

Payette Lakes Recreational Water & Sewer District

Regular Meeting
November 19, 2025

Directors Present

Ellen Holm, Chairperson (telephone)
Bill Weida, Vice-Chair

Dallas Young (telephone)
Todd Fereday
Brian Renstrom

Advisors Present

Adam Christenson, Legal Advisor (telephone)
David Watkins, J-U-B Engineers(telephone)
Maggi Lloyd, J-U-B Engineers

Staff Present

Tammie Richardson
Jeff Bateman

Also Present

Craig Groves, Pine Creek Ranch
Bill Hendrickson, Citizen

Chairperson Ellen Holm called the meeting to order at 9:00 a.m., and the Directors, Ellen Holm, Dallas Young, Brian Renstrom, Todd Fereday, and Bill Weida, all answered roll call.

Approve Regular Meeting Minutes for October 15, 2025

Dallas moved to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes for October 15, 2025, it was seconded by Todd and the motion carried.

Approve Regular Special Minutes for October 15, 2025

Brian moved to approve the Special Meeting Minutes with his corrections regarding his statement at the Public Hearing for October 15, 2025, it was seconded by Todd and the motion carried.

Approve October 2025 Treasurer's Report

Bill moved to approve the Treasurer's report for October 2025, it was seconded by Todd and the motion carried.

Consider Approval of State Revolving Fund Loan Offer (WW2601 and Agreement Legislative Supplemental Funding Grant Offer (WW2601LSF) and Agreement from the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (Resolution No. 2025-5)

Adam reminded the Board that the Idaho DEQ has approved the District's funding application and offered the District a couple of funding offers. One is a loan offer of \$2.813 million, which will be used towards the pond liner project. The second is a grant of \$4.186 million that does not require repayment, which relates to a couple of phases of projects, including I&I work that was identified, as well as the pond liner project. Both the loan offer and the grant must be accepted within 60 days from the date of notice, which was October 23. The 60th day is December 22, 2025. He commented that, for reference, the December board meeting is scheduled for December 17, which falls before the 60-day cutoff. There are several requirements and conditions that must be met to accept the loan and grant offers, which are memorialized in

agreements with DEQ. We did have a handful of comments on those agreements, and we are currently working through them with DEQ. Given this, we think it's best to table item five for the December meeting. That would still give us time to approve it at the December meeting and get that to DEQ within the 60-day timeframe. I think there's more to come on this next month, but I wanted to bring the Board up to speed. As part of accepting the offers, the board must adopt a resolution, which is what Resolution Number 2025-5 is, and that will come back before the board in December. Bill had a question about whether there is anything unusual about these two offers compared to what any other sewer district might receive. Or is this just a standard offer and agreement? Adam stated that he does not have the context to speak to historical amounts or similar matters, but that the structure of this is standard. It is typical for DEQ to offer both a loan component and potentially a grant component, as the language used is standard for their offers. However, he lacks the context to compare it to what other sewer districts are receiving. Tammie reported that the grant was a bit different and that DEQ worked hard to help us secure it.

The Board tabled this item until the December board meeting.

Discussion of Extended Easement Relocation of Outfall Regarding Mike Eckhart

Jeff reminded the board about the discussion from the last board meeting. This concerns the easement location on Mr. Eckhart's property. Jeff wanted direction from the board on whether we are willing to proceed with this or if we should leave the easement as is and address the issue if necessary. Jeff stated he does not think we will have to do anything with the outfall line, but you never know. Brian commented that one thing he noticed is that the existing easement is only about 20 feet wide. Brian asked Jeff if that caused the District any concern about trying to get equipment in and out to make repairs. Jeff stated that there is enough room for an excavator. His concern is that if we ever have to do anything to that, the proximity to his foundation on the south side is where he believes some extra shoring will need to be installed, and probably some flowable fill when we backfill. It is a concrete line and in good shape, but he can't say something will never happen; however, he does not see it as likely to take place.

Brian stated it may be a problem that we might have to deal with in 30 or 40 years. Todd commented that if it sold or they expanded, or put another outbuilding there, they could put something on top of the future easement. Brian commented that we'll have a really compact job site to work with. Todd stated he would rather upsize it to the 30-foot easement. Brian commented that he was leaning that way as well, as he feels the 20-foot easement's pretty tight. He gave an example from his most recent project, where they were not happy with the compact job site as described. They need room not just to get the tractor in and out, but also for two-way traffic to accommodate dump trucks and other vehicles. The question is whether we really need to replace that line; would 20 feet be enough? Todd stated that Mr. Eckhart should pay the survey and attorney fees, which Jeff agrees with, and that Mr. Eckhart should cover the cost of anything associated with this extended easement. Brian commented that we're trying to guess the price thirty years from now. The retaining wall and all the extra work involved versus moving the line doesn't seem like a significant difference in cost; we're committing our future selves to pay either way, so I'm leaning towards the 30-foot easement, like Todd.

