August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
1	Bryan Donaldson	Opposed	The proposal conflicts with the Valley County Comprehensive Plan's rural-character goals and with surrounding low-density agricultural and residential development.	Land Use	We disagree. The comprehensive plan advocates for clustered development to preserve open space. This is what RRV proposes. Under a traditional subdivision with private wells and septic, an estimated 998 lots could be created (gross acreage less areas with 30% or greater slopes and a 25% set aside for private roads and setbacks)
1	Bryan Donaldson	Opposed	The high-density housing, commercial uses, and lodge should be moved substantially away from existing low-density properties; events at the lodge should be restricted because of noise and traffic impacts.	Compatibility	Current zoning allows for up to one (1) new residential unit per acre with slopes less than 30 percent if served by individual wells and septic systems and 2.2 residential units per acre with slopes less than 30 percent if on a water or sewer systems. This would be 998 and 2,153 units respectively. The proposal represents a reduction in density below current zoning.
1	Bryan Donaldson	Opposed	The development would create ongoing fiscal burdens for the county, fire district, school district, and EMS, while relying on uncertain property-tax revenue.	Fiscal Impact	No development should be held hostage by possible policy changes by future legislative bodies. If the Idaho Legislature eliminates property tax, whether or not this project goes forward, a comprehensive statewide solution would be identified and apply equally under the law to all development new or old. The independent fiscal analysis indicated a surplus in funding following Phase 2 implementation. The applicant is open to discussions to adjust phasing to address some of the short term funding timing issues.
1	Bryan Donaldson	Opposed	All project traffic would depend on West Mountain Road, which is already deteriorating and overloaded; he questioned whether the 150-room lodge was included in the traffic analysis.	Traffic	The positive cash flows to the County fund from the development will contribute to ongoing operations and maintenance costs. The impact of the development on road capacity has been estimated by the traffic impact analysis, which did assume nightly rentals in all 250 units at the Village Center as well as restaurants and commercial uses and will result in participation by the developer in the cost of increasing the capacity of West Mountain Road and other roads in the Valley County network proportional to our impact. Other developments occurring throughout the area should also contribute proportionally to ensure overall fairness and alleviate impact on existing residents.
1	Bryan Donaldson	Opposed	He disputed the applicant's conclusion that the upper and lower groundwater zones are separate, citing similar static water elevations and arguing that the zones are interconnected	Groundwater	The groundwater study will be reviewed by IDWR. If a different methodology is required, the study will be revised.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
1	Bryan Donaldson	Opposed	Because the application is technically complex and continues to change, the county should retain independent professional experts before acting.	Independent Review	The County's process utilizes many outside reviewers for technical aspects of the application. The applicant continues to facilitate and respond to these reviews.
2	Roger Bradshaw	Opposed	A large volume of new and revised applicant material was posted only days before the hearing, with additional exhibits appearing within the final 24 hours.	Late Materials	The applicant submitted the materials on the date required by Valley County representatives. If applicant materials were late, they would not be included.
2	Roger Bradshaw	Opposed	The public did not have a meaningful opportunity to review and rebut roughly 1,398 pages of material, including broken or potentially duplicative attachments.	Public Review	The applicant continues to proactively review and respond to public comments. The process is ongoing.
2	Roger Bradshaw	Opposed	He cited state and county due-process requirements	Due Process	The process is ongoing.
2	Roger Bradshaw	Opposed	He asked the commission to keep the record open, continue accepting testimony, and continue the hearing to allow the public and affected agencies reasonable review and rebuttal time before deliberation.	Hearing Continuance	The process is ongoing.
3	Pete Fitzsimmons	Opposed	Advocates for an independent fiscal impact study	Fiscal Impact/ Independence	The RFP and proposals from the various firms were guided by the County. The Planning Commission selected the firm interpedently of the applicant. The applicant did not provide any input or recommendation on the selection or on the results. The applicant provided the publicly available information on the number and timing of development of all types in a spreadsheet format for ease of analysis. The analyst also requested preliminary pricing information from the applicant. As cited in the study, the underlying assumptions of value of future development is based on comparable buildings in Valley County, not on the pricing data provided by the applicant. The study was independently review by County staff who asked for additional information. The applicant made no comments and asked for no adjustments or changes to the study.
3	Pete Fitzsimmons	Opposed	The water-supply analysis relies on applicant estimates and historical information; independent testing and analysis are needed.	Water Supply	The applicants estimates are based on publicly available data and will be reviewed by IDWR and followed by test wells and analysis once again reviewed and approved by IDWR.
3	Pete Fitzsimmons	Opposed	The proposed wastewater system, combined with residential runoff, could harm the watershed.	Water Quality	The current study supplemented by future studies will quantify potential impacts to the watershed and will include mitigations required by IDWR. This is the standard process.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
3	Pete Fitzsimmons	Opposed	Wildfire mitigation and the ingress/egress plan are inadequate.	Wildfire Access	The wildfire mitigation and ingress/egress strategy have been reviewed and approved by the County's independent reviewers.
