

Payette Lakes Recreational Water & Sewer District

Regular Meeting
January 21, 2026

Directors Present

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

Dallas Young
Todd Fereday
Brian Renstrom

Advisors Present

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

Also Present

Adam Zaragoza, Ponderosa State Park
Matt Linde, Ponderosa State Park
Gavin Thoreson, IMCO Construction
Candi Millar, Patron

Staff Present

Tammie Richardson
Jeff Bateman

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

Approve Regular Meeting Minutes for December 17, 2025

Bill moved to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes for December 17, 2025, it was seconded by Dallas and the motion carried.

Approve December 2025 Treasurer's Report

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

Approve Ponderosa State Park, Kokanee Cove Sewer Line Extension Right-of-Way Agreement and Acceptance of Sanitary Sewer Line Improvements

Jeff informed the Board that the main sewer line has been completed for quite some time. Some rehab was needed around the pump station due to erosion. A new power line was installed, and we were having some issues getting the easement for it incorporated into the documents. With Adam's help and Adam Zaragoza from Ponderosa State Park, it's all been taken care of and is ready to sign. Adam added that we had previously discussed the transfer documents and that, as the Board is aware, we have standard transfer documents for these line extensions: a bill of sale, a contractor's affidavit, and an easement agreement. The only document that the District signs is the easement agreement. The Board has previously determined that line extension transfers using the standard language don't need to come back to the Board prior to execution. In this instance, however, because we're dealing with state-owned property, we did deviate from those standard documents a bit; we felt it was appropriate to come to the Board. For instance, the easement agreement, which we're calling the right-of-way agreement, includes additional language relative to winter park operations, basically ensuring that Lift Station 14 is

accessible by district personnel and vehicles or has a backup generator if the State begins utilizing the park sewer lines in the winter, which it does intend to do here in the near future. As Jeff indicated, the documents have been negotiated with the State, and he is comfortable that they adequately protect the District's interests. Adam believes there are representatives from the Idaho Department of Parks and Recreation at the meeting in case of any questions. He believes that if the documents are acceptable, the Board should move to approve the Kokanee Cove sewer line extension transfer documents, accept the sanitary sewer line improvements as defined in those documents, and then authorize Bill, as the Board's vice chair, to execute the right-of-way agreement. We have Bill doing that because Bill is here, and we need an original signature. Once executed, that right-of-way agreement will be recorded in the real property records.

Brian commented on maintaining the cross-country and snowshoe trails. He asked whether that was the idea that the road would be plowed only when we needed access. Jeff stated that it would be maintained year-round. Jeff explained that when this first came up before the project had even started, the State came to him and asked what they needed to do. He told them the District would need year-round access or a generator at the station. At the time, the State indicated it wouldn't use it during the winter, so it wasn't an issue. At some point, it was stated they would use it year-round. Jeff informed them he could not sign off on the project until the District was guaranteed year-round access or they had purchased a generator. Part of those negotiations is that the road will be plowed whenever it snows, so the District will have access to that station to maintain the pumps.

Adam Zaragoza, representative for the Idaho State Parks and Recreation, and Matt Lindy, the Park Manager, explained that they had the original documents for the right-of-way agreement. He stated that it has been really good working with Mr. Christensen, Jeff, and his team. This development is a big deal for the Park. He is not sure how many members know, but the Park is primarily not funded by the general tax base. Camping fees, user fees, and other sources fund them. This new development is an important financial deal for us to keep the lights on and maintain sufficient funding. Matt Lindy explained that if we do need to plow, there is a plan to alter the cross-country ski trail to keep 80% of it operational.

Brian moved to approve the Ponderosa State Park, Kokanee Cove Sewer Line Extension Right-of-Way Agreement and Acceptance of Sanitary Sewer Line Improvements, and to authorize Bill to sign, it was seconded by Ellen and the motion carried.

