D. Epperly for Elm Street Jiffy Mart, Fay Marler for Skyline Market, Robert Martin for Safeway Store #323, Don F. Jones for Village Market, Ralph Cowham for Safeway Store #365; BEER,

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

previously approved by the Police Chief, canned and bottled to be consumed on the premises, J. W. Banks and Dorothy Johnson Lehman for Hub Bar, Lloyd Feltman for Airport Service Station, Vernon Scheets for Stardust Restaurant & Lounge, Von McAtee for Samoa Club; BEER, previously approved by the Police Chief, canned, bottled and draught to be consumed on the premises, S. C. Montague & Eugene Peterson for Starlite Lounge, Reed McKnight for B.P.O Elks 1087, George M. McKissick for New Grand Hotel and Bar, Tom Mueller for Gas Lampe Pizza Shop, Oscar Matson for Matson's Service, Willard R. Wood for Westbank Coffee Shop & Lounge, George A. Winters for C & R Bar, Merrill and James Ingelstrom for Fords Bar, Ellen Campbell for The Dog House, Goldy E. Taylor for Stockman's Bar, Clara Eames for Mint Bar, H. W. Reeve for Dusty's, Lynn Pierce and Robert Newman for The Russett; LIQUOR, previously approved by the Police Chief, Dorothy Drake for Gem Rooms, Lois Carlson for Rialto Rooms. It was moved by Councilman Freeman, seconded by Leahy, that these licenses be approved. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

License application for DANCE HALL, previously approved by the Police Chief, Reed McKnight for B.P.O. Elks 1087. It was moved by Councilman Freeman, seconded by Page, that this license be granted, subject to the approval of the Police Committee. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

License applications for BEER, canned, bottled and draught to be consumed on the premises, Harry G. Strobel for Frontier Bar, John M. and Helen Hart Ransom, name change only, for Lobby Bar. It was moved by Councilman Freeman, seconded by Keller, that these licenses be granted subject to the approval of the Police Chief. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

This damage claim was presented and read:

Wayne Smith Agency  
Dubois, Idaho  
December 2, 1965

Neahl H. Johnson (Patrolman)  
2160 Aegan  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Dear Mr. Johnson:

I am enclosing two estimates on the repair of Sam Truman's vehicle, which you collided with just prior to Thanksgiving.

One statement is from Hart Pontiac Cadillac in the amount of \$80.94, and the other is from Imperial Motors, Inc. in the amount of \$76.22. I suggest that you turn these over to your insurance carrier (which I presume would be the insurance carrier for the City of Idaho Falls, and inform Mr. Truman as soon as possible when he may have this repaired".

I am mailing a copy of this letter to Mr. Truman for this information.

Sincerely yours,  
s/ Wayne M. Smith

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

It was moved by Councilman Freeman, seconded by Keller, that this be referred to the City Insurance Adjustor for investigation. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

Two City Redemption Tax Deeds were presented in the names of Edna M. Case Fearheller and the State of Idaho, Department of Highways, accompanied by appropriate resolution as follows:

**RESOLUTION (Resolution No. 1965-30)**

WHEREAS, the City of Idaho Falls, did, under and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 29, Title 50, Idaho Code, and by deed of the City Treasurer dated the 15<sup>th</sup> day of November, 1961, recorded in Book 139 of Deeds at Page 191, records of Bonneville County, Idaho acquire title to and possession of the following described real property, to-wit:

Lots One (1), Two (2), and Three (3), Block Thirty-seven (37) Highland Park Addition to the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho, as per the recorded plat thereof.

WHEREAS, Edna M. Case Fearheller has offered to pay to the City of Idaho Falls the amount for which said property was sold to the City, together with all the installments of assessments subsequent to the one for which said property was sold and then due, together with penalties and interest thereon;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Mayor and City Clerk be, and they hereby are, authorized and directed, upon the payment of said sum of money by said purchaser to make, execute and deliver to the said Edna M. Case Fearheller a deed to said property, pursuant to the provisions of Section 50-2951, Idaho Code.

PASSED BY THE COUNCIL this 9<sup>th</sup> day of December, 1965.

APPROVED BY THE MAYOR this 9<sup>th</sup> day of December, 1965.

ATTEST: s/ Roy C. Barnes  
CITY CLERK

s/ S. Eddie Pedersen  
MAYOR

**RESOLUTION (Resolution No. 1965-31)**

WHEREAS, the City of Idaho Falls, did, under and pursuant to the provisions of Chapter 29, Title 50, Idaho Code, and by deed of the City Treasurer dated the 20<sup>th</sup> day of January, 1964, recorded in Book 153 of Deeds at Page 495, records of Bonneville County, Idaho acquire title to and possession of the following described real property, to-wit:

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

Lots Thirty-one (31) and Thirty-two (32), Block Thirty-seven (37), Highland Park Addition, to the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho, as per the recorded plat thereof.