3	Pete Fitzsimmons	Opposed	The workforce-housing program is ill-defined, changeable, and potentially unenforceable; he also questioned the realism of the proposed farm-to-table restaurant.	Workforce Housing	Deed restricted work-force housing is not a requirement of approval for a subdivision or PUD in the Valley County code. The applicant has proposed a locals housing program, deed restricted housing at a range of price points, to proactively participate in a housing solution that will add housing to the local market at a multiple levels. Affordable housing at some undefined level of area median income is not what is being proposed. The proposal assumes a healthy range of housing focused on local, year-round residents. The farm-to-table restaurant serves two purposes, it is a buffer between the village center and existing residences and is a focal point for the restaurants and activities at the Village Center. The farm will include an orchard and crops in greenhouses to supply the farmers market and restaurants on a year round basis.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
3	Pete Fitzsimmons	Opposed	The fiscal study was not impartial and omits major costs, including reconstruction or rerouting of West Mountain Road, turn lanes, signals, road maintenance, schools, and expanded fire service.	Fiscal Study	The RFP and proposals from the various firms were guided by the County. The Planning Commission selected the firm interpedently of the applicant. The applicant did not provide any input or recommendation on the selection or on the results. The applicant provided the publicly available information on the number and timing of development of all types in a spreadsheet format for ease of analysis. The analyst also requested preliminary pricing information from the applicant. As cited in the study, the underlying assumptions of value of future development is based on comparable buildings in Valley County, not on the pricing data provided by the applicant. The study was independently review by County staff who asked for additional information. The applicant made no comments and asked for no adjustments or changes to the study. The proportional capital cost of road capacity improvements, schools, and public safety services to address the increased number of households served at the County's current level of service will be paid either through duly and appropriately calculated impact fees or through provisions of the Development Agreement.
3	Pete Fitzsimmons	Opposed	The analysis omits potential declines in surrounding property assessments, which could reduce the county tax base.	Property Values	The analysis by BBC did not find that there would be a decline in property values. This is a personal opinion asserted without evidence.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
3	Pete Fitzsimmons	Opposed	He argued the project would extract development value while leaving residents with depleted groundwater, watershed damage, lower property values, higher taxes, and reduced quality of life.	Cumulative Impacts	The State pf Idaho has a process to identify potential impacts on groundwater and watershed damage and identify strategies to prevent or mitigate the occurrence. The applicant is required to submit all plans an studies to the state for their review and approval prior to moving forward with the development. There is no evidence for lower property values. Future taxable values are adequate to fund services to the new households at current levels of service and will not be the cause of potential increases in property taxes. Quality of life will be enhanced through the addition of more than 1,400 acres of managed, publicly accessible open space and more than 23 miles of new trails; as well as additional services and community amenities.
4	Jean Odmark	Opposed	A development of this size would function as a new city, diminish existing property values, and reduce residents' quality of life.	Project Scale	The Idaho Public Transportation Plan projects Valley County's 2040 population will be approximately 14,350 people, 1,510 more people than currently reside in the county. The Idaho Department of Labor estimates Valley County's future population will be even higher at 15,500 people, 2,660 more people than today. The estimates of new resident population are accompanied by an estimated additional 7,500 seasonal peak population when visitors and part-time residents are included in the count. These estimates do not attempt to assign location to the growth and the Idaho Public Transportation Plan estimate predates any discussion of Red Ridge village The projected population of Red Ridge Village, at build out is between 482 and 596 people, meaning this location, close to existing infrastructure and near other development, could capture between 22 and 32 percent of projected growth within an area served by private utilities and roads and providing access t open space and trails. Growth is projected and expected in Valley County, Red Ridge Village is a proposed approach to managing that growth in a way that preserves significant open space for public use.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
4	Jean Odmark	Opposed	She questioned whether an aquifer study had been performed on the mountain rather than relying on lower-elevation locations.	Aquifer Study	IDWR will identify any needed follow up studies as part of the next step in the process. The initial study indicates there is adequate water to support the Red Ridge Village PUD
4	Jean Odmark	Opposed	The project would compound already substantial permitted growth in McCall and elsewhere in the county.	Cumulative Growth	The Idaho Public Transportation Plan projects Valley County's 2040 population will be approximately 14,350 people, 1,510 more people than currently reside in the county. The Idaho Department of Labor estimates Valley County's future population will be even higher at 15,500 people, 2,660 more people than today. The estimates of new resident population are accompanied by an estimated additional 7,500 seasonal peak population when visitors and part-time residents are included in the count. These estimates do not attempt to assign location to the growth and the Idaho Public Transportation Plan estimate predates any discussion of Red Ridge village The projected population of Red Ridge Village, at build out is between 482 and 596 people, meaning this location, close to existing infrastructure and near other development, could capture between 22 and 32 percent of projected growth within an area served by private utilities and roads and providing access t open space and trails. Growth is projected and expected in Valley County, Red Ridge Village is a proposed approach to managing that growth in a way that preserves significant open space for public use.
4	Jean Odmark	Opposed	Additional residents and visitors would add traffic to Highway 55, which he characterized as highly dangerous, particularly when combined with other regional growth.	Highway 55	Impacts on Highway 55 were part of the Traffic Impact Study. The scope of the study was reviewed and approved by ITD and ITD has "Accepted" the results. Red Ridge Village is a strategy to protect significant open space while responding to that growth.
4	Jean Odmark	Opposed	She urged the commission to deny the proposal.	Denial	

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
5	Emily Wilson	Neutral	How would the development improve the lives of existing year-round residents, and what is its long-term benefit to greater McCall and Valley County?	Community Benefit	Significant growth has occurred and is projected to continue to occur in Valley County. The Red Ridge Village Concept Plan proposes to provide for that growth in a way that preserves more than 1,400 acres of open space for public access through more than 23 miles of public trails. The proposal also adds services and resources to the area to provide more opportunities for business development and community activities at the Village Center. This results in long-term economic and environmental benefit to greater McCall and Valley County.
