City of Twin Falls Public Records Request

Requestor Information

Please list your information here. Include your request details in the space provided below.

Requestor First Name * [redacted]

Requestor Last Name * [redacted]

Requestor Address 1 * [redacted]

Requestor Address 2

Requestor City * [redacted]

Requestor State * [redacted]

Requestor ZIP Code * [redacted]

Requestor Phone Number * [redacted]

Requestor E-mail * [redacted]

Type of Request *

(•) Personal ( ) Commercial ( ) Legal

Request Details *

If you are requesting multiple records, please attach your list below. If you do not have a case/event/citation number, please include enough information to identify the records you want. If your request is for multiple items, it may be subject to fees for preparation. We have records for the Twin Falls Police Department (city, not county) only.

I am requesting all materials for the City of Twin Falls with the keyword of 'Market Analysis' possessed/received/sent by Travis Rothweiler, Gretchen Scott, Mitch Humble, Kristen Kohntopp and/or Breanna Howard. This should include files of any type, emails, messages, meeting notes, memos, meeting recordings, etc. I am requesting these materials dated on or after January 1st, 2026.

Attach Files to Your Request

If you have documentation that you wish to provide for this request, attach the files here.

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

Signature *


[redacted]

The City of Twin Falls will respond to this request within three (3) business days. Or up to 10 business days upon notification of the requesting party.

The City of Twin Falls maintains records for the City of Twin Falls, Idaho. For records including in Twin Falls County please contact Twin Falls County at www.twinfallscounty.org

Requested records will be provided electronically.

We do not provide your information to mailing lists. It will only be used to fulfill this request.



From	msrelay@tfid.org
To	[redacted]
Date	Sunday, May 31, 2026 04:43 PM MT
Subject	Copy of Form Public Records Requests
Attachments	City of Twin Falls Public Records Request.pdf
Filed under	#3946
Source file SHA-256	1eac451d86ea0a05064bc2424e13495a037bec6741a9728b3edad2bb990fde11

Your records request has been received.

You're receiving this email because someone requested that you get a copy of this form.

⚠️ **This message is sent from an account that is NOT MONITORED.**
Do not reply to this message — it will not be read.

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

From	msrelay@tfid.org
To	[redacted]
Date	Thursday, June 18, 2026 03:16 PM MT
Subject	Your City of Twin Falls Public Records Request
Attachments	none
Filed under	#3946
Source file SHA-256	5f2530425c086b3fd57c0dfe4de29af4f78f34c7c2670d1874ec48861453e242

[redacted]

Deputy City Clerk Rachael Long has been trying to reach you about your request from May 31st. That request is going to take additional time to prepare and will require payment before we start working on it. She has tried to email and call you about that payment. Please contact Rachael Long at rlong@tfid.org or at 208-735-7287 to arrange payment so that we can complete the May 31st request. Thank you.

Sincerely,
City of Twin Falls

⚠️ **This message is sent from an account that is NOT MONITORED.**
Do not reply to this message — it will not be read.

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

CITY OF TWIN FALLS

P.O. Box 1907
Twin Falls, Idaho 83303

BRUCE CASTLETON – CITY ATTORNEY
LINDA WELLS – DEPUTY CITY PROSECUTOR
NICOLE SWAFFORD—DEPUTY CITY PROSECUTOR
RACHAEL HUNSAKER – LEGAL ASST.

Telephone: (208) 735-7374
Facsimile: (208) 735-3147

E-mail: cityprosecutor@tfid.org

June 10, 2026

[redacted]

Update to the Public Records Request – #3946, [redacted]

Good Afternoon:

We have accessed the information pertaining to Market Analysis. It is determined that it will take additional time outside of the allowed 2 hours to review and redact all of the footage before it is released. Your request will require roughly 5 hours to respond to.

Idaho Code §74-102(10) allows the City to charge a fee for the compilation of public records requests when:

(i) The request is for more than one hundred (100) pages of paper records; or (ii) The request includes records from which nonpublic information must be deleted; or (iii) The actual labor associated with responding to requests for public records in compliance with the provisions of this chapter exceeds two (2) person hours.

Further, Idaho Code 74-102(11) states,

A requester may not file multiple requests for public records solely to avoid payment of fees. When a public agency or independent public body corporate and politic reasonably believes that

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

one (1) or more requesters is segregating a request into a series of requests to avoid payment of fees authorized pursuant to this section, the public agency or independent public body corporate and politic may aggregate such requests and charge the appropriate fees. The public agency or independent public body corporate and politic may consider the time period in which the requests have been made in its determination to aggregate the related requests. A public agency or independent public body corporate and politic shall not aggregate multiple requests on unrelated subjects from one (1) requester.

For purposes of this response, we have estimated the following time and costs necessary to adequately review, redact, and respond to your request:

Person	Rate	Hours	Total
Legal Review	$ 45.07	5.0	$ 225.35
(2 hours of review)		(2.0)	($ 90.14)
Total			$135.21

Before the City of Twin Falls can undertake this work and incur these costs, you will need to provide the City of Twin Falls with payment of $135.21 (See Idaho Code § 74-102(10) and (12)).

Once the City of Twin Falls receives this advanced payment from you it will begin the process of printing and/or reviewing the documents and will notify you when they are available for delivery to you. If the actual amount of work and copy charges is greater than the advanced payment above, you will be asked to make any necessary additional payment at the time the documents are delivered to you. If the advanced payment is greater than the actual amount of work and copy charges, the difference will be refunded to you at the time of document delivery or shortly thereafter.