Approve Abandonment of Peninsula Place Sewer Line Segment and Sewer Easement Between Manholes MH02C05-040 and MH02C05-050

Jeff went over the picture that Tammie sent to the Board for the section of the line under consideration for abandonment. Initially, that parcel was supposed to have six townhomes. A private owner bought that parcel and wants to put a house on it. Jeff thought the city water line was there; our print showed it there as well, but we found out that four years ago, the water line was removed. The only thing in that easement right now is our sewer line. The owner wants to abandon that 8-inch section of pipe right there and recap it on Spring Mountain Boulevard. He will need to plug the manhole, dig down to cap the line just outside the manhole, and either slurry-fill the existing line or remove it from the property. Jeff stated that, when he spoke to the owner on the phone, the owner had no problem with that. They sent us the legal description. We are waiting for the developer to provide a termination agreement for the easement in that

area so that we can vacate it. Jeff feels the Board could go ahead and approve it, under the condition that the termination easement documents are satisfactory to Adam and that they also meet all the requirements he will put in place. Jeff showed the Board the sewer line depicted in the picture, located between manholes 040 and 030. Adam informed the Board that we asked them to prepare the termination document, which is not an expensive document, but there's no reason the District should incur that expense. They will prepare it and present it, and he will ensure it's legally satisfactory. Then, as Jeff indicated, as long as his conditions for abandonment are met, we can execute that document and terminate the easement. Brian asked whether there are significant financial ramifications for the District. We're expending time and energy, which is money, and we would have gotten connection fees from six homes. Now we're only going to get one that has a financial impact on the District. Jeff explained that, in this case, it was an initially category C basin, which they could only have one connection under the policy right now. That's still what it is.

Bill moved to approve the abandonment of the Peninsula Place Sewer Line Segment and Sewer Easement between manholes MH02C05-040 and MH02C05-050, it was seconded by Brian, and the motion carried.

Consider Pond Liner Replacement Project CM/GC Recommendation from the Selection Committee and Award CM/GC Contract Contingent on IDEQ Approval

Maggi went over the CM/GC RFP. She reported that we received four proposals from ESI, IMCO Construction, Granite Construction (the big national one), and RSCI Construction. The selection committee (Brian, Todd, and Jeff) reviewed and scored all the proposals. Their recommendation is to award it to IMCO Construction. She presented the Proposal Review and Summary Report to the Board. We did include optional interviews as part of the RFP, but the scores were so different between the top two that we decided not to conduct them. Once the group had determined on IMCO, this was sent to Tom Mortell (Hawley Troxel), who reviewed it and had no concerns. DEQ also has a copy of the TM and RFP. They have everything they need to review. We haven't heard back from them; they don't authorize proceeding until we have the final agreement and cost from the contractor. David commented that the selection committee, which he thought did a great job reviewing all the proposals against the RFP and assigning scores, thought this was a good process. Brian commented that he feels what is important to us is that the committee was unanimous. There wasn't any real disagreement. We all scored IMCO as the first-place candidate. David commented that all four companies are good, with some experience and strong references. The things that stood out to him within IMCO were the very relevant example projects. And then the other thing they did well was communicate the important information. They had a very well-put-together proposal. Todd commented that he liked their approach and schedule.

Brian moved to approve IMCO for the Pond Liner Replacement Project, CM/GC Recommendation from the Selection Committee and Award CM/GC Contingent on IDEQ approval, it was seconded by Dallas and the motion carried.

Consider Approval of Amendment to the 2026 General Engineering Agreement for Public Outreach Support

Maggi explained this is for \$10,000 essentially to cover what we talked about last time with the website development and any other items that come up, essentially, that Tammy wants our support on, but the website's the main thing. Tammie reminded the Board that we budgeted

this in FY26, but we need to move it to a JUB agreement so they can invoice us for the time-and-materials task.

Brian moved to approve the amendment to the 2026 General Engineering Agreement for Public Outreach Support, it was seconded by Dallas and the motion carried.

Consider Approval of Amendment to the Lift Station 27 Replacement Project for Bidding and Construction Management Services

Maggi went over the replacement of lift station 27. The original scope was for design and DEQ approval. We did submit it to DEQ earlier this week, which marks the end of the scope. This amendment goes through bidding services and then construction management services. It also adds time to the project management task. This is a time-and-materials task. David said we're doing a lot of observation on these newer projects, and in the field, time is being shared between district staff and us. District staff will have some time out in the field, and we have one visit a week to check on it because we have to document buried items for the record drawings.

Brian moved to approve the amendment to the Lift Station 27 replacement project for bidding and construction management services, it was seconded by Ellen and the motion carried.

