

City of Nampa
Board of Appraisers Meeting Agenda
Thursday, March 2nd, 2022, 1:00 p.m.
Nampa Development Services Center, 500 12th Avenue South
Basement Large Training Room (or via Microsoft Teams)

The meeting will also be held via Microsoft Teams Meeting (Call in (audio only) at

[+1 208-906-6272](tel:+12089066272).,773710220# United States, Boise

Phone Conference ID: 773 710 220#

Call to Order
Roll Call of Board Members
Proposed Amendments to Agenda
Staff Communications <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Underlying Irrigation Districts Summary of Landowner Requests for Exclusion of Water Rights – <i>Daniel Badger, P.E., City Engineer</i>2) Discuss Nampa Shares and Cares Uses – <i>Doug Racine, Chief Finance Officer</i>
New Business <ol style="list-style-type: none">1) Irrigation Rate Discussion Questions with City’s Response - <i>Tom Points, P.E., Senior Director of Public Works</i>2) 15339 N Shiko Way Trash Services Dispute – <i>Mireya Pena, Customer Services Supervisor</i>
Adjourn

**Underlying Irrigation Districts
Summary of Landowner Requests for Exclusion of Water Rights
Board of Appraisers
March 2, 2023**

Boise-Kuna Irrigation District

No requests were received from the Boise-Kuna Irrigation District since last report of December 12, 2022.

Nampa Meridian Irrigation District

No requests were received from the Nampa Meridian Irrigation District since last report of December 12, 2022.

Pioneer Irrigation District

No requests were received from the Pioneer Irrigation District since last report of December 12, 2022.

Utility Billing Nampa Shares and Cares Program Update
Doug Racine, Chief Financial Officer
March 2, 2023

Pending Submittal

Irrigation Rate Discussion Questions from citizen Hubert Osborne

1. *You brought up the subject of irrigation water rates being different for different zone classification this morning. This subject was discussed, and nothing done about it back when I was on the Board of Appraisers I would doubt if it is legal to set rates in this way and think it is time for this inequity to be corrected. At the same time, I think irrigation rates in general need a close look with an eye on revision for more fairness.*

Residential vs. Non-Residential (Example Attached)

Non-Residential pays a higher rate than residential. Excluding the paved surface for non-residential reduces the overall assessment back down to the residential rate. Based on the Cost-of-Service Rate Study (COS) dated November 16, the residential and non-residential rates are different because they apply to different metrics. The residential rates are based on total lot size, while the non-residential rate is based on pervious square footage (total lot size less impervious surface area). Prior to the study, the city charged all customers based on lot size. The recommendation was to move non-residential users to pervious area (as a representation of the potential area to be irrigated). Non-residential users are more likely to have parking lots and other significant areas that are not irrigated. The city's fee schedule does not call this difference out specifically, but the lot/parcel measurements in the city's utility billing database should reflect the correct measurements for billing purposes. The COS analysis found that non-residential users were overpaying relative to residential users. At the time the City adopted the fees, legal review was completed. There were no concerns from a legal standpoint. If non-residential is still being charged on total lot size and being charged a higher rate per square foot than residential users, this needs to be corrected.

2. *The exemption of large parking lots from paying the city portion. The underlying assessment by the irrigation company's is still collected and companies such as Walmart have made the choice to not use the water even when it is available. (Nampa Meridian Irrigation came unglued when the city put this in effect as down the line it is possible some serious claims to water rights may be raised) See Darin Coons if you need verification*
 - A. *Sq. footage used for all properties (irrigated portion) including residential would be more fair.*
 - B. *It would also solve the rate problem when people want a desert landscape which likely will be pushed in future years as we look at ways to save water*

Exception of large parking lots

During the COS, the city identified where the expenses for the system occurred. The study found that non-residential was paying significantly more than their fair share. The current methodology was created to correct the rate discrepancy.

The city does not have a full inventory of impervious area measurements for its single-family parcels (residential). If the city decided to use the rate structure to incorporate impervious for every property, the GIS division would need to be expanded significantly. The current staff is not

sufficient to incorporate the added workload for this rate structure. The city would like to continue to capture impervious area for non-residential for future stormwater costs.

Exception for Desert Landscape

In rate design, there needs to be a balance between equity (in cost recovery) and simplicity/feasibility. Setting the rate structure to charge based on the type of landscaping would be inefficient and not feasible administratively, given that customers can change their landscaping type at any time.

Changing from grass lawns to desert landscape would represent a reduction in expected demand, but not necessarily potential usage. By charging irrigation rates based on square footage rather than actual water consumption, the rate structure will charge for the availability of irrigation water instead of the actual volume of water used. To target reductions in irrigation water use, metering and charging for direct usage would be the best approach.

Nampa applied for a grant to fund a portion of customers cost to convert to desertscape. If awarded the grant the City will be able to hire a staff member to administer the program with the grant funds and they can review the rate structure. Any rate deduction would be small since we still need to provide service to the property. The cost to meter the entire irrigation system is \$60 million and not feasible.

- 3. Irrigation water is assessed in two tiers with a break at 1/2 acre. I think an even rate based on usable Sq. ft. would be more fair.*

Two Tier Assessments

The intent of this tiered structure is unknown to current staff. The assumption is the lower rate for the higher tier was set up to mitigate the rate impacts to customers with large lots. The larger lots are more likely to have land areas which are not irrigated. This brings up the question again between expected vs. potential water demand. The city could research developing a uniform rate per square foot or increasing the number of tiers. During the COS, the decision was not to modify the two-tier rate structure as it would have significantly increased the assessment to large parcels. Large lot customers pay the higher rate up to the ½ acre and then the remainder of the parcel above the ½ acre pays the lower rate.