An attorney for the City of Twin Falls has reviewed your request and this response.

NOTICE: PURSUANT TO IDAHO CODE § 74-115 YOU HAVE 180 DAYS TO APPEAL THIS DECISION BY FILING A PETITION IN STATE DISTRICT COURT IN THE COUNTY WHERE ALL OR PART OF THE RECORDS ARE LOCATED

Sincerely,

/s/ Bruce Castleton

Bruce Castleton
City Attorney
City of Twin Falls

From	Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org>
To	[redacted]
Date	Monday, June 22, 2026 02:48 PM MT
Subject	Public Records Request
Attachments	Redaction For[redacted]#3946.pdf
Filed under	#3946
Source file SHA-256	e0dbef1033b4702a51e531deca654e9fd26b9bfa134dd5bdb4b4869d8414f15b

Hello,

I am reaching out to you about the public records request you made with the City of Twin Falls. We have located the information you have requested, and it has been determined that it will take longer than the 2 hours they are allowed.

Attached is the cost for them to move forward with this request. Please let me know if you would like to move forward with payment and I will have finance get the invoice created for this and sent over to you.

Rachael Long
Deputy City Clerk
City of Twin Falls
Twin Falls, ID 83303

"Records with Integrity"

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

CITY OF TWIN FALLS

P.O. Box 1907
Twin Falls, Idaho 83303

BRUCE CASTLETON – CITY ATTORNEY
LINDA WELLS – DEPUTY CITY PROSECUTOR
NICOLE SWAFFORD—DEPUTY CITY PROSECUTOR
RACHAEL HUNSAKER – LEGAL ASST.

Telephone: (208) 735-7374
Facsimile: (208) 735-3147

E-mail: cityprosecutor@tfid.org

June 10, 2026

[redacted]

Update to the Public Records Request – #3946, [redacted]

Good Afternoon:

We have accessed the information pertaining to Market Analysis. It is determined that it will take additional time outside of the allowed 2 hours to review and redact all of the footage before it is released. Your request will require roughly 5 hours to respond to.

Idaho Code §74-102(10) allows the City to charge a fee for the compilation of public records requests when:

(i) The request is for more than one hundred (100) pages of paper records; or (ii) The request includes records from which nonpublic information must be deleted; or (iii) The actual labor associated with responding to requests for public records in compliance with the provisions of this chapter exceeds two (2) person hours.

Further, Idaho Code 74-102(11) states,

A requester may not file multiple requests for public records solely to avoid payment of fees. When a public agency or independent public body corporate and politic reasonably believes that

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

one (1) or more requesters is segregating a request into a series of requests to avoid payment of fees authorized pursuant to this section, the public agency or independent public body corporate and politic may aggregate such requests and charge the appropriate fees. The public agency or independent public body corporate and politic may consider the time period in which the requests have been made in its determination to aggregate the related requests. A public agency or independent public body corporate and politic shall not aggregate multiple requests on unrelated subjects from one (1) requester.

For purposes of this response, we have estimated the following time and costs necessary to adequately review, redact, and respond to your request:

Person	Rate	Hours	Total
Legal Review	$ 45.07	5.0	$ 225.35
(2 hours of review)		(2.0)	($ 90.14)
Total			$135.21

Before the City of Twin Falls can undertake this work and incur these costs, you will need to provide the City of Twin Falls with payment of $135.21 (See Idaho Code § 74-102(10) and (12)).

Once the City of Twin Falls receives this advanced payment from you it will begin the process of printing and/or reviewing the documents and will notify you when they are available for delivery to you. If the actual amount of work and copy charges is greater than the advanced payment above, you will be asked to make any necessary additional payment at the time the documents are delivered to you. If the advanced payment is greater than the actual amount of work and copy charges, the difference will be refunded to you at the time of document delivery or shortly thereafter.

An attorney for the City of Twin Falls has reviewed your request and this response.

NOTICE: PURSUANT TO IDAHO CODE § 74-115 YOU HAVE 180 DAYS TO APPEAL THIS DECISION BY FILING A PETITION IN STATE DISTRICT COURT IN THE COUNTY WHERE ALL OR PART OF THE RECORDS ARE LOCATED

Sincerely,

/s/ Bruce Castleton

Bruce Castleton
City Attorney
City of Twin Falls

From	Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org>
To	[redacted]
Date	Wednesday, June 24, 2026 11:23 AM MT
Subject	FW: Public Records Request
Attachments	Redaction For[redacted]#3946.pdf
Filed under	#3946
Source file SHA-256	81038fd88c457d300e983b1f3099544a7d3ee784c1fa7db6f34ad189274ab93f

Following Up

From: Rachael Long
Sent: Monday, June 22, 2026 2:48 PM
To: [redacted]
Subject: Public Records Request

Hello,

I am reaching out to you about the public records request you made with the City of Twin Falls. We have located the information you have requested, and it has been determined that it will take longer than the 2 hours they are allowed.

Attached is the cost for them to move forward with this request. Please let me know if you would like to move forward with payment and I will have finance get the invoice created for this and sent over to you.

