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

Ken Roberts, Chairman
Carrie Potter, Vice-Chair

Brad Mabe, Commissioner
Ben Oyarzo, Commissioner
Heidi Schneider, Commissioner

MINUTES
Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission
February 25, 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 – Brad Mabe	Present
PZ Commissioner – Ben Oyarzo:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Carrie Potter:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Ken Roberts:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Heidi Schneider:	Excused
PZ Planner II – Lori Hunter:	Present

C. 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. Director Herrick presented the staff report and summarized the following exhibits:

- **Exhibit 1** – Susan Rouske, Blackhawk on the River resident, is opposed. (February 20, 2026)
- **Exhibit 2** – Steve Stuebner, Valley County Pathways, provided comments. (Received February 23, 2026)
- **Exhibit 3** – Betsy Booth, McCall, is opposed. (February 23, 2026)
- **Exhibit 4** – Brandon Flack, Idaho Fish and Game Department, clarified previous

comments. (February 24, 2026)

- **Exhibit 5** – Melissa Coriell, McCall, is opposed. (February 25, 2026)
- **Exhibit 6** – John Phipps is opposed. The land would be better used to provide timber and logging jobs for the community. (February 25, 2026)
- **Exhibit 7**– Gary and Renee Ladd, 8 Oneida Drive, are opposed (February 25, 2026)
- **Exhibit 8** – Presentation by Applicant (Hard copies were given to PZ Commissioners and a pdf was posted on the Valley County website.)

There was discussion between Staff and PZ Commissioners. Adams County officials were sent notice of the public hearing; however, no comments were received. The Compatibility Rating Process and Resolution 7-98 were discussed. The resolution specifically calls out Questions 6, 8, and 9 which deal with financial matters. The PZ Commission will make recommendations; however, the Board of County Commissioners will determine the numbers for Questions 6, 8, and 9.

Chaiman Roberts explained to the audience that there are differences in the process between conditional use permits and planned unit developments. He explained the process of a public hearing and asked that all comments be directed to the Commission, not the applicant.

The applicant was represented by five people, all whom participated in the presentation of the application (**Exhibit 8**):

- Christine Richman, urban planner with GSBS Architects, Salt Lake City, Utah,
- Sam Jones, GSBS Architects, Fort Worth, Texas,
- Teller Bard, civil engineer with Kimley-Horn and Associates INC, Boise, Idaho,
- Charles Brockway, civil engineer with Brockway Engineering, Twin Falls, specializing in the water supply aspects of this project, and
- Josh Gibbons, traffic engineer with Hales Engineering, Lehi, Utah.

An application for this development was previously submitted in October 2024. That application was withdrawn prior to a public hearing as the applicant determined more time was needed to meet with community and stakeholders. The first public open house was held exactly one year ago at the Mcall City Library, and a second open house was held the following night. Additional meetings occurred over the past year with stakeholders. The initial concept included almost 1000 residential units; this application has about 722 residences.

An overview of the proposal was given. The concept includes a village center and a farm-to-table vision. The site is adjacent to existing comparable development and near existing infrastructure. Growth has been occurring in this direction. There would be public benefits and amenities, including public access, increased wildfire safety, community amenities at the Village Center, buffers, and preservation of over 1500 acres of open space.

The applicant is requesting concept approval of the P.U.D. It is anticipated that the entire proposal would be implemented over twenty years or more. The applicant would like to have concept approval before making additional investment into engineering work.

Part of the site is within the conical zone of the McCall Airport; thus, building height restrictions would apply for this area.

Key elements that have come from conversations with stakeholders and the public were reviewed.

- Police protection – Sheriff's substation within the Village area and on-site private security

- Electrical Power – A new Idaho Power substation to be constructed during Phase 1A.
- Riparian Zones, streams, and wetlands would be preserved and enhanced. There are areas of water and season streams within the property.
- Fire Protection
    - Amend impact fee analysis to include site.
    - Identify location for new fire station.
    - WUI Plan – Additional plans for each phase would require greater detail. Outside consultant(s) would complete these plans
- Cross-section of the road – this modified version shows the pathway within a 70-ft R-O-W with the pathway outside of the 100-ft buffer areas.
    - No longer asking for variance from road width r-o-w.
- Internal roadways and access.
    - Traffic study was done in 2024 and revised in 2025.
    - Deceleration turn lanes into Red Ridge from West Mountain RD.
    - Two (2) permanent accesses with an additional emergency access.
- Proposed improvements off-site from traffic study.
- Proposed roadways design, ownership, and maintenance were reviewed.
- Stormwater and drainage
    - Post-development runoff cannot exceed pre-development.
- Public drinking water system
    - Regulated by Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ) and Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR).
    - The approval processes and requirements were reviewed.
    - Legal criteria for water permit; burden is on the applicant.
    - Anticipated design of wells will not affect existing wells.
- Wastewater
    - Reclaimed Water for Fire Flow and Irrigation
    - Enclosed wastewater facility
- Response to Public Comments
- Response to Agency Comments
- Response to Staff Comments within the Staff Report

Deed restrictions would be used for local work force housing. A plaza is proposed within the Village center. Small musical concerts could occur within the plaza; however, the amphitheater that was included in original 2024 submittal has been removed from this proposal. Short-term rentals would be allowed only in some condominiums with the Village Center. The phasing plan map is shown on Slide 51. The Village Center would be completed over time, generally during Phases 2-4.

Chairman Roberts opened the public hearing and asked for proponents.

Elaine Murray, 19 Gold Fork Bay Circle, Donnelly, stated growth will occur; growth cannot be stopped. The County can control how to manage this growth. New residents bring a greater tax base which is how many governmental services get funded. She lives in neighborhood with density of approximately one-third acre. Her neighborhood doesn't seem overcrowded due to the open space. A well-designed community has clustered density with open space. This proposal would add housing and deliver modern infrastructure including water and sewer paid for by the development. The alternative is a large lot, high-cost development that only the well-off segment of population could purchase. That alternative would increase commute lengths and the demand on infrastructure.

Chairman Roberts asked for undecided.

Andy Olavarria represented Valley County Pathways and read a letter submitted as **Exhibit 2**. If approved, trails and access would be a key asset. Public access similar to what Jug Mountain Ranch provides is requested. The applicant has closed trails and access that were once open to the public. Recreational easements and public parking in the village area are requested.

Art Troutner, 193 West Lake Fork Road, represented the Valley Soil and Water Conservation District. The District's response was included within the staff report. The Board requested their letter be read during public hearing. A comprehensive groundwater assessment study should be conducted by a third party with a credible technical background. Water quantity and quality are a concern. Where will the development obtain water?

Ron Derose, Adams County, lives in the New Meadows area, north of the proposed development. He is neutral regarding this proposal. Development is going to come to the area. The County can require the developer to pay for the costs of development including water and wastewater infrastructure. Development has costs, both financially and environmentally. The human footprint will increase and the resulting number of people and trails and will decrease the number of animals that use the area. Development does not improve the tax base; the tax base will not keep up with the costs of utilities, roads, etc.

Chairman Roberts asked for opponents.

Bill Marineau, 3306 Shaggy Mane, McCall, stated the proposed 100-ft buffer area would mostly benefit the proposed community, not the existing communities. He likes the farm component of the proposal. He would like lower density along West Mountain Road and greater space between the development and existing residents. Widening corners would not address problems caused by over 700 new homes with two or more cars per home. The impact on Highway 55 must be considered.

Margot Lojek, 1045 Valley Rim Road, said the proposal ignores Valley County Code 9-5-2E3 that states higher density projects be located near existing infrastructure and/or developed areas or near existing established incorporated communities. This community does not do that. The proposal is not consistent with the Valley County Comprehensive Plan goals and objectives in Chapter 13. Commercial village and condominium complexes are not to be within the rural area. Nor would 250 nightly rental condos be consistent with those goals. More information is needed. It is not what people who live here want to see.

Robert S. (spelling unknown), 405 N Samson Trail, stated the impact to McCall and Valley County of the overall development that includes Adams County should be a consideration. Congestion already exists; there are too many people for existing infrastructure. Concerns include impacts to traffic, ground water, and surface water. Will monitoring be adequate to identify ecological impacts? Cumulative impacts should be considered, not just this development. Is adding another 722 units the best thing for Valley County? Impacts, risks, and benefits must be evaluated.

Rebecca Hurd, 1505 Chris Lane, stated that although the applicant was able to tailor their presentation, those in opposition were not able to review the presentation in advance. Her family has run and biked and West Mountain Road for many years. The traffic impact study states that the development will generate 8,071 daily vehicle trips but provides no baseline average daily traffic count for West Mountain Road. The language throughout every technical appendix refers to needed information, for example, aquifer studies "ongoing"; water rights "being determined"; pre-development drainage baseline "will be established"; wetlands "not yet completed"; wildlife data "does not exist"; and housing standards "not finalized". The 62% open space is misleading as the majority of this is unbuildable and there are no conservation

easements to ensure permanency. There is a high risk of wildfire. Wildfires in this area are driven by southwest winds. Evacuation of residents and rental guests will be difficult. Baseline data is needed at the concept stage so Commissioners can determine if this development is appropriate for the site. This is a premature application without studies or binding commitments.

Ted McManus, 1045 Valley Rim Road, stated the location is inappropriate and inconsistent with the existing rural character. Traffic is a concern. The proposed density is more appropriate within city boundaries. Schools are near maximum capacity. Would existing residents be required to pay for new schools?

Pete Fitzsimmons, 8 Sawtooth Court, compared the proposal to Avimor and sprawl. The development would impact the property north and south of the site. Concerns include property value degradation (equity drop) and traffic impacts. Property owners of nearby large parcels want space and solitude.

There was a short recess to 8:19 p.m.

