

# Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission

PO Box 1350 • 700 South Main Street  
Cascade, ID 83611-1350



Phone: 208-382-7115  
Email: [cherrick@valleycountyid.gov](mailto:cherrick@valleycountyid.gov)

**Ken Roberts, Chairman**  
**Carrie Potter, Vice-Chair**

**Brad Mabe, Commissioner**  
**Ben Oyarzo, Commissioner**  
**Joel Carson, Commissioner**

## MINUTES

Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission

**August 27, 2026**

**Valley County Court House - Cascade, Idaho**

**PUBLIC HEARING - 6:00 p.m.**

**A. OPEN:** Meeting called to order at 6:00 p.m. by Chairman Roberts. A quorum exists.

|                                  |         |
|----------------------------------|---------|
| PZ Director – Cynda Herrick:     | Present |
| PZ Commissioner – Joel Carson    | Excused |
| PZ Commissioner – Brad Mabe      | Present |
| PZ Commissioner – Ben Oyarzo:    | Present |
| PZ Commissioner – Carrie Potter: | Present |
| PZ Commissioner – Ken Roberts:   | Present |
| PZ Planner II – Lori Hunter:     | Present |

## **B. NEW BUSINESS:**

1. P.U.D 26-001 Red Ridge Village: DF Development LLC is requesting approval of a Planned Unit Development (PUD) Concept Plan in accordance with Valley County Code Title 9 Land Use and Development, Chapter 9 PUDs. The concept includes 722 residential units including condominiums, multi-family local housing, and single-family residences on 2250 acres. Overall density would be approximately 0.3 units per acre. Approximately 1,400 acres of open space, recreation areas, and wildlife habitat would be created by clustering dwelling units in a village center and surrounding residential neighborhoods. The concept plan includes five development areas with amenities, roads, and a trail network. A water association would provide central water services. Both septic systems and a central sewage treatment facility are proposed. Access would be from West Mountain Road. The 2,250-acre site includes multiple parcels in Sections 3 and 10, T.17N, R.2E and Sections 13, 14, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, and 34, T.18N, R.2E, Boise Meridian, Valley County, Idaho. Action Item.

Chairman Roberts introduced the item and asked if there was any exparte contact or conflict of interest; there was none.

Chairman Roberts explained for the audience the differences in procedures between a PUD and a typical subdivision application. He explained that the Concept Approval is the first stage. If approved, this would be followed by multiple conditional use permits for different phases in the development. The intent is to hear from Staff, the applicant's representatives, agencies, and the public. Information, such as the application and staff report, is available on the Valley County website.

Director Herrick presented the staff report and displayed the site and GIS map on the projector screen. This application is only for Concept Approval as is allowed under Valley County Code 9-9-12. On August 24, 2026, the Board of County Commissioners approved the Public Safety Impact Study and Funding Agreement.

Director Herrick summarized the following exhibits, all of which were provided to the Commissioners:

- **Exhibit 1** – Scott and Rebecca Hurd, (August 19, 2026)
- **Exhibit 2** – City of McCall (August 21, 2026)
- **Exhibit 3** – Christine Richman’s email to Tim Thomas, McCall-Donnelly School District, referencing their discussion. (August 26, 2026)
- **Exhibit 4** – Comments in Opposition Received August 20 through August 26, 2026.
  - Barr Quarton
  - Bob Carroll
  - Tanya Gordon
  - Scott and Connie Harris
  - Erin Fanning
  - Melissa Coriell

Chairman Roberts referred to the spreadsheet that contains issues raised by Commission, agencies, and the public. Director Herrick stated Staff relied on the applicant to fill in the blanks to save staff time, however, the spreadsheet does include Staff input. Additional issues and comments will be added.

Chairman Roberts asked for the applicant’s presentation.

The following were present to represent the applicant:

- Christine Richman, urban planner with GSBS Architects,
- Nicole Hibbert, DF Development LLC, and
- Chuck Brockway, civil engineer with Brockway Engineering.