Rachael Long
Deputy City Clerk
City of Twin Falls
Twin Falls, ID 83303

"Records with Integrity"

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

From	No Reply <noreply@tfid.org>
To	[redacted]
Date	Wednesday, July 01, 2026 09:01 AM MT
Subject	Results of your Public Records Request #3946
Attachments	none
Filed under	#3946
Source file SHA-256	3558d6c52c0b4c49fd449befdbc96a966d5048954a420a04983a3e07c739da97

Fulfilled Request
Per your records request, filed on 05/31/2026

Attached please find the records held by the City of Twin Falls in response to your request. This link is expires in 30 days. During that time you may use this link to review and/or download a copy of the data.

https://lfws.tfid.org/PublicDelivery/Browse.aspx?dbid=0&startid=25144

This request is now concluded.
NOTICE: PURSUANT TO IDAHO CODE § 74-115 YOU HAVE 180 DAYS TO APPEAL THIS DECISION BY FILING A PETITION IN STATE DISTRICT COURT IN THE COUNTY WHERE ALL OR PART OF THE RECORDS ARE LOCATED

⚠️ **This message is sent from an account that is NOT MONITORED.**
Do not reply to this message — it will not be read.

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

From	[redacted]
To	Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org>
Date	Friday, July 10, 2026 10:16 PM MT
Subject	Re: Public Records Request
Attachments	image001.png
Filed under	#3946
Source file SHA-256	e566f2a694bd23ebcea9a9bb2d0055054c0e06ad58876b2e42eff7955e10db48

Subject: Request for Clarification Regarding Public Records Response #3946

Ms. Long,

Thank you for completing the response to my public records request. After reviewing the materials provided, I have several concerns that I need clarified.

My request was for **"all materials containing the keyword 'Market Analysis' possessed/received/sent by Travis Rothweiler, Gretchen Scott, Mitch Humble, Kristen Kohntopp, and/or Breanna Howard."** The response included fewer than ten documents, yet the documents provided clearly reference a market analysis that was completed, shared internally, and discussed in meetings. For example, the records include:

- A Microsoft Teams meeting titled **"City of Twin Falls – Market Analysis Results"**
- Internal Microsoft 365 sharing notifications for **"Market Analysis Results"**
- An invoice from HUB International, the vendor who performed the analysis

These items indicate that additional responsive materials exist, but they were not included in the response.

I acknowledge that the City sent a written notice invoking the additional 10 business days permitted under Idaho Code § 74-103(1). However, the final response was issued on **July 1, 2026**, which is well beyond the maximum 13 business days allowed by statute, even with the extension.

Additionally, when any portion of a record is withheld or redacted, Idaho Code § 74-103(4) requires the agency to provide:

- A statement that access is denied in whole or in part,
- The **specific statutory authority** for each withheld or redacted portion,
- The **name and title** of the person responsible for the decision, and
- Notice of the right to appeal.

Only the appeal notice was included. Without the required statutory citations or identification of the responsible official, I cannot determine what was withheld or why.

Idaho Code § 74-112 also requires agencies to segregate exempt and non-exempt information and release all non-exempt portions. The limited number of documents provided does not appear to reflect the full set of responsive materials.

To clarify the response, please provide:

1. Whether additional responsive documents exist that were not included.
2. Whether any materials were withheld or redacted, and if so, the **specific statutory exemptions** applied to each.
3. The **name and title** of the individual who authorized any withholding.

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

4. Whether the market analysis or compensation study was categorized under a different name in the City's financial system.

Additionally, for my records, please confirm whether the City Attorney or other legal counsel reviewed or approved any decisions to withhold or redact materials responsive to this request. If legal counsel was not involved, please identify the individual who made the determination and the basis for their authority to do so.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to your clarification.

Sincerely,
[redacted]

On Mon, Jun 22, 2026 at 8:48 PM Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org> wrote:

> Hello,
>
> I am reaching out to you about the public records request you made with the City of Twin Falls. We have located the information you have requested, and it has been determined that it will take longer than the 2 hours they are allowed.
>
> Attached is the cost for them to move forward with this request. Please let me know if you would like to move forward with payment and I will have finance get the invoice created for this and sent over to you.
>
> ***Rachael Long***
>
> Deputy City Clerk
>
> City of Twin Falls
>
> Twin Falls, ID 83303
>
> "Records with Integrity"

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

CITY OF TWIN FALLS

P.O. Box 1907
Twin Falls, Idaho 83303

BRUCE CASTLETON – CITY ATTORNEY
LINDA WELLS – DEPUTY CITY PROSECUTOR
NICOLE SWAFFORD—DEPUTY CITY PROSECUTOR
RACHAEL HUNSAKER – LEGAL ASST.

Telephone: (208) 735-7374
Facsimile: (208) 735-3147

E-mail: cityprosecutor@tfid.org

June 10, 2026

[redacted]

Update to the Public Records Request – #3946, [redacted]

Good Afternoon:

We have accessed the information pertaining to Market Analysis. It is determined that it will take additional time outside of the allowed 2 hours to review and redact all of the footage before it is released. Your request will require roughly 5 hours to respond to.

Idaho Code §74-102(10) allows the City to charge a fee for the compilation of public records requests when:

(i) The request is for more than one hundred (100) pages of paper records; or (ii) The request includes records from which nonpublic information must be deleted; or (iii) The actual labor associated with responding to requests for public records in compliance with the provisions of this chapter exceeds two (2) person hours.

Further, Idaho Code 74-102(11) states,

A requester may not file multiple requests for public records solely to avoid payment of fees. When a public agency or independent public body corporate and politic reasonably believes that

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

one (1) or more requesters is segregating a request into a series of requests to avoid payment of fees authorized pursuant to this section, the public agency or independent public body corporate and politic may aggregate such requests and charge the appropriate fees. The public agency or independent public body corporate and politic may consider the time period in which the requests have been made in its determination to aggregate the related requests. A public agency or independent public body corporate and politic shall not aggregate multiple requests on unrelated subjects from one (1) requester.

