

# Idaho Falls Auditorium District

---

*Building Planning & Design Committee* of the Board of Directors  
Shared Conference Room, 901 Pier View Drive, Idaho Falls, ID 83402  
26 July 2012  
10:00 a.m.

## Minutes

**In Attendance:** IFAD Board Member Bob Everhart; IFAD Legal Counsel Mark Fuller; Board Consultant Rebecca Casper; CRSA Representative Kevin DeKold; and SRL Liaison Tana Barney. Also present by phone/computer were: Horrocks Engineer Clint Boyle; and SHD Representatives Mike Harvey and Don Dethlefs.

### I. Call to Order.

Conducted by Board Member Everhart, the meeting was called to order at 10:08 a.m.

### II. Adoption of the Agenda.

Mr. Everhart amended the agenda to include adoption of the agenda, approval of committee minutes, and public comment by unanimous consent.

### III. Approval of Minutes from the Previous Committee Meeting.

After verifying that corrections to the minutes proposed via email had been incorporated into the final copy, Mr. Everhart approved the minutes by unanimous consent.

### IV. Building Architecture Discussion, Presentation & Update.

Mike Harvey and Don Dethlefs of SCD presented updated floor plans reflecting relocated ticketing entrances, a renovated main entrance, and 2 options for adding meeting room space—costing roughly in the area of \$3 million to incorporate. The basic drawings reflect a 4,000-seat arena, with restrooms and concessions inside the concourse to facilitate maximum window placement on the outside of the concourse. The drawings also indicate three elevators and various stairway entrances. The design allows space for retail space in the main lobby which could be a team store. However, some operators have found that incorporating a bar into the lobby brings in more revenue and team merchandise can be sold in kiosks located throughout the concourse.

Meeting room option #1 allows for meeting rooms on two levels placed on a corner (currently the northeast corner of the building and with a separate entrance and restroom facilities. This stand alone feature would allow the space to be used independent of concurrent arena functions

Meeting room option #2 allows for the addition of four “saddlebag” party rooms.” These would each be located off the concourse and require concourse access and restrooms as well as catering from the arena that uses the same door. Therefore, these rooms have somewhat limited usefulness as they could not accommodate a separate use if the arena were hosting an event. These rooms are also more expensive to build as they require the construction of more outside walls than option #1 and outside wall space is more expensive on a square-foot basis.

Due to its increased cost and limited usefulness, serious consideration of Option 2 waned early on. Remaining discussion centered on the following considerations associated with Option #2.

1. The square footage available in the rooms associated with option #1. The architects explained that the use of the rooms will dictate the capacity— theater, classroom, buffet, banquet, cocktail party etc. Each calls for a different square-footage per person calculation.
2. The nature and quality of catered events in the meetings space.
3. The possible relocation of the meeting room space to the back of the house, which involves a reconsideration of the location of the 2<sup>nd</sup> ice sheet.
4. The size of the plaza—as the meeting space encroaches on plaza space. Some of that space could be re-captured by limiting the turn-around space in the back of the house (which is currently much larger than most by about 40-60 feet).
5. The availability of the suites and open concourse areas for additional meetings and receptions.
6. The location of outdoor signage visible from the interstate. The architects pulled up drawings from other projects that show parapets that could easily support signage.

The architectural team offered to create new drawings to facilitate this discussion with the full board at the schematic design workshop on August 2<sup>nd</sup>:

1. A drawing moving the meeting space to the back of the house (designed to be a larger space). This will require flipping the back-of house design and location of the commissary to avoid complications associated with the subsurface level of lava and rock on the south side of the site. This was nicknamed the food-oriented option. (Note: This change affects the placement of a second ice-sheet.)
2. A drawing that expands the meeting space by relocating the concession and restroom areas on the east side of the building and possibly adjusting the footprint of the building one to the west.

The committee determined to report back to the Board and seek full board guidance on the desired use and size of the meeting rooms (banquet space v. meeting space), as well as create awareness of the problems associated with displacing the ice sheet. Mr. DeKold pointed out the necessity of

making the long term land use decisions associated with the site before the land can be deeded to the district.

**V. Calendaring.**

The committee discussed the schedule for upcoming committee and Board meetings and determined to present the findings from this meeting at the August 2<sup>nd</sup> architectural workshop to be held as part of Board Work session. It was further suggested that the committee meet again on August 15<sup>th</sup> just prior to the full board meeting to facilitate full discussions.

**VI. Public Comment.**

Meeting time was made available for public commentary, but no members of the public were present to provide comment.

**VII. Adjournment.**

The meeting was adjourned at 11:30 a.m.

DRAFT