

**AGENDA**  
**McCall City Council**  
**Special Meeting**  
**December 1, 2017 at 9:00 AM**  
**McCall City Hall (Lower Level) Legion Hall**  
**216 East Park Street**

**WORK SESSION**

**2017 Draft McCall Water Master Plan Presentation**

**Strategic Plan for the Library Expansion Project**

**ADJOURN**

Americans with Disabilities Act Notice:  
The City Council meeting room is accessible to persons with disabilities. If you need assistance, please contact City Hall at least 48 hours prior to the meeting at 634-7142.

**McCALL CITY COUNCIL  
AGENDA BILL**

216 East Park Street  
McCall, Idaho 83638

**Number AB 17-273**  
**Meeting Date December 1, 2017**

<b>AGENDA ITEM INFORMATION</b>				
<b>SUBJECT:</b>		<i>Department Approvals</i>	<i>Initials</i>	<i>Originator or Supporter</i>
<i>Strategic Plan for the Library Expansion Project</i>		Mayor / Council		
		City Manager	<i>AW</i>	
		Clerk		
		Treasurer		
		Community Development		
		Police Department		
		Public Works		
		Grant Coordinator		
<i>Work Session</i>				
<b>COST IMPACT:</b>	N/A	Parks and Recreation		
<b>FUNDING SOURCE:</b>	N/A	Airport		
		Library	<i>Meg</i>	Originator
<b>TIMELINE:</b>	N/A	Information Systems		
<b>SUMMARY STATEMENT:</b>				
<p>Presenting a review of the current project status by Meg Lojek, Library Director, and Heather Haynes, Expansion Committee Chair. The overview will be followed by consultants Beth Markley and Amy Rush presenting recommendations, observations and next steps followed by a Q&amp;A session and discussion. The goal of this work session is to consider possible funding options for this project within the context of the City’s Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) and fiscal year budget, and direct staff and Expansion Committee as to what else the Council would need to know in order to commit funding to the project.</p> <p>The Executive Summary Brief and Executive Summary One Page documents along with the 2018 CIP are attached.</p>				
<b>RECOMMENDED ACTION:</b>				
For discussion only. Council direction requested.				
<b>RECORD OF COUNCIL ACTION</b>				
<b>MEETING DATE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>			

**McCall Public Library  
Pre Campaign Planning Study  
Results, Analysis and Recommendations**

**Executive Summary**

**October, 2017**



## TABLE OF CONTENTS

---

Pre Campaign Planning Study Process .....	3
Organizational Strength .....	3
Leadership .....	3
Case for Support .....	4
Climate and Timing/Giving Potential and Personal Support .....	4
Final Thoughts .....	5
Recommendations, Observations, and Next Steps .....	7



## **STUDY PROCESS**

---

57 people were interviewed in a series of 44 meetings, including those with no current or previous official affiliation with the library, members of the Friends of the Library, current or former members of the board of directors. One former staff member was interviewed.

## **ORGANIZATIONAL STRENGTH**

---

The library is well thought of in the community. Many who use it recognize the need for updates and more space. Some do not use the library and wonder at its relevance in today's world. A few indicated they see the City involvement as a negative, or want more information on what the City's financial contribution will be. Overall, these two perspectives, while negative, were in particular far less prevalent than expected.

### **Recommendation**

- Update case materials should speak to the relevance of the library to nonusers (both for their benefit and that of library users), and the community at large.
- Identify the City's contribution and whether plans are being made for a bond levy and clearly spell this out in the case materials

## **LEADERSHIP**

---

Several names were suggested as potential campaign ambassadors. Ten respondents said they would be willing to serve in some capacity. Others would consider serving.

The staff of the McCall Public library is very well liked, and most respondents know Library Director Meg Lojek and feel good about the job she is doing.

### **Recommendation**

- Recruit campaign ambassadors within the business community and others who could tout the economic and community benefits of this project.
- Recruit a larger group of one to two dozen people to participate in a limited way in fundraising among their peer groups.
- Follow up with study respondents as soon as possible to get their response from the survey and consider becoming involved.