For purposes of this response, we have estimated the following time and costs necessary to adequately review, redact, and respond to your request:

Person	Rate	Hours	Total
Legal Review	$ 45.07	5.0	$ 225.35
(2 hours of review)		(2.0)	($ 90.14)
Total			$135.21

Before the City of Twin Falls can undertake this work and incur these costs, you will need to provide the City of Twin Falls with payment of $135.21 (See Idaho Code § 74-102(10) and (12)).

Once the City of Twin Falls receives this advanced payment from you it will begin the process of printing and/or reviewing the documents and will notify you when they are available for delivery to you. If the actual amount of work and copy charges is greater than the advanced payment above, you will be asked to make any necessary additional payment at the time the documents are delivered to you. If the advanced payment is greater than the actual amount of work and copy charges, the difference will be refunded to you at the time of document delivery or shortly thereafter.

An attorney for the City of Twin Falls has reviewed your request and this response.

NOTICE: PURSUANT TO IDAHO CODE § 74-115 YOU HAVE 180 DAYS TO APPEAL THIS DECISION BY FILING A PETITION IN STATE DISTRICT COURT IN THE COUNTY WHERE ALL OR PART OF THE RECORDS ARE LOCATED

Sincerely,

/s/ Bruce Castleton

Bruce Castleton
City Attorney
City of Twin Falls

From	Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org>
To	[redacted]
Date	Monday, July 13, 2026 09:19 AM MT
Subject	RE: Public Records Request
Attachments	Redaction For[redacted]#3946.pdf
Filed under	#3946
Source file SHA-256	5724ac62fa369e0df1fa9c63cb474d0214f5a8e75681ff11fd8ef51786cead9b

Good Morning,

In response to your email, over the course of several days I sent 6 emails total to the email address that you had on the form that their would be an additional fee to pay based off of what our City attorneys advised me, that their time would go over the 2 hour mark to review. There for the request went over the 10 days due to no response from your end that you would pay for the additional time over the 2hours. Attached is a copy of that request that was sent.

With no communication response our City attorney reviewed the information again. After further review from out City attorneys they gave the request to Human Resources due to Proprietary information. (Below is one of Attorneys responses)

(As I was reviewing the documents, I came across this statement from HUB: "This document and any attached materials are the sole property of HUB International and are not to be used by you other than to evaluate HUB International's service, and are not to be disseminated, distributed or otherwise conveyed throughout your organization to employees without a need for this information or to any third parties without the express written permission of HUB International." In sum, proprietary information is anything that is "privately owned, controlled, or exclusively made by a specific individual or company."
I reached out to Bruce, and he agreed that proprietary information is excluded from the public records act. The problem that he and I came across is that we didn't know enough about the project to differentiate between what was proprietary information created by HUB and what was data that Twin Falls provided. There are numerous emails, reports, and Excel spreadsheets. Anything created or owned by HUB while they were being paid for the project would likely be considered proprietary)

Once the information was given to Human Resources they worked with our agent from HUB and went through all the emails and information they had, what they sent to you was all that was allowed to be sent based on everything else was Proprietary information. Below is Human resources response:

(The search returned 117 entries.

Of those entries 109 are statutorily excluded from release by Idaho Code Section 74-107(1).

The remaining entries are available for your review.)

Hope this helps clear up any confusion.

Rachael Long
Deputy City Clerk
City of Twin Falls
Twin Falls, ID 83303

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

“Organized today.
Prepared tomorrow.
Making a Difference Everyday”

From: [redacted]
Sent: Friday, July 10, 2026 10:17 PM
To: Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org>
Subject: Re: Public Records Request

⚠ Caution: EXTERNAL SENDER – Be cautious opening any links or attachments from unknown or unexpected senders.
If the sender appears to be from tfid.org, do not trust the email.

Subject: Request for Clarification Regarding Public Records Response #3946

Ms. Long,

Thank you for completing the response to my public records request. After reviewing the materials provided, I have several concerns that I need clarified.

My request was for **“all materials containing the keyword ‘Market Analysis’ possessed/received/sent by Travis Rothweiler, Gretchen Scott, Mitch Humble, Kristen Kohntopp, and/or Breanna Howard.”** The response included fewer than ten documents, yet the documents provided clearly reference a market analysis that was completed, shared internally, and discussed in meetings. For example, the records include:

- A Microsoft Teams meeting titled **“City of Twin Falls – Market Analysis Results”**
- Internal Microsoft 365 sharing notifications for **“Market Analysis Results”**
- An invoice from HUB International, the vendor who performed the analysis

These items indicate that additional responsive materials exist, but they were not included in the response.

I acknowledge that the City sent a written notice invoking the additional 10 business days permitted under Idaho Code § 74-103(1). However, the final response was issued on **July 1, 2026**, which is well beyond the maximum 13 business days allowed by statute, even with the extension.

Additionally, when any portion of a record is withheld or redacted, Idaho Code § 74-103(4) requires the agency to provide:

- A statement that access is denied in whole or in part,

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

- The **specific statutory authority** for each withheld or redacted portion,
- The **name and title** of the person responsible for the decision, and
- Notice of the right to appeal.

Only the appeal notice was included. Without the required statutory citations or identification of the responsible official, I cannot determine what was withheld or why.

Idaho Code § 74-112 also requires agencies to segregate exempt and non-exempt information and release all non-exempt portions. The limited number of documents provided does not appear to reflect the full set of responsive materials.