Wyatt Albright, 3731 West Mountain Road, is an adjacent property owner and full-time resident. The traffic volume would not be compatible with the current lifestyle of residents. The road is not well maintained and there are many crashes and slide offs during the winter. Many pedestrians and bike riders use the road. During the neighbor meeting, the applicant's representative stated "roads are for the County to manage and not part of our project." Impact to the existing wells is a concern; just digging deeper would not necessarily protect existing wells. A water study should be done by a third party. The proposal would affect wildlife habitat and migration. A 100-ft area is not an adequate buffer zone. There is not enough information provided to assess road safety, water supply, current wildlife integrations or impacts on infrastructure.

Randy Fox, 311 E Lake Street, McCall, represented the Idaho Conservation League. Written comments were submitted. Concerns include the natural resources and availability of water. The results of studies that are required by DEQ and IDWR as well as the commitment and investment to fulfill those requirements should be known before the Commissioners make a decision.

Lea' Albright, 3731 West Mountain Road, is concerned about the impact to the character of the area, including non-motorized users, grazing sheep, wildlife, and existing dark sky. She prefers a low density, large-lot project. There is not enough information to fully understand the magnitude of the proposal and short and long-term effects of the residents, wildlife, and town of McCall. The Comprehensive Plan says to protect private property from negative effects of recreational uses and nearby incompatible uses. The proposed condos are incompatible with nearby properties. The project would increase noise, traffic, artificial light, human impacts, and crime. The proposed village center is directly adjacent to her property with high density condos directly adjacent. Her property would be surrounded by the Village area. Her property has a forest management plan in place and is assessed as agricultural. Dense urban environments should be within a city. She asked if the trail system would be free to access. How would open space be conserved?

Brian Donaldson, 19 Thunderbolt Place, has nearly 40 years of municipal infrastructure engineering in Idaho. This proposal would be isolated high density, leapfrog urban sprawl and is inconsistent with the Comprehensive Plan's goal of preserving the rural character. Concerns include infrastructure and transportation issues. Taxpayers would be responsible for the cost of remedies, including the fix to the S-Bridge. In comparison, Jug Mountain Ranch, another isolated PUD, has multiple access routes, significantly fewer impacts, and buffers the

development. This proposal's layout concentrates development along shared boundaries, disproportionately affecting adjacent residents and landowners. The right to develop should not override the established rights of existing residents. Concerns include transportation, safety, noise, lighting, and wastewater systems. The County does not have to accept incompatible and poorly designed developments.

Larry Brockman, 81 Sundance Drive, is opposed. Valley County has two sheriff deputies on duty at any time in this area. He was told to take pictures of license plates of speeding drivers near his home as the deputies cannot be there to enforce the speed limit. He is concerned that the cost of the low-income housing will not actually be affordable. Many (10-15) vehicles slide off between this site and McCall every year due to the corners and icy conditions.

Leslie Pierce, 405 N Samson Trail, stated there would be negative impacts outside of the development to roads, hospital, local businesses, law enforcement, etc. Where do the wet areas in the meadows drain to? She wanted more information on the proposed farm and orchard operations and the open space. She asked for clarification on the future Phase 6 area designated for estate lots. She is concerned that the State of Idaho is reducing the criteria for water. She would like more information regarding the quarry location and use.

John Phipps, Fruitland, is concerned that newcomers would ruin the place, the very reason they move here. Newcomers ruin the land and the community. This area is nice because people who have been here for generations have been taking care of it. He is not against logging, mining, or ranching; these things bring local jobs. The Wilks brothers do not have a right to the land; they have not treated the land well and wish to hurt the land more. All the money would go to outside businesses. The Commissioners should preserve what people love about the area.

Ann McQuade, 14042 Deerfield Road, is concerned that the proposal and the overwhelming growth will be approved. West Mountain Road is difficult. The developers should pay to realign the road, the new stop lights, and the impact to schools, not the Valley County taxpayers. The Wilks brothers do not care about the community.

There was no one else who wished to speak.

8:40 p.m.

Chairman Roberts stated the Commission is only considering the proposed P.U.D. Concept. If approved, the applicant would apply for conditional use permits for various phases. There is a lot of information for the Commissioners to review within the application and comments. Additional information from applicant is expected. The proposal will be evaluated using State of Idaho Code, the Comprehensive Plan, and Valley County Code. The process will take time. Chairman Roberts recommends that the public hearing and deliberations be tabled to another time. The PZ Commission decision will be a recommendation to the Board, not a final decision.

Chairman Roberts asked if the applicant's representatives wanted to respond to comments without reiterating the earlier presentation.

Ms. Richman agreed that this will be an ongoing process and a more robust technical approach to some comments will be done at a future date. In response to comments regarding ridgeline construction, there will be a ridgeline protection zone as noted in the application. There will be no structures within 50 feet of the ridge line, other than perhaps necessary water tanks that would be screened. The last phase includes a maximum of 15 estate lots that would be on the other side of the ridge. Many details will be worked through for this P.U.D. Avimor is a much

larger and a different type of development. They are aware of the need for additional details and studies going forward. A development agreement would address many concerns, particularly who pays for improvements to infrastructure such as roads and stoplights.

The Commissioners and Staff discussed the next step in the process and a future work session. The spreadsheets within the staff report that relate to comments, Comprehensive Plan, and mitigation were discussed. Commissioners will send comments to staff prior to the next meeting, including types of studies that would be necessary for P.U.D. Concept recommendation versus conditional use permit decision. Topics mentioned during discussion included:

- trail access,
- deed restrictions into perpetuity,
- restrictions of short-term rentals,
- agency feedback needed, specifically regarding impacts to schools and Highway 55,
- local county road access, carrying capacity, and safety,
- if the traffic study considered impacts to Highway 55, both north and south of McCall,
- cumulative impacts, and
- traffic impacts on West Mountain Road south of the proposed development.

The Commissioners would like the Road Department Director to attend the upcoming work session. Public testimony would not be taken during a work session. A future public hearing would be re-noticed.

Commissioner Schneider moved to continue the discussion of P.U.D 26-001 Red Ridge Village to March 31, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. for a work session. Commissioner Oyarzo seconded the motion. Motion carried unanimously.

E. FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS - *Action Items*:

- PUD-23-02, C.U.P-23-11, DR-23-28, and SR-23-18 Alpine Storage

Commissioner Mabe moved to approve the Facts and Conclusions as presented and authorize the chairman to sign. Commissioner Potter seconded the motion. Chairman Roberts abstained from voting. Motion carried unanimously.

Commissioner Schnieder moved to adjourn; Commissioner Potter seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Roberts adjourned the meeting at 9: p.m.

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

Ken Roberts, Chairman
Carrie Potter, Vice-Chair

Brad Mabe, Commissioner
Ben Oyarzo, Commissioner
Heidi Schneider, Commissioner

MINUTES
Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission
March 31, 2026
Valley County Court House - Cascade, Idaho
WORK SESSION - 9:00 a.m.

A. OPEN: Meeting called to order at 9:03 a.m. by Chairman Roberts. A quorum exists.

PZ Director – Cynda Herrick, AICP:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Brad Mabe	Present
PZ Commissioner – Ben Oyarzo:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Carrie Potter:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Ken Roberts:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Heidi Schneider:	Present
PZ Permit Technician– Hannah Smith:	Present

1. **MINUTES:** Commissioner Mabe moved to approve the minutes of February 25, 2026. Commissioner Schneider seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

2. **P.U.D 26-001 Red Ridge Village:** The Planning and Zoning Commission will hold a work session in order to discuss the P.U.D. The public is invited to attend. Public testimony will not be taken.

   - **Idaho Code 67-6512, Development Agreements, Mitigation of Impacts, Proportional Share Presentation**

The meeting started approximately 30 minutes late due to technical difficulties. Brian Oakey, Valley County Prosecuting Attorney, discussed a memo that he had given the Commissioners regarding the Idaho Code 67-6512. This was done to give overview to legal authorities on mitigation of impacts. This memo and discussion were not specific to Red Ridge. Local Land Use Planning Act (LLUPA) is the governing statute that is the umbrella authority to consider applications for PUDs and Conditional Use Permits specific to mitigation of impacts. Oakey emphasized that County Planning and Zoning Commissions have broad authority when it comes to mitigation of impacts. Idaho Code 67-6512 and 67-6513 are the portion of code that applies, with subsections stating that certain studies may be required before approval of an application.

Oakey further explained that the Commissioners need to focus their attention on evidence on the record, and appropriate mitigation requirements should be based on studies. Impacts need

to be determined based on what is provided, and then mitigation decisions can be made. All service sectors that the government provides should be carefully considered, as well as how the proposed application will affect these services. These service sectors can and should be providing information on how, if the application is approved, it will affect the delivery of the services.

The second half of the memo is designed to help guide the Commissioners to not cross the line. This requires that, even though the Commissioners have the authority to require Conditions of Approval that are designed to mitigate the impacts of a development, they can't overburden a single property owner with improvements to the community that aren't necessarily caused by the approval of the project.

There are specific laws protecting private property rights in Idaho and Commissioners must be aware of those laws. All requirements must be based on the evidence in the record. This is in reference to off-site issues.

A discussion between the Commissioners and Oakey occurred regarding how to determine what mitigation is proportional to the impact. There will be some data that doesn't exist or will be difficult to obtain, at what point can the applicant be asked for an analysis? If there is no information in the record, then a decision can be hard to defend in court. Ask for additional information, be it from the applicant or from agencies. Be reasonable, don't paralyze the process.

The discussion evolved to Development Agreements and how companies are hired and paid for to analyze data. In robust applications, developers should anticipate the need to hire analysts. The county's engineer can review documents that have been turned in if necessary.

The Commissioners were reminded that the P&Z Commission is only making recommendations to the Board of County Commissioners for PUDs but it is very important to learn everything available.

- **History of PUD Processing in Valley County with Documentation**
    - **Jug Mountain Ranch PUD**

1997, The project contained a golf course and the maximum units of 325. Their development agreement consisted of off-site road improvements. Not a lot of effort was put in, but it took a long time because it went to the supreme court where it was found the Valley County process was satisfactory. The project has its own sewer and water system.