Ms. Richman referred to a slide presentation (**Exhibit 5**). There is no new information in the presentation that was not included in the previous submittals.

- **Request – Concept Approval:** A recommendation to initiate drafting of a development agreement to identify the appropriate mitigations for identifiable impacts from our development.
- **The concept** – Clustered development, open space, public trails, trailheads, and parking.
- **Public benefits and amenities**
- **Revisions and updates submitted on August 19, 2026:**
  - Defined and refined strategies for implementation,
  - Updated Maps (Appendix A, Figures 6 and 17),
  - Appendix F revised based in input from Idaho Department of Fish and Game,
  - Lighting,
  - Local Housing,
  - Open Space and Amenities,
  - The third version of the Traffic Impact Study (TIS), which was revised based upon input from Valley County Road and Bridge Department, City of McCall Engineer, and Idaho Transportation Department.
  - Wildland Urban Interface Fire Protection Plan updated based on comments from Valley County Staff and McCall Fire District,
  - Addition of Water Requirements and Water Sufficiency Analysis
  - Fiscal Impact Analysis by BBC Research

- **Concept updates and Clarifications**
  - Converts the “temporary” northern access to permanent
  - Identifies the method of long-term open space preservation
  - Clarifies discussion of open space areas and wildlife
  - Reflects the results of the independent Fiscal Impact Analysis
  - Provides additional detail to the preliminary phasing plan
  - Incorporates the results of the Water Requirements and Water Supply Sufficiency Analysis

### **Water Requirements and Water Supply:**

Mr. Brockway reviewed the Water Requirements and Water Sufficiency Analysis report. He spoke about the demand for water and the ability of the aquifer to meet the demand and used a flowchart to explain the proposed process. He stated after treatment the water would be considered Class A potable drinking water. The estimated water demands for both potable and irrigation water were reviewed, by average daily demand, maximum daily demand, and peak hour demand. The use of recycled water will reduce water demand for the irrigated areas. Recycled water would be used for land application irrigation. At full buildout, 36 acres would be required to receive all recycled water. Supplemental fresh water would be used as needed. Rapid infiltration and storage would be used during winter.

Water demand was reviewed further. Regulatory restraints must be met for each well. Consumptive use estimates are:

- Residential / commercial 10%
- Irrigation 75%
- Rapid infiltration 0%
- Overall project
  - Irrigation season 76% consumptive (146 ac-ft)
  - Non-irrigation season 10% consumptive (80 ac-ft)
  - Annual 57% consumptive (154 ac-ft)

Groundwater supply productivity was reviewed. The questions are can the groundwater supply the well yield and is the amount sustainable. A map of all the wells in the study area was displayed. About 90% of the existing wells are domestic, shallow wells are in the upper aquifer system. There are 12 pretty deep wells with good well logs that resulted in a good lithologic or geologic cross-section of the aquifer. A west to east cross section of the aquifer for the area was graphed and show layers of clay, sand, and granite. The sand layers contain water. Mr. Brockway stated there are three general zones in this area: 1) Water table zone; 2) Intermediate artesian zone; and 3) Deep artesian zone. The artesian zones are confined below clay layers. Deep zones are separate from the upper water table. The report recommends wells that are similar to the two (2) deep wells for the Blackhawk area, which are less than two miles south of this project area. Both of these wells are completed in the deep artesian zone and have artesian pressures at the surface of about 12 to 22 feet above the surface. This means that the deep zones is separated from the upper water table aquifer which is not an artisan aquifer. The clay layers are essentially impermeable and cause the water to be under pressure a bit more. The wells for Red Ridge Village would be about 530 feet deep; the report should be corrected from 430 to 530-ft. There is at least 100 to 150-ft of productive sand strata at that depth. The well would be fully cased and sealed to screen out the upper water table. Several large wells that have data were used to estimate the productivity. The average is about 26 feet per day; therefore, more than sufficient for what is needed. Wells with design yield can be obtained, estimated specific capacity of 14.3-gpm/ft.