To clarify the response, please provide:

1. Whether additional responsive documents exist that were not included.
2. Whether any materials were withheld or redacted, and if so, the **specific statutory exemptions** applied to each.
3. The **name and title** of the individual who authorized any withholding.
4. Whether the market analysis or compensation study was categorized under a different name in the City's financial system.

Additionally, for my records, please confirm whether the City Attorney or other legal counsel reviewed or approved any decisions to withhold or redact materials responsive to this request. If legal counsel was not involved, please identify the individual who made the determination and the basis for their authority to do so.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to your clarification.

Sincerely,[redacted]

On Mon, Jun 22, 2026 at 8:48 PM Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org> wrote:

> Hello,
>
> I am reaching out to you about the public records request you made with the City of Twin Falls. We have located the information you have requested, and it has been determined that it will take longer than the 2 hours they are allowed.
>
> Attached is the cost for them to move forward with this request. Please let me know if you would like to move forward with payment and I will have finance get the invoice created for this and sent over to you.
>
> ***Rachael Long***
> Deputy City Clerk
> City of Twin Falls
> Twin Falls, ID 83303
>
> "Records with Integrity"

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.


CITY OF
TWIN FALLS
PEOPLE SERVING PEOPLE

From	[redacted]
To	Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org>
Date	Thursday, September 03, 2026 10:54 PM MT
Subject	Re: Public Records Request
Attachments	image001.png
Filed under	#3946
Source file SHA-256	c5b88693ce49367f54001f9997a79d07a358a6575c3c77cc80939a9b51f0450e

Ms. Long,

After reviewing the response and researching the public records request laws of Idaho, I believe that the response is missing content and context. Based on the information that was provided, it appears that there was more and that it was removed. I am entitled to know who removed/redacted material and why. A blanket denial of so much potential material is unacceptable.

Please produce a listing of what was removed and why it was removed. I'm sure redactions could have been made that would have sufficed to honor what needed to be from HUB International. Also, that shouldn't necessarily apply to the communication amongst the staff about the market analysis, the decisions made and the internal workings of how public funds are determined to be spent, both on the analysis itself and the employees. Please also include the name of the person in HR responsible for the redaction/removal of all of this material. I argue that emails and discussions about the material, not disclosing the sensitive and protected data itself is not included in HUB's proprietary information. That is after all, information that HUB doesn't even know about or possess.

For example, if specific dollar amounts from HUB communications were redacted, then that would be understandable, allowing more of a picture of what public funds were spent and how decisions were made and by whom. The point of the exclusions by HUB is surely to protect its business. Redactions can be made to protect that information from being provided to the public for free while still allowing the public to understand how the decisions are made and what is being done to ensure the City is being fair, equitable and competitive to its current and prospective employees, while being fiscally responsible at the same time.

Please make the effort to redact when necessary and only remove entire documents when appropriate.

[redacted]
On Friday, July 10th, 2026 at 22:16, [redacted] wrote:

> **Subject:** Request for Clarification Regarding Public Records Response #3946
>
> Ms. Long,
>
> Thank you for completing the response to my public records request. After reviewing the materials provided, I have several concerns that I need clarified.
>
> My request was for **“all materials containing the keyword ‘Market Analysis’ possessed/received/sent by Travis Rothweiler, Gretchen Scott, Mitch Humble, Kristen Kohntopp, and/or Breanna Howard.”** The response included fewer than ten documents, yet the documents provided clearly reference a market analysis that was completed, shared internally, and discussed in meetings. For example, the records include:
>
> - A Microsoft Teams meeting titled **“City of Twin Falls – Market Analysis Results”**
> - Internal Microsoft 365 sharing notifications for **“Market Analysis Results”**
> - An invoice from HUB International, the vendor who performed the analysis
>
> These items indicate that additional responsive materials exist, but they were not included in the response.

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

I acknowledge that the City sent a written notice invoking the additional 10 business days permitted under Idaho Code § 74-103(1). However, the final response was issued on **July 1, 2026**, which is well beyond the maximum 13 business days allowed by statute, even with the extension.

Additionally, when any portion of a record is withheld or redacted, Idaho Code § 74-103(4) requires the agency to provide:

- A statement that access is denied in whole or in part,
- The **specific statutory authority** for each withheld or redacted portion,
- The **name and title** of the person responsible for the decision, and
- Notice of the right to appeal.

Only the appeal notice was included. Without the required statutory citations or identification of the responsible official, I cannot determine what was withheld or why.

Idaho Code § 74-112 also requires agencies to segregate exempt and non-exempt information and release all non-exempt portions. The limited number of documents provided does not appear to reflect the full set of responsive materials.

To clarify the response, please provide:

1. Whether additional responsive documents exist that were not included.
2. Whether any materials were withheld or redacted, and if so, the **specific statutory exemptions** applied to each.
3. The **name and title** of the individual who authorized any withholding.
4. Whether the market analysis or compensation study was categorized under a different name in the City's financial system.

Additionally, for my records, please confirm whether the City Attorney or other legal counsel reviewed or approved any decisions to withhold or redact materials responsive to this request. If legal counsel was not involved, please identify the individual who made the determination and the basis for their authority to do so.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to your clarification.

Sincerely,
[redacted]

On Mon, Jun 22, 2026 at 8:48 PM Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org> wrote:

> Hello,
>
> I am reaching out to you about the public records request you made with the City of Twin Falls. We have located the information you have requested, and it has been determined that it will take longer than the 2 hours they are allowed.
>
> Attached is the cost for them to move forward with this request. Please let me know if you would like to move forward with payment and I will have finance get the invoice created for this and sent over to you.