WHEREAS, State of Idaho, Department of Highways, has offered to pay to the City of Idaho Falls, the amount for which said property was sold to the City, together with all the installments of assessments subsequent to the one for which said property was sold and then due, together with penalties and interest thereon;

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED:

That the Mayor and City Clerk be, and they hereby are, authorized and directed, upon the payment of said sum of money by said purchaser to make, execute and deliver to the said State of Idaho, Department of Highways a deed to said property, pursuant to the provision of Section 50-2951, Idaho Code.

PASSED BY THE COUNCIL this 9<sup>th</sup> day of December, 1965.

APPROVED BY THE MAYOR this 9<sup>th</sup> day of December, 1965.

ATTEST: s/ Roy C. Barnes  
CITY CLERK

s/ S. Eddie Pedersen  
MAYOR

It was moved by Councilman Leahy, seconded by Keller, that the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized to sign the resolutions and the deeds. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

A notice of completion of public works was presented, covering construction of the Boise Avenue water line. It was moved by Councilman Keller, seconded by Leahy, that the City Clerk be authorized to publish, as required by law. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

This memo from the Purchasing Department was read:

City of Idaho Falls  
Idaho Falls, Idaho  
November 29, 1965

Office of the Purchasing Agent  
41 Pieces of Cast Iron Water Pipe

Honorable Mayor and Councilmembers:

Tabulation of bids for cast iron water pipe is attached.

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

Evaluation of bids received show Waterworks Equipment Company of Salt Lake City submitting the low bid of \$3,977.32.

It is the recommendation of the Public Works and the Purchasing Department that the low bid be accepted.

This recommendation subject to your approval.

s/ W. J. Skow  
Purchasing Department

It was moved by Councilman Keller, seconded by Parish, that the low bid of Waterworks Equipment Company be accepted as recommended. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

The City Clerk presented the following:

Harold Collard  
755 Ninth Street  
November 23, 1965

Mr. Don Lloyd, Director of Public Works  
City of Idaho Falls  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

RE: RETENTION TANK WALLS WELL NO. 11

Dear Mr. Lloyd:

Enclosed are five (5) copies of Change Order No. 1 to the Well No. 11 Project.

Our Structural Engineer designed the tank on the assumption that the contractor would build it in four segments and that after opposite quarters were cast they would shrink before the other two segments were poured against them. Our successful contractor has enough form panels to pour and in expediency of time we feel that he should be permitted to do so. To provide better insurance for cracking we would like to recommend the inclusion of additional steel other than that shown on the plan. We would like to place a curtain of steel on the outside face of the wall of #4 bars at 24" o. c. both ways and a curtain of rebar on the inside face of the wall consisting of #4 bars at 12" o. c. both ways. This amounts to an additional 4,900 lbs. of rebar at a cost of \$517.00 for material plus a \$245.00 cost for labor of installation. The total cost of this extra would be \$762.00. I recommend that this Change Order be approved.

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

Yours truly,  
s/ Harold E. Collard

Attached to the foregoing was this memo from the Public Works Director:

City of Idaho Falls  
Public Works  
December 8, 1965

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council  
FROM: Donald F. Lloyd  
SUBJECT: WELL NO. 11

Attached hereto is Change Order No. 1 recommended by the architect for additional steel reinforcing in the tanks walls. Because of a change in the method of pouring and because it is felt that additional temperature steel will be required, we concur with the architect that this change order be approved.

s/ Don F. Lloyd

It was moved by Councilman Keller, seconded by Nelson, that this change order be approved as recommended. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

Next, from the Public Works Director, this memo was presented:

City of Idaho Falls  
Public Works  
December 7, 1965

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council  
FROM: Donald F. Lloyd  
SUBJECT: POSSIBLE SALE OF CITY GARAGE AND PROPERTY

Gentlemen:

In accordance with your instructions, we have had the City Garage and property appraised. Further, we are planning possible layouts for new shop facilities on the Soderquist property now owned by the City.

It appears appropriate then that we request authorization of the City Attorney to prepare the necessary legal notice for the sale of the City Garage property.

s/ Donald F. Lloyd

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

In answer to a question by a Councilman, the City Attorney advised that there should be at least three independent appraisers and that their appraisals, when made, should coincide within reason. It was moved by Councilman Nelson, seconded by Keller, that the Public Works Director be authorized and directed to appoint appraisers as recommended, working in unity, one with the other, and that their report be reflected to the Council for their consideration. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

This memo from the Public Works Director was then read:

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council  
AT: City Hall  
FROM: Donald F. Lloyd  
AT: Public Works  
DATE: December 9, 1965  
SUBJECT: BROADWAY SIGNALIZATION  
FILE: C 22-a

We have reviewed the proposed resolution, agreement, and plans submitted by the State, for the re-signalization of Broadway Street.

