James Miller
3833 Baja Way, Boise, ID 83709
[redacted]

President of Simco Estates HOA representative for Interested and Affected Property Owners

To: Cynda Herrick, Valley County Planning and Zoning Director

In the Matter of:

Project: Eld Ranch Estates Approval Opposition

The undersigned, representing interest and affected residential property owners, respectfully moves this Council to reconsider the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision made to Approve Eld Ranch Estates Development. The motion to reconsider is made pursuant to the applicable Idaho Code, Federal ADA, and Environmental Protection and is based on the grounds outlined below.

1. Traffic: The proposal doesn't adequately address offsite traffic improvements needed and state and federal ADA (disability) requirements. We request Valley County Require applicants to complete a traffic impact study, that also includes sidewalks, increased intersection traffic, road depreciation from construction equipment, signage and striping, bike lanes, school bus stop safety amongst other considerations that must be properly represented.

   The Simco Estates neighborhood specifically requires additional biking/walking room, signage and striping, intersection signage with the proposed development. Barker Ln into Simco Estates is currently a Dead End road in which a study must be conducted as the usage will change.

   Eld Ranch Estates Development has no language to culverts, drainage control, proper grading, aprons of entrances regarding the new proposed roadways.

   Nearby dangerous intersections that need "off site improvements" and proper studies completed prior to approval are as follows;

   a. Gold Fork Rd & Barker Ln, intersection traffic right away must be considered for proposal of road access through Simco Estates at Zoon Ln

b. Zoon Ln to proposed new road access.
c. Intersection of Barker Ln & Zoon Ln.
d. Intersection of Barker Ln & Barker Loop.
e. Intersection of Barrer Lp, Barker Ln, & Barker Lp.
f. Intersection of Barker Ln & Leland Dr.
g. Intersection of Gold Fork Rd & Farm to Market Rd.
h. Intersection of Roseberry Rd and Gold Fork Rd.
i. Intersection of Gold Fork Rd & Withers Ln.

2. A Required detailed wildlife impact study must be produced. The area is a major migratory corridor for big game and a haven for raptors and eagles. Several Golden Eagles live in the area. This development is adjacent to an existing wildlife corridor potentially resulting in legal implications. Additionally, environmental evaluation is required.
3. Wildfire: As wildfires rage through the rest, it's important for all future development considering the impacts of wildfire. Additional wildfire evaluation is required. 90% of wildfires are human caused, so a study is needed how this development will increase fire risk for neighboring properties. It is important to note that legal description of fire water access should be defined prior to approval.
4. Water: Laffinwell creek is a major contributor to the watershed, irrigation, wildlife and said 'reservoir' of the project. Water conservation and environmental impact studies are necessary to determine the continued existence and future impacts. It is also important to note that said 'Reservoir' is seasonal and does not meet the proposed usages. As well as only 'Phase 1' was noted in this proposal and Phase 2 is contains the direct impact.
5. Views: View corridor laws are to be protected and are not mentioned in this proposal. The new development will impact views and light pollution of surrounding properties as well as I-55 corridor.

Further Grounds for Reconsideration

Error in Factual Findings: The decision was made based on the factual findings that the proposed development does not create an adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhoods and environment, and is intended to improve local jobs and stimulate economic growth. However, there was insufficient consideration of the public testimony and written comments that raised significant concerns regarding traffic, safety, noise, and the overall scale of the development. These concerns warrant further investigation and discussion.

1. This proposal focuses on Phase 1 to pass the federal and local laws and regulations. It does not provide adequate documentation of the above-mentioned points for phase 2. Language throughout the proposal is inconsistent referring to 'phase 2' or 'parcel 2' in which should be required for accuracy and legal description. The due diligence must legally be met and is the responsibility of Valley County.
2. It is also important to note that this development is approximately three times the size of existing developments in the area and should not be able to use existing developments as a constituent for decision making or reference.
3. Furthermore, the said 'K2 Excavation & Construction' is not a local company, nor are the owners' primary residents based locally. It is Oregon based, and the owner full time residence is in Oregon. It is not in the interest of local jobs or revenue. Nor is Mark Young of Greater Good Investments primary residence reside in Valley County, however he is Idaho based.
4. The lot size, price stated, and building costs of a 'nature-centric' home of over 2,000 sq. ft, these homes do not meet the said, 'local affordable' as stated based on Valley Counties average income. No financial institute could loan on home in this area to say; a local teacher based on their average household income. This creates significant impact to the local economy.
    - Given the median household income in Valley County of approximately $76,000, the average "local resident" could afford a loan given financial institutions will only loan if the percent of income to housing is below 35%;
        - Home price $500,000
        - Down payment of 20%
        - Current interest rates 6.5%
        - Percent of income to housing = 42%
        - This shows that said development even at the lowest price point before taxes, insurances, and HOA dues are not intended to support local housing at an affordable price.
5. The inaccuracy of the feasibility of this proposed development demonstrates that it will only cause environmental impacts and financial harm to the local area if approved. Another development will cause prices to increase, further outpricing locals, harming our job market, school teachers whom already suffer from no affordable housing in the area and only caters to the wealthy looking to invest in 2nd homes and tax incentives.
6. The proposal references the following surrounding subdivisions; The Reserve, Elk Meadows, & Simco Estates. Currently there are 85% of lots unsold, owned by developers and or not built on. This does not match the reason for said Eld Ranch Estates to be necessary for additional housing and local tax implications.