City of Nampa
 Fee Change Request Form

Department **Public Works - Water - Irrigation Rates** Effective Date **03/01/2023**

Trans Code	New Fee?	Description	Current Revenue	Proposed Revenue	Percent Change*	Est Annual Dollar Incr
	No	Residential Irrigation Base Charge	\$19.40	\$20.56	6.00%	
	No	Residential Irrigation Tier 1	\$0.0137	\$0.0145	6.00%	
	No	Residential Irrigation Tier 2	\$0.0001	\$0.0001	6.00%	
	No	Residential Irrigation No Benefit Base Charge	\$19.40	\$20.56	6.00%	
	No	Residential Irrigation No Benefit Tier 1	\$0.0034	\$0.0036	6.00%	
	No	Residential Irrigation No Benefit Tier 2	\$0.0003	\$0.0003	6.00%	
	No	Non-Residential Irrigation Base Charge	\$19.40	\$20.56	6.00%	
	No	Non-Residential Irrigation Tier 1	\$0.0219	\$0.0232	6.00%	
	No	Non-Residential Irrigation Tier 2	\$0.0016	\$0.0017	6.00%	
	No	Non-Residential Irrigation No Benefit Base	\$19.40	\$20.56	6.00%	
	No	Non-Residential Irrigation No Benefit Tier 1	\$0.0055	\$0.0058	6.00%	
	No	Non-Residential Irrigation No Benefit Tier 2	\$0.0004	\$0.0004	6.00%	

Comments

Tier 1 = Total lot square footage under 21,780
 Tier 2 = Total lot square footage over 21,780

Comments on Competitiveness of New Rate

Increase of 6.0%

Reasons why Fee Change is Needed and What New Funding will be Used for

Rate increase needed for operations and maintenance.

33,413.59 sq ft

Residential Municipal	Tier 1	0.016427366	x 21,780 sq ft	\$357.79
	Tier 2	0.001205929	x 11,633.59 sq ft	\$14.03
Pioneer Irrigation District	Tier 1	0.00312063	x 21,780 sq ft	\$67.97
	Tier 2	0.00181275	x 11,633.59 sq ft	\$21.09
Irrigation Base Rate				\$23.27

Total Due \$484.14

33,413.59 sq ft

Non-Residential Municipal	Tier 1	0.026230311	x 21,780 sq ft	\$571.30
	Tier 2	0.001923483	x 11,633.59 sq ft	\$22.38
Pioneer Irrigation District	Tier 1	0.00312063	x 21,780 sq ft	\$67.97
	Tier 2	0.00181275	x 11,633.59 sq ft	\$21.09
Irrigation Base Rate				\$23.27

Less Impervious 20,000 sq ft

Non-Residential	Tier 1	0.026230311	x 13,413.59 sq ft	\$351.84
Pioneer Irrigation District	Tier 1	0.00312063	x 21,780 sq ft	\$67.97
Pioneer Irrigation District	Tier 2	0.00181275	x 11,633.59 sq ft	\$21.09
Irrigation Base				\$23.27

Total Due \$464.17

memo

City of Nampa

To: Board of Appraisers
 From: Mireya Pena
 CC:
 Date: 02/10/2023
 Re: Trash dispute 15339 N Shiko Way

Comments: Ms. Hays residing at 15339 N Shiko Way is wanting to dispute paying trash services. She is on a fixed income and is having a hard time paying for trash portion when she is only setting her carts out every 3 weeks. She is currently billed for 95gal trash service \$32.56, 1 -95gal trash cart \$3.76, 1 -95gal recycling cart, plus tax for both cart rentals tax \$0.46, totaling to \$40.54 every billing.

We did suggest that having smaller trash/recycling carts would help in costs. The total for the smallest carts (48gal) would be \$30.44 every billing. She would like to not pay for any of it as it is a financial burden and has a very hard time hauling carts because they are heavy.

City codes are below that state the required service and giving the customer the right to appeal.

- **3-3-7. - Compulsory use of collection system.**

No person shall be permitted to refuse to accept the collection and disposal service provided for in this chapter. The temporary failure of any person to receive such service due to circumstances beyond the control of the city shall not exempt such person from payment of charges provided by this chapter.

A.

Collectors shall collect refuse from each residential customer at least once each week or as may otherwise be provided by the city. Provided, however, that for all public buildings, hospitals, hotels, buildings and boarding and rooming houses or any other premises within the city designated by the responsible authority, all garbage shall be collected, removed and disposed of at least once each day.

(Ord. 2087)

- **3-3-9. - Occupant responsibilities.**

A.

Unless other arrangements are made with the collector, it shall be the duty of every occupant within the city to ensure the regular and timely removal of all refuse from their premises by making certain that all refuse containers are placed in a location reasonably accessible to the collector prior to regularly scheduled times of collection. "Reasonably accessible" shall mean within ten feet of a regular traveled vehicular way.

B.

Removal of all dead animals (except cats and like small animals) shall be the sole responsibility of each occupant.

C.

Removal of trees, construction and demolition waste, unwanted and abandoned vehicles and car bodies and all other large and bulky items of solid waste shall be the sole responsibility of each occupant.

(Ord. 2087)

- **3-3-12. - Appeal from service.**

Any person who will show cause for good and cogent reason(s) why they should be exempt from compliance with one or more of the provisions of this chapter or any ruling made hereunder, may petition the board of appraisers for consideration of an exemption or relief from such provisions or rulings.

(Ord. 2087)