Presentation of Draft Amended Density Map by District Engineer

David presented the density map that accompanies the amended density policy presented at last month's board meeting. He reminded the Board that the density policy is mostly the same. A few things were updated, fixing some holes and adding a new category for larger development. For the development of twenty-five or more EDUs, a sewer model run will be required. The biggest change is the non-residential parcel. As a reminder, when we did the interim policy, we weren't sure what to do with the commercial, so we just showed them all as one color because the master plan and the model hadn't been finished yet. To show all the city zoning and land use, we grouped them by similar sewer densities. These numbers reflect densities that we actually modeled in the master plan. The community commercial and central business district is both this darker color, at 30 per acre. The updated policy and map intend to make things a little easier when requests come in. For example, let's say a coffee shop wants to go somewhere. Jeff can look at the parcel on the map or in GIS to see what we modeled, and he knows what kind of sewer density we are comfortable with, without doing an additional model run. If it falls within the right density and isn't in one of these hatched areas, which are the surcharged basins, he can move forward. It meets the current density policy, and there's no reason to run a sewer model. He doesn't need to talk to JUB. It just moves forward. The intent is to identify the majority of requests that typically don't need a sewer model and make it a little easier for Jeff and staff to review the map, make those decisions, and move forward. He pointed to the 0.01 per acre on the map, which is mostly the airport. This covers most of the civic, parks, and similar things.

Brian commented that the map is great. Is there a procedure for changing the map? As an example, he used his neighborhood. He showed Wild Horse Park on the map, which, to him, does not make sense to have that Park there. It would be great to do a land swap with the City for a more valuable piece of land and turn it into four homes. He feels it's ideally suited for four homes. David, so the District has a policy for updating the density map. He used Colorado Street as an example. They worked with the City to try to double their density. There is a bottleneck they need to fix, but let's assume it wasn't there. They would go through their

process to double the density with the City. Then they would talk to us to see if they could change the density, let's say, from R4 to R8. They would submit a map update application to the Board. The intent is to update this regularly with all approved changes. So if things are increasing or changing in density, eventually the map should keep reflecting that, so you know what you've approved. The Colorado Street project was going through its process with the City, but stalled once they found out they would need to fix the bottleneck. But if they had moved forward with the sewer project and the development agreement, the application to change the sewer density map would have come before the Board. He showed the Board the Colorado Street project on the map, which is R4, but he believes the City approved that parcel for R8. Brian commented that he knows they want to move forward with that project. Tammie commented that they were waiting for Maverick to fix the bottleneck because they did not want to spend the money, and then the City did not approve Maverick's project.

David stated that when this pipe segment is upsized, this black hatching here all goes to the category A basin. Brian asked if that would be a high-priority project for us? Jeff disagreed. He stated that until we take care of the I&I and this bottleneck here, yeah, it's going to give us more connections, but it's also going to provide us with a lot more flow. We have limited capacity over here, and with a bunch of extra connections and fixing the bottleneck without addressing more I&I, he feels that is not in the best interest of the District. Jeff agrees that the bottleneck needs to be fixed, but if the developers want to upzone their project, they need to fix the bottleneck. That area is not on his priority list.

David, the other thing we added to the map that's not on the original map is that we labeled the bottlenecks, so you know which project in the master plan to look at that corresponds to these green circles, which are the surcharge manholes. We also added labels for build-out projects. So these aren't problems now, but they will be in the future. These are areas you should keep checking. For example, Pine Creek. When this starts developing, it is triggered on the model. It is only impacted by their development.

David had some comments from Jeff about the map. Instead of the black mesh hatching, Jeff was thinking bigger diagonal hatching because the mesh makes it hard to see what's behind it. There are some updates to the county parcels that aren't reflected on this map because it takes a lot of work to update the shapefile we use. So it would be hard to keep up with the county whenever someone subdivides or changes a boundary. We do need to change Pilgrim Cove as it's not showing as a camp. Another thing to keep in mind: this map update shows that all Category C basins have moved to Category B basins. He pointed to some dots on the map that are all category B surcharge spots.

Brian is concerned about how we will keep track. Let's say, hypothetically, somebody comes in and does a development here, and that's 10 units, so it's less than enough to trigger a model run. And then their neighbor does another 10 units, and then another 10 units. Do we have a process to save all those up so that when you run your next model, or annually, or whenever, we've got all those changes tracked and implemented in your model? Jeff agreed that we need to be mindful of whether we are approaching max build-out conditions. David explained that the standard process is to update your master plan every five years. In ten years, you will update your full planning document. It's a twenty-year planning document. So within ten years, you should be partway through your capital improvement plan, and then it's time to update and look out another twenty years. That is typically when people update the model to reflect all the minor changes that are coming in.