## CASE FOR SUPPORT

---

Respondents overall seemed clear on the need for a library, and relatively few questioned the relevance of libraries. There were various questions that a subsequent draft of the case should clear up, for example “How much will you be able to expand your collection with more space?” And “Will this new design accommodate what is projected for McCall for the next fifty years?”

### Recommendation

- State the “why” of the case with more stories and quotes, testimonials from community members or organization leaders, about how the library is used in the community.
- Emphasize the relevance of the library as a touch point/community center, since so many point to that as a primary function it now serves.
- Have data on hand for particular donors, including benchmark info for similar project and their expenses, data that supports the economic benefits to the community, data about staffing and accommodations the City has made to cover projected operating costs.
- Also, with regard to the architectural renderings, orient the reader with regard to the architectural plans more quickly in the document.
- Clarify the City’s contribution to the project.

## CLIMATE AND TIMING/GIVING POTENTIAL AND PERSONAL SUPPORT

---

The industry standard to estimate the feasibility of a campaign is to multiply the total gifts mentioned by a factor of 2.5 to 4 times for a range within which a campaign might be successful.

Since respondents mostly responded well to the message, the scope of the project, the organization, and the climate for a campaign of this size, it is reasonable to assume we may use the higher multiplication factor. However, the total response from this survey indicates a lower than optimal expression of support and few major gifts. **The total of the gifts indicated, times a factor of 4, results in an estimate of from \$1.4 to \$1.5 million.**

It is worth noting that campaigns can and do regularly raise far more than their campaign studies project, given the right fundraising team and a high level of perseverance. Of course, it is also true that campaigns can fail, even in light of favorable predictions. There are a number of factors that come into play during the course of a campaign that can impact its ability to achieve its goal.



Other campaigns being planned or currently active in the area are going to be a factor in this campaign, including the Ponderosa Center (\$30 to \$40 million), and McPaws (\$6 million). The St. Luke's campaign was referenced multiple times, however, they are within sight of their total \$5 million goal, and not likely to be a factor.

## Recommendations

- Set a modest campaign goal and work with the City to identify how the rest of the need will be met. Although the results of this study didn't come in quite at that level, a \$2 to \$3 million campaign goal would not be unreasonable.
- Identify and recruit campaign ambassadors as soon as the results of this survey are accepted by the board, and the campaign plan can be shared. Team members should be recruited for giving capacity as well as enthusiasm for the project. They will be well trained, and managed closely.
- Continue to try to connect with second homeowners. It will be critical to the success of the campaign to engage members of the second homeowner demographic on the campaign ambassador team to help expand our reach.
- Initiate conversations with area corporate and foundation representatives for leadership level gifts. Albertson's, Midas Gold and other corporate entities doing business in the area are good prospects.
- Finally, this is a project that would seem to be a good prospect for engaging a strong grassroots following, and every effort should be made to maximize that enthusiasm. This could be helpful in getting the word out for a future bond levy effort.

## FINAL THOUGHTS

---

In response to the question: "In 30 seconds or less, what would you say was the best thing this project had going for it?" some interpreted that to mean the library expansion project, some thought it meant the campaign.

- It's more than a library, it's a community center.
- The dedicated people who are working on it.
- The library expansion is needed.
- A great library can be a focal point of a community.
- We need to help people who want to learn more. Education is key.
- The new library will really enhance our community.
- It will give us a much-needed space for meetings and presentations.
- The library is the nexus for all the local organizations.
- It will be gorgeous and transform downtown, and it serves all ages and incomes



- The library provides inexpensive access for kids and a meeting space for the community.
- Meeting the needs of kids and a community meeting center.
- The library has proven to be in demand for many years, you have a strong argument in favor of the project, go for it!
- The need is there, people understand why it should be supported.

Interviewees were also asked if they had any final thoughts for the board of directors.

- I like that you really brought together the information from the public meetings.
- Unless the community is really educated on the need and what the library does, the numbers just seem too high.
- Be prepared for negativity because of the relationship with the City. Separate this campaign from the City as much as possible.
- Could the building be more “mountain-y” than this design?
- There needs to be more buzz in the community about the expansion project.
- I need more information on the long-term plan, and I would like them to seriously consider combining efforts with the Ponderosa Center.
- We need a better explanation of the construction and what the city is doing.
- Who are the architects?