5	Emily Wilson	Neutral	What share of the 722 residences would be occupied by full-time residents versus second homeowners or short-term visitors, and is the project fundamentally a year-round community or a resort/second-home community?	Occupancy Mix	170 of the 722 proposed housing units are proposed to be deed restricted for full-time residents at a range of housing prices. The 250 units at the Village Center are proposed as primarily short term rentals, of the remaining units the BBC Research Financial Impact study estimates that 121 units will be full-time residents. Based on the assumptions, 291 units or 40 percent will be occupied by full-time residents, this is 10 percent higher than the county-wide average.
5	Emily Wilson	Neutral	For the 170 deed-restricted local-housing units, how will 'local' be defined, will income or affordability requirements apply, and what home prices or rents are anticipated?	Local Housing	The proposal is to utilize the City of McCall's local housing deed restriction tool. The definition based on the McCall example is someone who is "employed and works a minimum of 30 hours/week or 1,560 hours/year within Valley County for 6 consecutive months or who has an employment offer from a Valley County Business, is a senior (age 65 and older) or disabled and the home is their primary residence." In addition, short term rentals or vacation rentals or sub-leasing is not allowed. A range of price points is anticipated in the deed-restricted local housing. Providing housing for permanent residents at a variety of price points relieves pressure throughout the housing spectrum, including at the more affordable price points.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
5	Emily Wilson	Neutral	What roadway, fire, EMS, and law-enforcement infrastructure and staffing will be needed, how will ongoing costs be funded, and who ultimately bears them?	Public Services	The applicant is funding, through the McCall Fire District, Valley Countywide EMS District, and the County Sheriff's Office a study of public safety needs. The study will address both capital and ongoing staffing needs. After completion of the public safety needs study, impact fees for capital investment and ongoing operational needs can be evaluated and the appropriate methods of funding identified.
5	Emily Wilson	Neutral	What enforceable safeguards will ensure promised benefits occur and impacts on residents, infrastructure, and public services are addressed?	Public Services	The County has a number of tools embedded in their code to ensure that all developments, including Red Ridge, adhere to established regulations, requirements, and rules. These include criteria relating to planning and zoning approvals as well as the process to issue a building permit. The Red Ridge Village approval before the Planning Commission is for the Conceptual Plan. a Conditional Use Permit and Preliminary Subdivision Plat application, hearing and approval process will be required before any development moves forward. If the developer does not fulfill identified obligations, the next step in the process cannot be achieved. For requirements not directly addressed Valley County code, the Development Agreement will include enforcement and remedy provisions. These may include prohibitions from issuing additional approvals or building permits, bonding for improvements or financial penalties.
5	Emily Wilson	Neutral	Advocated for enforceable safeguards	Enforcement	

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
6	Patty Young	Opposed	Wildfire mitigation cannot eliminate wildfire danger; fires can cross rivers and roads.	Wildfire Risk	The mitigations included in the Red Ridge Village Concept Plan represent best practices in limiting the threat and spread of wildfire by reducing fire fuels, creating fire breaks, and establishing defensible areas around structures. According to Xylo Plan, an independent fire prevention firm hired by the McCall Fire District, the strategies identified and included in the design of the Red Ridge Village Concept will reduce wildfire risk for existing homes and structures in White Cloud and Blackhawk by the River and other areas in and near McCall. Benefits existing residents do not currently enjoy.
6	Patty Young	Opposed	The commission should not decide the application until a credible emergency-evacuation plan is established.	Emergency Access	The Red Ridge Village Concept plan creates an emergency egress road north to Highway 55 via Fish Lake Road. West Mountain Road, north to Boydstun and Deinhard and south to Smylie lane is currently the only egress option for residents in White Cloud and Blackhawk by the River and Blackhawk on the Lake. The proposed Red Ridge Village emergency egress road provides a third option for existing residents and property owners as well as the new residents of Red Ridge Village. The alignment of the proposed egress road is on DF Development property until it meets the Forest Service Road. Issues related to an access easement will be resolved prior to submittal of the first CUP/Subdivision application. In addition the egress road on DF Development property, the Forest Service Road and the easement will be brought to IFC standards prior to vertical construction begins on Phase 1. These provisions are proposed for inclusion in the Development Agreement.
6	Patty Young	Opposed	Road access and evacuation routes must be resolved before expansion occurs.	Emergency Access	DF Development agrees that the County should have a comprehensive emergency evacuation plan and looks forward to participating in the planning process. However, unless the County is going to stall all new developments pending the creation of this plan, burdening Red Ridge Development in this way would be unfair.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
6	Patty Young	Opposed	The safety of current and future residents should take priority, and development in the area should be restricted until these questions are answered.	Public Safety	The applicant has entered into an agreement with the Fire District, the EMS District and the County to fund a comprehensive public safety plan which will guide capital and ongoing operations investments and cost sharing.
