Call to Order and Pledge to Flag

Invocation – Rev. Aaron Berkowitz - Nampa First United Presbyterian Church

Roll Call

Proposed Amendments to Agenda

(1) Consent Agenda (Action Items)

All matters listed within the Consent Agenda are considered to be routine by the Council and will be enacted by one motion. There will be no separate discussion on these items unless a Councilmember or citizen so requests in which case the item will be removed from the Consent Agenda and placed on the Regular Agenda.

1-1. Minutes
   a. Regular City Council Meeting – May 20, 2019
   b. Planning and Zoning Commission – May 14, 2019

1-2. The City Council dispenses with the Three (3) Reading Rule of Idaho Code § 50-902 for all ordinances

1-3. Final Plat Approvals
   a. None

1-4. Authorize Public Hearings
   a. Authorize Advertisement of Monday, July 1, 2019, Public Hearing to Present Recommended Fiscal Year 2020 Increases to Water Rates and Fees
   b. Authorize Advertisement of Monday, July 1, 2019, Public Hearing to Present Recommended Fiscal Year 2020 Increases to Water Hookup Fees
   c. Annexation and Zoning to RS-7 (Single Family Residential – 7000 sq. ft minimum lot size) zoning district, for Gemstone Subdivision at 3615 Southside Blvd (16 single family detached lots on 5 acres for 3.2 dwelling units per gross acre – a 5-acre or 217,800 sq. ft portion of the SE ¼ Section 20 T2N R2W BM), for Mason and Associates representing Lanco, Inc. (ANN-00119-2019)

1-5. Authorize Public Comment Period
   a. Authorize Staff to open up a CDBG 30-day comment period on June 14th for our Draft 2019 Program Year Action plan

1-6. Authorize to Proceed with Bidding Process
   a. Council authorize the Engineering Division to proceed with the formal bid process for the Indian Creek Pathway Extension (Taffy to Peppermint), Key No. 20141

1-7. Authorization for Execution of Contracts and Agreements
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*Or as Soon After 7:00 PM as Each Matter may be Heard
a. Council authorization for the Mayor to sign the Release of Lot Sale and Lot Improvement Delay Agreement (Exhibit A) for Lots 1 through 11, Block 8; Lots 1 through 5 and 19 through 21, Block 7; and Lots 30 through 48, Block 1 of Canyon Creek Subdivision No. 2

b. Authorize Mayor and Public Works Director to sign Task Order Amendment with Paragon Consulting, Inc. to provide construction engineering and inspection services for the Greenhurst Rebuild – Midland to Juniper project in the amount of $28,980.00 (T&M N.T.E.)

c. Authorize Mayor and Public Works Director to sign Task Order Amendment and Contract for Professional Services between the City of Nampa and Parametrix, Inc. for the Zone F Annual Pipeline Replacement project in the amount $ 93,519.00, Time and Materials Not to Exceed

   a. None

1-9. Resolutions
   a. None

1-10. Licenses for 2019
   a. Alcohol Renewal
      • Beer, Wine & Liquor for The Steel Horse Saloon located at 102 11th Ave N
   b. Alcohol New
      • None

1-11. Approval of Agenda

(2) Proclamations
2-1. None

Nampa Residents Wishing to Speak on an Agenda (5 persons limit) or Non-Agenda Item (5 persons limit) (3 Minute Limit)

• Boy Scouts of America - Mr. Lynn Gunter

Mayor & Council Comments

• Introduction of Butch Schierman, Director of IT

(3) Agency & Commission Reports
3-1. None

(4) Staff Communications
4-1. Staff Report – Tom Points
(5) New Business

5-1. **Action Item:** Award the bid and Authorize the Mayor to sign the contract with Consurco, Inc. for the Phase 2 Concrete Repair and Waterproofing Project for Hugh Nichols Public Safety Building for an amount not to exceed $175,487.00

5-2. **Action Item:** Resolution to Amend FY19 Budget

5-3. **Action Item:** 1st reading of ordinance modifying term end date for Nampa Development Corporation commissioners

5-4. **Action Item:** Reappointment of Randy Haverfield and Claudia Dina as Commissioners of the Nampa Development Corporation

5-5. **Action Item:** Appointment of the Workforce Development Director

5-6. **Action Item:** Middleton Rd & Lone Star Rd Intersection Improvement Utility Waiver Comments

5-7. **Action Item:** Discussion of Disposal of City Property/Paying it Forward

5-8. **Action Item:** Resolution for Disposal of Surplus Property for Fleet Department

5-9. **Action Item:** Authorize Mayor and Public Works Director to sign Amended Task Order for Professional Services between the City of Nampa and Keller Associates, Inc. for the Elevated Tank Replacement Study in the amount of $499,405.00, Time and Materials Not to Exceed