Todd stated that he thinks it makes sense, just in case, for future use.

Brian moved to approve the extended easement relocation of the outfall, with Mr. Eckhart covering the costs of the survey, attorney fees, and registering the documents it was seconded by Todd and the motion carried.

Approve Sewer Improvements Agreement with HTW McCall, LLC (Dawson Trails)

Jeff explained that this is the development agreement that the board tabled last month.

Brian moved to approve the sewer improvement agreement with HTW McCall, LLC (Dawson Trails), it was seconded by Todd and the motion carried.

Consider Approval for Carport on Sewer Easement for Idaho Ward Project (Hormaechea)

Jeff explained that on Mr. Hormachia's project, the initial plans presented appeared to be just car parking spaces. However, when Crestline came in and spoke with him, it turned out to be a carport sitting on part of the easement. There will be six feet from the center of the pipe to the edge of the carport, because our easement is fifteen feet on each side of the pipe, totaling a 30-foot easement. He does not have a problem with it as long as there's language in the easement stating that if we have to remove the carport to do any work on the line, then we're covered. He commented that we have six feet from the center of the pipe to the outside eave of the edge of the carport. So realistically, that's probably enough room. Brian asked about the surface finish. Jeff stated it's asphalt. Brian asked about the structure itself is it four corner posts, or is it cantilevered out? Jeff is not sure, and he said neither was Greg (Crestline) at that point. He is picturing it as something similar to what they have at the Springs Apartments. Bill commented that as we progress and encounter more high-density issues, these problems will likely arise repeatedly. He thinks we need to have a clear policy. Jeff stated that he was fine with this, but he never wants anything to be over the line. He continued, if it's on the edge of the easement, that's one thing, but we definitely can't have any buildings on our lines. Brian is on the opposite side and is having a hard time with this. He continued if you're talking four corner posts or six corner posts, and they're going to have to go down three feet with footings and columns and all of that. You're creating things that the excavator has to work around, which adds to the cost of repairs for us. The overhanging roof may be a minor issue, but it's the footings and foundation that are the real concern. Jeff commented that they will need to have some substantial footings underneath to support that weight. Brian is fine with the overhanging eave, but not with any footings or concrete work underground within 10 feet of the line, because we want to ensure an excavator can easily access the area and avoid increasing our construction costs. Jeff agrees that the more time they have to dig around with the items on the ground, the more it will cost us. Brian inquired about the carport's lighting, as well as whether it would have charging stations for electric vehicles and other amenities. Jeff responded that Greg said he wasn't 100% positive that they were going to have the carports. He said that's going to be one of those things they look down the line on when everything starts coming in for pricing. Todd requested some details on the footings and the specific location from that line to the footings, which he believes will determine our policy on that decision.

David commented that he is not exactly sure what language you're considering in the easement, but it appears that it could say nothing is buried within the easement. Still, if there's an overhanging carport above the easement, for example, if it needs to be removed to work on the pipe, that's at the cost of the easement owner, but it's allowed to exist above the easement. This would then allow the cantilevered option, but not the buried footings within the easement. Brian showed the Board a drawing he sketched up a detail that we could use as a standard where we go from the center line of pipe, have distance to an overhanging eave, distance to concrete footing, and distance to any electrical conduit or other piping, and kind of create just a standard detail for when this comes up in the future which they can adjust their blueprints for that section. Jeff commented that it sounds as if the Board does not want any electrical or other types of utilities in our easement. Jeff stated that on private property, that would work, but

when we're doing construction within city roads and the utilities' easement, that's a different matter, as it's a public right-of-way, so every utility has the right to access it. Therefore, there are places where we have major power lines, three feet off our sewer line, or even closer to it. Brian commented that he is thinking of branch circuits, not mains, but branch circuits for charging car chargers, overhead lighting, and other miscellaneous items that are on the landowner's side. Brian clarified that he is fine with the overhang within our easement, just not the underground part, because holding the snow will require substantial footings. Jeff will Reach out to Crestline to gather a bit more information, as this is all fairly preliminary. Talking to him last week, he wasn't sure if they would do the carports at this point. Brian stated that he does not want to discourage them from building nice buildings and providing amenities like covered parking; he wants to be careful so that it is not costly for us to work around these features.