## RECOMMENDATIONS, OBSERVATIONS AND NEXT STEPS

---

While the study process is critical to the development of a successful capital campaign, it has its limitations. The success of a campaign depends heavily on the commitment and the perseverance of the campaign ambassador team, effective leadership, a strong case, and a plan that starts at the top, focusing on the largest donors closest to the organization and moves out from there. Of course, there can be a number of outside factors in the success of a campaign that the organization cannot control, what happens to the economy, other campaigns, etc.

Therefore, the information in this document should serve as data from which to develop a roadmap for the campaign effort, rather than a hard-and-fast guideline. My recommendations include not only what I observed directly, but also what I've intuited after getting to know this project and the community of McCall a little better from the perspective of my experience in this type of project.

With that in mind, I have the following recommendations:

- **Establish a partnership with a 501(c)(3) organization as fiscal sponsor**, capable of accepting donations and managing a dedicated fund for this project. The City will not be an acceptable alternative to such an organization, regardless of its ability to accept tax-deductible contributions. There is no substitute for an IRS 501(c)(3) designation when it comes to foundations and corporations whose bylaws constrain them to give only to such entities, and there is a sizable contingency of prospective donors who will never give a contribution to a public agency no matter what the name on the check.
- **Establish an online giving portal and a relationship with a fund manager who can process gifts of appreciated assets pro bono or with only a minimal fee.** Giving to this effort should be as effortless as possible.
- **Set a goal of \$3 million for a capital campaign.** This is an amount that exceeds the \$1.4 to \$1.5 million projected in this study, but I believe that result is lower than it would have been had we had a specific leadership-level commitment from the City. In addition, I believe there was an impact to not having campaign leadership in place to test in the Leadership section of our survey. Having a strong team in place with committed leadership will lend significant credibility to this effort.
- **Advocate for the City to take on the responsibility for at least half of the amount projected to build this project, or \$3 million.** This may be through a combination of direct funding and a bond levy of some kind, but specificity in a plan for funding is key, and that funding should be substantial. This commitment will



serve as evidence that the expanded library is a priority. Especially in light of the competition for private funds in the community.

- **Begin recruiting a campaign ambassador team and chair for the campaign to be a part of the campaign development and training.**

- **Launch the campaign with an informational meeting and fundraising training session**, with the help of counsel, for those interested in furthering the campaign.

Training will emphasize the campaign timeline and explain the distinct phases of the campaign and the objectives of each. Not everyone will be involved in the leadership level outreach, but there may be a role for them at the outset anyway.



## McCall Public Library - Pre Campaign Planning Study: Results, Analysis and Recommendations, Executive Summary, October 2017

**STUDY PROCESS** - 57 people were invited to review the Library Expansion Campaign case for support and related materials in a series of 44 meetings from May – August. Interviewees included library users (including casual users and those close to the organization), non-users, and at least one former staff member.

**ORGANIZATIONAL STRENGTH** - The library is well respected in the community. Users recognize the need for updates and more space. A few wondered at the relevance of libraries in general or had concerns about City involvement (both in general and with concerns specific to McCall), however, such comments were less frequent than expected based upon the consultant’s experience with other such projects.

**LEADERSHIP** - The staff of the McCall Public library is well liked, and most respondents know Library Director Meg Lojek and feel good about the job she is doing. There were a number of names mentioned as prospective campaign ambassadors, and several respondents noted that they would like to be involved in such a capacity.

**CASE FOR SUPPORT** – Most respondents understand the need for a library expansion. Data on the economic impact of libraries, cost comparison information, and emphasis on the library as a hub for community activities could improve the Case for Support.

**CLIMATE AND TIMING/GIVING POTENTIAL AND PERSONAL SUPPORT** - There are a number of other campaigns that may affect our timeline and prospect pool, but respondents were generally optimistic about the potential for success of ours.

