

SUB 25-013 – List of Exhibits

Exhibits Received During Public Hearing on July 10, 2025

- Exhibit 1 – Daniel A. Nevala, Arkoosh Law Offices, legal representative of the property owners, requested that Commissioner Roberts disclose the prior business relationship and consider recusing himself from this matter. (July 3, 2025)
- Exhibit 2 – Michelle Eld Lowen, current property owner of the proposed subdivision, wrote in favor. (July 3, 2025)
- Exhibit 3 – Zach Lowen wrote in favor of the proposal. (July 3, 2025)
- Exhibit 4 – Dan Coonce, Valley County Public Works Engineer, stated Valley County owns a 70-ft right-of-way along Gold Fork Road just south of the parcel. County-maintained roads that would see increased traffic include Gold Fork Road. It is expected that transportation services would be impacted by increased traffic. Recommendations for mitigation were listed. (July 2, 2025)
- Exhibit 5 – Austin Jones, a property owner in Simpco Estates, is opposed to the addition of access through Simpco Estates. (July 7, 2025)
- Exhibit 6 – Draft Wildland Urban Interface Fire Protection Plan (July 8, 2025)
- Exhibit 7 – Applicant's Slide Presentation (July 10, 2025)

SUB 25-013 – List of Submittals and Testimony from Agencies / Experts

1. Brent Copes, Central District Health, stated subdivision application, fees, test holes, ground water monitoring and engineering report are required. (July 1, 2025)
2. Neil Shippy, Water District 65 Watermaster, stated the property has a portion of two water rights. An irrigation system to deliver water to each parcel is required per Idaho Statute 31-3805. (June 16, 2025)
3. Jerry Holenbeck, Donnelly Fire Marshal, listed requirements for roads, driveways, addressing, fire protection water supply, and wildfire prevention. All roads shall be inspected and approved by Donnelly Fire prior to final plat. A 30,000-gallon underground water storage tank is required. (June 23, 2025)
4. Dan Coonce, Valley County Public Works Engineer, stated Valley County owns a 70-ft right-of-way along Gold Fork Road just south of the parcel. County-maintained roads that would see increased traffic include Gold Fork Road. It is expected that transportation services would be impacted by increased traffic. Recommendations for mitigation were listed. (July 2, 2025 - Exhibit 4)
5. Email Correspondence between the applicant and Brandon Flack, Idaho Department of Fish and Game (IDFG) Regional Technical Assistance Manager with information and recommendations for avoiding and minimizing impacts. IDFG does not believe a wildlife impact study of the project property would provide significant new information about wildlife in the area. (April 25, 2025; August 13, 2025; August 19, 2025) *This information is also included in Section 12 of the application.*
6. Kendra Conder, Idaho Transportation Department, would like to review a master site plan for this subdivision to better understand the impact at full buildout. ITD reserves the right to make further comments. (July 25, 2025; August 18, 2025)
7. Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (DEQ) provided general comments on air quality, wastewater, drinking water, surface water, solid waste, hazardous waste, water quality, ground water contamination, and best management practices. (June 17, 2025; July 28, 2025)

SUB 25-013 – List of Submittals and Testimony from Public

1. Simpco Estates POA Board of Directors are opposed to any proposal for secondary road access through Simpco Estates. The paved roads within Simpco Subdivision were paid for by property owners in a shared cost arrangement with Valley County; these include Barker Lane, Barker Loop, Zoon Lane, and Leland Drive. Additional traffic would increase wear on the streets and negatively impact Simpco Estate property owners. (June 21, 2025) *Staff: HOA paid for the oil to make the asphalt per McFadden.*
2. Bob and Gerry Luffel, Barker Loop, stated this first phase of development seems reasonable and consistent with surrounding area. They oppose any future road access from Eld Ranch Estates through Simpco Estates. (June 21, 2025)
3. Kurt and Michele Stelling are opposed to any secondary access through Simpco Estates. They are concerned about the effect on wildlife; larger lots might be more favorable. (June 30, 2025)
4. Daniel A. Nevala, Arkoosh Law Offices, legal representative of the property owners, requested that Commissioner Roberts disclose the prior business relationship and consider recusing himself from this matter. (July 3, 2025 - Exhibit 1)
5. Michelle Eld Lowen, current property owner of the proposed subdivision, wrote in favor. (July 3, 2025 - Exhibit 2)
6. Zach Lowen wrote in favor of the proposal. (July 3, 2025 - Exhibit 3)
7. Austin Jones, a property owner in Simpco Estates, is opposed to the addition of access through Simpco Estates. (July 7, 2025 - Exhibit 5)
8. Andrew Chroninger, 534 Holmes Cemetery Road and Boise, borders the south side of proposed Phase 1. He is concerned with tree removal due to the required road width. This could cause erosion downhill towards his property. Leaving the trees would also block traffic noise to the adjacent neighbors. He is concerned about the number of additional wells. His well, dug in the early 1980's, had to be deeper than anticipated. Thus, he is concerned about impact to the water table. (Testified as "Undecided" during the public hearing on July 10, 2025)
9. Alisa Manley [spelling unknown] 264 Barker Loop, stated the area is pristine and provides wildlife habitat. There are a lot of meadows, and the elk migrate through the site. She is concerned about the impact of 70 lots on wildlife, the neighbors, and impact to wells. Growth needs to be accommodated but she is concerned about this pristine land and the impact seven phases would have on the area. (Testified as "Undecided" during the public hearing on July 10, 2025)
10. Jackie St. George, 89 Barker Lane, stated traffic and speeding has greatly increased over