Mr. Brockway then spoke about aquifer sustainability. Total discharge and total use were

reviewed. Per the Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR), the project cannot exceed the annual recharge. He concluded that 1) The aquifer can sustain the long-term withdrawal; 2) The upper zone is tributary to the river and lower ones likely not tributary, at least in the vicinity of the project; and 3) All zones are likely tributary to Cascade Reservoir based on topography and geology.

The local aquifer impact was the next topic. Local drawdown at project boundary would be 5-9 feet under the most conservative scenario (in the deep production zones, not the water table zone). Of the domestic wells within 0.5 miles of the project boundary, 70 of 73 are in the upper zone. A testing and monitoring program would occur. Shallow monitoring well at production well location would assess the effect during pump testing of production wells, including long-term trends. The applicant could also offer to monitor domestic well levels.

Groundwater supply map and drawdown line was reviewed.

Water rights were discussed. A municipal use permit application would be done through IDWR. There are options available if IDWR imposes a mitigation requirement: 1) Payette rental pool; 2) Long-term private arrangement with space holders; 3) Acquisition of storage contract, and 4) Acquisition of natural flow.

Mr. Brockway concluded that, based on all available data:

- Wells of the required capacity can be obtained
- The aquifer can sustain the proposed project water usage
- Water right can be obtained
- Water supply adequacy is confirmed

There would be an ongoing program of additional data collection, testing, and monitoring as permitting and well development proceeds. There would be a monitoring well. The exploratory well would get drilled prior to the production wells. Then the production wells would be drilled and tested. Approval from the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality would be required.

Chairman Roberts and Commissioner Mabe had additional questions and information they would like from the applicant: These include:

- Rapid infiltration systems
  - Where does the discharge go and which level of aquifer would that be?
  - Would the discharge be in the same aquifer as the existing shallow wells?
- Acre-ft calculation for winter storage
- Site for winter storage
- Required fire flow gallons per minute
- Adjacent wells in deep aquifer would want some avenue of mitigation in case there is drawn down on their wells
- Data on nitrogen and phosphate still in Class A treated water
- Comparison of phosphorus and nitrates between the treated Class A water and natural ground water.
- Options for mitigation of phosphorus and nitrates in the treated water.
- Expand how water would eventually end up in Lake Cascade
- A north to south map of the aquifer.

Ms. Richman discussed issues and proposed mitigations as summarized in the submitted spreadsheet.

### 1) **Roads**

- Applicant to construct all internal roads to County standards.
- Future Red Ridge Village HOA to fund operations & maintenance of all internal roads.
- Applicant to participate in funding improvements to mitigate impact on existing road network as identified in the TIS.
- Future general fund revenues at buildout to fund operation and maintenance of existing road network (see BBC Research Report).
- Discussion Points:
  - Proportional participation in county-wide road network improvements
  - Phasing adjustments to minimize property tax
  - Gap funding for remaining property tax lag

### 2) **Sewer / Septic**

- Will not know exact number of lots, if any, will use individual septic systems until the sewer system is engineered.

### 3) **Water**

- Private, internal centralized water system to serve all units/lots.
- Will comply with all required permits and approvals.
- The Water Requirements and Water Supply Sufficiency Analysis estimated demand and found adequate availability.
- Mitigation requirements of IDWR will be met.
- An independent, qualified and licensed operator will operate the facility.

### 4) **Schools**

- BBC Research estimated the number of students anticipated.
- Conversations and negotiations with McCall Donnelly School District concerning impacts will continue. Ms. Richman referenced **Exhibit 3**; the applicant's representatives have met three times with the McCall-Donnelly School District.
- Future general fund revenues at buildout to fund school operations (See BBC Research Report).
- Discussion points:
  - Impact of construction workforce on school enrollment.
  - Phasing adjustments to minimize property tax lag. Would be updated during future conditional use permit applications.
  - Gap funding for remaining property tax lag.