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

Rachael Long

Deputy City Clerk

City of Twin Falls

Twin Falls, ID 83303

"Records with Integrity"

From	Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org>
To	[redacted]
Date	Friday, September 04, 2026 04:02 PM MT
Subject	RE: Public Records Request
Attachments	none
Filed under	#3946
Source file SHA-256	558c1df3dec6f205951696b52d133d9ffb76fbc226a0d20263ea10d80a3c9bae

Good Afternoon,

Your email has been sent forward to the City Attorney and I will let you know what he responds with.

Have a great day
Rachael

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2026 10:54 PM
To: Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org>
Subject: Re: Public Records Request

⚠ Caution: EXTERNAL SENDER – Be cautious opening any links or attachments from unknown or unexpected senders.
If the sender appears to be from tfid.org, do not trust the email.

Ms. Long,

After reviewing the response and researching the public records request laws of Idaho, I believe that the response is missing content and context. Based on the information that was provided, it appears that there was more and that it was removed. I am entitled to know who removed/redacted material and why. A blanket denial of so much potential material is unacceptable.

Please produce a listing of what was removed and why it was removed. I'm sure redactions could have been made that would have sufficed to honor what needed to be from HUB International. Also, that shouldn't necessarily apply to the communication amongst the staff about the market analysis, the decisions made and the internal workings of how public funds are determined to be spent, both on the analysis itself and the employees. Please also include the name of the person in HR responsible for the redaction/removal of all of this material. I argue that emails and discussions about the material, not disclosing the sensitive and protected data itself is not included in HUB's proprietary information. That is after all, information that HUB doesn't even know about or possess.

For example, if specific dollar amounts from HUB communications were redacted, then that would be understandable, allowing more of a picture of what public funds were spent and how decisions were made and by whom. The point of the exclusions by HUB is surely to protect its business. Redactions can be made to protect that information from being provided to the public for free while still allowing the public to understand how the decisions are made and what is being done to ensure the City is being fair, equitable and competitive to its current and prospective employees, while being fiscally responsible at the same time.

Please make the effort to redact when necessary and only remove entire documents when appropriate.

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

[redacted] On Friday, July 10th, 2026 at 22:16, [redacted] wrote:

Subject: Request for Clarification Regarding Public Records Response #3946

Ms. Long,

Thank you for completing the response to my public records request. After reviewing the materials provided, I have several concerns that I need clarified.

My request was for **“all materials containing the keyword ‘Market Analysis’ possessed/received/sent by Travis Rothweiler, Gretchen Scott, Mitch Humble, Kristen Kohntopp, and/or Breanna Howard.”** The response included fewer than ten documents, yet the documents provided clearly reference a market analysis that was completed, shared internally, and discussed in meetings. For example, the records include:

- A Microsoft Teams meeting titled **“City of Twin Falls – Market Analysis Results”**
- Internal Microsoft 365 sharing notifications for **“Market Analysis Results”**
- An invoice from HUB International, the vendor who performed the analysis

These items indicate that additional responsive materials exist, but they were not included in the response.

I acknowledge that the City sent a written notice invoking the additional 10 business days permitted under Idaho Code § 74-103(1). However, the final response was issued on **July 1, 2026**, which is well beyond the maximum 13 business days allowed by statute, even with the extension.

Additionally, when any portion of a record is withheld or redacted, Idaho Code § 74-103(4) requires the agency to provide:

- A statement that access is denied in whole or in part,
- The **specific statutory authority** for each withheld or redacted portion,
- The **name and title** of the person responsible for the decision, and
- Notice of the right to appeal.

Only the appeal notice was included. Without the required statutory citations or identification of the responsible official, I cannot determine what was withheld or why.

Idaho Code § 74-112 also requires agencies to segregate exempt and non-exempt information and release all non-exempt portions. The limited number of documents provided does not appear to reflect the full set of responsive materials.

To clarify the response, please provide:

1. Whether additional responsive documents exist that were not included.
2. Whether any materials were withheld or redacted, and if so, the **specific statutory exemptions** applied to each.
3. The **name and title** of the individual who authorized any withholding.
4. Whether the market analysis or compensation study was categorized under a different name in the City’s financial system.


Additionally, for my records, please confirm whether the City Attorney or other legal counsel reviewed or approved any decisions to withhold or redact materials responsive to this request. If legal counsel was not involved, please identify the individual who made the determination and the basis for their authority to do so.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to your clarification.

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

Sincerely,[redacted]

On Mon, Jun 22, 2026 at 8:48 PM Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org> wrote:

> Hello,
> I am reaching out to you about the public records request you made with the City of Twin Falls. We have located the information you have requested, and it has been determined that it will take longer than the 2 hours they are allowed.
> Attached is the cost for them to move forward with this request. Please let me know if you would like to move forward with payment and I will have finance get the invoice created for this and sent over to you.
> ***Rachael Long***
> Deputy City Clerk
> City of Twin Falls
> Twin Falls, ID 83303
> “Records with Integrity”
> 

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

From	Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org>
To	[redacted]
Date	Wednesday, September 16, 2026 11:03 AM MT
Subject	RE: Public Records Request
Attachments	none
Filed under	#3946
Source file SHA-256	2554f1bf1bfaefd5116d5e5991dd64ba8110113d959d29a1b0c022a10e10b971

Good Morning,

Sorry for the delay in response I was out sick. I have heard back from our City attorney and he wanted me to let you know that for your public records request the exemption is below on why things were exempt.