past six years, particularly by gravel trucks and UTVs. Barker Lane is very dusty with deep ruts. The road collapsed in 2024 and created a 4-foot hole. There is an average of 20-30 gravel trucks per hour. Seeing the beautiful area developed makes her sad. The developer should be required to provide money for road improvement, particularly for Barker Lane. She paid \$4000 for small strip of dust abatement last year; however, it only lasted three weeks due to the large amount of traffic. (Testified as "Opposed" during the public hearing on July 10, 2025)

11. Lawrence Meredith, 95 Barker Lane, stated Barker Lane is a gravel road. The only speed limit sign is posted on west end of Barker Lane; one is also needed on the east end. Speeding is an issue on Barker Lane. The prevailing wind is southbound; thus, dust is horrendous on the south side of Barker Lane. The road was not designed for the large amount of traffic that is currently occurring. Elk use the proposed site as a corridor; many stay at Vicki Eld's old feedlot area and winter in the proposed subdivision area. The site is also used by deer and other wildlife. People who are moving here should pay for additional infrastructure, not long-term residents. Impact fees should be imposed. The developer should be required to pave Barker Lane. (Testified as "Opposed" during the public hearing on July 10, 2025)
12. Rick Avila, 12966 Zoon Lane, a Simpco Estates POA board member, stated the amount of people going north through Simpco Estates would far exceed any traffic going south through the proposed subdivision. He is concerned about the loss of farm and grazing land. Converting the site into lots of Phase 1 would lead to the approval of future phases. Other concerns include wetlands that provide wildlife with a source of water; the site is used as an elk migration route. This proposal is a waste of agricultural land. There are no trees in the additional phases; thus, homes would be very visible. (Testified as "Opposed" during the public hearing on July 10, 2025)
13. Austin Jones, Boise, purchased property in Simpco Estates in 2024; he chose the site for the rural area. Developing this area does not make sense since when there are many lots for sale in Valley County. Lots have been for sale in Simpco Estates since 2000. This proposal does not make sense for the rural area. (Testified as "Opposed" during the public hearing on July 10, 2025)
14. Richard and Deidre Avila, 12966 Zoon Lane, August 4, 2025, are opposed. Reasons are impacts to raptors, including Bald Eagles; interruption of elk migration and impacts to year-round use; the proposal is 2x the density of Simpco Estates; traffic and commuting concerns; and negative impacts to the water table, Laffinwell Creek, and the life of the wetlands. (August 4, 2025)
15. Jason and Jackie St. George, 89 Barker Lane, are opposed. Road improvements should not be paid by current locals. Elected officials should care about the environment that he current locals, live and work in. This would affect the farmers/ranchers and wildlife in the area. Dirt roads designed for ranching have turned into highways for speeding recreational vehicles, huge gravel trucks, and delivery vehicles leading to speeding, ruts, washboards, and potholes. proposed subdivision does not benefit the community. "Are we

to be a sea of multi million dollar secondary homes or a beautiful mountain tight knit community that serves its locals?" (August 18, 2025)

16. James and Toni Miller, 318 Barker Loop, are concerned with any future road access through Simpco Estates. Studies on traffic and environmental impacts are warranted. Over 60% of the lots in the adjacent Simpco Estates have no residential improvements; thus, additional lots will not bring local jobs and affordable housing. (August 19, 2025)
17. Ruth Johnson is opposed. Staff were unable to open the attached document. (August 19, 2025)
18. Merri M. Williams, 315 Barker Loop, supports the appeal letter. The application is incomplete. The impacts of the entire development plans should be thoroughly examined. (August 20, 2025)
19. Bob and Gerry Luffel, 303 Barker Loop, are opposed. Reasons include roadway and traffic impacts to Simpco Estates; wildlife impacts; Higher density than Simpco Estates due to lack of common area; and a dense development belongs closer to town. (August 20, 2025)