- **Meadows at West Mountain PUD**

2001, There are currently 229 units, but they were approved for 381 units. 96 of the units were to be multi family. The proposed two 5-acre commercial sections have not been developed. There weren't a lot of amenities with the project. It was put forward as affordable housing. It will eventually connect into the main NLSW water system but is facing problems at this time; it is connected to central water. The project was the equivalent of a large subdivision and did not face much opposition, so it went quickly.

- **Tamarack PUD (fka WestRock)**

1998, A Capital Contribution Agreement covered roads, fire, schools, county services, and gave the County cash payments for 3 years to cover services until taxes kicked in. Tax info was provided to Commissioners. Currently it is built out to 700-800 units out of a total ~2100. All

potential impacts and issues were put into a spreadsheet and then addressed. There has been $30 Million dollars in taxes created by Tamarack over the course of a 20-year span. An economic and fiscal impact analysis was done in 2009 by Idaho Economics, a private company. During the review process, Tamarack submitted a fiscal impact analysis that was completed by CH2M Hill to determine what the impacts would be to the county and service providers. Part of the process was getting all the agencies potentially impacted into one room and having a discussion led by the board of County Commissioners. Commissioners discussed number of meetings and timeline that had occurred during the process.

- **Garnet Valley PUD**

2023, 316 units proposed as affordable housing. There was a Development Agreement, roads, and assurity of loan income. There was a lot of opposition, but it didn't take a lot of time.

- **MacGregor Townsite PUD**

335 units, village-esque with some affordable housing. The Development Agreement covered sewer, water, roads. It will be on NLSW. Improvements they were making to the sewer system will improve service to others. Created spreadsheet was not as extensive as the one created for Tamarack.

- **Bella Reve PUD**

Approved for 698 units along the end of Kantola Ln. It was going to be on NLWS. It had a lot of wetland and water issues and ran into problems with the recession. The PUD expired.

- **Gold Fork Bay PUD**

This project went to the Supreme Court. Valley County won, the project was never developed and then they came back with smaller PUD proposal.

- ***Presentation and Discussion with Red Ridge Developer***

Christine Richmond of GSBS Architects in Salt Lake City, Utah. The company has been digging into issues that have been identified by agencies and the public. This includes the map relating to the WUI prevention plan and providing a map with detail about open space as it relates to wildlife. They met with Idaho Fish and Game and will continue to work with them, including getting input while creating CCRs. She states that the company is looking forward to continuing conversations around services in Valley County. She is aware that there will be follow up studies needed in the process, but they want to get the scope right for the studies to provide analysis that commissioners need. She states that this meeting is the kickoff for discussions about impacts and what mitigations would be.

Chairman Roberts asked Christine Richmond if they have reviewed the WestRock paperwork. The company should view that as a shopping list and be prepared for any/all those questions or requests. They discussed the difference in scope between Red Ridge Village and Tamarack. Richmond states she is hoping to leave the room today with a schedule regarding the meetings going through the spring and summer. She wants to quantify impacts and wants to know how to marshal resources appropriately.

Chairman Roberts reiterates that it is the job of the P&Z Commission to determine potential impacts of the project as well as appropriate mitigations and give an appropriate recommendation to the Board of County Commissioners. It will take time to determine these factors.

Richmond states that they want to work cooperatively to get on the same page as the Commission.

The remainder of the Work Session consisted of discussing the below topics:

- ***Identify Agencies that may be impacted: road department, fire department, EMS, school, McCall, Fish and Game, schools, ITD, etc.***
- ***Identify grouping for agencies to invite to work with P&Z Commission.***
- ***Identify criteria to address issues and impacts with potential mitigation.***

The Commissioners and Director Herrick discussed scheduling of meetings and what needs to be required from the applicant.

Commissioners stated that they need more information on impacts such as water, fire, EMS, scale versus location, in order to decide how they can mitigate the impacts

It was determined that the Commissioners need to figure out what is lacking in the application and give the applicant direction. This brought up the topic of what is the difference between a PUD Concept Approval and a PUD Approval. What falls under a concept? What is too much to ask for from a concept? Was enough information submitted to make a decision? What is the applicant's idea of what they turned in, is it a concept or is it a full PUD? What is the applicant asking for?

Christine Richmond of GSBS Architects stated that they are hoping to get a "level of confidence", that as they get through the phases and engineering, and when they actually bring in each phase of the project for approval, they will have worked through the details related to mitigation and everyone on both sides are on the same page. The reason GSBS have asked for a concept is because the property is large and complicated. The choices made in phase one will affect the final phase, and they don't want to cause problems in phase one that appear in the final phase.

The Commissioners and the applicants continued to discuss what will be needed. Chairman Roberts stated that if the Commissioners are supposed to make an informed decision, they will need to hear from impacted services to see if the issues can be mitigated. GSBS has had conversations with some agencies and anticipates that a new fire and EMS station will be needed based on conversation with those agencies. Other things need to be done regarding managing impact costs. Similar things with traffic, water, and sewer would be needed as well.

Chairman Roberts stated that the Commissioners need to idenitfy a list of affected entities, and the applicant needs to meet with them and pose the question "could the impacts of the project be reasonably mitigated". The P&Z Commission then needs to make the decision if issues are mitigated by the responses.

The Commissioners then discussed if the project being compatible to surrounding land use and the comprehensive plan counts as concept approval. Do they need to know if impacts are mitigatable before they can know if it is compatible. How much more information does the Commission need before they can make that decision.

The applicant stated they are ready to start having conversations about costs of things and impacts, and that analyses would need to be done, but they have not done it yet.

The Commissioners and Director Herrick discussed the comments received by the public. Concerns made by the public need to be addressed at some point. It would be helpful to see the comments broken down to "No" and why, and comments with impact concerns and mitigation options.

They then discussed when to meet and decide "yes or no". Whether or not agencies should be reached out to first, and to what depth, was discussed. If impacts can be mitigated on a certain level, is the concept sound? Answers can be compared to the comp plan and the first three lines of the compatibility matrix.

A work session with agencies was discussed. Agencies would be invited to attend or comment and determine impacts and if it can be mitigated, and what is needed to help the agencies decide if something can be mitigated. Applicant could reach out and set up communication.

The applicant stated that agencies like IDWR and DEQ won't be able to comment without a full analysis.

It was decided that it is the applicants responsibility to get answers and pay for the process to get the answers.

A list of agencies was created that would be invited to attend the work session or send in comments.

List of agencies: Valley County Road Department, McCall Fire Department and EMS, schools in McCall, Cascade, New Meadows, Idaho Fish and Game, Adams County, Solid Waste companies, ITD, West Central Mountain Housing Trust (does product meet affordable housing definition), Soil and Water Conservation District, DEQ, IDWR, Law Enforcement, Airports, City of Donnelly, hospitals, Idaho Power, sewer and water districts, Valley County Building Department, sheriffs, McCall Police Department, Idaho Department of Lands, snow mobile groups, transit companies, possibly Army Corp of Engineers, Valley County Pathways.

Workforce housing for construction crews was briefly discussed.

Commissioner Schneider asked the applicant about the plan for Adams County. The Applicant stated that a lot of the land would end up in conservation, with areas near preexisting communities possibly built out in 30+ years. GSBS is not currently working with Adams County beyond meeting them regarding the emergency egress route that would exit into Adams County as opposed to going through White Tail Subdivision.

The Commissioners, Director Herrick, and the applicants discussed some aspects of what the development would look like. Sewer and water would probably remain on the property, commercial uses on site would include a year-round farmers market, convenience retail, and other undetermined small format retail. Conservation of the land would likely be accomplished through deed restriction, HOA control, and a Development Agreement.

The Commissioners and Director Herrick discussed at what point it would make sense to look at/ask for economic and fiscal impact analyses. It was decided that these analyses were necessary before a decision could be made.

The applicant stated they are poised to start analyses but want to get scope right. Is there a list of groups that they should get bids from?

The process of picking an analyst company was discussed. The applicant will put out a request for a proposal to companies, and the P&Z Commission will pick one of the companies to recommend to the Board.

The time frame for how long an analysis would take, and when to schedule meetings was discussed. Two work sessions will be held before the next Red Ridge Village public hearing, one with agencies, one with fiscal impact analysis information.

The first work session will be May 21st, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. This will be the meeting with agencies to help determine if things can be mitigated in a reasonable matter. The agencies will be noticed.

Kierstin Deitrich, Director of the Valley County Road Department entered a discussion with the Commissioners about being unable to comment properly on the project until things are finalized. They further discussed that the main concern right now is about off-site improvements and funding. Are there major roadblocks or concerns? They then discussed mitigation of impacts off-site and Development Agreements.

McCall Fire Department confirmed what the Commissioners are looking for and if there are obvious deal breakers. The Fire Department would welcome a meeting with the developer before May 21st meeting.

The applicant is expected to reach out and have discussions with agencies.

April 21st 8:30 a.m. Commissioners Brad Mabe, Heidi Schneider, Carrie Potter and Director Cynda Herrick will be in a special meeting to recommend to the BOCC which company will be hired to do the economic and fiscal impact analysis report. The recommendation will be put on the April 27th BOCC meeting for the Board to approve.

The second work session will be June 25th, 2026, at 9:00 a.m. The fiscal and economic impact analyses will be discussed.

The Commissioners very briefly discussed a ground water study taking place after conceptual approval. If the Commissioners feel they aren't getting info back from agencies that will help make an informed decision, they can ask for more.

Chairman Roberts adjourned the meeting at 11:50 a.m.

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

Ken Roberts, Chairman
Carrie Potter, Vice-Chair

Brad Mabe, Commissioner
Ben Oyarzo, Commissioner
Heidi Schneider, Commissioner

MINUTES
Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission
April 21, 2026
Valley County Court House – 219 N Main ST, Cascade, Idaho
WORK SESSION – 8:30 a.m.

