Payette Lakes Recreational Water & Sewer District

Regular Meeting
April 15, 2026

Directors Present

Ellen Holm, Chairperson (telephone)
Bill Weida, Vice-Chair (absent)
Dallas Young (telephone)
Todd Fereday
Brian Renstrom

Advisors Present
Adam Christenson, Legal Advisor (telephone)
David Watkins, J-U-B Engineers
Bennett Welco, J-U-B Engineers

Staff Present
Tammie Richardson
Jeff Bateman

Also Present
Craig Groves, Patron
Bill Henrickson, Resident

Todd Fereday called the meeting to order at 9:00 am, and Directors Brian Renstrom, Dallas Young, and Todd Fereday all answered roll call. Bill Weida was absent. Ellen Holm joined later.

Approve Regular Meeting Minutes for March 19, 2026

Brian moved to approve the Regular Meeting Minutes for March 19, 2026, it was seconded by Dallas and the motion carried.

Approve March 2026 Treasurer's Report

Brian moved to approve the Treasurer's report for March 2026, it was seconded by Dallas and the motion carried.

Set FY27 Budget Public Hearing Date for August 19, 2026

Tammie reported that she must submit the budget public hearing date to the Valley County Clerk by April 30, 2026.

Brian moved to set the FY27 Budget Public Hearing Date for August 19, 2026, it was seconded by Todd and the motion carried.

Ellen Holm joined the meeting at 9:03 am.

Consider Approval of Amended Density Policy of the District (Resolution No. 2026-2)

Jeff explained that, after the master plan was done and adopted, the density policy and the density map needed to be updated. Jeff commented that we made a few small changes based on their comments, but nothing major. David stated that we didn't have any comments on the map, so we reprinted the last version we submitted to the Board. The one on the wall right now is the current version that, if you vote today to adopt the policy, that map will be adopted. Adam stated there were just a couple of minor changes to the policies. The first was adding an accessory structure definition to the policy, which cross-references the definition used in the

District's accessory structure policy and cleans up that language. As Jeff indicated, it stemmed from a comment the City made. The second was lowering the threshold in section 5, Romanette 8, from 25 EDUs to 20 EDUs, which is what's in the resolution before the Board now. That was based on Jeff's suggestion that the 25 EDU threshold seemed a little high, to him. The Board could agree to that lower threshold here today, tell us to use the original 25, or pick a different number, but he did want to point out that it had changed. Otherwise, the policy in front of you is substantively the same as what you've already reviewed. Jeff explained that lowering that threshold comes from some of Brian's concerns and some phone calls he received from developers.

Brian moved to approve the Amended Density Policy of the District (Resolution No. 2026-2), it was seconded by Todd and the motion carried.

Consider Approval of Amended Density Map of the District

David explained that when he presented the map last time, he made some visual changes to better show the category B and category C basins. The biggest change is that non-residential densities are now shown. Where on the old map it was all just one color for non-residential, and the policy treated it all the same way. But now there's at least a level set for the non-residential ones. They go past it; they can still submit for a higher density because commercial is not as easy to pin down as residential. Todd asked if this was available to the public. David replied that he has a PDF version that can be shared or put on the website. He knows the City has requested a copy of the map. Brian asked about the date. David showed the Board the adoption date and a place for the Chair or Vice Chair to sign, with today's date set for adoption.

Brian moved to approve the Amended Density Map of the District, it was seconded by Ellen and the motion carried.

Consider Approval of Line Extension for Blackwell Subdivision

Jeff explained that this is a little development on First Street, just north of the Trails Edge development. They can have 6 connections. He sent the plans to Brian and Todd for review. Brian asked if these were single-family dwellings or condos? Jeff replied that there are single-family dwellings, or at least that's what's been presented to him. Jeff explained that he has preliminary drawings and will redline them as soon as the line extension is approved. He will send them back to their engineer so they can make the changes. After they do that, we'll send them on to JUB for their review as well. Brian asked about the demo plan. Jeff answered that it is where the Trails Edge subdivision is going to go, and all that's getting demoed as well. Brian was just wondering how all the pieces fit together. Jeff answered that he has their preliminary drawings. Once the line extension is approved and they have fixed what he redlined, he will send the preliminary drawings to JUB for the QLPE.

Brian moved to approve the line extension for Blackwell Subdivision, it was seconded by Dallas and the motion carried.