This Contract and Resolution calls for the City and State to share equally the entire cost which is now estimated to be \$18,625.00, of which, the City has already spend \$1,240.65 in furnishing and installing poles. We will, therefore, be committed to provide \$17,384.35 prior to the time when the State advertises for bids.

As has been the case in past agreements, this agreement calls for the State to retain ownership of the controllers and cabinets, the vehicle and pedestrian signal heads, and the pressure detectors and radar sampling detectors. The City retains ownership of the pole foundations, the poles, the wire and conduit.

The City will be required to remove and reinstall all necessary existing street and parking control signs.

The City is responsible for replacing the lamps, provide all maintenance and the power costs while the State will furnish any items of equipment for this maintenance.

With reference to the plans, there are some details which the Electrical Engineer and myself feel should be discussed further with the Highway Department. We are, therefore, suggesting that approval of this agreement be postponed until the next Council Meeting.

Respectfully submitted,  
s/ Donald F. Lloyd, P.E.  
Public Works Director

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

It was moved by Councilman Keller, seconded by Leahy, that approval of the agreement be postponed as recommended. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

Finally, from the Public Works Director, this memo was considered:

City of Idaho Falls  
Public Works  
December 9, 1965

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council  
FROM: Donald F. Lloyd  
SUBJECT: AWARD OF CONTRACT FOR FIRE TRAINING FACILITIES

The tabulation of the bids received November 23, 1965, for construction of the Fire Tower Training Facilities, is attached.

The low bid, submitted by Clark Brothers Construction Company, exceeds the Engineer's Estimate by about \$2,600. It is our opinion that re-advertising will not result in lower bids and feel that the low bid submitted reflects the best price which can be obtained.

These bids have been discussed in some detail with the City Attorney and with the Fire Chief. It is our recommendation, with the concurrence of both, that the low bidder, Clark Brothers Construction Company, be awarded the contract in the amount of \$25,621.

s/ Donald F. Lloyd

Not mentioned in the above but proposed in an attached memo from the City Engineer was his recommendation that water mains in the amount of \$4,465.00 be deleted, lowering the net contract figure to \$21,156.00. This brought up the question of water line right of way access and it was learned that same has not yet been acquired. Therefore, it was moved by Councilman Freeman, seconded by Keller, that award of the bid in question be tabled until December 21<sup>st</sup>, and that, meanwhile, every effort be made to resolve the problem. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

A contract was presented between the City and the State of Idaho, Department of Commerce and Development, referred to in said contract as the Planning Agency, whereby the City would agree to pay said Planning Agency \$17,440.00, \$8,250.00 of which would be established as a credit in favor of the City by the Planning Agency with the understanding that the City would perform certain services, in behalf of the Planning Agency including personal services, and for this the Planning Agency would agree to assist the City in the conduct of a planning project and to render certain technical or professional services of a planning nature. It was moved by Councilman Page, seconded by Keller, that the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized to sign and the Controller be immediately authorized to issue a warrant to the Planning Agency for the amount as indicated as now being due and payable. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

This memo from the Electrical Engineer was submitted:

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

December 9, 1965

TO: Mayor Pedersen and Council  
FROM: W. H. Fell, Electrical Division  
SUBJECT: TWO WAYS RADIO MAINTENANCE

PROBLEM:

Motorola, radio maintenance contractor and supplier of new equipment, has discontinued their subcontractor, Wells Radio Repair Service, a local business. Motorola has offered a reduced price maintenance contract through Teton Communications, apparently a new repair organization. Wells Radio, whose service has been apparently satisfactory, wishes to continue servicing City radios at a reduced price.

All affected Division Heads are satisfied with the service according to a poll taken December 3, 1965. It is the opinion of responsible City Officials that we have been and are dealing with a competent and responsible local radio repair service.