### 5) **Wildfire**

- Fire Prevention Plan identifies the following mitigations:
  - Construction of trail/road/open space network as fire breaks.
  - Implementation of Firewise Communities USA Community Design Practices.
  - Defensible space framework around all structures implemented and enforced through homeowner association (HOA).
  - Road network to meet all International Fire Code (IFC) requirements.
  - Water system to meet National Fire Protection Association (NFPA) and IFC standards.
- Discussion points:
  - Conditions of approval to include required components of CCRs.
    - HOA would maintain and enforce the defensible spaces around structures. Particularly important as many homes would not be primary residences.

## **6) Fire and EMS**

- Area not currently in Impact Fee collection area.
- New development outside optimal service areas.
- McCall Fire District and Valley Rural Countywide EMS District pursuing Public Safety Impact Analysis.
- Future general fund revenues at buildout to fund public safety operations (See BBC Research Report).
- Discussion points:
  - DF Development reviewing the agreement to fund Public Safety Impact Analysis.
  - Future agreement needed to fund study recommendations.
  - Phasing adjustments to minimize property tax lag.
  - Gap funding for remaining property tax lag.

## **7) Housing**

- Concept includes a range of housing types and pricing.
- Includes area of deed restricted local housing with a range of price points.
- Deed restriction language modeled on City of McCall.
- Discussion points:
  - Language of deed restriction and ability to amend program based on market forces

There was discussion between the Commissioners and Ms. Richman on the proposed housing. A variety of units are proposed, some very high end and others affordable worker housing.

- Commissioners desired to see the proposed numbers of units at different price points.

Commissioners referred to a question in the staff report regarding if the \$930,868 assessed value for townhomes/duplexes used to determine ad valorem taxes in the fiscal impact analysis can contain a portion of what is purported to be the community/affordable type of housing. Ms. Richman believes that BBC Research used the applicant's potential pricing and the average pricing for adjacent developments.

## **8) Recreation**

- Applicant to construct 18+ miles of non-motorized and 5+ miles of motorized publicly accessible trails & trailheads.
- HOA to fund operations & maintenance of all trails & trailheads.
- Applicant to connect internal trail system to regional trail system as applicable.
- Impact of future residents on existing recreation system to be funded through current user fee schedule & general fund.
- Discussion points:
  - Long-term management plans and specific designs to be provide with each phase.
  - Phasing adjustments to minimize property tax lag.
  - Gap funding for remaining property tax lag.

Ms. Richman confirmed the easements would be to Valley County.

## **9) Wildlife**

- Idaho Department of Fish & Game asked for clarifying edits.
- Ensured inclusion of areas of connectivity through the village center to allow wildlife movement.
- Wildlife safe fencing, lighting, and landscaping included in all publicly community areas.

- Wildlife safe fencing, lighting, and landscaping standards included in design guidelines enforced by the HOA Design Review Committee.
- Discussion Points:
  - CCRs to include best practices for wildlife safe development, e.g. wildlife-safe fencing, lighting and landscaping standards.
  - IDFG input on draft CCRs as part of individual phase approval process.

## **10) Fiscal Impacts**

- Independent Fiscal Impacts Analysis completed by BBC Research.
- RRV projected to generate a positive net fiscal impact to Valley County General Fund, McCall Donnelly School District, McCall Fire District, and Valley Rural Countywide EMS District.
- For all entities there is a potential shortfall between revenues and expenditures due to delayed property tax collections.
- Discussion points:
  - Phasing adjustments to minimize property tax lag
  - Gap funding for remaining property tax lag

Ms. Richman responded to questions from Commissioners regarding property tax increase threshold, impact fees, and phasing plans. Phasing plans are based on both practicality of construction of 118 units and the projected gap. Adjusting the growth and need for services allows the applicant to ensure that the 8% threshold is not met. Capital investment would occur either through impact fees or the developer's proportional participation payments (e.g. for roads).

Chairman Roberts stated the following should be added to the spreadsheet:

- Solid Waste Impacts
- Material Sourcing – e.g. where are aggregates obtained (locally, on-site, or out of the area)?
- Roads – sections 1-2 – Impacts on Highway 55

*7:45 p.m. Short recess*

Chairman Roberts opened the public hearing for public testimony.