Brian asked how the District documents all changes so we can ensure everything is included in the next update. David explained what he would do when updating the model. He gets a new parcel shapefile from the county. He would also receive new aerial imagery and the District's report on how many sewer connections were sold. Then, what our modelers do is connect a digital line from the houses to the sewer line. And that's where it determines where the sewer flow is getting injected into the sewer lines. We would have the old model behind it, looking at things. But there would be a bunch of vacant lots in the old model that now we can see our homes between your sewer accounts, the county parcels, and the aerial imagery, and we'd be drawing new lines for those. So that's how we would typically update it when it's a small thing. If it's a development, we're going to have a list of all the model runs we did for developments, when they're major developments, and those all get incorporated into the new model. We can include those at any time. Brian stated that it seems roundabout and complicated, because we would have to submit a permit application for every new connection. David agreed, but the value of our spending time updating one home compared to what it actually changes in the system would not change the sewer model. Brian asked whether we could add twenty connections to the map if we sold 20 permits in a month. David replied, yes, it's just a matter of how much time you want us to spend and how valuable it is. Brian is advocating running the model more frequently so we have as much updated information as possible. Bill asked how the City has been roped in and whether they will be given a copy of the map. David replied that the sewer densities we modeled, which we have consolidated into fewer categories, are the same as those we shared with the City during the master plan. Jeff replied that the City will be given a copy of the map. Jeff also informed the Board that he and Lorraine worked on preliminary development questions that he will present at the next board meeting. It will help collect the information on the development.

Adam reminded the Board that the policy itself was presented last month. It is not on today's agenda because we were waiting for board comments on that policy. That policy can come back before the Board at the February meeting for approval, then be sent to the City. If the Board is satisfied with the policy as written, it can vote to send it to the City in February. The City would then have thirty days to provide comments before the Board could approve it. Based on your meeting schedule, that likely means an approval of an amended policy at the April meeting. It is our view that it would be best to update the density map at the same time you update the density policy, as both are intended to work together and bring the District out of the interim density period. Those documents are different, as David explained, but they are obviously intended to work together. It doesn't make a lot of sense to update one without the other right now. So we wanted to present the density map today so you could get a sense of perspective as you look at the policy, but we're not there yet in terms of the process for actually updating the policy. Adam, from a process standpoint, if any Board member has comments on the draft policy from last month, could you get them to us? We can then hopefully incorporate them for the February meeting and approve the policy to be presented to the City. We are still operating under the existing policy and map. And as David was explaining, as far as certain space and categorization, right, that will change with the new map and the new policy, but it hasn't changed yet. Jeff stated that, under the new policy, everything in a category C basin will become a category B basin, allowing them to reach the current density set on the map. As it is a category C basin, it's one connection per acre or per lot right now.

Engineer's Report

Maggi reported that we finalized the design for lift station 27 and submitted it to DEQ, so we're

just in a holding pattern until we get their approval. We have a couple of projects we're kicking off that are funded under the DEQ funding signed last month: Lake Street, the CIPP endpoint repair under the buildings over there by the beach. We are starting the design as well as the blower upgrades at the wastewater treatment plant. We have the kickoff meeting for the design on that today. We are holding off on starting Wooley until after the JWAG meeting to see if we can coordinate more with the City, because they're going to do a street reconstruction over there. The QLPEs have been pretty quiet. We did get one for Hardy Township, where they made some revisions to an old one, so she needs to resubmit that DEQ. Everything else she has been working on is related to the liner project.