Consider Approval of CM/GC Storage Pond Construction Services Agreement with IMCO, Contingent on IDEQ Approval

David stated that we are one step closer. The agreement went back to IMCO yesterday. There are about three or four comments that need to be resolved. He feels it will be resolved in the next couple of weeks. We could have a Special Board Meeting to consider approval and award the contract for lift station 27. The Board tabled this item.

Engineer's Report

David reported he has been continuing to work on the liner project and the CM/GC contract. The PER has been approved. As it stands now, the only steps to start construction are the approved plans and specs, and the CM/GC will need to finish their cost estimating and construction schedule. Those would all need to be completed before construction can start.

There was a bid opening for lift station 27. We had two bids from Granite and K2. The price range was $445k to $467k, with K2 being the lowest bid. We will present more on this at the Special Board Meeting, but we've finished the bid evaluation. It just wasn't on time for the board meeting. With the current climate, he would not recommend rebidding. Tammie pointed out that it is within our FY26 budget, but it's just over the bid estimate.

David went over the Wooley and Spruce Street projects. Spruce is now at about 90% design. Woolly, we have it at about a 30%. It hasn't been prioritized yet because we'll finish that design after we get these other two out. Lake Street is now finished, and it's off to DEQ for approval.

David went over the collapsed line by the bridge. We submitted a tech memo to ITD. They rejected it and said they want to know more about groundwater and shoring, and whether shoring is required. We are now evaluating what a double-stack box would look like, how much excavation is needed, and whether shoring is required, based on the bridge's location relative to the sewer. It's not yet clear whether they'll approve the open trench. It looks unlikely, but they haven't officially said no a third time. Brian asked what their proposed alternative is. David answered that they want us to use one of the trenchless technologies, even though it costs more and there's a much higher risk that it won't work. Trenchless, especially in an area where you have large rocks or boulders, and if you do an unguided trenchless, there's a lot of risk of getting off path, and there's a lot of critical utilities in this area. So getting off path could mean drilling through a water line, etc. Brian stated we could make matters worse.
David explained that there is a very big cluster of utilities. If he had 10 years to plan out this project, we'd probably be going south and doing a new siphon on the south side. Because it's cleaner to the south, but the problem is the siphons on the north side of the bridge. That is the situation we're in right now. Some trenchless methods, like pipe bursting, have merit but still pose a significant risk. Then, after you do that, the final pipe will not be ideal. It'll have a big hump, just like the existing pipe. Jeff commented that pipe bursting could make it even worse, causing the bathroom to back up all the time. Todd asked if the trenchless method doubles the price? David answered that it could easily double the price. You're essentially hiring a sub to mobilize a large piece of equipment, and then you have to demo the park to the north to create a pit for it to sit in. Jeff commented that it's got to be at the elevation of the existing line. David commented that, with the surface repair alone, you're rebuilding the City's park because you have to demo the trees, all the signs, the paving, etc. Jeff said we would have to have a hole 13 feet deep, 15 feet wide, and 30 feet long right there.
Brian stated that the City won't be very happy with that, and he wouldn't blame them; it doesn't sound like a good alternative.

David commented that the whole time we'll have to use kid gloves on the water main there because two water mains cross the river and feed the entire west side of town. Brian asked about rerouting, and David explained the issues with that.
Jeff stated that, at this point, if we have a spill, he will blame ITD because they aren't allowing us to fix our critical infrastructure.
David reported that JUB prepared soil sampling maps for the operators to use when soil sampling on the reuse sites scheduled for April 29. We are also working on submitting a seepage testing procedure. We wrote a seepage testing procedure for pond one at the treatment plant. That's been a compliance item for a few years, but we were waiting to hopefully do the dredging on pond one first. DEQ requested we do it now, and after we dredge. We wrote a procedure that the staff is reviewing right now.
Bennett gave a summary of the funding options he is looking into. He has looked into about five funding agencies across six programs. The first one is through the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, the Section 595 Rural Idaho Program. It's a 75/25 split grant, with them fronting 75%. It's a really competitive program because it's pretty solid and easy to apply to. You give them a general overview of the project and its cost, and they add it to their spreadsheet. Every year, when they're distributing funds, they review and decide which projects to fund. I put a lot of our projects that are kind of in the near future on that list. 2026 had already been assigned, so fiscal years 2027 and 2028 will be eligible. As for the Bureau of Reclamation, they have two WaterSmart grants. One is a small-scale water-efficiency grant, and that one's kind of a bread-and-butter meter project. He spoke with them, and they said that our metering replacements, if we can argue that they're upgraded and not one-to-one replacements, which they are, they'll go 50-50 on construction costs and give up to $125,000. That application is due in June. There's a Water Smart Drought Response Program that seems to cover most of our infrastructure upgrade projects, with a 50-50 split and funding up to $1.5 million. That one's due in late July. He also looked into the USDA Rural Development, the water waste disposal loan and grant program. That one: because the median household income in the area is so high, it's unlikely we'll get any grants, but they'd work with us on loans if we wanted to. The pipe improvement projects could cost about $1 to $2 million per year for five years, according to the Master Plan, and we may also be able to include lift-station projects. That one has strings attached because it's federal, so we need BABA, but we can apply at any time for the IDEQ state agriculture BMP grant. That one's a 60-40 split with a maximum of $250,000. He was talking to some of our guys, and we think that if we didn't want to do the water-smart meters, we could maybe swing the meters for an agricultural BMP. The final one, he believes, the City sent: it was the BRIC grants. That's a potential opportunity. He wasn't able to look into it too deeply, though, because that's a DHS one. He will contact them when they are back in the office and see if he can learn a little bit more about it. Based on what he was reading, it seems like we would be eligible for that one as well. David commented that one reason we're not seriously considering adding the already-funded projects to that water-smart one for BOR is that you can't start construction until you go through the application process and get approval. If we tried to blend it into the liner project, which already has two agencies funding it, that would pause the project, and we wouldn't be able to start construction. It would be better to flag other projects in the Master Plan.