RECOMMENDATION:

1. Cancel Motorola contract in accordance with contractual provisions.
2. Continue utilizing Wells Repair Service with a 10% overall price reduction on an interim period basis.
3. Request bid proposals and evaluate for repair service on a new revised contractual basis as may best meet the needs of the City.
4. Refrain from purchasing any additional radios from anyone without explicit agreement on availability of service repair notes to City and warranty provisions on suitable nature.

s/ W. H. Fell

It was moved by Councilman Leahy, seconded by Keller, that the four points of recommendation be accepted and approved. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

An extension rider to Union Pacific Agreement L. D. #16458 was presented, covering a water pipe line encroachment. It was moved by Councilman Leahy, seconded by Keller, that the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized to sign. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

The City Clerk presented the following:

City of Idaho Falls  
Office of the City Clerk  
December 8, 1965

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

To the Honorable Mayor and City Council  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Gentlemen:

All Councilmen have been handed a list of closed utility accounts, totaling 227 in number and \$6,965.31, which we are recommending be charged off our accounts receivable, inasmuch as they have been on our books for four years and are now considered legally un-collectable by virtue of the Statute of Limitations.

Please be advised that, with no exception, these accounts have been in the hands of a professional collector for one year or longer. They remain uncollected for a variety of reasons including customers who cannot be located, or have declared bankruptcy or are deceased, etc.

It should be made clear that, even though these accounts are charged off, collection efforts in the part of the professional collector will continue.

We ask your authorization to proceed accordingly.

Respectfully submitted,  
s/ Roy C. Barnes  
City Clerk

Carl Broadhead	F-57-AA	\$ 8.95	Milo Andrus	I-680	\$ 16.50
Lynn Bateman	F-63-AA	67.65	Clair L. Kelsey	I-820	35.15
Robert Windsor	F-86	62.75	Ercele Hiskey	I-912	9.60
Roy Gray	F-105	10.25	Margie Carter	I-912-A	20.60
Carl Sommers	F-108-AA	101.35	Donald Winder	I-912-B	13.30
Ruby Demott	F-126	20.25	George Lopez	J-284	22.55
Victor Vaugn	F-151-DA	57.05	Northwest Sheet Metal	J-294-AB	62.15
Joseph T. White	F-153-HA	21.85	Marjorie Christensen	J-397	30.90
Leda Ungern	F-189-CA	33.35	Wayne Kearney	J-470	13.35
Melvin Clay	F-190-CAB	5.65	Cecelia Reynolds	J-590	37.90
Eugene A. Johnson	F-190-CAB	8.60	Rose E. Henrie	J-726	10.75
Albert Charboneau	F-192-BA	56.55	Lucille Wershey	J-787	80.95
Elmer Mercer	F-193	6.35	Eldon Cunningham	J-795	12.65
Freda Windsor	F-197-A	34.16	Ezra Rhoades	J-799	257.95
Elbert Ritchie	F-199	12.70	Judy Russell	J-818-A	37.85
Paul Williams	F-200-B	48.45	Joseph S. Winegar	J-939	67.55
Del Campbell	F-203-C	67.95	Joanne Bales	J-947	12.60
Morris Robinson	F-206-AA	51.45	Frank T. Lemming	J-947	26.30

DECEMBER 9, 1965

Nelson Roberts	F-212-BAA	\$ 10.55	Rich Plan of Idaho	J-974-A	\$ 39.45
Joe Evans	F-216-C	10.00	Jim Vincent	J-1002	15.80
Clarence Rogers	F-258-A	66.75	Jack Joslin	J-1071	22.60
Harold Studley	F-258-A	49.40	Sam McKnight	K-58-ABB	13.70
Roy Peterson	F-269	47.05	Lee Roberts	K-59-AE	28.90
Jack R. Mechan	F-272-B	28.25	C. R. Moore	K-131-E	22.85
Vernon Clifford	F-279-AA	8.05	Bill Williams	K-137	32.30
Jack R. Machen	F-280-ABB	12.00	Betty White	K-282	20.45
C. Walker	F-280-AC	56.15	Ronald Hoffman	K-298	28.50
Jeanette Likes	F-291	23.80	Gary D. Williams	K-356	16.60
Larry L. Davies	F-324	9.80	Bethel M. Wilson	K-362	31.60
Rilda Slocum	F-349-A	53.60	Ralph L. Jacobs	K-377	22.45
Ralph Wheeler	F-425	60.35	Ernest Blotter	K-473	16.90
B. J. Vanderberg	F-530	49.15	Robert Jaynes	L-4	18.50
Roscoe Hix	F-601	38.00	Larry Narum	L-75-C	32.10
Allen Bolter	H-44	27.50	John Martinez	L-75-CC	20.84
Dorothy Child	H-119-A	12.40	Francis Garcia	L-84	20.05
Kay Talbot	H-05	6.10	Jay Denning	L-95-B	13.35
Jack Shield	H-207	14.60	Carol Flemming	L-266	29.40
L. E. Hjort	I-7-B	36.75	Maxine Ross	L-341	17.40
Arthur Morgan	I-7-B	47.45	Mildred Webb	L-546	27.65
C. W. McDonald	I-7-C	22.40	Robert E. Rupe	L-559	22.30
R. A. Warren	I-7-D	11.45	Lynn Russell	L-564	38.85
Nolen Martensen	I-7-D	12.40	Roger Shepard	M-32	26.30
Ruby Messick	I-18-C	10.35	Harold Holbrook	M-32-B	34.35
Bob Wright	I-18-C	18.20	Lee Barnes	M-103	29.80
Kenneth Munn	I-21-A	22.00	Cathryn Fohrenk	M-07-AA	26.55
Diana Outcelt	I-24	35.60	Don Craig	M-112-AB	36.85
Blaine Holbrook	I-24	25.25	Lyle McAllister	M-124	15.95
James W. Jones	I-45	29.60	Lamont Waltrers	M-124-A	18.05
Ray Gosnell	I-63	24.00	Richard Cunningham	M-151-A	30.65
Ray Docken	I-121	18.35	Marcell Bird	M-176	21.80
Darwin Chambers	I-124	19.35	Gary Whalen	M-216-A	28.30
J. A. Moses	I-132	9.00	Harold W. Muchow	M-218-B	11.45
Winnie Molen	I-206-B	10.95	Alfonso Pacheco	M-222-AA	30.65
Robert Sauer	I-220	10.45	Gary Van Slyke	N-220	9.00
Dorothy Hainline	I-235	32.80	George Conaway	N-234	10.10
Gilbert Stotts	I-250	12.75	William Chapple	N-380	12.50
S & M Enterprises	I-297	72.65	Sandy Larna	N-414-B	7.20
Harriett D. Moore	I-409	50.00	Junior Stevens	N-490	7.05
T. E. Stolworthy	I-521-B	16.80	Dell Winters	N-503	22.25