The Board tabled this item so Jeff could get more information.

Consider Approval for the Blower Upgrade Project at the Wastewater Treatment Facility with JUB Engineers

Maggi went over the Blower Upgrade Project at the treatment plant. JUB will complete the design to replace the three existing blowers and design piping modifications to allow the blowers to be isolated for Ponds 1 and 2, as well as size the diffusers. In conjunction with the blower replacement design, we will complete the initial sizing of the diffusers for both Pond 1 and Pond 2. This encompasses project management, design, including the PER to DEQ transition, and electrical design. There will be an amendment for bidding and construction. Brian inquired about the acoustics during his introductory tour, and he recalls it being extremely loud. He wondered if there was any need to consider noise mitigation for the operators in the adjacent room. Jeff agreed that the VFD harmonic balancer in that new building is loud. Staff has discussed installing a wall to eliminate some of that noise and getting those small dog houses that go over them, but he is unsure if we'll have room. Maggi replied that it is not in the inner scope. She knows they are wearing earmuffs in that room. Jeff stated that this winter, the staff will install a wall there. The staff had done some conduit work, which helped alleviate some of the sound issues.

David commented that during the PER, we can examine different-sized blowers and various types of blowers. Many of the newer, high-efficiency models come with sound enclosures. However, as Jeff was saying, it all depends on whether they fit in there and whether we use two or three blowers. There are definitely options that could help, but space may be limited. Jeff said Ross and Wyatt are also looking into some blowers and speaking with other treatment facilities that have recently upgraded blowers. Bill stated he is a living, walking example of what happens in those environments and would say that I'm highly interested in not having the workers be exposed to what I was exposed to. Even wearing earmuffs and protective ear gear, he did both, and it still wasn't sufficient. Jeff, we could also use some foam against that wall to help dampen the sound. There are some things we can look into for that, but yes, we definitely want to protect staff from going deaf. Having ringing in their ears all the time is not a good thing. Maggi stated that JUB can explore the best alternatives so we can keep the staff's hearing safe. Brian also volunteered to help explore the best options.

Brian moved to approve the blower upgrade project at the wastewater treatment facility with JUB engineers, not to exceed \$102,000, it was seconded by Todd and the motion carried.

Authorize Scope and Fees for JUB Engineers for 2026 General Engineering Service Agreement

David explained that this agreement follows the same format and task numbering that we've used over the past couple of years. There are multiple tasks, including project management, engineering reuse, engineering support, plan review, sewer model runs, and GIS support, among others.

Brian moved to authorize the scope and fees for JUB Engineers for the 2026 General Engineering Service Agreement, not to exceed \$173,000 it was seconded by Bill and the motion carried.

Mission Street Update

Maggi, they have one service marker that needs to be installed, and we need the final paperwork. She did review one round of red lines from them, and then they just need to resubmit.

Engineer's Report

David reported that the most significant event of the last month was our meeting with DEQ in Boise. Mike, Jeff, Bill, and he went down to DEQ. The main takeaway from that is that our next action item is to resubmit the PER for the Pond Liner project with some updated information that DEQ requested. He hopes to submit it to Bill and Jeff this week for review, and then it should be ready after their review to be sent to DEQ again.

Maggi reported that she should have 90% design ready for Jeff to review next week.

Pond Liner Update

David informed the Board that he will resubmit the PER, as we previously stated. He sent out the CMGC RFP for the group to review, and it will be in the Star Newspaper this week. Proposers can access it on QuestCDN. David mentioned that they have another one of these out right now in Lewiston and would like to caution staff that many contractors see these and think you are bidding on a project, so that you might receive a slew of phone calls from people asking, 'What kind of pipe?' I'm trying to put together the prices. As a reminder, if those people call, please ask them to reread the RFP. This is a qualifications-based selection of a CMGC. There's no construction bid as part of this. I think that 60% of our comments on the other one were related to that. People often misunderstand what it is.

Legal Report

Adam stated that things continue to be very busy. As David alluded to, much of the work has shifted focus to the pond liner project. We had that conversation with DEQ a couple of weeks ago, and we'll discuss it further later. We've also worked with JUB on the CMGC RFP and the associated contract. As mentioned, we've been working on the DEQ loan and grant offers, and we are getting everything in place for approval.

Consider Approval of Annual Employee Appreciation Gifts

Tammie presented that over the last few years, the Board has generously provided each employee with a \$200 gift card, which is what I am requesting again.

Todd moved to approve the annual employee appreciation gift cards for \$200.00 it was seconded by Bill and the motion carried.