6	Patty Young	Opposed	She directed the commission to written testimony from Josh Warden regarding wildfire response.	Wildfire Response	The Red Ridge Village WUI FPP has been reviewed and accepted by the County Wildfire Coordinator. The mitigations identified by the applicant in their plan will be included in the conditions of approval and the Development Agreement as appropriate. The applicant will also include the requirements, including the use of fire resistant building materials and the creation and maintenance of defensible space in the CC&Rs and responsibilities of the future HOA.
7	Brent Thayer	Opposed	As the nearest resident to the proposed high-density area, he is directly concerned about impacts to his approximately 280-foot well and household water supply.	Well Impacts	The water demand and resource study found that limited, if any impact on existing wells is expected. The IDWR will review the study and review and approve follow up actions to confirm the preliminary findings of the study, identify locations and depths of test and monitoring wells and other actions. As an owner and operator of an existing well, Mr. Thayer's well will be known to IDWR and next steps will ensure his rights.
7	Brent Thayer	Opposed	The proposal disregards the McCall impact-area plan, which contemplated single-family development in this location.	Land Use	Red Ridge Village falls outside of the McCall area of impact.
7	Brent Thayer	Opposed	Apartment buildings would be directly visible from his home and incompatible with the existing neighborhood.	Compatibility	The Red Ridge Village Concept Plan includes a 100+ foot landscaped buffer between West Mountain Road and the future townhome development. The buildings will be a maximum of 35' and surrounded by existing and new tree plantings. Visibility from the road will be limited and screened. Mr. Thayer's property at 7 Thunderbolt Place

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
7	Brent Thayer	Opposed	An apartment 'wall' would interrupt an active wildlife route used by deer, elk, foxes, and other animals.	Wildlife Corridor	The Red Ridge Village concept includes clustered development with large areas of open space connected by open space corridors of between 200 and 400 feet in width. This layout has been presented to IDFG for their review and input.
7	Brent Thayer	Opposed	The plan appears driven by profitability rather than community needs; he suggested relocating high-density uses away from existing homes or rejecting the plan so it can be redesigned.	Project Redesign	The Red Ridge Village concept plan is significantly less dense than allowed by Valley County Code and than existing, more traditional developments in the area, such as White Cloud. White Cloud Phase 1 gross density is 1.95 units per gross acre, Red Ridge Village's total development gross density is 2.92 units per gross acre allow the developer to preserve more than 1,400 acres of the 2,252 acre property for permanent, publicly accessible open space. Something White Cloud did not provide.
8	Wes Keller	Opposed	Residents perceive substantial losses to hospitals, schools, traffic conditions, dark skies, wildlife migration, and water resources, with relatively few community gains.	Community Impacts	Red Ridge Village benefits the community by opening more than 1,400 acres of open space for public access via more than 23 miles of privately maintained trails. Red Ridge Village also improves wildfire safety by mitigating current wildfire threat on the western edge of McCall through the creation of a series of fire breaks and defensible spaces to slow the spread of wildfire if it occurs on Red Ridge. Additionally, the Red Ridge Village concept includes an emergency egress route for future and current residents.
8	Wes Keller	Opposed	The claimed affordable housing appears questionable given estimated average housing costs, and the applicant should demonstrate a clearer community benefit.	Local Housing	The Red Ridge Village Local Housing proposal is not a traditional approach commonly referred to as "Affordable Housing". The approach is one that offers local housing at a range of price points to take pressure off of the McCall/Valley County housing market at a variety of levels. By offering housing to locals who can afford a somewhat more expensive unit a current unit will be made available. This is an approach that utilizes a variety of strategies to create a more comprehensive and sustainable approach to housing. In addition, the developer is seeking partners to help offset the cost of developing in the area to make more units available at the lower price points.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
8	Wes Keller	Opposed	The water presentation was too basic and overconfident given the scarcity of monitoring wells and limited groundwater information identified by the Idaho Water Resources Research Institute.	Groundwater Data	The water demand and resource study found that limited, if any impact on existing wells is expected. The IDWR will review the study and review and approve follow up actions to confirm the preliminary findings of the study, identify locations and depths of test and monitoring wells and other actions.
8	Wes Keller	Opposed	Groundwater and existing water-right impacts should be studied before approval rather than monitored only after project wells are operating.	Water Rights	The water demand and resource study found that limited, if any impact on existing wells is expected. The IDWR will review the study and review and approve follow up actions to confirm the preliminary findings of the study, identify locations and depths of test and monitoring wells and other actions.
8	Wes Keller	Opposed	He questioned moving forward when the applicant had not yet secured the necessary water rights and could face instream-flow constraints.	Water Rights	Securing water rights will be a condition of the next level of approval. The concept approval will trigger test wells and any instream-flow constraints as well as all conditions and mitigations identified by IDWR.
9	Rebecca Hurd	Opposed	Remote public participation should be available so residents unable to attend can provide testimony; she also said the commission should review every submitted	Public Access	This is an item for Valley County
9	Rebecca Hurd	Opposed	The volume of opposition and absence of supportive letters indicate the hearing should not be treated as a procedural checkbox.	Public Opposition	The number of hearings, discussions, open houses and meetings initiated by both the developer and the Planning Commission indicates that no one is taking public input lightly. The absence of supportive letters may also be an indicator of the level of public discourse in the area.
9	Rebecca Hurd	Opposed	Applicant materials were submitted after the public-comment deadline and the applicant presentation was unavailable to the public beforehand; firm applicant deadlines and public review time are needed.	Late Materials	The process is ongoing.