### RECOMMENDED NEXT STEPS

---

- **Establish a partnership with a 501(c)(3) fiscal sponsor.** Although the City can accept charitable contributions, there are those who would pause before making a charitable contribution to a taxing entity
- **Set a goal of \$3 million for a capital campaign.** While the revenue projections from this study range from \$1.4 to \$1.5 million, a more aggressive total goal is not unwarranted given the case strength, the economic climate, and estimated capacity.
- **Advocate for the City to match the public campaign,** for a \$6 million total.
- **Recruit a campaign chair and campaign ambassadors** and train in the cultivation of and approach to prospective donors.
- **Launch the campaign** with an informational meeting and fundraising training.



www.markley.com  
m: 208-484-4424  
e: beth@markley.com

**City of McCall, FY18 Capital Improvement Plan Project List, Note: This list is the Master List With All Projects and Equipment**

Project #	Project Name	Department	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	Total	Score
3149-2018-02	Downtown Core Redevelopment	LOT-Streets	700,000	4,150,000	1,800,000	1,700,000	-	8,350,000	36.57
3149-2018-03	E. Deinhard Lane Street Reconstruction	LOT-Streets	-	-	-	108,033	972,300	1,080,333	33.86
3149-2018-01	Idaho Street/Brown Circle Reconstruction	LOT-Streets	1,138,800	-	-	-	-	1,138,800	32.86
2557-2018-01	Library Expansion: Planning, Engineering, and Construction	Library	160,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	4,688,400	5,148,400	32.14
2859-2018-01	Wooley Boardwalk/ Pathway	Recreation	-	275,000	-	-	-	275,000	32.43
2859-2018-10	Legacy Promenade Repair	Recreation	120,000	-	-	-	-	120,000	32.43
3149-2018-04	Streets - Maintenance Improvement Projects (MIP)	LOT-Streets	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	350,000	1,750,000	32.29
2859-2018-04	Commercial Waterfront Improvements	Recreation	-	-	475,000	-	-	475,000	32.00
2859-2018-13	Warren Wagon Pathway	Recreation	-	45,000	-	-	-	45,000	30.29
2455-2018-01	STP Rural- Mission Street Reconstruction	Streets	-	330,000	-	-	2,039,000	2,369,000	29.86
2859-2018-15	Parks and Recreation Master Plan Update	Recreation	-	-	-	-	60,000	60,000	29.57
2859-2018-20	Riverfront Park Planning & Development	Recreation	-	-	-	125,000	800,000	925,000	31.43
2956-2018-09	East Parallel Taxiway Relocation	Airport	3,500,000	2,700,000	4,000,000	-	-	10,200,000	29.00
2956-2018-08	Update Airport Master Plan	Airport	250,000	-	-	-	-	250,000	28.86
2859-2018-14	Spring Mtn. Pathway	Recreation	-	-	150,000	-	-	150,000	28.71
5485-2018-04	Maintenance building addition	Golf	40,000	-	-	-	-	40,000	28.29
2859-2018-02	City Dock Replacement	Recreation	-	50,000	50,000	-	-	100,000	26.86
2859-2018-05	Davis Street Pathway	Recreation	-	-	-	130,000	-	130,000	26.71
5485-2018-05	New Maintenance Building	Golf	-	-	-	-	920,000	920,000	26.71
2859-2018-11	Lick Creek Road Pathway	Recreation	-	-	-	140,000	-	140,000	26.43
E2859-2018-17	Alternate/Replacement Equipment for John Deer/Tool Cat	Recreation	56,000	-	-	-	-	56,000	26.14
2859-2018-07	Harshman Skate Park Repair	Recreation	45,000	-	-	-	-	45,000	25.14
2956-2018-04	Apron Construction - Rehabilitate Remaining Apron Pavements	Airport	-	-	2,000,000	-	-	2,000,000	25.14
2956-2018-03	Apron Construction - Replace Surface lost to Txy Relocate	Airport	-	82,000	1,500,000	1,500,000	2,000,000	5,082,000	24.71
2956-2018-06	Install Airport Fencing	Airport	-	-	-	-	550,000	550,000	24.71
1044-2018-01	Senior Center Building Envelope Refurbish	Administrative	-	90,000	-	-	-	90,000	24.57
2956-2018-07	Apron Construction - Rehabilitate Hangar Taxiways	Airport	-	-	920,000	-	-	920,000	24.57
5485-2018-03	Club House Kitchen Buy Out	Golf	30,000	-	-	-	-	30,000	24.57
1042-2018-02	Fiber Optic Network Links to City Facilities - Information Systems	Information Syste	142,000	157,000	93,500	73,000	16,000	481,500	24.00
2859-2018-18	River Access	Recreation	-	-	-	-	65,000	65,000	23.29
5485-2018-01	Parking Lot Overlay	Golf	65,000	-	-	-	-	65,000	23.14
2956-2018-05	Increase Runway Length	Airport	-	-	-	-	240,000	240,000	22.71
E5485-2018-06	New Rough Mower	Golf	60,000	-	-	-	-	60,000	22.71
2956-2018-11	Storm Drain	Airport	-	25,000	-	-	-	25,000	22.57
E1050-2018-01	Marked Patrol Unit Purchase	Police	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	100,000	500,000	22.29
E2956-2018-02	Acquire SRE	Airport	-	-	-	500,000	-	500,000	21.86
5485-2018-02	Club House Heating/Cooling Upgrade	Golf	40,000	-	-	-	-	40,000	21.43
E2859-2018-12	Mini Excavator & Transport Trailer	Recreation	-	-	-	-	55,000	55,000	21.29
E2859-2018-16	Parks and Recreation Superintendent Vehicle	Recreation	-	25,000	-	-	-	25,000	20.71
2859-2018-06	Gold Glove Park Repair and Improvements	Recreation	29,000	-	-	-	-	29,000	20.43
2956-2018-10	Approach Lighting	Airport	-	-	-	-	300,000	300,000	20.43
E1042-2018-01	Datacenter Infrastructure Expansion - Accommodate Growth	Information Syste	27,050	16,250	19,500	16,250	19,500	98,550	20.29