You may view the hearing by going to www.co.valley.id.us and click on "Watch Meetings Live".
The item is an Action Item.

1. **OPEN**: Meeting called to order at 8:30 a.m. by Chairman Roberts. A quorum exists.

PZ Director – Cynda Herrick:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Brad Mabe	Present via Teams
PZ Commissioner – Ben Oyarzo:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Carrie Potter:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Ken Roberts:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Heidi Schneider:	Present
PZ Planner II – Lori Hunter:	Present

2. **P.U.D 26-001 Red Ridge Village:** The Planning and Zoning Commission held a work session in order to discuss the P.U.D. The public was invited to attend; however, public testimony was not taken.

   - **Decision on which company proposal to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners concerning the Fiscal and Economic Impacts Analysis.**

Christine Richman (GSBS Consulting), Hallie Adams, and Nicole Hibbert, represented the applicant and attended the work session via Teams.

The PZ Commissioners received the two proposals prior to the work session. Valley County will not be responsible for the cost of the fiscal and economic impacts analysis.

Ms. Richman explained the Request for Proposals (RFP) process and responded to questions from Commissioners. Five firms were identified based on similar work on this topic completed within the northwest United States to ensure they were familiar with resort communities in this part of the country. These firms were: EcoNorthwest, University of Idaho Economic Impact Center, BBC Research & Consulting, RKG Associates, and Applied Economics LLC. The first four companies responded that they were interested and could meet the project end date of June 2026. A draft RFP was sent to Director Herrick and DF Development LLC personnel. After Staff requested edits were done, the RFP was sent to the four interested firms. RKG Associates and BBC Research & Consulting responded.

The scope of the RPF included project kickoff meeting, economic impact analysis (construction and operations), fiscal impact analysis, a report, and a presentation. The fiscal impact analysis includes anticipated revenues and public service costs.

DF Development would provide anticipated budgets related to cost of construction based on Valley County standards (roads, infrastructure, etc.) and cost for vertical construction. These costs are estimated by Civil Engineers.

The chosen company would reach out to the various departments and organizations to determine costs.

Ms. Richman has no previous experience with any of the five companies. She does not believe DF Development has any either. The two proposals were received yesterday and sent directly to Valley County Staff.

Regardless of which company is chosen, the PZ Commission believes it is appropriate for PZ Director Herrick to be at the meetings with the company and various agencies to clarify information, make sure concerns are not missed, and be available for questions. Staff would not lead the process.

All commissioners stated they have had a chance to read the two proposals. An error was identified in each proposal by Commissioner Potter; each referenced the wrong location. These were likely due to the use of templates and would not affect the final results.

The Commissioners discussed each of the two proposals. Commissioners concurred that the BBC proposal was more specifically directly to resort towns within Idaho. The company appears more knowledgeable about resort areas, Idaho, and the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD). The RKG proposal seemed to have a stronger analytic analysis, greater detail, and a 10-year model. Both are using the same modeling engine for impact analyses. RKG is a larger company compared to BBC. BBC may be more familiar with impacts to affordable housing and resort communities.

The Commissioners concurred that the study should not just focus on revenue generation but also include impacts to schools and other public services within the analysis. The study should include affordable housing and ITD planning. The timeline was discussed; should results be based on a 10-year model or on a percentage of buildout. The applicant's 10-20 year phasing plan should be considered as it will affect the timing of impacts. Director Herrick added, as an example, Tamarack Resort had to provide a cash payment to Valley County to cover employee costs before the project resulted in increased revenue from property taxes to account for a three-year gap in ad valorem tax revenue. The timing of infrastructure improvements was discussed further. A sequencing plan will be done by Valley County separately from the economic and fiscal impact study. The timeline of expenses is associated with milestones of buildout; fiscal impacts are based on the implementation timeline.

Discussion included the deliverables listed within the RFP. Commission Mabe stated that neither proposal referenced Valley County's access to raw data after the presentation. A spreadsheet of the data was desired by Commissioners along with a list of assumptions.

The RFP outlined what was needed. Both companies responded in a way that indicated they can do the job. The cost difference between the companies was not significant.

Additional information desired should include, but not be limited to, housing, overall congestion on Highway 55, and ITD. Other impacts such as water quality and wildlife are not included in fiscal analysis but will be addressed by agencies.

Commissioners concurred that either company was acceptable. BBC is preferred due to the company's experience with resort towns and Idaho. This would result in a better report for the public, PZ Commission, and PZ Staff. While RKG is probably a larger company with greater resources, BBC has responded to what was requested.

Commissioner Schneider moved to recommend to the Board of County Commissioners that BBC Research & Consulting complete the fiscal impact analysis for Red Ridge Village [PUD 26-001]. Commissioner Potter seconded the motion. The motion passed unanimously.

Chairman Roberts adjourned the meeting at 9:25 a.m.

Agenda subject to change.

Valley County adheres to ADA requirements. If anyone requires an accommodation, please contact our office prior to the meeting.

Valley County Board of County Commissioners

PO Box 1350 • 219 N Main Street
Cascade, Idaho 83611-1350

Phone (208) 382-7100
Fax (208) 382-7107

SHERRY MAUPIN
Chairman of the Board
smaupin@valleycountyid.gov

KATLIN CALDWELL
Commissioner
kcaldwell@valleycountyid.gov

NEAL THOMPSON
Commissioner
nthompson@valleycountyid.gov

GABRIELLE KNAPP
Clerk
gknapp@valleycountyid.gov

IN THE OFFICE OF THE VALLEY COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS
CASCADE, IDAHO
April 27, 2026

PRESENT: **SHERRY MAUPIN (CHAIRMAN)**
NEAL THOMPSON (COMMISSIONER)
KATLIN CALDWELL (COMMISSIONER)
GABRIELLE KNAPP (CLERK)

Chairman, Sherry Maupin led the Pledge of Allegiance.

Action Item: Chairman Maupin presented the commissioners' agenda for April 27, 2026. Commissioner Caldwell made a motion to approve the commissioners' agenda for April 27, 2026, as amended. Commissioner Thompson seconded the motion. No further discussion, all in favor. Motion passed to approve the commissioners' agenda for April 27, 2026, as amended.

Action Item: Commissioner Maupin presented the commissioners with the meeting minutes from April 13, 2026. Commissioner Caldwell made a motion to approve the meeting minutes from April 13, 2026. Commissioner Thompson seconded the motion. No further discussion, all in favor. Motion passed to approve the meeting minutes from April 13, 2026.

Action Item: Senior Deputy Auditor, Robyn Elliott, presented the Fiscal Year 2026 claims and board order claims to the commissioners.

Fiscal Year 2026 Claims

General Fund	$155,983.84
Road & Bridge	$51,007.71
American Rescue	$1,557.00
District Court	$5,032.02
Revaluation	$21.00
Solid Waste	$309.80
Interlock Device Fund	$1,084.50

Waterways	$650.00
McCall-Donnelly Snowmobile	$159.92
Cascade-Warm Lake Snowmobile	$39.98
Smith's Ferry Snowmobile	$379.45
Title III	$591.61
Extension Agent Fund	$595.95
OHV	$579.85
Total:	**$217,992.63**

Action Item: Commissioner Thompson made a motion to approve the claims and board order claims as presented for April 27, 2026. Commissioner Caldwell seconded the motion. No further discussion, all in favor. Motion passed to approve the claims and board order claims as presented for April 27, 2026.

Action Item: Planning and Zoning Director, Cynda Herrick asked the commissioners to choose a contractor to prepare economic and fiscal impact analysis for Red Ridge Village. Commissioner Thompson made a motion to approve the BBC Research and Consulting for Red Ridge Village Project. Commissioner Caldwell seconded the motion. No further discussion, all in favor. Motion passed to approve the BBC Research and Consulting for Red Ridge Village Project.

Chairman Maupin started a conversation with the commissioners about limiting square footage for properties in Valley County. Planning and Zoning Director, Cynda Herrick gave her opinions on this topic. The commissioners expressed concerns that this hinges on property owners' rights.

Chairman Maupin started a conversation about creating floorplans that are pre-approved for ADU units to provide for affordable housing. Planning and Zoning Director, Cynda Herrick gave her opinion on the topic. The commissioners discussed the pros and cons of this. Chairman Maupin said she would follow up with more research about deed restrictions.

Action Item: Road Director, Kerstin Dettrich discussed the proportionate share guidelines for development agreement cost estimates with the commissioners. Commissioner Caldwell made a motion to approve the proportionate share guidelines for development agreement cost estimates. Commissioner Thompson seconded the motion. No further discussion, all in favor. Motion passed to approve the proportionate share guidelines for development agreement cost estimates.

Road Director, Kerstin Dettrich discussed the Lake Fork Site master plan & Gold Dust Site master plan. She would like to work on a master plan for Gold Dust within her department. For the Lake Fork Site she has compiled the past activity at that location. Chairman Maupin said that it would be a collaborative effort not just the road department. She questioned if now is the time to do this since we will continue mining. Kerstin felt that we should start the master plan now and continued mining. They discussed what this plan may cost. The commissioners agreed to come back to this matter after the master plan for the fairground is completed.

Road Director, Kerstin Dettrich discussed the Warren Wagon Road. The original request was for Valley County to open Warren Wagon Road early this year. Director, Dettrich explained to the commissioners that she feels like they can come up with a maintenance agreement. She felt like we should have a fixed open date like the second week of May. She walked the

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

Ken Roberts, Chairman
Carrie Potter, Vice-Chair

Brad Mabe, Commissioner
Ben Oyarzo, Commissioner
Heidi Schneider, Commissioner

MINUTES
Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission
May 21, 2026
Valley County Court House - Cascade, Idaho
WORK SESSION – 9:00 A.M.

1. **OPEN**: Meeting called to order at 9:00 p.m. by Chairman Roberts. A quorum exists.