9	Rebecca Hurd	Opposed	No test well has been drilled on the site, and the water analysis relies on data from Blackhawk more than a mile away while acknowledging uncertainty about aquifer connectivity.	Test Well	The water demand and resource study found that limited, if any impact on existing wells is expected. The IDWR will review the study and review and approve follow up actions to confirm the preliminary findings of the study, identify locations and depths of test and monitoring wells and other actions.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
9	Rebecca Hurd	Opposed	Groundwater, wastewater, traffic, wildfire/evacuation, wildlife, and fiscal studies should be independently scoped, hired, and reviewed by the county, though paid for by the applicant.	Independent Studies	The groundwater, wastewater, traffic, wildfire, and wildlife studies are required to be completed by the applicant and reviewed and approved by independent government agencies. The applicant has complied with these requirements. The public safety and fiscal studies have been or are being scoped, hired, and managed by the County or District but funded by the applicant.
9	Rebecca Hurd	Opposed	The project would generate more than 8,000 daily vehicle trips and concentrate commercial, lodging, rental, event, and retail traffic on rural roads.	Traffic	The Traffic Impact Study has evaluated the impact of anticipated trips and identified mitigations for the impact. The study has been accepted by ITD. The next step in the process is identify the proportionate share of Red Ridge Village trips on the need for these improvements as there are a number of developments occurring in the area and each new home and new development also has an impact.
9	Rebecca Hurd	Opposed	The commission should hold its own work session to define and document the review process; she also objected to using a tracking spreadsheet prepared and populated by the applicant.	Review Process	The Planning Commission held their own review meeting and revised the tracking spreadsheet on September 24.
10	Jeanie Carpenter	Opposed	The applicant and commission should define what they mean by a 'long-term' water supply, and an unbiased independent water study is needed.	Water Supply	The parameters and definitions used in all water studies in Idaho are dictated and reviewed and approved by IDWR. This is the process the applicant will initiate if Concept Approval is received.
10	Jeanie Carpenter	Opposed	The timing, funding, and capacity of the HOA to assume its stated responsibilities remain unclear.	HOA Capacity	The applicant is currently evaluating independent HOA management companies qualified to manage the variety of duties and responsibilities identified for the Red Ridge Village HOA.
10	Jeanie Carpenter	Opposed	The record does not adequately address hospital capacity or the staffing and employee-housing needs created by a development of this size.	Healthcare Capacity	The application met with representatives of St. Luke's as part of the process. The discussion focused on housing needs and recruitment and retention of medical staff. The conversation is ongoing.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
10	Jeanie Carpenter	Opposed	The estimate of school-aged children needs stronger support.	School Enrollment	The school enrollment estimate provided by the independent fiscal analyst BBC Research is based on county-wide historical averages. The number of school-age children living in the new housing units will depend on the overall mix of housing types as well as family decisions relating to school enrollment (Idaho has an open enrollment policy which makes it difficult to draw a direct line from new housing units to classroom utilization). The approach used by BBC reflects best practices for the industry. As Red Ridge Village housing units are built and occupied in each phase the applicant and the school district will have the opportunity to evaluate the accuracy of the projections prior to the application for the next phase.
10	Jeanie Carpenter	Opposed	Construction-phase impacts require more analysis, including the gravel pit, noise, operating hours, and weather-related complications.	Construction Impacts	Construction impacts include noise, dust, traffic, and workforce implications such as housing and school enrollment. Each application for each phase of the project will include a comprehensive plan that addresses these and other identified impacts in accordance with current Valley County ordinances and any mitigations included as a condition of approval or the Development Agreement associated with the Concept Plan approval.
10	Jeanie Carpenter	Opposed	She asked whether the CC&Rs have been prepared and are available for public review, and urged the commission to prioritize local residents' needs.	CC&Rs	A preliminary overview of the CC&Rs contemplated can be found in each of the Appendices included in the original application submitted in December 2025. In particular, Appendix A, Figures 10-Building Types and Materials and 11-Landscape Materials, Appendix F-Ecological Considerations, Appendix G-Lighting Standards, Appendix I-Open Space and Amenities, Appendix K-WUI Fire Protection Plan, and Appendix L-Design Standards. Appendix F, Appendix G, and Appendix I. When the Planning Commission completes its work and provides a comprehensive list of the conditions of approval and contemplated mitigations a consolidated CC&Rs document will be completed for submittal with the Phase 1 CUP/Preliminary Subdivision Application.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
11	Eric Young	Opposed	High-density condominiums and commercial zoning adjacent to low-density rural residential properties are incompatible and fail to protect neighboring property rights; he requested removing those uses from the PUD.	Compatibility	The Red Ridge Village Concept Plan clusters the housing units and village center to preserve over 1,400 acres of open space. Eliminating the clustered housing and village center amenities would in a more traditional single family subdivision and the loss of open space. The areas with townhomes and the village center are buffered from existing development by a minimum 100 foot landscaped buffer in addition to agricultural uses. The overall density of the Red Ridge Village Concept Plan is lower than adjacent more traditional developments and preserves for permanent public use significant open space and trails.
11	Eric Young	Opposed	Optimistic fiscal assumptions could shift infrastructure costs to residents; a binding development agreement should guarantee that no project costs fall on county	Fiscal Protection	A development agreement will be required as part of the Concept Plan approval process.