7. These statistics show that new build is not viable on this side of highway 55 as the 'nature-centric' recreation area is west of highway 55. This side of highway 55 should be preserved to active farming, ranching, agriculture and wildlife.

Here's our major concerns. We ask that Valley County guarantee that all legal grounds and points can be met adequately and accurately prior to the final approval of Eld Ranch Estates.

Sincerely,

James Miller Sec/Treas

President – Simco Estates HOA.

Director - Simco Board Member

Simpco Estates POA
From: James Miller [redacted]
Sent: Wednesday, July 23, 2025 2:09 PM
To: Cynda Herrick <cherrick@valleycountyid.gov>
Cc: James Miller [redacted]
Subject: Simpco Estates POA

Hello Cynda,

The document that Elisa Manley dropped off at your office late Monday afternoon mistook my title as President of Simpco Estates and also misspelled Simpco as Simco. I am actually the Sec/Trea. Enclosed is a signed corrected document with the correct title and correct spelling of Simpco Estates. Please accept the amended document as the official letter in the appeal of Eld Ranch Estates.

Regards,

Jim Miller, Sec/Trea
Simpco Estates POA

James Miller
3833 Baja Way, Boise, ID 83709
[redacted]
Sec/Trea of Simpco Estates POA representative for Interested and Affected Property Owners

To: Cynda Herrick, Valley County Planning and Zoning Director

In the Matter of:

Project: Eld Ranch Estates Approval Opposition

The undersigned, representing interest and affected residential property owners, respectfully moves this Council to reconsider the Findings of Fact, Conclusions of Law, and Decision made to Approve Eld Ranch Estates Development. The motion to reconsider is made pursuant to the applicable Idaho Code, Federal ADA, and Environmental Protection and is based on the grounds outlined below.

1. Traffic: The proposal doesn't adequately address offsite traffic improvements needed and state and federal ADA (disability) requirements. We request Valley County Require applicants to complete a traffic impact study, that also includes sidewalks, increased intersection traffic, road depreciation from construction equipment, signage and striping, bike lanes, school bus stop safety amongst other considerations that must be properly represented.

   The Simco Estates neighborhood specifically requires additional biking/walking room, signage and striping, intersection signage with the proposed development. Barker Ln into Simco Estates is currently a Dead-End Road in which a study must be conducted as the usage will change.

   Eld Ranch Estates Development has no language to culverts, drainage control, proper grading, aprons of entrances regarding the new proposed roadways.

   Nearby dangerous intersections that need "offsite improvements" and proper studies completed prior to approval are as follows.

   a. Gold Fork Rd & Barker Ln, intersection traffic right away must be considered for proposal of road access through Simco Estates at Zoon Ln

b. Zoon Ln proposed new road access.
c. Intersection of Barker Ln & Zoon Ln.
d. Intersection of Barker Ln & Barker Loop.
e. Intersection of Barker Loop, Barker Ln, & Barker Loop.
f. Intersection of Barker Ln & Leland Dr.
g. Intersection of Gold Fork Rd & Farm to Market Rd.
h. Intersection of Roseberry Rd and Gold Fork Rd.
i. Intersection of Gold Fork Rd & Withers Ln.

2. A Required detailed wildlife impact study must be produced. The area is a major migratory corridor for big- game and a haven for raptors and eagles. Several Golden Eagles live in the area. This development is adjacent to an existing wildlife corridor potentially resulting in legal implications. Additionally, environmental evaluation is required.
3. Wildfire: As wildfires rage through the West, it's important for all future developments to consider the impacts of wildfire. Additional wildfire evaluation is required. 90% of wildfires are human caused, so a study is needed how this development will increase fire risk for neighboring properties. It is important to note that legal description of fire water access should be defined prior to approval.
4. Water: Laffinwell creek is a major contributor to the watershed, wildlife, and said 'reservoir' of the project. Water conservation and environmental impact studies are necessary to determine the continued existence and future impacts. It is also important to note that said 'Reservoir' is seasonal and does not meet the proposed usages. Only 'Phase 1' is mentioned in this proposal, while Phase 2 addresses the direct impact.
5. Views: View corridor laws are to be protected and are not mentioned in this proposal. The new development will impact views and light pollution of surrounding properties as well as the Hwy 55 corridor.

Further Grounds for Reconsideration

Error in Factual Findings: The decision was made based on the factual findings that the proposed development does not create an adverse impact on the surrounding neighborhoods and environment and is intended to improve local jobs and stimulate economic growth. However, there was insufficient consideration of the public testimony and written comments that raised significant concerns regarding traffic, safety, noise, and the overall scale of the development. These concerns warrant further investigation and discussion.

