



# City Council Meeting Minutes

680 Park Avenue  
Idaho Falls, ID

Thursday, March 12, 2026

6:30 PM

City Council Chambers

## 1. Mayor Burtenshaw Called the meeting to Order at 6:30 PM

### Present:

Mayor Lisa Burtenshaw  
Councilor Michelle Ziel-Dingman  
Councilor John Radford

Council President Jim Francis  
Councilor Jim Freeman  
Councilor Brandon Lee (*via Teams*)

### Absent:

Councilor Kirk Larsen (*Work travel*)

### Also present:

Scott Davis, Rose Hill Sexton  
Stephen Boorman, Interim GM - IF Power  
PJ Holm, Parks and Recreation Director  
Zack Jones, City Attorney

Anthony Link, Airport Ops Manager  
Pam Alexander, MS Director  
Chris Fredericksen, Public Works Director  
Emily Geisler, City Clerk

## 2. Pledge of Allegiance

Antonio Meza led those present in the Pledge of Allegiance.

## 3. Public Comment

1. Teri Ireland, a downtown Idaho Falls business owner, resident, and representative of the Downtown Merchants Association, spoke about the proposed alcohol reform ordinance discussed in a recent work session.
  - She expressed concern that the ordinance is too vague, raises many unanswered questions, and may not have been thoroughly researched, potentially conflicting with existing state alcohol laws.
  - Ms. Ireland also warned that the ordinance could create significant burdens for local businesses, particularly for special events. She cited an example of a local business’s annual wine sale, where many volunteers—including some from out of state—help run the event.
  - Under the proposed rules, she said requiring all volunteers to receive alcohol service training for a single-day event could be an unreasonable burden for vendors and organizers.
  
2. Shane Dial, a downtown business owner and president of the Downtown Merchants Association, spoke about the proposed server training ordinance.
  - He stated he supports alcohol server training and already requires it for his employees, but he strongly objects to how the ordinance is written.
  - Mr. Dial argued the ordinance gives too much authority to the Chief of Police to determine which training programs are approved without clear criteria or legislative

- oversight, creating uncertainty and potential costs for businesses if approved programs change.
- He also expressed concern that the ordinance would allow frequent enforcement checks by law enforcement, potentially disrupting businesses and leading to selective enforcement.
  - Mr. Dial said the requirements—such as producing certification on demand and renewing training every three years—could create administrative and financial burdens for businesses with high employee turnover.
  - He compared the proposal to Boise’s ordinance, claiming Idaho Falls’ version is broader, requires more frequent renewal, and covers more types of workers.
  - Mr. Dial also argued the ordinance could criminalize employees for minor compliance issues and unfairly hold bars responsible for patrons’ behavior outside their establishments.
  - Overall, he said while he supports the intent of responsible alcohol service, he believes the ordinance is overly broad, burdensome, and grants excessive enforcement power.
3. Antonio Meza, a downtown restaurant owner and resident, spoke about the proposed alcohol ordinance.
- He first expressed support for a recent social media statement (unrelated to the alcohol ordinance) by the county sheriff, noting he believed the sheriff received unfair criticism.
  - Regarding the ordinance, Mr. Meza emphasized that local businesses support responsible and safe alcohol service, but he raised concerns about the sudden introduction and quick timeline for implementation, which he said businesses only recently learned about.
  - He questioned what incident prompted the ordinance and whether local businesses were consulted during its development.
  - Mr. Meza also worried about the economic impact, suggesting the requirements for training, testing, and certification could create additional costs for businesses already facing high expenses and staff turnover.
  - He asked why nonprofits would be treated differently than bars and restaurants under the ordinance.
  - Mr. Meza encouraged the City to collaborate with business owners when developing policies to ensure both law enforcement and businesses can work together effectively.
4. Matt Jacobsen, a Bonneville County resident and local business owner, spoke about the proposed alcohol server training ordinance.
- He stated that server training is valuable and widely supported, but expressed concern about how the ordinance is written, saying it lacks clear definitions and specific standards.
  - Mr. Jacobsen questioned what incident or data prompted the ordinance, noting that downtown issues appear to have improved after additional police presence was added in previous years.
  - He argued the ordinance could criminalize simple paperwork violations, since failure to produce or maintain a training certificate could result in a misdemeanor.