Request Approval to Close at 12:00 p.m. Christmas Eve, December 24, 2025

Tammie is requesting approval to close at 12 p.m. Christmas Eve, December 24, 2025. For the last few years, we've followed Valley County's example and closed our offices at noon, so I'm requesting permission to do the same.

Brian moved to approve closing the office at 12:00 p.m. on December 24, 2025 it was seconded by Todd and the motion carried.

Staff Report

1. Tammie reported that we sold one permit in October and have five pending for review, which will be for November.
2. Tammie reported that she is attending the PERSI workshop in Boise.
3. Tammie reported that we hired Clover Field to replace Lorraine, and she has been doing a great job. We have Lorraine until January 31, 2026.
4. Tammie reported that the FY25 audit will be on February 3, 2026.
5. Tammie commented that she is trying to set up a JWAG meeting for February 5, 2025, and so far, Nathan has confirmed.
6. Jeff reported that the hospital workforce housing has fixed the bellys in the line, and everything is pretty much done. He is waiting for the legal description so that he can provide it to Adam, allowing him to begin preparing the closing documents.
7. Jeff reported on the Koknee Cove project. They have gotten the alarm working at the lift station, but the retaining wall is not yet complete.
8. Jeff reported that the hydrocleaner (Whitewhale) we got back seems to be working a lot better than it did. There is still one issue with the hydraulics, and the guys down there did everything they could to try and get it going. The tank requires you to rev it up a little bit higher RPMs than we used to when we first got it. They flushed it several times, changed the filters, and went through everything several different times. They can't get that one valve to work correctly.
9. Jeff went over the Boydston & Pinedale project. They went ahead and paved prior to us looking at the video camera, they have several bellys in the line so they had to redo that and then when they paved they did not follow our specs and did not take the frames off the manholes and so now they have to rip all that pavement up because the manholes will stick up higher than the finished grade. They really screwed it up. They stopped for the year and will resume in the spring.

General Public Comment (Limited to 3 minutes per individual)

Craig Groves wanted to again thank the board for hosting the public hearing on the annexation of the Stockton 90. While he is disappointed with the outcome, he respects the process, the transparency, and the overall discussion. He wanted to inform the board that the demand for and need for housing are unlikely to subside in McCall, so he intends to pursue the development of the 68-acre site. Although it will be costly, he realizes that off-site upgrades will be required. He is hopeful that he might be able to schedule a one-on-one meeting with Jeff in the near future to discuss the concept, plans, and the line extension agreement for your consideration. He had the opportunity over the last four or five years to attend the West Central Mountain Economic Development Conference. I've noticed that nobody from the sewer board's there. This last year, we had members of Idaho DEQ, Idaho Housing, bankers, city officials, government officials, and state officials. A lot of information happens there, including what

makes a thriving community. I would therefore like to encourage the board to consider sending at least one member or two to those conferences in the future.

Bill Hendrickson stated he will make it quick and has four short questions. Regarding the funding for the loan and the grant, does anyone know if there's a timeline associated with using those funds if they are approved? If you don't know the answer, then we can table it. The second question is, he is certainly in favor of the Pondliner CMGC approach and supports the advanced RFP. He asked if that would be on the website so he can review it. Not to provide comments, but to stay informed. Is the RFP for the CMGC available? Maggi replied that it will be on QuestCDN, which is publicly available, and in the Star Newspaper this Thursday. Bill asked if the 2026 budget is available for capital improvement projects. Tammie replied that he can speak to her after the meeting to request these things. Bill stated that his last question is that he is curious about the next JWAG meeting, having heard about the previous discussions regarding it, and a rumor that something is planned for possibly February. Is there something on the calendar for the JWAG meeting? Tammie replied that she had reported it in her staff report. It is scheduled for February 5, 2026.

Executive Session: § 74-206(1)(f) Bill moved to enter into Executive Session, Idaho Code § 74-206(1)(f), to communicate with legal counsel for the public agency to discuss the legal ramifications of and legal options for pending litigation, or controversies not yet being litigated but imminently likely to be litigated. The mere presence of legal counsel at an executive session does not satisfy this requirement; it was seconded by Todd. In a roll call vote, the motion carried unanimously.

Decision from Executive Session

Bill moved to approve the letter to be sent to DEQ and authorized Ellen Holm to sign, it was seconded by Brian and the motion carried.

Bill moved to adjourn the meeting, it was seconded by Dallas and the motion carried.

Submitted by: Tammie Richardson



Bill Weida, Vice Chair