City of McCall, FY18 Capital Improvement Plan Project List, Note: This list is the Master List With All Projects and Equipment

Project #	Project Name	Department	FY18	FY19	FY20	FY21	FY22	Total	Score
E2859-2018-08	1-Ton Dump - Landscape/Chipper Truck	Recreation	-	36,000	-	-	-	36,000	17.57
E2455-2018-02	Streets Dump truck	Streets	-	100,000	-	-	-	100,000	17.00
2455-2018-05	Public Works Facilities Plan	Streets	50,000	-	-	-	-	50,000	15.14
E2956-2018-01	Acquire Ops Truck	Airport	-	-	-	-	37,500	37,500	14.00
E2455-2018-04	Service Vehicle Rotation	Streets	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	33,000	165,000	13.86
2455-2018-06	Dust abatement tank storage	Streets	-	-	-	50,000	-	50,000	10.14
<b>Total</b>			<b>6,935,850</b>	<b>8,664,250</b>	<b>11,591,000</b>	<b>4,925,283</b>	<b>13,245,700</b>	<b>45,362,083</b>	

CIP	6,935,850	8,664,250	11,591,000	4,925,283	13,245,700	45,362,083
Operating Cap.	88,000	49,000	65,300	10,000	27,000	239,300
<b>Funded</b>	<b>7,023,850</b>	<b>8,713,250</b>	<b>11,656,300</b>	<b>4,935,283</b>	<b>13,272,700</b>	<b>45,601,383</b>
						-
Available	9,675,311	7,120,486	11,940,293	5,259,000	13,579,586	47,574,677
	-	2,621,461	1,028,697	1,312,690	1,636,408	6,599,256
Remaining	2,651,461	1,028,697	1,312,690	1,636,408	1,943,294	8,572,550
check	-	-	-	-	-	-