- Mr. Jacobsen also raised concerns about vague approval standards for training programs, which appear to be determined by the Chief of Police without clear criteria, potentially forcing businesses to repeatedly retrain employees.
  - He questioned who exactly must be certified within a business and how compliance would be tracked, especially with employee turnover.
  - Mr. Jacobsen also warned that on-demand certificate checks by officers could disrupt business operations and suggested compliance checks should instead be handled through management records.
  - Overall, he urged the Council to clarify the ordinance, establish objective standards, and avoid overly harsh penalties for administrative violations.
5. Liza McGeachin, a local resident and bar/restaurant owner, spoke briefly during public comment.
- She expressed support for the concerns raised by previous speakers regarding the proposed alcohol ordinance.
  - Ms. McGeachin encouraged open discussion and collaboration between the City and the hospitality industry to work toward a shared understanding and solution.
6. Tom Larsen, a longtime Idaho Falls resident and owner of MarCellar's, spoke about the proposed alcohol ordinance.
- He echoed the concerns raised by other members of the Downtown Merchants Association, particularly about government overreach and the way the ordinance is written.
  - Larsen said he supports responsible alcohol server training but felt some aspects of the proposal resembled a "show me your papers" approach and went too far.
  - Drawing on his 20 years of experience running MarCellar's, he said serious incidents related to alcohol at his business have been rare and staff are generally capable of recognizing when someone has had too much to drink.
  - He shared examples of past disturbances at his business to illustrate that issues are usually handled effectively by staff and local police when they occur.
7. Christina Thomson, a local bar owner, spoke in opposition to the proposed alcohol server training ordinance as written.
- She agreed with previous speakers that the ordinance would create additional burdens for both business owners and employees.
  - Ms. Thomson noted that free alcohol server training already exists through the state, and many local businesses regularly send employees to those trainings.
  - She indicated that her own employees complete training annually and suggested the existing system is simpler and effective.
  - Overall, she expressed support for the concerns raised by other downtown business owners.
8. Jake Schaefer, owner of the Frosty Gator and a longtime local business owner, spoke about the proposed alcohol ordinance.
- He said he had not read the ordinance but came to the meeting after hearing concerns from other business owners.

- Mr. Schaefer questioned why bars and restaurants would be held responsible for patrons' behavior, arguing individuals should be accountable for their own actions.
- He raised concerns that the ordinance could create additional licensing, training, and financial burdens, especially in an industry with high employee turnover.
- Mr. Schaefer suggested the proposal would become a revenue source for the City through fees for classes, licenses, and certifications.
- He also argued the City should focus on enforcing existing laws rather than creating new regulations, noting he was unaware of overservice citations in Idaho Falls.
- Overall, Mr. Schaefer expressed opposition to the ordinance and urged the City to prioritize enforcement of current rules before adding new requirements.

#### 4. Consent Agenda

##### A. Municipal Services

1. **26-99** Quote from Mountainland Supply Company for ductile pipe in the amount of \$75,125.19.
2. **26-101** Treasurer's Report for January 2026

##### B. Idaho Falls Power

1. **26-94** Utility Board Minutes from February 2026
2. **26-95** Locating services with Stake Center Locating, LLC for \$188,067 plus a 10% contingency
3. **26-100** Amended Board Policy No. 5 for Financial Stability and Creditworthiness

##### C. Office of the City Clerk

1. **26-82** City Council Meeting Minutes (02.23.2026, 02.26.2026, 03.06.2026)
2. **26-83** February Licensing through the Office of the City Clerk
  - a. 34 New Business Licenses
  - b. 10 Renewed Business Licenses
  - c. 27 Contractor Licenses

**Motion:** Approve, accept, or receive all items on the Consent Agenda according to the recommendations presented.

- Moved by: Councilor Dingman
- Second: Councilor Radford
- Vote: Aye: Francis, Dingman, Freeman, Lee, Radford. Nay: none.
- Motion carries.