David stated that the CM/GC is obviously the bigger piece that has moved forward on the liner. We finally heard back from DEQ, but they haven't officially sent us anything yet; they have the PER and are reviewing it. They will have some comments. They will require another tech memo about the temporary treatment option. They want more detail after the CM/GC is on board, and we actually know exactly where it's going and how it will be plumbed in. The liner inspection: District staff have been collecting data and conducting inspections. So far, we haven't picked up any water saturating through that embankment. Right now, the underdrain is keeping up, and the embankment is doing well. There's been no visual evidence of water seeping through or anything on the embankment. Bill stated that what you're getting is really evidence of stuff coming up from underground. We did a walk-through with the geotechnical team, and we should have a scope and fee from them. They're going to come in and provide a second opinion on the embankment to make sure we're not missing anything important to track. During the walk-through, they did not see any major flags. We had a meeting with them, and at least off the cuff, they seem to agree that watching for water in that embankment is the main thing. But they seem to think that some water in the embankment wouldn't be the end of the world; they agree that, at some point, it will become unsafe, so it's important to track it and monitor it. But right now we have zero feet of water in the embankment. David commented that there's not much else to report on the pond liner until we get the CMGC fully on board. We're waiting on all the constructability, the construction schedules, cost estimates, and the temporary treatment. We need to work with them to figure out which ones they work well with, and they are confident that they can get in on time and plumbed in. Brian asked what our look-ahead schedule would be for getting the CMGC on board and starting. David is hoping to have their contract before the Board next month. DEQ is reviewing, and it could be a week or two. Brian suggested that we hold a special meeting as soon as possible to review the contract, rather than waiting until next month. He would like to see this get going as quickly as possible.

Pond Liner Update

Combined with the Engineers' Report.

Legal Report

Adam stated that things have remained busy in the new year. Aside from what we've already discussed today, we've continued working on various aspects of the pond liner project. We've also been working to finalize the line extension transfer documents relative to the St. Luke's workforce housing project. Those, as of now, do follow the form documents, so those may not come back before the Board, but we are still working through those with the St. Luke's folks.

Staff Report

1. Tammie reported that we sold zero permits in December and January.

2. Tammie reported she has been busy working on the FY25 upcoming audit scheduled for February 3, 2026.
3. Tammie reported that we have a JWAG meeting on February 5, 2026.
4. Jeff reported that, as Maggie said, we did another QLPE on the Hardy projects, and he sees the project starting here sometime shortly. He did receive the plans from Crestline. The plans have been reviewed and returned with redlined items for them to fix.
5. Jeff reported that we received a sewer model run request for the same property that Maverick was looking into. It's for a 70-room hotel. We haven't received the check yet. As soon as he gets it, he will send that information to JUB so they can start the model run. His assumption is they'll run into the same bottlenecks Maverick did.
6. Jeff reported that the sewer model run came back from the City of McCall-owned property over by the Central District Health Building. Leap Housing paid for the sewer model run. That model run came back, and everything looked good, with no system upgrades required for that project.

Bill stated he wanted to hop in and play like a member of staff. He reported that he and Jeff met with the new mayor and the city manager yesterday. He thinks it was a good meeting and that he got some attention to the issue of what happens if there's a fire. If Idaho Power shuts off the electricity and the City leaves the water on, the sewer flows into the lake, which is what it will do. This is the second year I've presented it to them, and he wants this to be read into the record that we have been trying to instigate the establishment of a committee that would have a phone call before everybody ran around and filled the lake with raw sewage. It seems to him that since this is the main drinking water, it would be a big issue.


The other issue is that we've had people attending the board meeting, and they're more than welcome to attend. However, what we've had is people who have no connection to the system coming in, not members of the community who have no connection to the sewer system, and submitting written questions. He is suggesting a policy change: they can submit written questions if they wish, but they go to the Board of Directors. They must be accompanied by a statement from the people they represent, including the group they represent and the interests they have in the sewer district. Anybody who's been reading the ads Tamarack has been putting out is aware that they are back to their old methods of selling property: doing all sorts of interesting advertising, none of which is true. We've been getting a lot of gaslighting over the last year. And the basic way this runs is that the assumption that is being peddled is that all the problems with Cascade Reservoir are due to leakage from our pond. And I'd like to cut that off as close as we can here. We have a lot of data that indicates where the problems are coming from, and it's not coming from our pond, and most people realize that. I think if somebody wants to wander in and make points for selling real estate, that's fine. But I don't have to have them do it on our time. And I want to put a border between the staff and us, because they've been running around on this crap, and they need the protection. Tammie stated that she can get with Adam to update our public records request.

General Public Comment (Limited to 3 minutes per individual)

Candi Millar commented that she is glad to see the draft density map presented and will request a copy of the draft comments. Also, it's encouraging to see a new website, and hopefully, you can post these documents there. So people listening and sitting in the gallery here will know what you're talking about. So anyway, thanks for your efforts and Happy New Year.

Brian moved to adjourn the meeting, which was seconded by Dallas and the motion carried.

Submitted by: Tammie Richardson


William Weida, Vice-Chair