Idaho Code § 74-107(1): Trade Secrets Exemption

The statute exempts **trade secrets** from public disclosure, including those found in agency RFPs and related procurement documents. A trade secret is defined as proprietary information (such as formulas, techniques, or research) that has independent economic value from not being generally known and is subject to reasonable efforts to maintain its secrecy

---

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2026 10:54 PM
To: Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org>
Subject: Re: Public Records Request

⚠ Caution: EXTERNAL SENDER – Be cautious opening any links or attachments from unknown or unexpected senders.
If the sender appears to be from tfid.org, do not trust the email.

Ms. Long,

After reviewing the response and researching the public records request laws of Idaho, I believe that the response is missing content and context. Based on the information that was provided, it appears that there was more and that it was removed. I am entitled to know who removed/redacted material and why. A blanket denial of so much potential material is unacceptable.

Please produce a listing of what was removed and why it was removed. I'm sure redactions could have been made that would have sufficed to honor what needed to be from HUB International. Also, that shouldn't necessarily apply to the communication amongst the staff about the market analysis, the decisions made and the internal workings of how public funds are determined to be spent, both on the analysis itself and the employees. Please also include the name of the person in HR responsible for the redaction/removal of all of this material. I argue that emails and discussions about the material, not disclosing the sensitive and protected data itself is not included in HUB's proprietary information. That is after all, information that HUB doesn't even know about or possess.

For example, if specific dollar amounts from HUB communications were redacted, then that would be understandable, allowing more of a picture of what public funds were spent and how decisions were made and by

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

whom. The point of the exclusions by HUB is surely to protect its business. Redactions can be made to protect that information from being provided to the public for free while still allowing the public to understand how the decisions are made and what is being done to ensure the City is being fair, equitable and competitive to its current and prospective employees, while being fiscally responsible at the same time.

Please make the effort to redact when necessary and only remove entire documents when appropriate.

[redacted]

On Friday, July 10th, 2026 at 22:16, [redacted] wrote:

> **Subject:** Request for Clarification Regarding Public Records Response #3946
>
> Ms. Long,
>
> Thank you for completing the response to my public records request. After reviewing the materials provided, I have several concerns that I need clarified.
>
> My request was for **"all materials containing the keyword 'Market Analysis' possessed/received/sent by Travis Rothweiler, Gretchen Scott, Mitch Humble, Kristen Kohntopp, and/or Breanna Howard."** The response included fewer than ten documents, yet the documents provided clearly reference a market analysis that was completed, shared internally, and discussed in meetings. For example, the records include:
>
> - A Microsoft Teams meeting titled **"City of Twin Falls – Market Analysis Results"**
> - Internal Microsoft 365 sharing notifications for **"Market Analysis Results"**
> - An invoice from HUB International, the vendor who performed the analysis
>
> These items indicate that additional responsive materials exist, but they were not included in the response.
>
> I acknowledge that the City sent a written notice invoking the additional 10 business days permitted under Idaho Code § 74-103(1). However, the final response was issued on **July 1, 2026**, which is well beyond the maximum 13 business days allowed by statute, even with the extension.
>
> Additionally, when any portion of a record is withheld or redacted, Idaho Code § 74-103(4) requires the agency to provide:
>
> - A statement that access is denied in whole or in part,
> - The **specific statutory authority** for each withheld or redacted portion,
> - The **name and title** of the person responsible for the decision, and
> - Notice of the right to appeal.
>
> Only the appeal notice was included. Without the required statutory citations or identification of the responsible official, I cannot determine what was withheld or why.
>
> Idaho Code § 74-112 also requires agencies to segregate exempt and non-exempt information and release all non-exempt portions. The limited number of documents provided does not appear to reflect the full set of responsive materials.
>
> To clarify the response, please provide:
>
> 1. Whether additional responsive documents exist that were not included.
> 2. Whether any materials were withheld or redacted, and if so, the **specific statutory exemptions** applied to each.
> 3. The **name and title** of the individual who authorized any withholding.

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.


4. Whether the market analysis or compensation study was categorized under a different name in the City's financial system.

Additionally, for my records, please confirm whether the City Attorney or other legal counsel reviewed or approved any decisions to withhold or redact materials responsive to this request. If legal counsel was not involved, please identify the individual who made the determination and the basis for their authority to do so.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to your clarification.

Sincerely, [redacted]

On Mon, Jun 22, 2026 at 8:48 PM Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org> wrote:

> Hello,
> I am reaching out to you about the public records request you made with the City of Twin Falls. We have located the information you have requested, and it has been determined that it will take longer than the 2 hours they are allowed.
> Attached is the cost for them to move forward with this request. Please let me know if you would like to move forward with payment and I will have finance get the invoice created for this and sent over to you.
> ***Rachael Long***
> Deputy City Clerk
> City of Twin Falls
> Twin Falls, ID 83303
> "Records with Integrity"
> 

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

From	[redacted]
To	Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org>
Date	Friday, September 18, 2026 09:31 PM MT
Subject	RE: Public Records Request
Attachments	none
Filed under	#3946
Source file SHA-256	38f4b7b252ad55fff195442af429aa4f1262db4acade45015b44d88c291c1b98

This is still not enough of a response.

How many documents were removed?
Were they all removed under the same statute?
Who made the decision/performed the removal?
Why was everything removed rather than redact the parts, numbers, etc. that fall within that statute?