DECEMBER 9, 1965

Marlin D. Anderson	I-531	\$ 27.85	Emma Albee	N-20-A	\$ 44.60
P. W. Chriswell	I-532	84.95	Albert Howard	N-657	13.05
Robert Warren	I-555	29.15	Bud Hincks	G-36	31.60
Cleo Nielsen	I-614	11.90	Allan Jensen	G-43	10.85
E. E. Butterworth	N-684	6.40	Jim Hicks	G-46-AA	18.80
John Coder	N-696	35.45	Arlene Perry	G-50-BA	14.60
J. P. Kessler	N-1122	32.25	Sharon Holst	G-55	29.10
Keith Beazer	N-1137	22.90	Fred Moorman	G-55	23.20
Hale Hubbard	S-171	21.80	Don Waters	G-73-BB	9.25
Ted Armstrong	T-13	18.35	Bobs Richfield Service	G-74-A	81.65
F. L. Granthan	T-36	22.55	Marguerita Tisa	G-127	38.65
Charles Langseth	T-43	17.00	Ronald Wise	G-133	28.30
Edward Croft	T-131	19.90	Bill Dodds	G-133	9.80
John R. Strouse	T-136	23.45	Keith Richfield	R-4	14.80
Clifford Melvin	T-191	57.55	C. H. Connelly	R-152	7.70
Duane White	T-200	72.70	Bob Wiseman	R-195	10.50
Roland F. Bateman	T-502	46.95	W. S. Harrow	R-206	32.50
John S. Brown	WB-15	10.00	Cora Nelson	R-208	13.10
Lloyd Clapp	WC-2	13.00	Don Espy	R-218	11.05
Gene's Refrigeration	A-6-A	19.86	Ellis Higley	R-218	24.40
Robert Newman	A-59-A	16.75	Lamont Miller	R-229	11.50
Vicki Waits	A-78-C	9.70	Jennie Dutton	R-233-AB	32.80
Colin Hincks	A-100-B	9.65	William F. Wilson	R-253	11.25
James Johnson	A-100-R	8.25	Howard Ashby	R-253-A	18.00
Theo Ashment	A-103-AA	8.35	Templeview Service	R-259	118.85
R. L. Scheeberger	A-114-B	7.60	John Newman	R-261-C	5.45
Walt's Cosmopolitan	A-124	308.00	Joe Shinko	R-261-C	10.55
Joseph Morgan	B-104-A	13.00	Bea Parsons	R-261	8.10
Turf Club	C-47-A	29.20	Marcell Keele	R-303	16.35
A. W. Wetzell	D-53	16.80	Tobe's Eat House	R-429	252.55
Lucille Mathieson	D-153	18.85	W. O. Stogner	OC-30	23.45
Meredith Thornsborough	D-158	70.65	Joan Haws	OC-106-C	73.95
Janice Hill	E-3	11.50	Mrs. Robert Thurman	OC-127-A	15.60
Alice Billman	E-7-B	15.20	Merlin Allgood	OC-164-B	42.95
C. L. Buckner	E-7-B	10.45	Walter Weaver	OC-176	42.40
Thomas Murphy	E-8-B	15.80	Gerald Bowen	OC-199	131.35
H. G. Tincher	E-10	10.70	Robert Hansen	OC-245	20.70
Ruth Dillard	E-11-A	21.35	Buhl Broadbent	OC-248	97.45
Frank Daniels	E-11-A	9.10	Francis Provencow	OC-424-A	16.60
Wayne Bennett	E-21	31.25	Glen Duncan	OC-496	38.60
Bill Jacobson	E-41-A	34.60	R. H. Gregg	OC-496	60.30