PZ Director – Cynda Herrick:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Brad Mabe	Present
PZ Commissioner – Ben Oyarzo:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Carrie Potter:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Ken Roberts:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Heidi Schneider:	Present
PZ Planner II – Lori Hunter:	Present

2. **PUD 26-001 Red Ridge Village – Discussion with Agencies Regarding Possible Impacts and Mitigations:**

   The Planning and Zoning Commission held a work session in order to discuss the PUD. The public was invited to attend. Public testimony was not taken.

Applicant's representatives in attendance:

- Christine Richman, planner with GSBS Consulting, Salt Lake City, Utah
- Nicole Hibbert, DF Development
- Teller Bard, civil engineer with Kimley-Horn and Associates INC, Boise, Idaho,
- Josh Gibbons, traffic engineer with Hales Engineering, Lehi, Utah.

Agency representatives in attendance:

- Ryan Garber, McCall Fire Department
- Valerie Greear, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality Water Quality Engineering Manager;
- Dan Smith, Idaho Department of Environmental Quality Senior Water Quality Engineer;
- Vincent Trimboli, Idaho Transportation Department
- Brandon Flack, Idaho Department of Fish and Game Regional Technical Assistance Manager;
- Regan Berkley, Idaho Department of Fish and Game Regional Wildlife Manager;
- Michelle Groenevelt, McCall Community & Economic Development Director;
- Dave Bingaman, Valley County Recreation Director; and
- Kerstin Deitrich, Valley County Road Department.

In addition to agency comment letters, Commissioners received two spreadsheets for review – a

draft tracking spreadsheet and a spreadsheet prepared by developer responding to previous agency comments.

Adams County - Related Comments

Meredith Fisher, Adams County Planning & Zoning Administrator, was unable to attend but submitted a letter dated May 15, 2026. The primary impact to Adams County is the use of Fish Lake Road as an emergency access route. A portion of the road is under County jurisdiction; a private landowner owns a portion as well. They have met with the applicant and believe reasonable mitigation can be achieved by:

1) Fish Lake Road brought up to standards as determined by International Fire Code and Adams County.
2) The cost of improvement for Fish Lake Road as well as ongoing maintenance should be the responsibility of the developer.

Director Herrick stated there should be a timeline associated with the road improvement. Chairman Roberts stated the private landowner should be included in these discussions and agreement also. Ms. Richman stated there is an ongoing discussion regarding the limited easement that crosses private property. The easement is in review to determine if emergency egress is included. Ms. Richman stated the plan is to bring the road up to emergency egress standards prior to occupancy of Phase 1. An agreement with Adams County and the private landowner would need to be in place before any work began on right of way. This agreement would be included in the development agreement with Valley County. Josh Gibbons and Teller Bard provided additional information. The roadway would only be for emergency egress only emergency egress. A gate meeting International Fire Code (IFC) standards for emergency egress would be installed; this would be an electronic gate that opens automatically.

Director Herrick inquired if West Mountain Road was to be closed due to an emergency, crash, or construction, would this roadway be available?

Ryan Garber, McCall Fire Department, stated the road would be constructed to access road standards which is 20-ft wide and able to support fire apparatus. The gate would meet IFC requirements. The access and water supply shall be in place prior to vertical development.

Ms. Richman stated that requiring the water supply and emergency egress road completed prior to vertical development is acceptable.

Idaho Department of Environmental Quality - Related Comments

The applicant's representatives provided information and responded to questions from Staff and Commissioners. They have met with DEQ. A central waste water and centralized water system is proposed. The water system would meet Class A classification which is suitable for irrigation reuse. During the non-irrigation system, they are looking at a rapid infiltration system. Water rights would be granted by Idaho Department of Water Resources (IDWR). There would be two wells to provide water for domestic use and fire flow. DEQ will review the sewer system, the recharge mechanism, and the reuse mechanism for the treated effluent. The agencies have established processes and requirements for these. A 12–18-month process is expected; there will be varying stages of approval. The applicant has not done a specific analysis of the aquifer. IDWR is currently issuing water rights; the applicant has seen nothing to suggest there is not adequate water in the aquifer. Ms. Richman confirmed that a lack of water would limit buildout. The intent is to have 100% of units on central systems; however, the largest lots on west side of the development may need to be on individual septic and wells. This possibility has been discussed with Central District Health. Chairman Roberts stated concerns include water quality

and quantity and impact on groundwater. Mr. Bard stated Class A treatment recharge is regulated. They have not determined the best treatment system at this time but the method would be enclosed and self-contained and not an open lagoon.

Valerie Greear, Water Quality Engineering Manager, and Dan Smith, Senior Water Quality Engineer, both of Idaho DEQ, provided information and answered questions. They each are involved in the engineering and discharge permits for water and wastewater infrastructure. There are many steps involved in the permitting process. The process includes a facility plan, preliminary engineering report, construction plans, and a technical financial and managerial document for long-term operation of a facility. Concurrently there will be a permit application for the discharge, irrigation reuse, and rapid infiltration process. The applicant will be required to show that there will be no significant impact on groundwater. Focus will include nitrates, viruses, coliform, and phosphorus. There will be a long-term groundwater monitoring requirement, operating plan, and operating manual. All this must be in place prior to recommending removal of sanitary restrictions. The applicant of privately owned systems must demonstrate how a minimum of one year worth of expenses will be maintained. Prior to releasing sanitary restrictions, DEQ wants to see the "backbone infrastructure", including treatment plat, lift stations, and main collection system for wastewater and wells, storage tanks, etc. for drinking water. The lag between release of sanitary restrictions, building permits, and occupied homes was reviewed; this is included in the design process. The reuse permit process and requirements were discussed. There must be no impact to groundwater. Irrigation must be "just what the crops need" and not exceed the amount of nitrates and phosphorus that the plants can use. Class A water will be sufficient for the proposal. Chairman Roberts asked if there is expertise within DEQ to make recommendations on nitrate and phosphorus or would it be appropriate to have the applicant address this; he does not want to add to the problems on Lake Cascade. Ms. Greear stated she will get back to the Commission with an answer after further review. As part of the reuse and rapid infiltration permitting process, DEQ will ask for additional information including a phosphorus absorption study to determine how much phosphorus the rapid infiltration basins will be able to handle. The permit will establish a concentration limit for nitrogen and probably also for phosphorus. Director Herrick asked the applicant if the intent for the Class A wastewater will be for irrigation, land application, or for infiltration. Mr. Bard responded that the effluent will be treated to the same quality regardless of the method. Ms. Richman stated that Kimley-Horn will be doing multiple studies regarding phosphorus loading as part of the DEQ application process.

There was further discussion between Commissioners, Ms. Richman, and DEQ representatives regarding the long-term operator of the wastewater system. Ms. Richman stated they will take DEQ's advice for a third-party licensed operator instead of the homeowner association.

Recommended COA – The wastewater system shall have a third-party operator that is not the homeowner association.

Commissioners asked if DEQ has any oversite of Valley County's transfer site. Ms. Greear stated that would not be in her purview. Chairman Roberts stated requirements and capacity does needs to be addressed. Director Herrick stated Valley County recently expanded the facility. She will find out what permit(s) required for any further expansion.

Idaho Transportation Department – Related Comments

Mr. Gibbons, representing the applicant, stated Hales Engineering completed the traffic impact study (TIS). There have been coordination meetings with ITD, City of McCall Staff, Valley County Staff, and Valley County Engineer (Parametrix). An updated TIS was completed recently. The City of McCall's recommended for a revised TIS in five years (2031) is a

reasonable request. The updated study, revised due to previous comments, clarifies reasonings for assumptions, updated models, and added crash data history. New recommendations include

1) A dedicated left turn for eastbound traffic at the Highway 55 and Deinhard Lane intersection,
2) Northbound and southbound turn lanes at the intersection of Highway 55 and Johnson Lane, and
3) Wider radius on curves on West Mountain Road.

The TIS did not analyze Smylie Lane or southbound traffic on West Mountain Road from the site as they do not believe much traffic will go that way. Valley Count has stated that at some point Smylie Lane will be paved. New traffic counts and analysis should occur at that time.

Vincent Trimboli stated ITD has received the updated TIS. Additional information on trip capture rates and traffic rates was received last Friday and has not yet been reviewed fully. ITD believes that an agreement on proportional impacts and mitigation can be accomplished. Director Herrick stated that details will be in a development agreement that includes the Board of County Commissioners, Valley County Road Department, and the City of McCall.

City of McCall did submit a letter that includes impacts to intersections within the City of McCall.

Chairman Roberts asked about the traffic volume on Highway 55 between Deinhard Lane and Highway 44; he is concerned about the impact to Highway 55 congestion and safety due to adding another large development in addition to other development occurring. Mr. Trimboli stated that a corridor study between Smiths Ferry and Deinhard has started. The plan is to look at a series of potential mobility and safety improvements. All intersections will be analyzed. The study will determine priorities and type of improvements such as additional turn bays, passing lanes, drainage improvements, shoulder widening, and widening the highway to include a center turn lane between Deinhard Lane and Lake Fork. Improvements would occur over a three to 20-year timeline. A similar study is also occurring on Highway 95, particularly between Payette and Weiser. Mr. Trimboli listed ongoing and planned improvements to Highway 55 including the safety sign in Round Valley, the signal at the Banks intersection, and widening of bridges. Chairman Roberts stated this applicant probably has to help fund a portion of some of the future improvement projects.

<u>Idaho Department of Fish and Game – Related Comments</u>

Ms. Richman stated wildlife and fisheries impacts were considered in the concept plan design. They have talked with IDFG several times, particularly regarding open space and proposed CCRs for both the open areas and residential areas. The draft CCRs will be available for review by IDFG at a future date. IDFG has recommended the applicant also reach out to U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service (USFWS).