Pond Liner Update

Combined with the Engineers' Report.

Legal Report

Adam reported that, aside from things we've already discussed, such as the density policy and topics we'll discuss later, we have continued to assist with the CM/GC contracting effort. As David indicated, hopefully, we are getting close to that. There have been a number of one-off things that we've been working with Jeff on that we don't need to discuss today. The only other thing I would mention is that the legislature did adjourn, which is always nice, and he is not aware of any new laws that will directly or materially impact the District from this session.

Consider Approval to Purchase Hose from Fire Safety USA, not to Exceed $5,885.00

Jeff explained that there's been a bit of a mix-up with this whole process of getting this hose. When he initially reached out to them, he thought we were getting a heck of a deal here for $3,200. They came back to him, said they had a mistake on their website, and could not honor that price. He thought he had told them he could purchase it at this time, pending Board approval. He then received an invoice for $5,885 with a $3,243.85 credit, so he thought we had received a discount on the hose, not realizing they had charged the credit card for $3,243.85. He had misread the invoice. The total cost of that 1200-foot hose is $9,128.85, which is still a good deal. He commented that we were able to complete the bypass for the Dawson Street project with a 427-foot hose, but that's all we had, and thankfully, we had enough to get it done. He reminded the Board that the hose is older, and staff conducted a simulation at the wastewater plant to ensure everything would be watertight before the Dawson bypass. The new hose will be strictly used for bypassing, not for reuse projects. We need to know we'll have adequate hose so we don't have to worry about spilling when we're doing a planned or emergency bypass. Tammie commented that she got with Adam, and he said that when the Board makes the motion, have them add this as the additional amount needed for approval, since we still need the hose and it's still an okay deal. She went over the policy we follow: if the amount is less than $5,000, we don't come before the Board, but if it's over $5,000, we request the Board's approval. We want to be transparent about the fact that the hose is really $9,128.85.

Brian moved to approve the purchase of the hose from Fire Safety USA for an additional amount of $5,885.00, it was seconded by Ellen and the motion carried.

Update on April 2, 2026 JWAG Meeting

Jeff reported that he thought the meeting was pretty good. He went through the District's upcoming projects. We also went over some of the emergency response stuff that Bill's really diving into. Tammie reported that Nathan gave us an update on the upcoming City projects. Michelle let us know the City is starting the comprehensive plan with the kickoff this month. They will be in touch with us on that kind of stuff.

Staff Report

1. Tammie reported that we sold 6 permits in March and have sold 2 so far in April.
2. Tammie commented that she will start the FY27 rough draft for presentation at the May board meeting.
3. Tammie informed the Board that she will be attending a Budget/Levy workshop held by the Idaho State Tax Commission in May.
4. Jeff reported on the Dawson Street project. There was a three-way manhole on Dawson Street, and the base was cracked from installation back in the day. He had the staff try to fix it with our chemical grout. Still, it did not work, so we decided to replace it during construction on Dawson St. We set up a bypass for Monday to have the new manhole