#### 5. Regular Agenda

##### A. Parks & Recreation

1. **26-84** Ordinance Amending Title 8, Chapter 11, Cemetery Regulations

##### **Presentation/Discussion (Director Holm, Sexton Davis):**

- Parks & Recreation staff presented a proposed ordinance to amend Idaho Falls cemetery regulations (Title 8, Chapter 11).
- The changes aim to correct formatting inconsistencies and establish clearer rules for winter grave decoration removal and Memorial Day weekend restrictions.

- The proposal would require artificial winter decorations to be removed by March 1 instead of April 1.
- It would also restrict funerals during Memorial Day weekend, with the updated restriction running from Friday at 8 a.m. through Memorial Day at 11:59 p.m. (shortened from the earlier proposal that extended into Tuesday).

#### Context and Rationale

- Parks staff reviewed the last 10 years of burial data, finding 30 burials occurred during the Memorial Day weekend period, averaging about three per year.
- Cemetery Sexton Scott Davis, a longtime City employee, explained that the restriction is mainly for safety and visitor access.
- Memorial Day weekend brings very large crowds to the cemeteries, making it difficult to safely operate heavy equipment used for burials and to provide privacy for funeral services.
- Mr. Davis cited a recent example where visitors were unable to access graves due to congestion and a funeral service, prompting the department to address the issue.

#### Operational Concerns

- Funerals require tents, chairs, and equipment, and may require moving headstones temporarily to dig graves if equipment cannot access the site.
- Staff believe limiting burials during the busy weekend would improve safety, accessibility, and the overall experience for visitors and grieving families.

#### Council Discussion

- A Councilmember asked whether delaying a burial could increase costs for families, since remains may need to stay longer with the mortuary.
- Staff confirmed there could be additional costs, though delayed burials for scheduling reasons are already common.

**Motion:** Approve the ordinance amending Title 8, Chapter 11 to establish dates for winter grave decoration removal and Memorial Day weekend burial restrictions under a suspension of the rules requiring three complete and separate readings, request that it be read by title, and published by summary.

- Moved by: Councilor Freeman
  - Second: Councilor Radford
  - Vote: Aye: Francis, Dingman, Freeman, Lee, Radford. Nay: none.
  - Motion carries.
- Ordinance 3641 Title Read:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO; AMENDING TITLE 8, CHAPTER 11, TO PROHIBIT BURIALS IN CEMETERIES DURING A PERIOD OF TIME SURROUNDING MEMORIAL DAY, TO EXTEND THE PERIOD WHEN GRAVE DECORATIONS ARE PROHIBITED, AND TO MAKE FORMATTING CHANGES, CODIFICATION, PUBLICATION BY SUMMARY, AND ESTABLISHING EFFECTIVE DATE.

## B. Airport

### 1. 26-98 Ordinance Amending Title 9, Chapter 4, Section 9, Parking at Airport

#### **Presentation/Discussion (Operations Manager Link):**

- The Idaho Falls Regional Airport proposed an amendment to the City ordinance related to parking restrictions at the airport.
- Airport Operations Manager Anthony Link explained that the current ordinance requires “No Parking” signs along runways, taxiways, and aprons, which is impractical and not compliant with aviation safety standards.
- FAA safety areas near runways and taxiways must only contain essential, fixed aviation infrastructure (such as lights or pilot directional signs), so general “No Parking” signs are not appropriate in those locations.
- The amendment would remove that requirement and update terminology to align with FAA standards, specifically replacing the term “ramps” with “aprons” for aircraft parking areas.

#### Council Discussion

- Council President Francis noted that another section of the ordinance still states no parking is allowed on International Way at any time, which conflicts with the City’s current practice of limited parking in that area.
- Staff indicated the issue likely exists in multiple sections of the City code.
- Councilor Radford suggested approving the amendment now and having staff return later with a correction to the conflicting language after further review, if needed.