11	Eric Young	Opposed	Building in a timbered wildland-urban interface conflicts with recent county policy and presents serious fire risk; a full independent defensible-space review is needed.	Wildfire Risk	The WUI Fire Protection Plan has been reviewed by Valley County's wildfire experts, updated based on their input and accepted as meeting current County standards and best practices. Additionally, the Red Ridge Village Concept Plan includes provisions for maintenance of defensible space by the HOA, ensuring that structures that are occupied part-time are maintained at the identified standard.
11	Eric Young	Opposed	Every structure should connect to a centralized sewer system, without exceptions, and the developer should pay for required lift stations and related infrastructure.	Wastewater	The Red Ridge Village Concept Plan prioritizes connecting all structures to the planned waste water system.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
12	Judy Anderson	Opposed	The PUD concept process is inadequate for reviewing a development comparable to a small city and favors the applicant by allowing major details to remain unresolved.	Concept Process	The County's PUD Concept approval process allows the County, stakeholders, and the public to identify the issues and mitigations, follow up studies and investments needed prior to entitling the development. If the Concept Plan is approved, the applicant will move forward with the detailed studies and activities identified as part of the initial phase application. If the results of those studies, analyses, and commitments meet the minimum criteria identified in current Valley County Code and the Development Agreement the project can move forward. If the results of the studies or the mitigation criteria are not met, the project will not move forward. This process protects all parties.
12	Judy Anderson	Opposed	Concept approval could make the project difficult to stop later; missing information and a developer-supplied fiscal analysis warrant denial now.	Premature Approval	Even if the Planning Commission and County Commission approve the Concept Plan, there are several hurdles the project must clear before any construction begins.
12	Judy Anderson	Opposed	Past large developments demonstrate risks of incomplete infrastructure, taxpayer-funded roads, bankruptcy, unpaid taxes, and unpaid construction obligations.	Developer Risk	The current applicant cannot be held responsible for prior developments and assumes that the County's approach to mitigations and the Development Agreement will be informed by past experiences.
12	Judy Anderson	Opposed	The proposal would worsen the local housing crisis because most units would likely become second homes, large luxury homes, or short-term rentals rather than housing for local workers.	Housing Impact	The Red Ridge Village proposal includes 170 deed-restricted local housing units at a range of price points. The proposal is intended to add housing reserved for year-round local residents rather than rely solely on market-rate or visitor-oriented housing. The applicant is also working with local housing representatives to refine target price points and implementation tools. Adding deed-restricted local housing increases the supply available to local residents and is intended to relieve pressure across the broader housing market.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
12	Judy Anderson	Opposed	The number, terms, and enforceability of local-housing units remain unclear and appear insufficient relative to county needs.	Local Housing	The proposal is to utilize a local-housing deed restriction modeled on the City of McCall's approach. The current Concept Plan identifies 170 deed-restricted local housing units at a range of price points. The specific terms, administration, monitoring, and enforcement provisions will be further defined through the Development Agreement, CC&Rs, and subsequent approvals. The applicant is also working with local housing representatives to refine the program.
12	Judy Anderson	Opposed	She questioned whether the county should enter a long-term business relationship with the developer, citing past conduct and a lack of trust.	Developer Trust	The current application should be evaluated against the applicable County standards, the supporting technical studies, and enforceable commitments established through the approval process. The Development Agreement and subsequent phase approvals provide mechanisms for documenting obligations and ensuring that required improvements and mitigations are completed before later approvals proceed.
13	Ron Miner	Opposed	After attending the hearing and considering the information presented, he moved from undecided to opposed despite his strong support for private-property rights.		
13	Ron Miner	Opposed	His primary concerns are traffic and the loss of quality of life in the southwest McCall corridor near the project.	Traffic	The Traffic Impact Study evaluated anticipated project trips and identified improvements associated with project impacts. The study scope was reviewed by the applicable agencies and the results have been accepted by ITD. The next step is to determine Red Ridge Village's proportionate share of needed off-site improvements, recognizing that other existing and proposed development also contributes traffic to the regional network. The project also preserves substantial open space and public trail access as part of the proposed development pattern.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
13	Ron Miner	Opposed	The project's size, breadth, and added commercial development are inappropriate outside an already congested McCall urban area.	Project Scale	Significant growth has occurred and is projected to continue in Valley County. Red Ridge Village proposes to accommodate a portion of that growth through clustered development served by private infrastructure while preserving more than 1,400 acres of open space and more than 23 miles of public trails. The Village Center concentrates commercial and lodging uses within the project rather than dispersing them across the site. The overall Concept Plan is intended to manage projected growth while preserving substantial open space.
14	Leah Albright	Opposed	The water study does not assess impacts on shallow domestic and agricultural wells directly adjacent to the project.	Well Impacts	The initial water demand and resource study found that limited, if any, impact on existing wells is expected. IDWR will review the study and identify the follow-up testing and analysis required, including the location and depth of test and monitoring wells. If the follow-up work identifies that the available water resource cannot support the proposed development, the project will have to be scaled to the demonstrated resource or otherwise revised.
14	Leah Albright	Opposed	Although more than 70 domestic wells lie within one-half mile in the upper zone, the study provides no quantitative drawdown model or contour mapping for that zone and analyzes only three deeper wells.	Drawdown Modeling	The current water study is an initial resource assessment. IDWR will review the methodology and determine the additional testing, monitoring, and analysis required as the project advances. Concept approval does not authorize water-system construction or use; the required water-right and water-system approvals must be obtained before the applicable phase can proceed.