Bryan Donaldson, 19 Thunderbolt Place, disclosed that he and Mr. Brockway worked together on a project in the 1990's as engineers. He is opposed as the project is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan. The proposal is urban sprawl with urban density in the middle of lightly populated and agricultural area. The project would not preserve rural character and would locate high density adjacent to low density. It would include events such as weddings which would further increase noise and traffic. It would cause an ongoing financial burden on governmental services. Relying on property taxes is ill-advised based on Idaho Republican Party's platform. All vehicular impacts are isolated to the single egress and egress of West Mountain Road which is already deteriorating. The 150-room lodge was not referenced in the traffic study. A calculation of static well water levels in White Cloud development reveals a water surface elevation on 4,930-feet. The static water surface elevation of the Blackhawk well is 4,927-ft. The artesian condition at Blackhawk is due to its 150-ft lower ground elevation. He disagrees with the water report that the upper and lower zones are separate distinct aquifers as the zones have the same piezometric elevation and are interconnected.

Roger Bradshaw, 3771 West Mountain Road, submitted a letter that was included in the Staff Report. In addition, he wished to raise a procedural due process concern regarding the timing and volume of new and revised material submitted, included exhibits. He asked that the public

hearing be continued to a future date to allow review and response by the public.

Chairman Roberts stated that the public hearing will remain open and there will be another opportunity for comment.

Pete Fitzsimmons, 8 Sawtooth Court, stated there were multiple defects in the application. The aquifer study appears to be based on applicant's estimate and historical data. An independent testing and study is needed. The inadequate wastewater treatment and residential runoff would destroy the watershed. The wildlife plan and emergency ingress/egress plan is inadequate. The housing agreement is ill defined, changeable, and could be unenforceable in the future. The proposed farm is not practical based on growing season. The economic impact study was done by an impartial company as shown in their RFP. It did not include costs to rebuild West Mountain Road nor improvements to other roads. The project would negatively affect the property values of surrounding properties. He compared the project and negative fracking impacts.

Jean Odmark, identified as a previous Commissioner, is opposed to a new city. It would devalue property values and decrease the quality of life. She is concerned about the aquifer higher on the mountain. The City of McCall has approved new building permits for 220 residences. Highway 55 safety is a concern.

Emily Wilson, 146 East Lake Fork Road, is here to understand the impacts and proposed safeguards for a development of this scale. She would like the following questions to be addressed. How would this development improve the lives of the current full-time residents? What positive impacts would it have on the greater McCall and Valley County community. Of the 722 proposed residences, what percentage would realistically be occupied by full-time residents versus second homeowners or short-term visitors. What qualifications would the 170 deed-restricted units require? What additional infrastructure and staffing will be necessary at full buildout. How will ongoing costs be funding for governmental services? What enforceable safeguards will exist to ensure the proposed benefits actually occur and that infrastructure and public services are addressed?

Patty Young, 793 Chad loop, is opposed to the concept. She referred to recent fires in Spokane area; mitigation does not solve all the fire danger. She referred to a letter from Josh Warden regarding fire concerns. What are the exit routes? Plans should be in place prior to a wild fire. The safety of current and future residents should be prioritized.

Brent Thayer, 7 Thunderbolt Place, stated his home is the closest house to the proposed high density development and likely the closest well. He would be looking at apartment buildings. The impact to wildlife is a concern. There is a game trail through the White Cloud common area to the proposed development which would then be blocked by an urban wall of apartments. High density should be relocated. This plan is about developer's profit. His well is 280-ft and located near the east lot line, approximately 150-ft from West Mountain Road.

Wes Keller, 260 Moonridge Drive, stated people see a sense of loss and not much gain from this proposal. There would be some new trails and shopping, but a drain on hospitals and schools, additional traffic, additional lighting, impacts to migrating elk, and increased water use. The County should ask more of development. Will there really be affordable housing? There was a good presentation from the Idaho Water Resource Research Institute in McCall that stated there is a scarcity of water, very few monitoring wells in McCall area, and little data. Monitoring and data gathering should be done before approval of development. He was surprised that the applicant does not have water rights.