<b>Funding Sources</b>	<b>FY18</b>	<b>FY19</b>	<b>FY20</b>	<b>FY21</b>	<b>FY22</b>		
Local Option Tax - CY Revenue	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,900,000	\$ 2,058,033	\$ 1,222,300	\$ 5,180,333	
Local Option Tax - Fund Balance	\$ 1,596,250	\$ 2,800,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 4,396,250	
Water Fund - Revenue	\$ 252,750	\$ 200,000	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 552,750	
Sewer District	\$ 104,800	\$ 150,000	\$ 50,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 304,800	
Franchise Fees	\$ 65,000	\$ 1,250,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 1,315,000	
General Fund - Prop. Tax Capital	\$ 315,525	\$ 626,350	\$ 513,762	\$ 489,250	\$ 281,750	\$ 2,226,637	
General Fund - Fund Balance	\$ 394,659	\$ 399,400	\$ 113,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 907,559	
Streets Fund - CY Revenue	\$ 133,000	\$ 157,000	\$ 133,000	\$ 183,000	\$ 283,000	\$ 889,000	
Streets Fund - Fund Balance	\$ 185,000	\$ 100,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 285,000	
Library Fund - Fund Balance	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 240,000	\$ 240,000	
Recreation Fund - CY Revenue	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 256,000	\$ 200,000	\$ 56,000	\$ 512,000	
Recreation Fund - Fund Balance	\$ 35,000	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 35,000	
Airport Fund - CY Revenue	\$ -	\$ 31,150	\$ 376,788	\$ 150,000	\$ 561,750	\$ 1,119,688	
Airport Fund - Fund Balance	\$ 201,091	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 201,091	
Local Option Tax - Tourism	\$ 210,500	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 210,500	Recommended
MRA/Public Private Partnerships	\$ 48,000	\$ 65,000	\$ 225,000	\$ 5,000	\$ 54,750	\$ 397,750	Potential
Grants	\$ 3,482,275	\$ 2,934,350	\$ 7,988,250	\$ 1,850,000	\$ 4,504,750	\$ 20,759,625	Potential
Debt Service	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ 6,068,400	\$ 6,068,400	
	<b>7,023,850</b>	<b>8,713,250</b>	<b>11,656,300</b>	<b>4,935,283</b>	<b>13,272,700</b>	<b>45,601,383</b>	

**McCALL CITY COUNCIL  
AGENDA BILL**

216 East Park Street  
McCall, Idaho 83638

**Number AB 17-272**  
**Meeting Date December 1, 2017**

<b>AGENDA ITEM INFORMATION</b>						
<b>SUBJECT:</b>		<i>Department Approvals</i>	<i>Initials</i>	<i>Originator or Supporter</i>		
<b>2017 Draft McCall Water Master Plan Presentation</b>  <b>Work Session</b>		Mayor / Council				
		City Manager	AW			
		Clerk				
		Treasurer				
		Community Development				
		Police Department				
		Public Works	NTS	Originator		
		Golf Course				
		<b>COST IMPACT:</b>	~\$180,000	Parks and Recreation		
		<b>FUNDING SOURCE:</b>	N/A	Airport		
		Library				
<b>TIMELINE:</b>	N/A	Information Systems				
		Grant Coordinator				
<b>SUMMARY STATEMENT:</b>						
<p>For over 2 years, the Public Works/Water Department and SPF Water Engineers (SPF) has been in the development stages of a new Water Master Plan (WMP). Utilizing a 50% matching grant from the Idaho Department of Transportation, SPF was hired complete the technical analysis and draft the 2017 Water Master Plan. The plan evaluates the existing conditions of the water treatment and distribution system; documents the City's water rights; develops a hydraulic model for identifying deficiencies and forecasting system performance over time; defines current customer demand and forecasted growth over time based on historical data; and ultimately describes a 20 year Capital Improvement Plan that will meet regulatory requirements and establish industry standard maintenance and infrastructure replacement programs.</p> <p>The draft plan will be made available for public comment on November 30, 2017 and will also be submitted to IDEQ for their comments as well. SPF and City staff will present the 2017 (draft) Water Master Plan during this work session and paper copies of the draft will be provided at that time. The WMP Executive Summary is attached.</p> <p>Final revisions to the plan will be incorporated during December and a tentative public hearing for Council adoption is scheduled for December 28<sup>th</sup>.</p>						
<b>RECOMMENDED ACTION:</b>						
For discussion only. Council input and Q&A requested.						
<b>RECORD OF COUNCIL ACTION</b>						
<b>MEETING DATE</b>	<b>ACTION</b>					

## ***Section 1 – Executive Summary***

### ***Introduction***

The City of McCall owns and operates a water system that provides water service to over 3,200 service connections and a service population that can exceed 20,000 during peak usage. The purpose of this Water Master Plan is to provide the City of McCall a comprehensive planning document with information and recommendations necessary for the responsible management of the water system.