5-10. **Action Item:** Authorize Mayor and/or Public Works Director to Execute any Necessary Documents Pertaining to the Idaho Transportation Department Right-of-Way Acquisition of City of Nampa Cemetery Property

5-11. **Action Item:** (1) Authorize Addition of AECOM to 2018-2019 Request for Qualifications First Choice Hiring Roster, and (2) Authorize Mayor and Public Works Director to sign Miscellaneous Professional Services Term Agreement, and (3) Authorize Mayor and Public Works Director to sign Task Order for Scope of Work with AECOM for Benefit/Cost Ratio Determination for SH-45 Realignment in the Amount of $53,890.00 Time and Material Not to Exceed (T&M NTE) for Street Division

5-12. **Action Item:** Award bid to Paul Construction Inc. and authorize the Mayor to sign contract for the South Sugar Street Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk & North Nampa Bike and Pedestrian Improvements project

5-13. **Action Item:** Resolution Directing Staff to Proceed with Contracting Phase II of the Nampa Wastewater Treatment Plant Improvements and Approving Project Packaging and Project Delivery Contracting Methods

*Or as Soon After 7:00 PM as Each Matter may be Heard
(6) Public Hearings

6-1. Action Item: Continued from May 20, 2019 - Consider Project Packaging and Delivery Approach for Phase II Upgrades at Nampa Wastewater Treatment Plant

6-2. Action Item: Variance to Zoning Ordinance Section 10-8-6 requiring a 6,000 sq. ft minimum lot size within the RS-6 (Single Family Residential – 6000 sq. ft) zoning district, for properties located at 1217 11th Ave S (the NE ½ of Lot 9, Bk 59 Waterhouse Addition) and 1223 11th Ave S (the SE 100 ft of the SW ½ of Lot 9 and SE 100 ft of Lot 11, Bk 59 of Waterhouse Addition). The applicant proposes adjusting the lot line between 1217 and 1223 11th Ave S by approximately 16 ft to the southwest, thereby increasing the lot size for 1217 to approximately 5098 sq ft (still a substandard lot size, but would allow space for construction of a dwelling or placement of a double wide manufactured home on a foundation). The adjustment would decrease the lot size of 1223 11th Ave S to approximately 5879 sq. ft (a substandard lot size but would still accommodate the existing dwelling), for Jose Sanchez (VAR-00072-2019)

6-3. Action Item: Vacation of a 10 ft x 70 ft long portion of the Lone Star Rd Right-Of-Way, located on the west side of the property addressed as 561 Lone Star Rd (Canyon County Parcel R15216010A1), a .741 acre parcel located within an RS-6 (Single Family Residential – 6000 sq ft minimum lot size) on the south side of Lone Star Rd. The applicant states they are requesting the Vacation of Right-Of-Way in order to align the property lines after dedicating 15 ft of Lone Star Rd Right-Of-Way to the City of Nampa on the east side of the subject property, for Mitchell Page. (VAC-00035-2019)

6-4. Action Item: Variance to Zoning Ordinance 10-16-15 (C) and 10-33-04 (A) (1) requiring a 20 ft setback from the front property line. The applicant has requested a reduction to 10 ft for the setback from the front property line for property located at 520 Caldwell Blvd (R3130700000), and the western portion of 504 Caldwell Blvd (R3131000000), within a BC (Community Business) zoning district, in order to allow for construction of 9,960 sq ft temperature conditioned self-storage facility and associated 621 sq ft office for Phase III of the Big Storage facility. The applicant states they are requesting the Variance in order to allow for a unified appearance and landscaping buffer with the existing facility at 504 and 498 Caldwell Blvd; as well as alleviating the development difficulties presented by the variation in the property lines fronting the north side of Caldwell Blvd, for Aaron Lafky, of Lafky Properties. (VAR-00073-2019)

(7) Unfinished Business

7-1. Action Item: First Reading of Ordinance for LID 163

7-2. Action Item: 1st reading of ordinance for Annexation and Zoning to RD (Two-Family Residential) for Mattingly Creek Subdivision at 2008 W. Orchard Ave. (A 3.5-acre portion of the SE ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 17, T3N, R2W, BM – 11 Two Unit Single Family Residential Attached lots on 3.5 acres for a total of 22 dwelling units on 3.5 acres or 6.29 dwelling
units/gross acre) for Pontifex Capital, LLC represented by Bob Taunton, Taunton Group LLC (ANN 105-18) (PH was 1-22-2019)

(8) Pending Ordinances (Postponed Due to Lack of Supporting Documentation)

8-1. 1st reading of ordinance for Annexation and Zoning to Light Industrial at 58 and 0 N. Kings Rd. for construction of Storage Units (A combined 3.87 acre or 168,577 sq. ft. portion of the South Half of the NW ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 24, T3N, R2W, BM) for Cody Lane-Trek Investment Group (PH was 9-17-2018)