Rebecca Hurd, 1505 Chris Lane, stated new information was in her letter submitted August 19, 2026. Public has submitted over 375 pages of opposition, concerns, and questions. Not one letter in support was submitted for tonight's public hearing. Commissioners should require the applicant submittals by a specific timeline and give the public and agencies time to review and comment. The water report does not save the water is safe to pump; it says the connection between the aquifer zones is inconclusive. The applicant has not drilled a single test well. The submitted documents and reports are insufficient for this large of a development. The Commission should require independent comprehensive studies of the groundwater and water availability, the wastewater system, traffic safety, wildfire and evacuation capacity, wildlife, and true fiscal costs to Valley County. These should be paid for by the developer but scoped and hired by Valley County. A commercial center with multiple restaurants, 250 rental rooms, a grocery store, retail, and outside events will impact the area. The applicant supplied and populated the spreadsheet that the PZ Commission will use.

Jeanie Carpentier, Pioneer Road, concurred with previous comments. What does "long-term" mean regarding water? There needs to be a nonbiased independent water study. At what point would the HOA be fully established and funded? No information has been provided on the impacts to the hospital; it also has a housing shortage for employees. How was the number of school children estimated. There has not been enough information from the application regarding the impact of the construction phase including gravel pit noise and hours of operation. Are draft CCRs available for review? The Commission should pay attention to needs of locals.

Eric Young, McCall, said the proposal is useless urban sprawl that needs major modifications or should be denied. It does not support the core reasons people choose to live, work, and recreate in Valley County. Per Valley County Code Title 9, the proposal is an incompatible land use and would bring high density and commercial zoning immediately adjacent to established low density rural residential lots. The existing property rights of neighboring property owners should be protected. The commercial and condominium portions should be completely removed. The fiscal gaps are a concern. The BBC Research study uses optimistic timelines; taxpayers should not bear short-term costs for the infrastructure improvements of a private development. Building in timbered areas is against Valley County Code. There should be a fully independent review of the fire plan. All structures should be connected to sewer; no septic systems should be allowed.

Judy Anderson, W Lake Fork Road, stated the PUD process is inadequate for permitting a small city. The concept approval process is biased towards the developer. If concept approval is given, there is no path remaining that could realistically stop the development from proceeding. This proposal would make the housing crisis worse. The vast majority of housing would be second homes, big mansions, and short-term rentals; the very housing pattern that has led to increased market price and loss of rental housing. She does not trust the applicant based on past history.

Ron Minegar, 1425 Chris Lane, stated his background includes a 49-year real estate career and he is an advocate of strong private property rights. Based on information he has learned tonight, he is opposed to the proposal. He is primarily concerned about traffic impacts and the quality of life in the southwest McCall area. He is opposed to the size and breadth of the proposal and the infusion of more commercial development outside the city of McCall.

Lea' Albright, 3731 West Mountain Road, previously submitted a letter in opposition. Her testimony focused on gaps in the water study. The study does not include impact assessment on shallow domestic wells. She has an agricultural well on property adjacent to the proposed condominiums, approximately 200-ft away. The study acknowledges 70+ domestic wells within 0.5 miles within the upper water table zone. The Study states the draw down in the in upper

aquifer zone to be “minimal”, but no additional data was provided. The study was reactive, not protective. There was no baseline water line data for domestic wells nor any specific protection of upper zone wells. The report states that separation of the water zones may not be complete and recommends treating immediate and deep zones as a combined resource. There was no analysis for seasonal variations that could exacerbate drawdown. A pre-development baseline survey of water levels in all domestic wells within one mile should be required. Contiguous monitoring should occur during buildout, not just pump testing. There should be automatic reduction clauses requiring Red Ridge to reduce pumping if domestic well drops below x amount. There should be legal liability for damages to affected domestic wells and existing water rights. There should be financial assurances for \$3 million plus held by the County. Her well is approximately 150-ft deep.