**Motion:** Approve the Ordinance amending Title 9, Chapter 4, Section 9, to remove the requirement that no-parking signage must be posted by an apron, runway, or taxiway of the Idaho Falls Regional Airport to prohibit parking

- Moved by: Councilor Radford
- Second: Councilor Freeman
- Vote: Aye: Francis, Dingman, Freeman, Lee, Radford. Nay: none.
- Motion carries.

**ORDINANCE 3642 TITLE READ:** AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, AMENDING TITLE 9, CHAPTER 4, SECTION 9, TO REMOVE THE REQUIREMENT THAT NO-PARKING SIGNAGE MUST BE POSTED BY AN APRON, RUNWAY, OR TAXIWAY OF THE IDAHO FALLS REGIONAL AIRPORT TO PROHIBIT PARKING; CODIFICATION; PUBLICATION BY SUMMARY; AND ESTABLISHING EFFECTIVE DATE.

## C. Public Works

### 1. 26-85 City of Idaho Falls Subdivision Irrigation Water Agreement with New Sweden Irrigation District

#### **Presentation/Discussion (Director Fredericksen):**

- The Public Works Department presented two items: an Irrigation Water Agreement with New Sweden Irrigation and the Freeman Park water conversion.

- The New Sweden Irrigation Agreement is similar to a previous 2025 agreement with Idaho Irrigation. Key points:
  - Applies to properties west of the Snake River, while the 2025 agreement covered the east side.
  - Allows new developments to use surface irrigation water instead of City potable water where surface water rights exist.
  - Provisions are nearly identical to the prior agreement, with only references updated for New Sweden Irrigation.
- Council asked if current users on City potable water could convert to surface water. Staff noted:
  - Conversion is unlikely unless the property already holds surface water rights.
  - Each case could be evaluated individually with the irrigation district if a valid water right exists.

This ensures efficient use of surface irrigation while minimizing reliance on potable water for new development.

**Motion:** Approve the Subdivision Water Irrigation Agreement with New Sweden Irrigation District and authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the necessary documents.

- Moved by: Councilor Dingman
- Second: Councilor Radford
- Vote: Aye: Francis, Dingman, Freeman, Lee, Radford. Nay: none.
- Motion carries.

## 2. 26-86 Bid Award - Freeman Park Surface Water Conversion

### **Presentation/Discussion (Director Fredericksen):**

- Bids opened March 5; Outback Landscaping Inc. was the lowest responsible bidder at \$384,453.70.
- Work to begin before April 13 and be completed within 130 calendar days.
- Will divert water from the Snake River to irrigate Freeman Park, connecting to the existing control and irrigation system, which requires trenching throughout the park. No new automated sprinklers are being installed.
- Purpose:
  - Reduce potable water use at Freeman Park.
  - Support conservation efforts and free up potable water for new development.
- Water savings: exact numbers not yet available but expected to be substantial—potentially similar to other large users like Pinecrest Golf Course, which uses about 1 million gallons per day in peak summer.
- Staff will provide future reporting on actual water savings after project completion.

**Motion:** Approve the plans and specifications; award to the lowest responsive, responsible bidder, Outback Landscape, Inc., in the amount of \$384,453.70; and give authorization for the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the necessary documents.

- Moved by: Councilor Dingman

- Second: Councilor Radford
- Vote: Aye: Francis, Dingman, Freeman, Lee, Radford. Nay: none.
- Motion carries.

## D. Idaho Falls Power

### 1. **26-96** IFP 26-07 FHWA Charging and Fueling Infrastructure Grant - Idaho Falls Electric Vehicle (EV) Charging Stations - Alpine Construction Management

**Presentation/Discussion (Interim GM Boorman):** The City discussed a federal grant for Level 2 and Level 3 electric vehicle chargers.