14	Leah Albright	Opposed	The monitoring proposal is reactive and limited to short pump tests; it lacks long-term monitoring and predevelopment baseline measurements for existing wells.	Baseline Monitoring	The current study is the first step in the water review process. If Concept Approval is received, IDWR review will guide the locations and depths of test and monitoring wells and the additional baseline and monitoring information required. Water availability and impacts will therefore be tested and reviewed before the applicable development phases are released for construction.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
14	Leah Albright	Opposed	The study provides no assurance that deep pumping will not drain shallow wells, no upper-zone minimum-water-level protections, and no seasonal-variation analysis.	Aquifer Protection	The initial water demand and resource study found that limited, if any, impact on existing wells is expected. IDWR will review that conclusion and identify any additional testing, monitoring, operating limits, or mitigation required. If the demonstrated water resource is inadequate for the proposed development, the project will need to be scaled back to match the available resource or otherwise revised.
14	Leah Albright	Opposed	Uncertainty about clay separation and the recommendation to treat intermediate and deep zones as one resource suggest hydraulic connections are being understated.	Aquifer Connectivity	The interpretation of aquifer conditions and hydraulic connectivity is a technical issue that will be reviewed by IDWR. If IDWR requires a different interpretation, methodology, or additional testing, the analysis will be revised accordingly. The applicant will be required to satisfy the applicable water-resource requirements before the relevant phase can proceed.
14	Leah Albright	Opposed	She requested baseline surveys for domestic wells within one mile, quantitative modeling, continuous monitoring during buildout, automatic pumping-reduction triggers, developer liability for well damage, and at least $3 million in financial assurance held by the county.	Water Mitigation	The applicant supports an IDWR-directed monitoring and mitigation program based on the results of the required follow-up water studies. The appropriate monitoring locations, baseline period, operating thresholds, mitigation measures, and any financial assurance should be tied to demonstrated impacts and requirements established by the reviewing agencies and the County rather than established in advance without the benefit of the follow-up technical work.
15	Art Troutner	Opposed	The project's water plan is fragile because it relies unrealistically on rented water.	Rental Water	Securing the necessary water rights and demonstrating an adequate water supply are conditions that must be satisfied through the applicable IDWR and County review processes before development can proceed.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
15	Art Troutner	Opposed	A new water right would have the lowest priority and cannot be treated as a dependable supply.	Water Priority	The priority and reliability of any new water right will be evaluated through the IDWR water-right process. The project must secure the water rights necessary for the applicable phase and comply with any conditions imposed through that process before the development can proceed.
15	Art Troutner	Opposed	Rental-water availability changes annually with snowpack, precipitation, existing needs, and higher-priority users; recent availability does not guarantee future supply.	Water Reliability	The project's development approvals will require demonstration of adequate water supply for the uses proposed in each phase.
15	Art Troutner	Opposed	Growing demand and finite supply make rental water unsuitable as a long-term growth strategy.	Water Supply	The project must obtain the necessary water rights and approvals for each applicable use. If the available water resource is less than assumed, the development program and/or irrigated acreage will need to be adjusted to the demonstrated supply.
15	Art Troutner	Opposed	The amount needed to irrigate approximately 76 acres may not be available in most years.	Irrigation Supply	The project must obtain the necessary water rights and approvals for each applicable use. If the available water resource is less than assumed, the development program and/or irrigated acreage will need to be adjusted to the demonstrated supply.
16	John Phipps	Opposed	The development would weaken the community's social compact, personal relationships, and connection to the land.	Community Character	The applicant recognizes that community character is an important consideration. The Concept Plan responds by clustering development and preserving more than 1,400 acres of open space, providing more than 23 miles of public trails, and concentrating higher-intensity uses rather than extending development throughout the property. These are intended to preserve substantial portions of the landscape while accommodating a share of projected County growth.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
16	John Phipps	Opposed	Rapid growth of this kind can damage community bonds, local prosperity, wildlife, and long-established ways of life.	Growth Impacts	Growth is occurring and is projected to continue in Valley County independent of Red Ridge Village. The Concept Plan is intended to manage a portion of that growth through clustered development, permanent open space, public trails, local housing, and coordinated infrastructure rather than a more dispersed development pattern. Wildlife, traffic, water, public services, and other impacts are being addressed through agency review and proposed mitigations.
16	John Phipps	Opposed	The applicant's prior restriction of land access and the proposal's impacts on land, animals, and long-time families conflict with local stewardship values.	Stewardship	The Concept Plan includes substantial permanent open space, public trail access, wildlife-oriented design measures, and management standards intended to protect natural resources while allowing development in designated areas. The applicant has coordinated with Idaho Fish and Game regarding wildlife provisions and will continue to refine applicable CC&R and management requirements through the review process.
16	John Phipps	Opposed	The commission has a legal, constitutional, moral, and ethical obligation to deny the proposal.	Denial	
16	John Phipps	Opposed	Newcomers should join and respect the existing community rather than support development that harms it.	Community Values	The Concept Plan is intended to integrate new development with the broader community through public trail access, local housing, community-oriented uses at the Village Center, and preservation of substantial open space. The applicant recognizes that community values are an important part of the County's review and will continue to address identified impacts through the public process and Development Agreement.