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

Ralph Croy	E-41-C	\$ 10.05	Don Nakaii	OC-563	\$ 18.45
Betty Nichols	E-42-AA	6.05	Marion Nordstrom	OC-596	20.70
Robert Harbough	E-42-AA	11.75	Walter D. Kane	OC-610	33.30
Margaret Henderickson	E-74-B	10.00	Carl L. Swanson	OC-624	16.15
Erma Donohoe	E-85-A	65.55	LaMar Williams	OC-629	6.35
Bob A. Williams	E-103-AE	53.25	Edith Winder	OC-636	57.70
Carolyn Rogers	E-118-A	21.95	Donald Floyd Taylor	OC-680	67.30
Carolyn Brumfield	E-128	29.00	Lee Beaman	OC-1158	24.50
Earl Hayes	E-128-A	24.15	Garth C. Reynolds	OC-2342	29.65
Ivan W. Watson	E-129-AC	12.55	Joseph W. Rivard	OC-3081	34.10
John Kochler	E-130-C	4.55	Ralph Hancock	OC-4053	6.05
Larry Simmons	E-150-AC	12.15	Fent Clark	OC-7024	13.65
Don Snoweenger	E-157	10.80	Elaine Black	OC-7080	35.65
Ray Mitchell	G-16-A	5.70			

**TOTAL: \$6,965.31**

It was moved by Councilman Page, seconded by Freeman, that this list of closed utility accounts be charged off as recommended. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

This memo from the City Clerk was then read:

City of Idaho Falls  
Office of the City Clerk  
December 9, 1965

To the Honorable Mayor and City Council  
Idaho Falls, Idaho

Gentlemen:

On November 23<sup>rd</sup>, sealed bids were opened on certain used office equipment located in the office of the City Clerk.

No bid was received for the N. C. R. Class 2000 Utility Biller.

The high bid received for four items of addressograph equipment, including an addressing machine, a suction feeder, an embossing machine and three cabinets with drawers and plates, was \$1,850.00 from Business Management Service, Idaho Falls, with the knowledge and consent of the Mayor and in the interest of time, this bid was accepted and payment has been received. The purpose of this memo is to seek Council ratification in accepting said bid and also, to ask Council authorization to proceed in an attempt to successfully sell the billing

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

machine by negotiation at a fair price at the discretion of the City Clerk, the City Controller and the Mayor.

Respectfully submitted,  
s/ Roy C. Barnes  
City Clerk

It was moved by Councilman Leahy, seconded by Parish, that the action in accepting the high bid for the addressograph equipment be duly ratified and that the N. C. R. machine be disposed of, if possible, in the manner proposed. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

This letter was read from Mr. E. F. McDermott, acting as Chairman of the Idaho Falls Civil Service Commission:

City of Idaho Falls  
Idaho Falls, Idaho  
November 24, 1965

The Honorable S. Eddie Pedersen  
Mayor of Idaho Falls, Idaho

Dear Mayor Pedersen:

Enclosed herewith are copies of the revised Rules and Regulations of the Idaho Falls Civil Service Commission for yourself and Council. We request that, at your earliest convenience, you submit this to the Council for formal approval so that we may go ahead with the printing of the regulations. We would be happy to meet with you and the Council at anytime if you have any questions or suggestions that you care to have us consider.

At the request of the Commission, I'm writing to commend the excellent services provided by Mrs. Lorna Coughlin, who was assigned to us as our Secretary. She has certainly discharged the duties capably. She has made a study of the program and has been very beneficial to the Commission. In view of the fact that the Ordinance #1133 provides the Council may determine extra compensation for this additional work, it is our recommendation that Mrs. Coughlin's service be recognized financially if such can be fitted into your financial program.