Chairman Roberts asked Ms. Albright to provide well data to Staff.

Art Troutner, 193 West Lake Fork Road, represented himself but is also on the boards of the Lake Irrigation District and the Valley County Soil and Water District. His primary concern is water availability and the applicant's unrealistic reliance on rental water. The district has been renting water as long as allowed by the State of Idaho. The Lake Irrigation District always has had folks ready to rent water. The applicant plans on applying for water rights; this would put them last on availability, not a good position. Rental water is not available in consistent amounts year to year; it is dependent on variety issues. It is a luxury that will not always exist. Other people will have priority. Water demand is growing; however, water is a finite resource. The amount of water to irrigate 76 acres will not typically be available.

John Phipps, Fruitland, stated that the founders of the United States wrote the constitution in social compact theory. Individual liberty must have strong community bonds. What are the lasting impacts if this goes wrong. God made man to serve the land. By serving the land, we serve one another. By serving one another, we worship God. The applicants have not been community or environmental stewards. This development would harm the land, animals, and the long-term families that live here.

Royce Bartholomew, 3600 Fish Creek Road, Adams County, stated the road goes through his property. He has not been contacted by the applicant. DF development has an easement to use the road for them and invitees. This does not seem to include a development. When Mr. Bartholomew purchased the property four years ago, he approached DF Development on maintaining the road which was full of rusted, damaged culverts. He spent \$45,000 on gravel and new culverts. DF Development paid zero even though the easement states they are responsible for 50% of the maintenance. He cautioned the Commission and stated his experience shows a poor track record.

Wyatt Albright, 3731 West Mountain Road, stated that the proposal would significantly illuminate the visible sky. He would like to see some submittals of the detailed photometric plan that goes beyond the property line. He would also like to see what lighting they are proposing during the construction phase and prohibitions of night work. There should be enforcement mechanisms allowing adjacent property owners to trigger County action for violations. He requested a comprehensive accumulation impact assessment that shows how Red Ridge Village combined with other current developments would collectively strain West Mountain Road, emergency services, groundwater, aquifers, etc. He requested independent hydrological study and traffic study to model the worst-case current construction scenarios and demonstrate no adverse impacts to adjacent property owners. He would like a three-year study by a licensed hydrologist in an independent peer review by the US Geological Survey and a binding reliability for water supply impacts to adjacent property owners. Baseline measurements must be established before any ground disturbances. This would include annual groundwater monitoring and

quarterly reports showing the aquifer levels compared to preconstruction baseline. There should be an immediate halt to any approvals if the development starts to affect the baselines. Secretarial Order 3362 emphasizes the conservation and improvement of habitat I big game winter ranges and migration corridors. The cumulative impacts could fragment large interior habitat blocks, reduce the connectivity between seasonal ranges, and increase the edge effects such as weed invasion. This would impact the elk in the area. The various studies should be done before approval, not afterwards.

*8:47 p.m.*

Chairman Roberts thanked the public for their input. Commissioners have a lot of study to do. There will be another opportunity for public input. The next step would be to work on the issues and possible mitigations. This application does not include a conditional use permit. In the future, if a conceptual plan is approved, there will be additional application where significant impacts are mitigated. Director Herrick stated that compatibility ratings are based on proposed mitigation. That would occur at the conditional use permit level.

There was discussion between the Commission and staff on deadlines for future information and public comments. The preference was to allow additional public testimony on all information. This would provide a good vetting of ideas. The applicant will submit additional information and will have a chance for rebuttal after public comments and testimony as long as new information is not submitted during the rebuttal.

The next step would be to work on the spreadsheet of issues and mitigation and identify any holes. The applicant would submit information two (2) weeks in advance of the meeting. This would give the public a week to review and submit comments that would be included in the next staff report.

The next meeting will be a discussion between Commissioners and Staff. There will not be an applicant presentation nor response at that time.

Commissioner Mabe moved to table PUD 26-001 Red Ridge Village Concept to September 24, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. Commissioner Potter second the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Roberts adjourned the meeting at 8:57 p.m.