Brandon Flack, IDFG Regional Technical Assistance Manager, stated IDFG Staff has met a couple times with the applicant to discuss initial plans. Most IDFG concerns are general in nature. IDFG disagrees with the claims that the area is important winter range for elk or deer. Those animals do migrate through the area but go to lower elevations for the winter. Northern ground squirrels, a threatened species under the Endangered Species Act, are not found at the site. The recommendation to contact USFWS is because IDFG does not have jurisdiction over threatened or endangered species. The impact to downstream water quality and quantity are concerns of IDFG Staff. Private ponds are discouraged due to water quality and quantity concerns. IDFG does not have jurisdiction over the water or land; thus, IDFG collaborates with other agencies and the County to conserve and preserve habitat for fish and wildlife. There is a

mitigation hierarchy. First, if at all possible, avoid impacts. Secondly, minimize impacts. The applicant has done this be clustering development, including natural open space, and implementing best management practices, CCR requirements, landscaping practices, and wildlife friendly fencing. Thirdly, provide compensatory mitigation for the permanent loss of wildlife habitat due to buildings, asphalt, etc. For example, the Avimor developer voluntarily included a wildlife habitat mitigation plan in their development agreement with Ada County. That plan includes an acknowledgement that the project is going to affect habitat, a natural features analysis, and other assessments. The plan created a conservation advisory committee, a conservation and education program, and perpetual compensatory mitigation via a conservation fund. The plan includes construction and timing precautions to minimize effects to wildlife, pest control and invasive weed management plan, a recreation plan, guidelines related to human wildlife interactions, and specifies how the conservation funds are allowed to be used for on-site improvements, community education and outreach, and off-site habitat improvements or land acquisitions and conservation easements. Other developments with Wildlife Mitigation Plans include Dry Creek Ranch and Harris Ranch in Ada County, Bound Creek in Elmore County, and the Mayfield Springs and Mayfield Townsite communities. These all have wildlife habitat mitigation plans with funding mechanisms in place to help offset those impacts.

Regan Berkley, IDFG Regional Wildlife Manager in McCall, stated there are not clearly mapped ungulate migration corridors for this site. Animals do move through this area and use it spring, summer, and fall seasons. In addition to bear-resistant trash cans, a prohibition of feeding wildlife was recommended to the developer similar to restrictions of the City of McCall. Feeding disrupts natural migration patterns.

Mr. Flack responded to questions from Chairman Roberts regarding wildlife habitat mitigation plan and/or a list of things that would be appropriate mitigations. Appropriate minimization methods have been provided to developer including landscaping, wildlife-friendly fencing, trash containers, and outdoor domestic pets. The applicant has not inquired about possible compensatory mitigation at this time. There is a precedent in other places for compensatory mitigation for PUDs, solar, geothermal, and wind developments, data centers, etc. that are permanently removing wildlife habitat. In most of these situations the developer brings this plan as part of a development agreement. A consultant typically writes the plan. The initial funding input is from the developer but the funding mechanism for the conservation fund actually comes from people who live in the community through annual HOA dues. The fund is managed by a third-party manager. A conservation advisory committee includes the developer and HOA representatives.

Commissioner Mabe stated he would be interested in reading an existing wildlife habitat mitigation plan. Director Herrick will obtain some approved plans for review.

<u>City of McCall – Related Comments</u>

Ms. Richman stated they have met with the Mayor, Michelle Groenevelt, the McCall Police Department, and other City of McCall Staff.

Michelle Groenevelt stated City of McCall did submit a letter that includes items to include in a development agreement. Traffic is likely the thing that would impact the City the most. McCall's engineering team has been working with County Staff regarding the TIS. There are three intersections that would fail in terms of level of service; thus, mitigation is required. The three intersections are multi-jurisdictional: City, County, and ITD. As stated earlier, McCall is requesting a five-year update to the TIS as existing conditions will change over time. The city would like the applicant to work with the regional transit organization, especially if work force housing is provided at the development. This would also be a nice amenity for homeowners

and visitors. There is a commitment to work force housing in the application; however, details and tools have not been identified. The development agreement should include these. Ms. Groenevelt replied to questions from Commissioners. The city is working on wildfire mitigation standards and has general standards for mitigation, but have not adopted specific building standards. City Staff have been working with homeowners and HOAs on education and on-ground fire mitigation. PUD regulations allow the ability to require additional requirements, especially areas that are high risk and on the edges of communities. Commissioner Mabe referred to the statement that says the city continues to believe that additional certainty and detail are necessary at the concept stage and ask what specifically is wanted. Ms. Groenevelt referred to the letter and stated bullet points list additional detail desired.

Fire and Emergency Services – Related Comments

Ms. Richman stated they have had several meetings with McCall Fire, Donnelly Fire, and the EMS district. They have identified a need for additional services and additional studies are required.

Ryan Garber, McCall Fire, stated the discussion have involved two main topics:

1) Code requirements for infrastructure and development and
2) Staffing, buildings, and apparatus needs to provide emergency services.

The next step would be a Public Safety Study to determine staffing requirements for both fire and EMS services and possible funding mechanisms. Growth is limited by State of Idaho Statutes due to limits on levies and property tax funding. The discussions have included how to take on a large development and have adequate staffing.

Ms. Richman recognized the statute limitations on budget growth regardless of the actual increases in taxable value; this is a challenge to County services as well. The ongoing Fiscal and Economic Impact study will calculate the gap and compare when new taxable value come on versus what the service costs might be. She has provided the contact information for the fire and EMS districts and other agencies to BBC Research. There will be more information available at the work session scheduled in June 2026.

Director Herrick explained that Impact Fees were approved for the fire departments. This money is collected at the time of building permit. The funds must be used for capital improvements only, not wages.

Ms. Richman confirmed that there would be fire hydrants throughout the development including the large lots.

Chairman Roberts recommended that the fire department owns the property for additional facilities. Ms. Richman stated one complication to that is that the Valley County Sherrif has requested a Sherrif station within the same facility. No development is proposed in the Donnelly Fire Department service area, only open space.

Commissioners asked how much of land is currently covered by Southern Idaho Timber Protective Association (SITPA). Annual dues would currently be paid to SITPA; how would this development impact SITPA as far as suppression requirements, responsibility, and funding? Ms. Richman will follow up.

Recreation – Related Comments

Ms. Richman stated they have met with Dave Bingaman. Discussions have included trails,

particularly motorized trails and a snowmobile parking area. They are still working on the details, design, and management within the overall snow grooming trail system. Other discussions have focused on public access to the trail system within Red Ridge Village and an additional trailhead. These will be funded through HOA fees to maintain the overall trail system.

Dave Bingaman, Valley County Recreation Director, concurred with these comments. Outdoor recreation drives development in Valley County and is a major contributor to the local economy. How development affects recreation access should be considered throughout Valley County. Recreational access in this area is limited; anything that can improve and maintain historic access is needed. The addition of the Sunflower Flat access would be great winter and summer access. He requested the Commissioner consider permanent recreational easements. Off-road parking for recreational use is a challenge in the West Mountain Road area. He will provide the Commission with a document that shows what he is requesting from the applicant.

Commissioners concurred that adding additional development leads to more people recreating throughout Valley County. Providing a large public parking area and bathroom facilities will benefit both the community and the applicant. Director Bingaman stated the applicant has assured him that the majority of the trails in the development would be public trails for pedestrians and cyclists. Ms. Richman stated that a fee system is in place to offset the operating costs of the County's parking lots; this new snowmobile parking area would become part of that system.

Director Bingaman stated that impacts to West Mountain Road corridor should be considered. This is an important recreational access point for off-road vehicles to get outside of McCall. Traffic and potential road upgrades should be considered.

Ms. Richman confirmed that the plan is for a permanent easement for the snowmobile parking area; both the homeowner association and Valley County would be parties to the easement(s).

Valley County Road – Related Comments

Kerstin Deitrich, Valley County Road Department Director, referred to the previous memo submitted by the Road Department. Parametrix will review the TIS amendment provided by the applicant; it was submitted very recently. The applicant did add a statement into the amendment that when Smylie Lane is paved, access to the south could be studied with new traffic data.

Pathways along West Mountain Road were not in the 2023 Transportation Plan. Primary concerns will be traffic patterns and coordination with City of McCall and ITD. There was additional discussion on corridors for recreationists and county rights-of-way widths. Widths of rights-of-ways may need to be increased throughout Valley County. From a funding perspective, money must be used for roadwork, not recreation or pathways. Additional discussions between the Road Department, Recreation Department, and Board of County Commissioners are needed for planning.

JUB Engineers has been contracted to do a rapid assessment of the Valley County road network; results are expected soon. Smylie Lane has significant issues and is also a recreation access road. Results will be given to the Red Ridge Village developer. There is a prescriptive easement for West Mountain Road through the area of proposed development. Valley County asks for maximum road right-of-way width based on road classification; 100-ft is required for West Mountain Road. This width has been accommodated by applicant in proposed plan. Director Herrick stated the width needs to be able to accommodate space for pathways. Director Deitrich stated additional discussion County road right-of-way widths is

needed. The road, shoulders, drainage, tree removal, and fence relocations need to be addressed. Director Deitrich asked for additional information from Director Bingaman regarding pathways. A grant has been applied for engineering design for the entire West Mountain Road corridor. It is an important corridor to distribute traffic onto roads in addition to Highway 55.

Idaho Power – Related Comments

The PZ Commission has been given a response letter from Idaho Power. Any system upgrades required would be customer funded to ensure costs are not shifted to existing Idaho Power customers. Ms. Richman stated they have met with Idaho Power personnel several times. Power lines inside the development will be underground. Transmission lines will meet Idaho Power standards.

McCall-Donnelly School District – Related Comments

Ms. Richman previously submitted comments from a meeting with the School Superintendent on Mach 31, 2026. Feedback on the previous agreement for Tamarack Resort included that it was difficult to count school kids associated with Tamarack. Planning and long-term needs of the school district were discussed. A third elementary school would likely be needed in 10-15 years; a site has not been determined.

Next Steps

PZ Staff will insert agency comments into the spreadsheet. Idaho DEQ and Valley County Recreation Department will provide additional information. Ms. Richman will provide an excel document of the spreadsheet provided by the applicant.