On behalf of the Commission, I am

Sincerely,  
s/ E. F. McDermott, Chairman  
I. F. Civil Service Commission

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

The City Attorney commented to the effect that he had studied said rules and regulations and found them to be in excellent legal form and that they were not in conflict with either State Statute or City ordinance. The Fire Chief concurred except to say that they do not spell out the Civil Service status of certain employees such as secretaries. It was moved by Councilman Freeman, seconded by Keller, that the Idaho Falls Civil Service Rules and Regulations be accepted and adopted, subject to an amendment, forthcoming from the City Attorney in ordinance form, to clarify the point as presented by the Fire Chief. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

This memo from the Police Chief was presented, acting in the capacity of Chairman of the Traffic Safety Committee:

City of Idaho Falls  
Idaho Falls, Idaho  
December 9, 1965

TO: Honorable Mayor and City Council of the City of Idaho Falls  
FROM: Traffic Safety Committee  
SUBJECT: REQUEST FOR TRAFFIC CHANGES

It is herein recommended and permission requested to initiate the following changes in traffic control.

1. That the parking lot between Yellowstone Avenue and the railroad tracks between "C" Street and Broadway be restricted to two (2) hour parking.
2. That Skyline Avenue be designated as a 25 MPH zone from a point approximately 300 feet south of the curve entering the airport on to the terminal area.
3. To install a clock controlled school signal system on Anderson Avenue at Whittier School. This signal system would show blinking amber lights with a designated speed of 20 MPH during such times the students were going to or from school. During the interim period of no student traffic and after hours the signal plates are turned designating a speed of 35 MPH.

Your consideration of these proposals are appreciated.

Respectfully submitted,  
s/ Robert D. Pollock, Chairman  
Traffic Safety Committee

It was moved by Councilman Freeman, seconded by Page, that these recommendations be accepted and approved, subject to review at a later date on item pertaining to two hour enforced parking on

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

the parking lot between Yellowstone Highway and the railroad tracks. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

The Police Chief appeared and noted that Presidents of several P.T.A.'s have requested lower speed limits on First Street, between Wabash and Tabor. However, it was generally agreed that no action be taken on the matter until a memo of recommendation is presented in writing.

Councilman Parish presented a proposal as sponsored by the Independent Insurance Companies, whereby they would make available a sticker which would read "Lock Your Car - Take Your Keys" to be placed on parking meters. It was moved by Councilman Page, seconded by Keller, that this program be approved. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

The City Attorney presented and read the following:

City of Idaho Falls  
Idaho Falls, Idaho  
December 9, 1965

TO: The Mayor and City Council of the City of Idaho Falls:  
RE: CITY OF IDAHO FALLS VS. GENERAL ELECTRIC COMPANY ET AL, CIVIC ACTION NO. 465-16 (IDAHO DISTRICT)

This memorandum sets forth the background and status of the above action, as well as making recommendations as to the conclusion of the litigation.

Early in 1965 upon learning that violations of the Clayton Anti-Trust Act by certain suppliers of electrical equipment in many areas of the country had possibly affected the City of Idaho Falls adversely, the legal department made an investigation of the facts then available and reported to the Mayor and Council that there was sufficient evidence to warrant the filing of a civil suit. The legal department was then authorized to do so. It was necessary that the suit be filed at the earliest possible date because of the statute of limitations. Because without very extensive and prolonged investigation, it was impossible to determine which purchases through the years were probably or possibly affected by the violations of the Anti-Trust Act, the complaint was filed including all purchases. The suit was filed in the Federal District Court for Idaho in April, 1965.

After much further discovery proceedings in the action, and local investigation, it became apparent that a full and proper investigation and appraisal of the case could not be had without access to numerous and voluminous records and evidence obtained in cases in other parts of the country. These records could not be obtained without great expense to the City, and so request was made of the Mayor and City Council to associate a nationally known firm of Anti-Trust Attorneys headed by Joseph H. Alioto in order to obtain the required records in appraising the case.

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

This association was granted and the information and appraisal obtained. The Anti-Trust Attorneys were to receive one-third (1/3) of the gross proceeds realized from the proceedings.

Upon full appraisal of the facts and the law, and following extended negotiations with Council for General Electric Company and other defendants, it was concluded that settlement of the action should be had for the gross amount of \$30,000.00. This figure was arrived at after weighing all factors involved in the suit, including the factor or rather extensive court costs and expenses in depositing numerous persons in various parts of the country. These prospective expenses are now estimated at roughly \$20,000.00.

The firm of Joseph H. Alioto, through its Salt Lake representative, Daniel Berman, has agreed to reduce its fee to one-fourth (1/4) of the gross recovery, and would therefore be entitled to \$7,500.00 from the proceeds of the proposed settlement.