- A previous charger from Blink was purchased last year.
- Some project costs at the Idaho Falls Power yard are not grant-funded, but consolidating work under one contractor is more efficient and cost-effective.
- Recommendation: proceed with Alpine Construction Management as contractor.
- Additive items in the bid (like a water meter and landscaping features) were opted out; these do not affect the charging stations themselves.
- The decision focuses on efficiency and minimizing unnecessary components, keeping the project aligned with grant and operational needs.

**Motion:** Accept and approve Alpine Construction Management’s agreement plus a 10% contingency to construct four City Electric Vehicle Charging stations at a not-to-exceed cost of \$1,951,430.80 and give authorization to the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the necessary documents.

- Moved by: Councilor Freeman
- Second: Councilor Radford
- Vote: Aye: Francis, Dingman, Freeman, Lee, Radford. Nay: none.
- Motion carries.

### 2. **26-97** Resolution Amending the Idaho Falls Power Service Policy

**Presentation/Discussion (Interim GM Boorman):**

- The City Council reviewed a resolution amending the Idaho Falls Power Service Policy, which governs system construction, developer interactions, and infrastructure procedures.
- Updates include clarifications from a recent agreement with Rocky Mountain Power filed with the PUC.
- An FAQ section was added to help customers better understand the policy and simplify key areas.
- A brief note of appreciation was made by Mr. Boorman for crews and customers following recent outages, highlighting teamwork and community support.

**Motion:** Approve the resolution amending the Idaho Falls Power Service Policy and give authorization to the Mayor and City Clerk to execute the necessary documents.

- Moved by: Councilor Freeman

- Second: Councilor Radford
- Vote: Aye: Francis, Dingman, Freeman, Lee, Radford. Nay: none.
- Motion carries.

**E. Municipal Services****1. 26-87** Public Hearing for Sale of Real Property, 610 Water Avenue**Presentation/Discussion (Director Alexander):**

- The City Council conducted a public hearing regarding the potential auction of City-owned property at 610 Water Avenue.
- Background:
  - The property was surveyed in March 2024 and a residential appraisal completed in 2025, identifying its highest and best use.
  - At the February 12, 2026, meeting, the Council declared the property value at \$53,500.
- Purpose of the hearing:
  - Required by Idaho Code to allow public awareness and input on the potential sale.
- Discussion included infrastructure considerations, such as an existing sewer line in the alley, and a recap of previous Council discussions.
- Outcome:
  - The hearing was conducted and then closed, with the Council prepared to authorize moving forward with a public auction of the property as the next step.

**Motion:** Auction the City property located at 610 N. Water Avenue, Idaho Falls, Idaho.

- Moved by: Councilor Radford
- Second: Councilor Freeman
- Vote: Aye: Francis, Dingman, Freeman, Lee, Radford. Nay: none.
- Motion carries.

**2. 26-88** Bid IF-26-004, 2026 Concrete Replacement for Public Works**Presentation/Discussion (Director Alexander):**

- The City Council reviewed the 2026 concrete replacement projects as part of Public Works' seasonal preparations.
- Bids received: Two, opened March 6, 2026.
  - TR West Construction was deemed non-responsive due to unclear terminology in their bid.
  - Reinhart Concrete (Capp LLC dba Reinhart Concrete) was the lowest responsive, responsible bidder.

- Contract award: \$501,007.50, based on a three-year average of concrete work and planned projects.
- No additional questions were raised.

**Motion:** Accept and approve the lowest responsive bid from CAPP, LLC, DBA Reinhart Concrete, for a total of \$501,007.50 and authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to sign the necessary documents.

- Moved by: Councilor Radford
- Second: Councilor Freeman
- Vote: Aye: Francis, Dingman, Freeman, Lee, Radford. Nay: none.
- Motion carries.

**3. 26-89** Bid IF-26-005, Purchase of Superpave Hot Mix Asphalt for Public Works

**Presentation/Discussion (Director Alexander, Director Fredericksen):**

- Bids received: Two, opened March 6, 2026.
- Lowest responsive, responsible bidder: Knife River, \$174,200.
- Project timing: Asphalt plants expected to start operations around March 16, 2026, with ground temperatures needing to be above 44°F.