1. This proposal focuses on Phase 1 to pass the federal and local laws and regulations. It does not provide adequate documentation of the above-mentioned points for phase 2. Language throughout the proposal is inconsistent referring to 'phase 2' or 'parcel 2' in which should be required for accuracy and legal description. The due diligence must legally be met and is the responsibility of Valley County.
2. It is also important to note that this development is approximately three times the size of existing developments in the area and should not be able to use existing developments as a constituent for decision making or reference.
3. 'K2 Excavation & Construction' is not a local company, and its owners do not primarily reside locally. It is Oregon based, and the owner full time residence is in Oregon. It is not in the interest of local jobs or revenue. Nor is Mark Young of Greater Good Investments primary residence residing in Valley County; however, he is Idaho based.
4. The lot size, price stated, and building costs of a 'nature-centric' home of over 2,000 sq. ft, these homes do not meet the said 'local affordable' as stated based on Valley Counties average income. No financial institute could loan on home in this area to say; a local teacher based on their average household income. This creates significant impact on the local economy.
    - Given the median household income in Valley County of approximately $76,000, the average "local resident" could not afford a loan given financial institutions will only loan if the percent of income to housing is below 35%.
        - Home price $500,000
        - Down payment of 20%
        - Current interest rates 6.5%
        - Percent of income from housing = 42%
        - This shows that said development, even at the lowest price point before taxes, insurances, and HOA dues are not intended to support local housing at an affordable price.
5. The inaccuracy of the feasibility of this proposed development demonstrates that it will only cause environmental impacts and financial harm to the local area if approved. Another development will cause prices to increase, further outpricing locals, harming our job market, schoolteachers who already suffer from no affordable housing in the area and only cater to the wealthy looking to invest in 2nd homes and tax incentives.
6. The proposal references the following surrounding subdivisions; The Reserve, Elk Meadows, & Simpco Estates. Currently there are 85% of lots unsold, owned by developers and or not built on. This does not match the reason for said Eld Ranch Estates to be necessary for additional housing and local tax implications.

7. These statistics show that the new development is not viable on this side of highway 55 as the 'nature-centric' recreation area is west of highway 55. This side of highway 55 should be preserved to active farming, ranching, agriculture and wildlife.

Our major concerns have been stated. We ask that Valley County guarantee that all legal grounds and points are met adequately and accurately prior to the final approval of Eld Ranch Estates.

Sincerely,

James Miller

Sec/Trea – Simpco Estates POA.

Director

RECEIPT

DATE 7/21/25 No. 074227

RECEIVED FROM Limpia & Estates Property owners $ 1000.00

DOLLARS

○ FOR RENT
⊗ FOR Appeal of CUP 25-013

ACCOUNT	
PAYMENT	
BAL. DUE	

○ CASH [redacted]
⊗ CHECK
○ MONEY ORDER
○ CREDIT CARD

FROM _____ TO _____

BY _____

3-11

0006332013

STATE OF IDAHO
Office of the secretary of state, Phil McGrane
ANNUAL REPORT
Idaho Secretary of State
PO Box 83720
Boise, ID 83720-0080
(208) 334-2301
Filing Fee: $0.00

For Office Use Only
-FILED-
File #: 0006332013
Date Filed: 6/29/2025 1:41:04 PM

Entity Name and Mailing Address:

Entity Name:	SIMPCO ESTATES PROPERTY OWNERS' ASSOCIATION, INC.
The file number of this entity on the records of the Idaho Secretary of State is:	0000330123
Address	JAMES F. MILLER 3833 S. BAJA WAY 3833 S. BAJA WAY BOISE, ID 83709

Entity Details:

Entity Status	Active-Good Standing
This entity is organized under the laws of:	IDAHO
If applicable, the old file number of this entity on the records of the Idaho Secretary of State was:	C107034

The registered agent on record is:

Registered Agent	Bob Luffel Registered Agent Physical Address 1411 N COVE COLONY WAY EAGLE, ID 83616 Mailing Address 1141 N COVE COLONY WAY # 1141 BOB LUFFEL EAGLE, ID 83616-4689

The name and street address of the new registered agent and office in Idaho is:

Registered Agent	Registered Agent James F Miller Physical Address: 3833 S BAJA WAY BOISE, ID 83709-4424 Mailing Address: 3833 S BAJA WAY BOISE, ID 83709-4424

☒ I affirm that the registered agent appointed has consented to serve as registered agent for this entity.

Corporate Officers and Directors:

Name	Title	Business Address
~~Bob Luffel~~	~~Director~~	~~BOB LUFFEL 1141 N COVE COLONY WAY EAGLE, ID 83616~~
James Dugger	President	P.O. BOX 144 MCCALL, ID 83638
James F Miller	Secretary	3833 S. BAJA WAY BOISE, ID 83709
Rick Avila	Director	P.O. BOX 758 DONNELLY, ID 83615

Page 1 of 2

The annual report must be signed by an authorized signer of the entity.
Job Title: Secretary/Treasurer

james F Miller — Sign Here
06/29/2025 — Date

Page 2 of 2