It is the studied opinion of this office that the offer of settlement contained in the letter of December 3, 1965, signed by William S. Holden and submitted herewith, should be accepted by the City and that the Mayor should be authorized to execute all documents necessary to release the defendants from liability and suits.

It is the further recommendation of this Department that the City remit to Daniel Berman, Attorney, the sum of \$7,500.00 as fees from the proceeds of the \$30,000.00 settlement.

Respectfully submitted,  
s/ A. L. Smith  
Office of the City Attorney

In connection with the foregoing, this resolution was introduced:

**RESOLUTION (Resolution No. 1965-32)**

BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho, that S. Eddie Pedersen, Mayor of the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho, be and he is hereby authorized and empowered to compromise and settle any and all antitrust claims for damages arising out of the purchase of electrical equipment and associated mechanical products which the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho, has or may have against General Electric Company, Westinghouse Electric Corporation, McGraw-Edison Company, Allis-Chalmers Manufacturing Company, Moloney Electric Company and Warner Electric Corporation.

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the said S. Eddie Pedersen, Mayor, be and he hereby is authorized to execute on behalf of the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho all settlement agreements, covenants not to sue, dismissals and all other documents and instruments necessary or convenient to effectuate any settlement agreements entered into on behalf of the City of Idaho

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

Falls, Idaho, by reason of the foregoing authority and to receive such payments on behalf of the City of Idaho Falls, Idaho which are due under a letter agreement dated December 3, 1965.

It was moved by Councilman Leahy, seconded by Keller, that the foregoing resolution be adopted and approved, that the recommendations as set forth in the letter from the City Attorney be accepted and approved and that the Legal Department be complimented for the compromise settlement in the manner as indicated. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

Councilman Nelson presented a renewal extension to a lease and concession agreement between the City and Leonard Messmer, lessee and operator of the Airport Café and Lounge, identical in terms and conditions as the original, dated December 4<sup>th</sup>, 1964. It was moved by Councilman Nelson, seconded by Parish, that the Mayor and City Clerk be authorized to sign. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

Councilman Nelson reported that the Airport Advisory Committee had prepared a resolution, establishing and adopting minimum standards, rules and regulations for fixed base and other commercial operations at the Airport. He presented copies to all Councilmen and asked that this be studied and considered at the next Council Meeting. Nelson also reported that the McCarley proposal, petitioning to be considered as a non-exclusive operator at the airport is being studied by the Airport Advisory Committee who will soon make recommendations to the Council in this regard.

Councilman Page presented the following written recommendation as submitted by the Recreation Commission:

MEMORANDUM

December 9, 1965

TO: Mayor and City Council  
FROM: Recreation Commission  
SUBJECT: RECOMMENDATIONS

The Recreation Commission at their regular meeting held on December 9, 1965, voted unanimously to make the following recommendations to the Mayor and Council.

1. Improve the interior of the Recreation Center by painting and better lighting. Identification of building by placing signs on the outside, with one on "A" Street and another on Memorial Drive.
2. The lease be reinstated to the Art Guild for use of Log Hut at Highland Park. In view that we have invested \$750.00 for improvements to Log Hut and since we are charging \$35.00 a month to Community Players, same amount be charged to Art Guild starting January 1, 1966.

DECEMBER 9, 1965

---

3. Present space held by other organizations in Recreation Center is badly needed by Recreation Department. Recommend that these organizations look for other facilities so this space could be used by Recreation Department.
  
4. The major portions of Ernie Craner's budget have been reviewed by the Commission and approved. Also for the second time the Commission recommends that a supervisor be hired to assist Mr. Craner.

Respectfully submitted,  
s/ Pauline Fisk, Secretary  
Recreation Commission

By general Council agreement authorization was granted to place identification signs on the Recreation Center Building. All other items were taken under advisement.

Councilman Parish reported on the point step range salary schedule and noted that it had been revised from its original form on a 3% step program, rather than 5%. He said the time element had been virtually disregarded and left to the discretion of the Division Head. Parish commented further that the job description was still an integral determining factor. He introduced a revised resolution accordingly. This matter was tabled for further study and consideration by the Council.

Councilman Leahy asked that the City advertise for bids on a tree trimming contract to be awarded sometime soon after January 1<sup>st</sup>, 1966. It was moved by Councilman Leahy, seconded by Keller, that the City Clerk be authorized to advertise accordingly, date of the bid opening to be determined by the Electrical Engineer. Roll call as follows: Ayes, 6; No, none; carried.

There being no further business, it was moved by Councilman Page, seconded by Leahy, that the Meeting adjourn. Carried.

ATTEST: s/ Roy C. Barnes  
CITY CLERK

s/ S. Eddie Pedersen  
MAYOR

\*\*\*\*\*