**Motion:** Accept and approve the lowest responsive responsible bid from Knife River for a total of \$174,200.00 and authorize the Mayor and City Clerk to sign the documents.

- Moved by: Councilor Radford
- Second: Councilor Dingman
- Vote: Aye: Francis, Dingman, Freeman, Lee, Radford. Nay: none.
- Motion carries.

**F. Office of the City Clerk**

**1. 26-92** Ordinance Update - Process for Run-Off Elections

**Presentation/Discussion (Clerk Geisler):**

- Background: A 2009 state law consolidated elections at the county level. While most City code was updated, references to runoff elections still reflected outdated City-level responsibilities.
- Purpose of the ordinance: Clarifies that the county clerk, not the City clerk, handles the runoff election process, aligning the City code with state law.
- Council members noted it as a clean-up measure, appreciated the clarification, and recognized the county's role in managing elections.

**Motion:** Approve the Ordinance updating City Code Title 1, Chapter 5, Section 11 and Chapter 6, Section 15, to align with current Idaho Code, under a suspension of the rules requiring three complete and separate readings and request that it be read by title and published by summary.

- Moved by: Councilor Francis
- Second: Councilor Radford
- Vote: Aye: Francis, Dingman, Freeman, Lee, Radford. Nay: none.
- Motion carries.

**ORDINANCE 3643 TITLE READ:** AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, AMENDING TITLE 1, CHAPTER 5, SECTION 11, AND CHAPTER 6, SECTION 15, TO BRING THE PROCESS FOR RUN-OFF ELECTIONS INTO CONFORMANCE WITH THE IDAHO CODE; CODIFICATION; PUBLICATION BY SUMMARY; AND ESTABLISHING EFFECTIVE DATE.

## 2. 26-93 Ordinance Amendment - Vehicle Sales on Public Sidewalks

### **Presentation/Discussion (Clerk Geisler):**

- Issue: Two sections of City code conflicted—one allowed sales on sidewalks, while the mobile food section prohibited vehicles from driving onto sidewalks. Confusion existed over what qualifies as a “vehicle.”
- Amendment: Clearly defines that *motor* vehicles cannot go onto sidewalks.
  - Example: Hot dog carts may be on sidewalks; hot dog trucks must stop at the curb.
- The amendment resolves confusion for the public and ensures consistent enforcement.
- Parking pads for food trucks (e.g., on Memorial Drive) are managed by Parks and Recreation and are separate from sidewalk regulations.

**Motion:** Approve the Ordinance updating City Code Title 4, Chapter 12, Section 23, to allow non-motorized vehicles to make sales on public sidewalks, under a suspension of the rules requiring three complete and separate readings and request that it be read by title and published by summary.

- Moved by: Councilor Francis
- Second: Councilor Radford
- Vote: Aye: Francis, Dingman, Freeman, Lee, Radford. Nay: none.
- Motion carries.

**ORDINANCE 3644 TITLE READ:** AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF IDAHO FALLS, IDAHO, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF THE STATE OF IDAHO, AMENDING TITLE 4, CHAPTER 12, SECTION 23, TO ALLOW MOBILE VENDORS AND ITINERANT MERCHANTS TO MAKE SALES FROM NON-MOTORIZED VEHICLES BUT NOT FROM MOTORIZED VEHICLES LOCATED ON



# City Council Meeting Minutes

680 Park Avenue  
Idaho Falls, ID

PUBLIC SIDEWALKS; CODIFICATION; PUBLICATION BY SUMMARY; AND ESTABLISHING  
EFFECTIVE DATE

## 6. Announcements

- The meeting concluded with Council member updates and announcements.
- Council discussed the irony of mental health funding cuts in Idaho, referencing recent City Club discussions/ behavioral health initiatives like the Crisis Center and Rise Up program.
- Farewell to City Clerk Emily Geisler, acknowledging her contributions and service.
- Council noted recent state legislation impacting local land use:
  - Senate Bill 1753 allows duplex or twin homes on lots previously limited to single-family homes, potentially reducing local control over zoning.
  - Senate Bill 1280 permits manufactured homes on single-family lots.
- Upcoming calendar events and Council agenda items will be shared in a Friday letter, with dates subject to change; Council members were encouraged to coordinate with their liaisons.