This plan reviews existing population and water demands, and uses available data to project future water demand over a 20-year planning horizon. The facilities for water supply, treatment storage, and distribution are evaluated with regard to Idaho Department of Environmental Quality (IDEQ) regulatory requirements.

### ***Overview of Existing System***

Payette Lake is the source of supply for the system, and provides consistently high quality raw water. Existing water system facilities include the following:

- Two raw water pumping stations
- Water treatment plant
- Two storage tanks
- Three booster pump stations
- Nine pressure zones
- 19 pressure reducing valve stations, and
- 89.6 miles of distribution system piping.

### ***Water Requirements***

- Average day demand (ADD) for the system is 1.1 million gallons.
- Maximum day demand (MDD) is 2.83 million gallons.
- Peak hour demand (PHD) is 5.34 million gallons.
- Over the past 18 years, maximum day demand increased at an annualized rate of 3.1%.
- Water demands are projected to increase at a rate of 3% annually over the 20-year planning period (which is consistent with growth projections published in the current City Comprehensive Plan). Current and projected water demands are shown in Table 1-1.

**Table 1-1  
Water Demand Projections**

Year	Equivalent Residential Units (ERU)	Average Day Demand (mgd)	Maximum Day Demand (mgd)	Peak Hour Demand (mgd)
2017	4551	1.10	2.81	5.34
2022	5276	1.28	3.26	6.19
2027	6116	1.48	3.78	7.18
2032	7090	1.71	4.38	8.32
2037	8220	1.99	5.08	9.64

1. ERU = equivalent residential unit, a unit of water system capacity defined as the average demand of single family dwellings.
2. mgd = million gallons per day

### **Summary of System Evaluation Results**

Overall, the water system facilities are in good condition and have adequate capacity to meet current water demands and IDEQ regulations. Major pumping, treatment, and storage facilities all meet current standards. However, some distribution system piping is undersized and incapable of delivering fire flow in certain areas of the system. These deficiencies have been identified and prioritized for future pipeline upgrade projects.

As water demands increase over the 20-year planning horizon, facility improvements will be needed to provide increased water delivery capacity. In addition, as facilities continue to age, upgrades will be necessary to maintain the required level of service.

### **Capital Improvement Plan**

Chapter 9 includes a detailed capital improvement plan to address existing deficiencies and future needs. An estimated \$12.6 million worth of water system improvements are identified over the next 10 years (2018-2027) in 2017 dollars.

- Distribution system piping upgrades are the largest category of projected capital improvements. Forty-two pipeline upgrade projects have been identified, comprising 38,000 linear feet, at an estimated cost of \$7.6 million over the next 10 years.
- The City will need to construct additional storage by 2026 in order to meet storage requirements for peak hour demand and fire flow. A 1.0 million gallon storage tank is included in the CIP at an estimated cost of \$2.2 million.
- Water treatment and pumping capital expenditures are estimated to be \$795,000 over the next 10 years.
- Additional firm raw water pumping capacity will be needed by 2019, and can be achieved by installing a standby generator at the Davis Beach Pump Station.
- Maximum day demand is projected to exceed the capacity of the water treatment plant in the year 2039. Planning, land acquisition, design, and construction of a new water treatment plant are projected to occur between 2029 and 2038. The timing and cost for

this major capital expenditure should be monitored and adjusted in future Master Plans as the City grows and water demands increase.

### ***Summary***

Overall, the water system is in good condition and is able to meet existing water demands. The City is fortunate to have an abundant source of high quality water in Payette Lake. Major capital projects undertaken during the past 25 years have the City well situated to meet current and future water needs. The water treatment plant has adequate capacity to meet maximum day demand through 2039 (at projected growth rates). Additional water storage capacity will be needed by 2026 to meet peak demand and fire flows. The largest current need is distribution system piping upgrades to meet fire flow requirements and replace aging infrastructure.

DRAFT