

- C. LoBuono asks if the study would be invalidated if the board were to change the current design. Krueger agreed and explained that they would be finding answers in regard to whether the current design is feasible for the area.
- D. Krueger asked if the board wants to add the Economic Impact (EI) element to the study. LoBuono brought up the fact that every study he researched included the Economic Impact study with the Financial Feasibility and Market Analysis. It includes testing how much money tourists spend when they come through town, not just money spent at the building. "The scenarios are the building design, site, seating, sq footage, and other elements that you've designed is what we will be evaluating. We will offer a base case, high case, low case. Show production from year 1 to 30."
- E. Krueger stated that they are half way through the marketing evaluations. LoBuono asked how do you feel about the scale and scope we have presented? Does it seem reasonable? Krueger: So far, it seems like it [the building] is needed, but I have to reserve final judgment for after the study is complete.
- F. Kirkham: Have you met with Centennial Management? Yes.
- G. Have they provided you with income proforma? No.
- H. Kirkham: Can you send your findings to board members before it is presented so we can review it before it is formally presented? Yes.
- I. Gazdik: the two things we need to decide are if we do the economic impact study, and if there are other people we want you [Krueger] to call. The board promised to discuss and get back with Krueger following the meeting.

VIII. Discussion on EI study:

- A. Lobocono in favor. Fuller explains that it is more than the board originally thought was needed. Swanson said it would be interesting to have that information, but felt like the board would be paying for the same information twice. Hammond thought it would be positive, as did Scott. Nitschke wanted to wait until after the study results to decide if the board gets the EI study, and suggested that Scott find out what the incremental cost would be to decide to do it at a later time.
- B. Krueger said that it would be \$4,000 do it now, and \$6,500 if we were to wait the results 2-3 weeks after the final report. Kirkham said that too much information can cloud important information so voted to wait. Comment from the public voted in favor.
- C. Motion to include the Economic Impact. Seconded. Passed.
- D. Scott will let CSL know to move forward with EI study.
- E. Gazdik requested that each board member send Scott any suggestions from the board on who Krueger calls for the study.

IX. Discussion on Executive Director report. Nitschke has concern with his priorities. LoBuono thinks he does a good job. Scott mentions he is in contact with the board chair (Gazdik) almost daily.

X. Event Center Design Requirements:

- A. Nitschke requested a document for the design requirements. Kevin Dekold said that document isn't necessary. The plan is already in

place. LoBuono suggested we wait until we get the study back so we know we need it for this particular design. Kirkham suggested the board pull one together since most of the requirements are known within the board. Public comment said there is already a document like that, but Nitschke rejected that document explaining that it is a response to the requirements, not the list of requirements. Public comment explains the document that they were given at the beginning of this project was based on the things that the board told them.

- B.** Discussion on whether or not to go to the public now decided to not approach the public until we have fewer options. Fuller reread the motion made by Nitschke from the previous meeting pertaining to the work meeting to build this document, emphasizing that there is no need for decision now.

XI. Executive Director Report:

- A.** Scott requested support to not write a business plan or a project management plan until after the results of the feasibility study have been provided. It is in Scott's contract to have a draft done already, but asked for understanding to wait.
- B.** Scott promised to provide a timeline of events by the end of the week. Nitschke explained the necessity of having a plan. Gazdik requested that Scott provide an explanation of what he has done so far in the next meeting.
- C.** Scott has been interviewing for the administrative assistant and hasn't found anyone. LoBuono suggests to raise the financial reward up to \$18 maximum, and offer it according to Scott's discretion. He made a motion to have the range of up to \$18 per hour. Seconded. Motion passed.
- D.** Scott mentioned the training document all the board was given at the beginning of the project and explained that his document control plan would be based on it.
- E.** Scott asked for questions and Nitschke asked about the meeting he had with Laura Lewis. Scott explained that he informed her of holding off on the Pathway fundraising.

XII. Fuller offered a basic review of agenda protocol. Gave a copy of the applicable statutes. Gave a copy of a handbook provided by the City of Idaho Falls and explanation of Robert's Rules of Order. Stated that generally the agenda is set by the chairman. Can be overruled by the board. Make the recommendation at the end of meetings or email the chairman.

XIII. Next meeting is May 22, 2018.

XIV. Board and public input for the next agenda: follow up with IE Productions.

XV. Fuller requested a contract from Hammond. Made plans to get that set up.

XVI. Motion to adjourn. Seconded. Passed.