There being no further business, the meeting adjourned at 7:49 PM.

/s/ Emily Geisler \_\_\_\_\_  
Emily Geisler, City Clerk

/s/ Lisa Burtenshaw \_\_\_\_\_  
Lisa Burtenshaw, Mayor



09/17/2019

# Transfer of power service from Rocky Mountain Power to Idaho Falls Power – FAQ's

Frequently asked questions regarding transfer of service or the removal of Rocky Mountain Power owned assets.

1. *My property has been annexed into the City and I would like to change power service provider to Idaho Falls Power. Who should I contact?*

You can initiate the request by calling ~~the Idaho Falls Power Customer Service Manager, Wid Ritchie at 208-612-8143-[writchie@ifpower.org](mailto:writchie@ifpower.org)~~, or the Idaho Falls Power Compliance Manager Richard Malloy at 208-612-8428 [rmalloy@ifpower.org](mailto:rmalloy@ifpower.org).

2. *Is there a cost to me to transfer the service?*

Idaho Falls Power pays for all the infrastructure costs, such as poles, wire, and transformers, up to the meter point. There is a revenue portion that amounts to 167% of the previous year's total bills. This cost is shared 50/50 with the customer and Idaho Falls Power. Idaho Falls Power will amortize the cost over a three - five year period as a location surcharge on the monthly utility bill. Typically, because Idaho Falls Power rates are significantly less than Rocky Mountain Power, the customer does not see an increase in the cost of their monthly bill. After the customer's location surcharge is paid, the surcharge automatically drops off.

3. *Can I voice my opinion on a buyout?*

Yes. Before approval the IPUC will hold a public hearing for all public comments.

4 *How long does it take to transfer service from Rocky Mountain Power to Idaho Falls Power?*

~~It is anticipated to take from three to five months to complete the transfer of service and associated assets. Typically, it is has taken from five months to a year to complete the transfer of service and associated assets.~~

5. *Why does it take so long to transfer service?*

There are several steps that need to occur to complete the transfer; agreement between the utilities, an accounting of the cost of the assets, calculation of the revenue cost and Idaho Public Utilities Commission for approval. ~~In our experience the most significant drivers of the schedule are the time required for Rocky Mountain Power's process and the Public Utilities Commission approval.~~

6. *Can Idaho Falls Power expedite the transfer?*

~~In February 2026, IFP and RMP expedited the transfer by working with local representatives. This should reduce the time from a year to three to five months. No. Idaho Falls Power can only forward the request to Rocky Mountain Power to initiate the transfer and Idaho Falls Power has no control over the PUC's schedule.~~

7. *I'm a developer and need to have Rocky Mountain Power assets removed from the property. Can I remove them?*

No. The asset exchange must be completed before any assets such as poles, transformers, conductor (wire), ect. can be taken out of service or removed.

8. *Is there someone I can contact if the transfer length of time is negatively impacting me or my business?*

Yes, you can call the Idaho Public Utilities Commission in Boise at the following address. As a part of the Idaho State government, their primary function is to serve power customer interests in the state of Idaho and as such they are receptive to customer concerns.

By written letter to:

P.O. Box 83720 Boise, ID 83720-0074  
11331 W. Chinden Blvd. Building 8, Suite 201-A  
Boise, ID 83714  
Phone: 208.334.0300  
Toll Free: 1-800-432-0369  
Fax: 208.334.3762

Call or email to:

Stephen Goodson – Policy Analyst  
208-344-0323 [Stephen.goodson@puc.idaho.gov](mailto:Stephen.goodson@puc.idaho.gov)

Online form –<https://puc.idaho.gov/Form/ConsumerAssistance>  
208-334-0369 or 1-800-432-0369