Ms. Richman stated that in additional to meeting with the Adams County Planner, they also have met with Adams County Commissioners, mayors of New Meadows and Donnelly, and St. Lukes. Concerns are similar to other concerns documented, including local housing and housing for the construction workforce.

Ms. Richman will reach out to the local transit company to find out what the criteria for creating a new route.

Ms. Richman stated the public safety plan will be underway soon. The RFP and selection process will be run by the McCall Fire and EMS District jointly. Red Ridge Village is on their June 2nd and June 9th agendas. The water availability plan needs internal approval. Ms. Richman will look at examples of wildlife mitigation plans and compare to their current plans.

The next PZ work session is scheduled for June 25, 2026.

Chairman Roberts adjourned the meeting at 11:42 a.m.

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

Ken Roberts, Chairman
Carrie Potter, Vice-Chair

Brad Mabe, Commissioner
Ben Oyarzo, Commissioner
Heidi Schneider, Commissioner

MINUTES
Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission
June 25, 2026
Valley County Court House - Cascade, Idaho
WORK SESSION – 9:00 A.M.

1. **OPEN**: Meeting called to order at 9:00 p.m. by Chairman Roberts. A quorum exists.

PZ Director – Cynda Herrick:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Brad Mabe	Present via Teams
PZ Commissioner – Ben Oyarzo:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Carrie Potter:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Ken Roberts:	Present
PZ Commissioner – Heidi Schneider:	Present
PZ Planner II – Lori Hunter:	Present

2. **PUD 26-001 Red Ridge Village – Discussion Regarding Fiscal and Economic Impact Analyses**

Kevin Williams, BBC Research and Consulting, Denver, Colorado, submitted the draft report (**Exhibit 1**) and reviewed the method and results in a presentation (**Exhibit 2**). He and the company has expertise in fiscal and economic analysis across the Mountain West. The presentation includes information that addresses the "gap" in property taxes, i.e., the delay between construction and an increase in property taxes due to increased property valuations.

Growth adds structures, people, risk, and additional property tax revenues – increasing demand for services from multiple areas across the County including EMS, fire response, schools, and other general government services. Valley County retained BBC Research & Consulting to analyze the fiscal impacts of this development on Valley County governmental services.

The study reviewed the:

- Steady state revenue and expenditures created by Red Ridge Village on the operation of Valley County, McCall Fire Protection District, Valley Countywide EMS District, McCall-Donnelly Joint School District No. 421 by
    - Estimating property taxes for each phase of development and
    - Estimating expenditures required to serve new development; and
- Economic impacts of residential, commercial, and support facility construction.

Key Considerations

- Concentration of non-primary and seasonal housing,
- Impacts of Idaho House Bill 389,
  - Limited capture of property tax from new growth (3 % per year and 90 % of value)
  - Statutory cap of 8 percent revenue growth per year
- Homeowners Property Tax Exemption
  - Reduction of taxable value by 50 percent up to $125,000
  - Modeled using conservative assumptions
- Timeline of Property Tax Realization

Fiscal Year 2024 was used for expenditures.

Chairman Roberts asked what Valley County annual revenue growth is currently. If the County has 6-7% range now, the County may risk bumping up against the 8% cap with additional development. He stated the additional development is a cumulative effect, not just growth from the proposed Red Ridge Village.

There was additional discussion between the Chairman and Mr. Williams. Resort communities do tend to do growth in waves with undulating market property values. Mr. Williams said the 2008 recession and pandemic times would be worth considering. How fast were the budget increases during 2005, 2006, and 2007? It is important to note that those years were before the approval of Idaho House Bill 389. The homeowners tax exemption results were modeled using conservative assumptions for the Red Ridge Village development; the current Valley County rate was used with an expectation of higher non-homeowner-owned homes. The 2023 Valley County Demographic Trend forecast calculated that 17% of homes in Valley County had homeowner exemptions and 83% did not. The calculations assumed that 65% of services were resident driven.

A key consideration for this analysis is the timeline of property tax realization, i.e. the gap between when new property is built and when property taxes are collected at a higher value. Communication between the County, taxing districts, and developer would be important.

Key Results

- Overall magnitude:
  - 5.3 percent increase in units over 15-20 years
  - 11.5 percent increase in property taxes at buildout
- Impact at buildout – likely that revenues will exceed expenditures on completion of each phase. Sensitivity analysis suggests fiscal impacts on operations will be positive.
- Capital impacts – a key element for consideration. Road and sanitation investment agreed to by developer. Public safety study is important. Impact fees and agreements with the developer are tools for the County.
- Phasing – HB 389 have a meaningful impact on initial impacts.
- Economic impact – Construction activities will create hundreds of jobs annually during development.

There was discussion on impact fees and capital costs. If impact fees are not adequate, than all taxpayers pay for the impacts. Impact fees should be as current as possible; recent growth in equipment costs are noticeable. Capital costs are assets that have a depreciated life and will

need to be replaced. A public safety study has been proposed by the fire department and EMS District.

The following were reviewed:

- The development plan with phasing and type of construction (e.g. residential, commercial),
- General Fund Revenues and Expenditures at buildout,
- McCall Fire Protection District Revenues and Expenditures at buildout,
- Valley Countywide EMS District Revenues and Expenditures at buildout,
- McCall-Donnelly School District Revenues and Expenditures at buildout, and
- Economic Impact.
    - The result is a net surplus at buildout.
    - Economic impact over the full construction period would be around $1 million.

The date used the conservative assumption that properties being built are similar to current properties on same size lot; however, it is likely these new lots/homes would be assessed at higher values.

If there is an event that causes assessed values to drop substantially, the revenue would stay same since levy rates would increase. This is a budget-driven system.

TIMELINE ANALYSIS

- Property Tax Lag – A property's assessment does not change instantaneously when occupied. As a result there can be a "gap" between the time the county serves new residents and when it collects new property tax revenue. This gap can result in up to a 3-year gap in realization of total property value.
- Red Ridge Village phasing – The phasing of the development impacts this gap.
- Modeling approach – Due to the minimum development timeline (15 years for 5 phases of housing), BBC assumed the quickest development scenario along with reduced collections for recent builds.

Example calculations for Phases 1 and 2 were reviewed.

RESULTS FOR "GAP" ANALYSIS

- Valley County General Fund
    - Surplus by Phase 2.
    - Recover deficit 3-4 years after Phase 2 buildout.
- McCall-Donnelly School District #421
    - Surplus by Phase 3.
    - Recover deficit 6 years after Phase 3 buildout.
- McCall Rural Fire District
    - Surplus by Phase 2.
    - Recover deficit after 2 years of Phase 3 buildout.

- Valley County EMS
  - Surplus by Phase 2.
  - Recover deficit after 2 years of Phase 2 buildout.

"GAP" ANALYSIS SUMMARY

- Phase 1 Gap of $300,000 annually across all four entities
- Potential mitigation from developer
- Long term outlook - All entities collecting more revenue than required to serve Red Ridge Village by Phase 3.

Current residents are helping bridge gap of operational services whether large development or one house

KEY RESULTS REVISITED

- Increased property taxes – commensurate or exceeding operational expenses
- Capital impacts – developer agreements and impact fees
- Phasing – Idaho state law impacts how the County might consider pace of growth. Property tax lag or "gap" creates challenges in Phase 1. Growth eliminates gap by Phase 2 or 3.
- Economic impact – substantial job impacts during buildout

Chairman Roberts added that due to the current political environment, the 90% might be dropped to 85%. There was further discussion on impact fees, capital contribution agreements, and developer discounts for property values. A previous capital contribution agreement for WestRock had the developer subsidized the delay or "gap". This agreement was negotiated between the Board of County Commissioners and developer and considered a fiscal impact analysis and agency comments.

There was discussion on the impacts of development to other Couty services including recreational areas, road access, and parking. It would be appropriate to use an impact study to find a way to fund these public assets.

The BBC study looked at previous budgets for maintenance and operation funds. Other funding sources for roads (e.g. federal funding) was not considered. There was further discussion if the traffic impact study included secondary trips (e.g. for shopping or recreation) Mitigation would be included in development agreement. Valley County now has a robust recreation department now; an impact fee may need to be used for equipment or land.

The assumptions of the study were reviewed. The projected costs of units were based on the types of buildings in the concept plan. Values were obtained from the Valley County's Assessor's data.

The ownership and value of the open space and trail system was discussed. The open space area would be owned by the homeowner association. Rights would be given to property owners and Valley County. The area would remain open to the public.

Director Herrick will research the following:

1) How many years has Valley County gotten close to an 8% increase?
2) How many years has Valley County been unable to take the entire 3% of 90% of new construction value?
3) Clarification on the "developer's discount" for property values as it affects the timing of the change in market value of a newly platted lot.
4) Capital infrastructure that has not been addressed and could be addressed by impact fees.

Impact fee funds are obtained at time of building permits. Impact fees apply over entire County. A development agreement or capital contribution agreement would also address some fees.

The next steps were discussed. The PZ Commissioner will review compatibility and land use. General mitigation is appropriate at the time of Concept Approval. Specific financial agreements would be negotiated between the Board of County Commissioners and the applicant. Staff will work with the applicant to complete the spreadsheet previously discussed. The spreadsheet is designed to look for gaps in information.

Upcoming meeting dates and schedules were discussed.

A public hearing will be scheduled for Thursday, August 27, 2026, at 6:00 p.m.

The PZ Commission is tasked with making a recommendation on the Concept Approval to the Board of County Commissioners.

Chairman Roberts adjourned the meeting at 10:15 a.m.

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

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 remail 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.

B rent 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 Dode. 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 lead 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 mad 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.

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

Ken Roberts, Chairman
Carrie Potter, Vice-Chair

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

MINUTES
Valley County Planning and Zoning Commission
September 24, 2026
Valley County Court House - Cascade, Idaho
9:00 A.M.