installed, plus an additional manhole that they were going to install for the Dawson project as a doghouse. Jeff told them (Dawson contractor) why we're doing the bypass for our manhole to get a precast manhole to stick there instead of the doghouse, because he does not like the doghouse. Everything was going well until they set the base of our manhole, and found out the precaster had the slope off. We had to keep our bypass going so they could get a new manhole. That same night, the contractor did not put a plug in the 8-inch line in the new manhole west of where ours was (the Dawson project), which stubs out to the south. Sometime during the night, their pump quit working, and there's a little slew right there, right next to that manhole that bank gave away. It put thousands of gallons of water into our system, plus the guys worked for 8 hours cleaning the line. We got 6 & 1/2, thirty-gallon buckets of gravel and grit out of our line. In the process of that, we were using the white whale (hydrovac) with the sucker on it, and it quit working again and started acting just like it did before. We will have to get that back to the shop to see what's going on again. He told the contractor that we would be charging for staff and equipment cleaning on that line. If we don't apply the emergency rates on this project, the invoice will be $5,380 for our normal rates. If we want to charge the emergency rates, the amount is $10,480. He is fine either way, but wanted to get the Board's input. He wants to talk to the contractor to get their price for installing that manhole and see if we can go ahead and swap invoices. Todd asked whether the manhole base was just cast incorrectly. Jeff replied that the slope where the 8-inch existing line on Dawson tied into the grade was not properly poured by the precaster to connect to the existing 8-inch line.

Todd asked how many times our cleaner has broken down in the past year. Jeff stated 3, and it's 15-16 years old. It was lemon from day one. We've had issues with it several different times. There's a lot of history behind this. We had spent $10,000 a few months ago getting it repaired. Brian asked about investigating a replacement for next year's budget. Jeff replied that he has thought of that, but it won't be cheap, as it will need to be a custom build to fit on our barge. Jeff explained that the District purchased the cleaner to clean the lines around the lake because we were losing access points to all of our lift stations. Homeowners didn't want us going through their property with the Honey Dippers or the septic system people, truck haulers to get their pump equipment & hoses down through their property. It was a special build, so it would adequately fit on that barge. Todd asked if he thinks we can get it fixed. Jeff replied we are going to try. When we took it down there last time, they told us we flushed everything we could, but there's no doubt there are microfibers and metal fibers throughout this whole hydraulic system, because the pump blew up and sent all those microfibers everywhere. Jeff stated that the unfortunate part is that there are fewer than 1000 hours on it.
Brian went back to the emergency versus non-emergency and asked whether staff were working 8 to 5 or after hours. Jeff answered that it was during the day. He also showed the Board a picture of all the debris coming down our pipe. He is fine with the regular rate on that, just because it probably could have been done faster if we had the white whale working.

5. Jeff reported that he is working with Crestline on the E4 project. To his knowledge as of yesterday, we have not heard from the property owner about where we want to reroute that line on the river down here to eliminate 300 feet of the easement and reroute it to where it has only 60 to 70 feet of easement.

6. Jeff went over the Hormaechea project. ITD has agreed to them digging the State right-of-way, but they gave the impression that they want to keep both lanes open. Crestline will need them to revise plans because ITD dinged them on the PVC pipe, which we knew they would.

General Public Comment (Limited to 3 minutes per individual)
Craig Groves, 154 Shadows Trail, Donnley. He wanted to bring to the board's attention that the West Central Economic Development Council is holding a workshop over the next three days on housing affordability in the valley, and he would welcome your attendance. Also, regarding the State, in the last legislative season, Adam mentioned there were no bills that affected the District, which he agrees with, but he wanted to bring the board's attention to Senate Bill 1354 regarding accessory dwelling units. The state legislature, of course, recognizes the housing affordability issue statewide, and they passed this bill. It doesn't affect the City of McCall because it has fewer than 10,000 people. But I thought I'd bring this to your attention so that, as time passes, it might be something the District has to deal with. Thank you.

Executive Session:

a. Pursuant to Idaho Code § 74-206(1)(d), To consider records that are exempt from disclosure as provided in chapter 1, title 74, Idaho Code.
b. Pursuant to 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.

Brian moved to enter into Executive Session, Idaho Code § 74-206(1)(d) it was seconded by Ellen. In a roll-call vote, the motion carried unanimously, with Dallas, Ellen, Brian, and Todd answering aye.
Brian moved to enter Executive Session under Idaho Code § 74-206(1)(f), it was seconded by Dallas. In a roll-call vote, the motion carried unanimously, with Dallas, Ellen, Brian, and Todd answering aye.

Decision from Executive Session
No action was taken.

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

Submitted by: Tammie Richardson

Ellen Holm, Chairperson