I have still not been provided with enough information to consider this matter concluded.
Consider this an official appeal if that weren't already apparent enough from the previous emails. The materials left allude to several meetings and emails and completed reports. It would be quite possible to redact things like specific numbers. In this case, that would constitute the trade secrets. The city's decision-making process is not part of the trade secrets exemption and effort can and should be made to be transparent in accordance with Idaho law regarding requests for public information.

On Wednesday, September 16th, 2026 at 11:03, Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org> wrote:

> Good Morning,
>
> Sorry for the delay in response I was out sick. I have heard back from our City attorney and he wanted me to let you know that for your public records request the exemption is below on why things were exempt.
>
> **Idaho Code § 74-107(1): Trade Secrets Exemption**
>
> The statute exempts **trade secrets** from public disclosure, including those found in agency RFPs and related procurement documents. A trade secret is defined as proprietary information (such as formulas, techniques, or research) that has independent economic value from not being generally known and is subject to reasonable efforts to maintain its secrecy

---

From: [redacted]
Sent: Thursday, September 3, 2026 10:54 PM
To: Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org>
Subject: Re: Public Records Request

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

⚠️ **Caution: EXTERNAL SENDER – Be cautious opening any links or attachments from unknown or unexpected senders.**
If the sender appears to be from tfid.org, do not trust the email.

Ms. Long,

After reviewing the response and researching the public records request laws of Idaho, I believe that the response is missing content and context. Based on the information that was provided, it appears that there was more and that it was removed. I am entitled to know who removed/redacted material and why. A blanket denial of so much potential material is unacceptable.

Please produce a listing of what was removed and why it was removed. I'm sure redactions could have been made that would have sufficed to honor what needed to be from HUB International. Also, that shouldn't necessarily apply to the communication amongst the staff about the market analysis, the decisions made and the internal workings of how public funds are determined to be spent, both on the analysis itself and the employees. Please also include the name of the person in HR responsible for the redaction/removal of all of this material. I argue that emails and discussions about the material, not disclosing the sensitive and protected data itself is not included in HUB's proprietary information. That is after all, information that HUB doesn't even know about or possess.

For example, if specific dollar amounts from HUB communications were redacted, then that would be understandable, allowing more of a picture of what public funds were spent and how decisions were made and by whom. The point of the exclusions by HUB is surely to protect its business. Redactions can be made to protect that information from being provided to the public for free while still allowing the public to understand how the decisions are made and what is being done to ensure the City is being fair, equitable and competitive to its current and prospective employees, while being fiscally responsible at the same time.

Please make the effort to redact when necessary and only remove entire documents when appropriate.

[redacted]

On Friday, July 10th, 2026 at 22:16, [redacted] wrote:

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.

Subject: Request for Clarification Regarding Public Records Response #3946

Ms. Long,

Thank you for completing the response to my public records request. After reviewing the materials provided, I have several concerns that I need clarified.

My request was for **“all materials containing the keyword ‘Market Analysis’ possessed/received/sent by Travis Rothweiler, Gretchen Scott, Mitch Humble, Kristen Kohntopp, and/or Breanna Howard.”** The response included fewer than ten documents, yet the documents provided clearly reference a market analysis that was completed, shared internally, and discussed in meetings. For example, the records include:

- A Microsoft Teams meeting titled **“City of Twin Falls – Market Analysis Results”**
- Internal Microsoft 365 sharing notifications for **“Market Analysis Results”**
- An invoice from HUB International, the vendor who performed the analysis

These items indicate that additional responsive materials exist, but they were not included in the response.

I acknowledge that the City sent a written notice invoking the additional 10 business days permitted under Idaho Code § 74-103(1). However, the final response was issued on **July 1, 2026**, which is well beyond the maximum 13 business days allowed by statute, even with the extension.

Additionally, when any portion of a record is withheld or redacted, Idaho Code § 74-103(4) requires the agency to provide:

- A statement that access is denied in whole or in part,
- The **specific statutory authority** for each withheld or redacted portion,
- The **name and title** of the person responsible for the decision, and
- Notice of the right to appeal.

Only the appeal notice was included. Without the required statutory citations or identification of the responsible official, I cannot determine what was withheld or why.

Idaho Code § 74-112 also requires agencies to segregate exempt and non-exempt information and release all non-exempt portions. The limited number of documents provided does not appear to reflect the full set of responsive materials.

To clarify the response, please provide:

1. Whether additional responsive documents exist that were not included.
2. Whether any materials were withheld or redacted, and if so, the **specific statutory exemptions** applied to each.

3. The **name and title** of the individual who authorized any withholding.
4. Whether the market analysis or compensation study was categorized under a different name in the City's financial system.

Additionally, for my records, please confirm whether the City Attorney or other legal counsel reviewed or approved any decisions to withhold or redact materials responsive to this request. If legal counsel was not involved, please identify the individual who made the determination and the basis for their authority to do so.

Thank you for your attention. I look forward to your clarification.

Sincerely, [redacted]

On Mon, Jun 22, 2026 at 8:48 PM Rachael Long <rlong@tfid.org> wrote:

> Hello,
>
> I am reaching out to you about the public records request you made with the City of Twin Falls. We have located the information you have requested, and it has been determined that it will take longer than the 2 hours they are allowed.
>
> Attached is the cost for them to move forward with this request. Please let me know if you would like to move forward with payment and I will have finance get the invoice created for this and sent over to you.
>
> ***Rachael Long***
>
> Deputy City Clerk
>
> City of Twin Falls
>
> Twin Falls, ID 83303
>
> "Records with Integrity"
>
> 

Requester names and personal contact details redacted by Oversight Archive.