A. OPEN: Meeting called to order at 9:08 a.m. by Vice Chairman Potter. A quorum exists.

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

B. MINUTES: Commissioner Mabe moved to approve the minutes of August 27, 2026. Commissioner Carson seconded the motion. Motion passed unanimously.

C. NEW BUSINESS

1. **PUD 26-001 Red Ridge Village:** The Planning and Zoning Commission tabled the public hearing on August 27, 2026. Commissioners will compile information in the spreadsheet for impacts and mitigations. The public is invited to attend. Public testimony will not be taken. Additional testimony will be continued to a later date.

The PZ Commission and Staff reviewed and discussed the draft spreadsheet dated September 22, 2026.

Roads

Much of information regarding mitigation is in the application and the May 2026 Traffic Impact Study. Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) is working on a Corridor Assessment Plan for Highway 55 between Round Valley and McCall. Highway 95 would also be impacted by further development. Lack of infrastructure, particularly roads, is a frequent comment from the public. Roads need to be built to meet capacity for peak times. What is the current capacity and existing gap? Traffic impacts are both a specific PUD 26-001 concern and a more general concern for the entire Valley County.

There was further discussion on this matter. The Comprehensive Plan refers to Highway 55. . There would be significant impact on the highway infrastructure. What is needed to determine a recommendation for the proposed concept? Is an independent study needed? There was discussion on weekend and seasonal use versus average daily trips. What is the gap between

current capacity and projected capacity. Issues were raised by City of McCall on secondary impacts.. Key intersections are listed on the spreadsheet and in the traffic impact study. Traffic engineers are the professions that the Commissioners need to rely on.

- Have ITD give presentation with numbers. Data is needed to determine how PZ decisions affect traffic safety. Desired information includes level of service, planned improvements, impacts to traffic during these improvements, and time schedule(s).
    - The Commission would then use this information to determine if an independent study of the traffic impacts is needed.
    - This would also be good information for entire County.
    - Information on Highway 95 would also be good. This development would also impact Highway 95.

The number of trips per day from the development to Highway 55 was noted in applicant's information.

Commissioners are concerned with the carrying capacity gaps, level of service, and traffic safety at peak intervals.

The other gap is other travel within Valley County. This development would impact other County Roads, not just immediate access to Highway 55. People would use County roads to travel to recreational sites, restaurants, shopping, grocery stores, etc.

Director Herrick stated the Board of County Commissioners' agenda for September 28, 2026, includes a discussion on Impact Fees. Impact fees are applied at time of building permits. Should some be assessed at the developer level?

Chairman Roberts stated that the resulting traffic should be an important factor when looking at developments. Need to look at and identify gaps. How would infrastructure be paid for and who is responsible for construction. Commission Mabe concurred; traffic amount and road conditions are regular issues for proposals. This problem is bigger than this application; however, it has to be addressed for this significant development.

There was further discussion on impact fees and using a development agreement to mitigate impacts of construction. There are separate impacts that should be paid for by developer and by the home builder. Off-site road mitigation requirements are required. A levy may be needed for ongoing maintenance and operations of the Road Department; increasing building capacity is the responsibility of developers and new people in the County.

The Valley County Master Transportation Plan is on the website and is being updated. The Road Director has been involved in the traffic impact study for Red Ridge Village.

Commissioner Potter reminded the Commissioners that they are looking at the land use and are to make a recommendation if the land use is compatible. Their recommendation would include requirements to prove that impacts can be mitigated, not conditions of approval. Chairman Roberts concurred; the concept process identifies things that will need to be mitigated in future conditions use permits.

There was further discussion on requiring an independent traffic study, beyond the Valley County Engineer. The Valley County Engineer is reviewing all the traffic information for completeness and verification of road carrying capacity. Chairman Roberts would like an

additional independent study Commissioner Mabe and Commissioner Potter believe the reviews are being done appropriately, and another review is not needed.

The applicant must ensure all appropriate easements are in place for emergency ingress and egress using Fish Lake Road (Spreadsheet # 7.14) in Adams County.

At this time no lots would be in Adams County.

- Development agreement should include a requirement that if future development in Adams County will connect to roads in Valley County, then impacts will need addressed by Valley County.

Sewer / Septic

The applicant has stated that the resulting wastewater would have a Class A water rating. Commissioner Mabe stated this is a chance to improve the existing water quality. The Commission needs to verify that the discharge will be better than the existing ground water in regards to phosphorus and nitrate levels. Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) would allow up to 10% additional phosphorus to be discharged.

DEQ would not authorize release of sanitary restrictions until there was capacity in the sewer system. A plat would not be recorded until the sanitary restrictions were released.

The proposed number of septic systems was discussed. A lift station, pressurized lines, and/or grinder sump stations may be required to connect all homes to sewer.

- Goal is 100% of homes on central sewer. However, the PZ Commission may approve exceptions based on practicality and cost.

Potable Water

The developer will need water rights. An independent ground water study was done by the applicant. There are issues with the rental pool, limitations, and ongoing discussion. Long-term availability of water for the proposed development is a big concern of Commissioners. There is no guarantee that rental pool would be available every year.

- The Commission would like to have a presentation on water by a water specialist.

There was conflicting testimony at the public hearing on August 27, 2026, regarding ground water.

- Since water is a significant issue, the Valley County Engineer shall review and verify the applicant's data and determine that the assessment is correct.

Schools

The correspondence between the McCall-Donnelly School District and the applicant identifies issues to be mitigated as part of the development agreement and impact fees.

- Updated enrollment count and projections from the School District are needed.

Wildfire

The applicant is working with Mara Hiawatschek, Valley County Wildfire Mitigation Program Director, Ms. Hlawatschek has reviewed the submitted Wildland Urban Interface (WUI) Plan and required changes to be made. Enforcement of the WUI Plan would be included in the development agreement and within CCRs.

The Board of County Commissioners has entered into an agreement with Valley County Emergency Services, the Fire Departments, and Valley County Sherrif for a public works assessment. The applicant is willing to pay for their proportional share.

The use of Fish Lake Road for emergency egress and ingress was discussed further. There is a disagreement if the developer can use and improve the roadway through another's private property for emergency egress/ingress.

Housing

There was discussion on limiting short-term rentals within the proposed development. Short-term rentals have different impacts than primary residences or second home ownership.

- Applicant shall clarify if short-term rentals would be allowed and, if so, in what housing type (condominium versus single-family residence). What limitations would exist on short-term rentals in the development?

Commissioners discussed the proposed affordable housing, the feasibility of the program, and income levels. Deed restrictions are proposed for affordable workforce housing similar to the existing McCall housing program. Impact fees will result in higher housing costs, but can be scattered among different housing types. Average home price could be misleading due to a wide range of pricing for different types of homes.

- Have applicant provide information on number of units, projected price, and how price will be restricted for affordable housing.

- How many units will be eligible to be in the affordable housing program?

Recreation

A Recreation Capacity Report was recommended by Chairman Roberts. Are parking lots adequate for additional vehicles? The developer should be responsible for their proportionate share of needed improvements.

- Director Herrick will distribute the Valley County Recreational Strategic Plan to Commissioners. There is a recreational planner and advisory group.

- Ensure the proposed 18 miles of trail are financially guaranteed.

- Long-term public access shall be guaranteed in a development agreement.

- The Valley County Recreational Director would like a recreational pathway along West Mountain Road to provide connectivity.

Wildlife

Director Herrick has discussed Wildlife Habitat Overlays with Idaho Fish and Game personal, including corridors for wildlife movement. Open Space, not a designated conservation easement, has been proposed.

- Part of the Open Space area should be protected in a conservation easement.

Fiscal Impacts

The phasing of impacts was discussed.

- Update spreadsheet to add McCall-Donnelly School District.
- In future, add info from the proposed Public Works Assessment Study.

Financial guarantees were discussed. What infrastructure should be bonded?

- A sequencing plan would be a very useful tool. This would include infrastructure construction and landscaping timelines.

Specifics would be included in the development agreement. Ties with impact fees discussion.

Tamarack Resort did a capital contribution agreement to fill the funding gap between increased infrastructure costs and increased property taxes paid to Valley County.

Solid Waste / Recycling Facility

Solid waste and recycling need to be addressed. Recent updates have been made to the Valley County Transfer Site. The County is hiring a solid waste manager.

- Information regarding the capacity of the solid waste / transfer facility is needed. Would this project overload the current facility?
- What about the resulting tree stumps from development? Is there an alternative to transporting these to the Transfer Station Site?

Conclusion

The Commissioners discussed what additional information is needed to determine a recommendation for the Concept Approval request. Are there items that cannot be mitigated?

Commissioners concurred there are five issues that need more information. Won't have all the answers. At what cost is the developer willing to go to mitigate. Developer will have to make this decision. Other issues can be mitigated but these five (5) issues need to be addressed.

1) Roads
2) Sewer
3) Water Access Issue
4) Fiscal Impact Gap
5) Easement for ingress/egress through Adams County.

The Public hearing is still open. Prior to next public hearing, Commissioners would like information on the following:

- ITD information as discussed earlier in the meeting.
- Review of water report by Valley County Engineer or other professional.
- Public Works Study – expected timing of results?
- Information on Housing as discussed earlier in the meeting.
- How does the applicant intend to close the gap on the five above-listed issues?

The Commission is tasked with determining if the development makes sense conceptually. Are there items that need mitigation or are deal breakers? The Commission should determine what needs to be addressed prior to making a recommendation on concept approval. Other items and mitigation would be addressed during the conditional use and preliminary plat process.

The timeline for future meeting(s) and public hearing was discussed. All new information shall be received two weeks prior to the public hearing to give time for the public to comment.

Commissioner Mabe moved to table the public hearing for PUD 26-001 Red Ridge Village until November 19, 2026, at 4:00 p.m. Commissioner Potter seconded. Motion carried unanimously.

Meeting adjourned at 11:06 a.m.