17	Royce Bartholomew	Opposed	Fish Lake Road crosses his Adams County property and is identified as emergency egress, but he was not contacted about the proposal.	Emergency Egress	DF Development has provided a copy of the easement and a legal evaluation of the appropriateness of the proposed use as emergency egress.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
17	Royce Bartholomew	Opposed	The project needs at least two valid access routes; West Mountain Road alone is insufficient.	Access	Red Ridge Village roads and emergency access facilities will meet applicable IFC and Valley County standards.
17	Royce Bartholomew	Opposed	He questioned whether an easement allowing use by DF Development and its invitees legally permits use by an entire community and requested legal review.	Easement Rights	DF Development has provided a copy of the easement and a legal evaluation of the appropriateness of the proposed use as emergency egress.
17	Royce Bartholomew	Opposed	He spent approximately $45,000 improving Fish Lake Road and replacing culverts, while DF Development paid nothing despite an easement provision he said requires it to pay half of maintenance costs.	Road Maintenance	DF Development has provided a copy of the easement which includes certain obligations along with a letter outlining DF Development's participation in costs associated with the easement.
17	Royce Bartholomew	Opposed	He argued the applicant's maintenance history and handling of easement obligations raise concerns about reliability and trust.	Developer Trust	The current application should be evaluated on the enforceable commitments made for Red Ridge Village.
18	Wyatt Albright	Opposed	The lighting from 722 units would significantly affect neighboring dark skies; a detailed photometric plan should evaluate spillover beyond project boundaries.	Dark Skies	Appendix L requires exterior lighting to comply with Valley County lighting requirements, use full-cutoff fixtures to reduce light spill and protect night skies, and limits color temperature to 3,000K. Detailed lighting plans will be reviewed as individual phases and buildings are designed. Compliance with the adopted lighting standards and County requirements will apply at the project level and to individual development areas.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
18	Wyatt Albright	Opposed	Construction lighting and nighttime work need restrictions, enforcement mechanisms, and a process allowing adjacent owners to trigger county enforcement.	Construction Lighting	Construction impacts, including lighting, hours of operation, noise, dust, and traffic, will be addressed in the construction management plan required for each applicable phase in accordance with Valley County ordinances and conditions of approval. Permanent exterior lighting is separately governed by the project lighting standards and County requirements. Enforcement mechanisms can be incorporated through County approvals and the Development Agreement where appropriate.
18	Wyatt Albright	Opposed	The application lacks a cumulative-impact analysis accounting for Red Ridge together with other active development and their combined effects on West Mountain Road, fire/EMS service, and groundwater.	Cumulative Impacts	The review process is considering the project within the existing and projected conditions of the surrounding transportation and public-service networks. For transportation, the Traffic Impact Study identifies project impacts and the next step is to determine Red Ridge Village's proportionate share of needed improvements. Fire/EMS and water impacts are being addressed through separate agency and technical review processes. Other developments should likewise mitigate their proportionate impacts so existing residents are not assigned the cost of regional growth.
18	Wyatt Albright	Opposed	The county should commission independent hydrologic and traffic studies using worst-case concurrent-construction scenarios.	Independent Studies	Groundwater and traffic studies are subject to review by the agencies with jurisdiction and follow-up work will be required where those agencies identify additional information needs. The Traffic Impact Study scope was reviewed by the applicable agencies and accepted by ITD. IDWR will review the water-resource work and identify required follow-up testing and monitoring. The applicant will comply with those agency-directed review requirements rather than duplicate studies without an identified technical basis.
18	Wyatt Albright	Opposed	He requested a multi-year hydrologic study, independent peer review, baseline measurements before disturbance, annual groundwater monitoring, quarterly public reports, binding liability, and a halt to later approvals if aquifer conditions decline.	Groundwater Monitoring	The current water study is the initial step in an ongoing regulatory process. IDWR will identify the test wells, monitoring wells, baseline information, and additional analysis required to confirm water availability and impacts. The applicant supports monitoring and enforceable mitigation tied to demonstrated impacts and agency requirements. If the water resource cannot support the proposed development, the project will need to be scaled to the demonstrated resource or otherwise revised before later phases proceed.

August 27 Public Hearing Comment Summary

Commentor	Name	Position	Summary	Category/Topic	Response
18	Wyatt Albright	Opposed	The proposed city center and condominiums would fragment elk habitat and migration routes, increase edge effects and disturbance, and undermine claimed wildlife-preservation areas.	Wildlife Habitat	The Concept Plan clusters development specifically to preserve large contiguous areas of open space rather than spreading development across the property. More than 1,400 acres are proposed as open space. The applicant has coordinated with Idaho Fish and Game regarding wildlife provisions, including areas of minimal disturbance and wildlife-friendly design measures. The Village Center and townhome areas are concentrated development areas, while the broader open-space system is intended to retain habitat value and wildlife movement opportunities.
18	Wyatt Albright	Opposed	The necessary studies should be completed before concept approval, not afterward.	Preapproval Studies	Concept approval is intended to identify the studies, mitigations, standards, and commitments that must be completed as the project advances; it does not authorize construction. Subsequent CUP and Preliminary Subdivision Plat approvals are required before development proceeds. Water, access, infrastructure, and other technical requirements identified by the County and reviewing agencies must be satisfied at the applicable stage, and the project cannot proceed to later approvals if required criteria are not met.