8-2. 1st reading of ordinance for modification of an Annexation and Zoning Development Agreement (Ord. 3554 – Instr. # 200629961) between BB One LLC and the City of Nampa by amending Exhibit B - Commitments and Conditions, and introducing an Exhibit C - Preliminary Plat for Laguna Farm Apartments pertaining to Parcel #R3041700000 (1652 Idaho Center Blvd.) a 24.53-acre property in a GB2 (Gateway Business 2) zoning district in Government Lot 1 and the NE ¼ of the NW ¼ of Section 7, T3N, R1W, BM - for Kent Brown representing FIG Laguna Farms LLC (DAMO 027-18) (PH was 2-4-2019)

8-3. 1st reading of ordinance for Annexation and Zoning to BC at 0 Star Rd (Parcel R3036301200) on the south side of Ustick Road, east of Star Road, for access to City utilities for a mixed-use development. (A 4.72 acre parcel situated in the NW ¼ Section 5 T3N R1W BM, Tax 99106 in Lot 4) for Matt Garner representing JABR, LLC (Justin Reynolds and Alan Bean). (ANN-00112-2019) (PH was 4-15-2019)

8-4. 1st reading of ordinance for Annexation and Zoning to RS–6 (Single-Family Residential Districts/ Zones) at 904 W Greenhurst Rd. (A 1.92 acre or 80,376 sq. ft portion of the SW ¼ of Section 33 T3N R2W BM), for Blake Wolf for connection to City utilities and construction of single-family housing. (ANN-00114-2019) (PH was 5-20-2019)

8-5. 1st reading of ordinance for Annexation and Zoning to RD (Two-Family (Duplex) Residential District/Zone at 3500 E Greenhurst Rd. (A 1.33 acre or 57,913 sq ft portion of the SW ¼ of Section 36 T3N R2W BM, in the SE ¼ of Section 26 T3N R2W BM) for Roberta Konzek (ANN-00117-2019) (PH was 5-20-2019)
8-6. 1st reading of ordinance for Brownstone Estates Subdivision at 12203 W Karcher Rd. (14 Fourplex lots for a total of 56 multiple family dwelling units on 6.63 acres for 8.8 units per gross acre, and 94 single family detached dwellings on 24.36 acres for 3.85 units per gross acre – An approximate 30.8 acre parcel of land located in the NE ¼ Section 13 T3N R2W BM, Nampa), for Kent Brown, representing Providence Properties, LLC. (DAMO-00028-2019).

a. Zoning Map Amendment from RS-8.5 (Single-Family Residential Districts/Zones) to RS-7 (Single-Family Residential Districts/Zones) for approximately 25 acres, and Zoning Map Amendment from RS-8.5(Single-Family Residential Districts/Zones) to RP (Residential Professional District/Zone) for approximately 2 acres at 12203 W Karcher Rd (for land located in the NE ¼ Section 13 T3N R2W BM), for Kent Brown representing Providence Properties, LLC (ZMA-00104-2019) AND

b. Modification of Annexation and Zoning Development Agreements between Quantum Investments Realty, LLC and the City of Nampa, Recorded 02/08/2008 as Inst. No. 2008006946 and Inst. No.2008006947, for property located at 12203 W Karcher Rd, modifying Exhibit A – Legal descriptions, Exhibit B – Conceptual Plans, and Exhibit C – Conditions of Approval, to match a new site design and layout; (PH was 5-20-2019)

(9) Executive Sessions

9-1. Motion to Adjourn into Executive Session Pursuant to Idaho Code 74-206 (1) (c) To acquire an interest in real property which is not owned by a public agency;

Adjourn

Next Meeting

Regular Council at 6:00 PM – Monday June 17, 2019 - City Council Chambers

♦ Individuals, who require language interpretation or special assistance to accommodate physical, vision, hearing impairments, please contact the City Clerk’s Office at Nampa City Hall, (208) 468-5426. Requests should be made at least five (5) days prior to the meeting to allow time to arrange accommodations

♦ Any invocation that may be offered before the official start of the Council meeting shall be the voluntary offering of a private citizen, to and for the benefit of the Council. The views or beliefs expressed by the invocation speaker have not been previously reviewed or approved by the Council and do not necessarily represent the religious beliefs or views of the Council in part or as a whole. No member of the community is required to attend or participate in the invocation and such decision will have no impact on their right to participate actively in the business of the Council.
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*Or as Soon After 7:00 PM as Each Matter may be Heard
Copies of the policy governing invocations and setting forth the procedure to have a volunteer deliver an invocation are available upon written request submitted to the City Clerk.
Mayor Kling called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

Clerk made note that Councilmembers Rodriguez, Bruner, Hogaboam, Levi, Haverfield, Skaug were present.

yect (1) Consent Agenda (Action Items) yect

Mayor Kling stated that the agenda would be amended by postponing item #6-3. Consider Project Packing and Delivery Approach for Phase II Upgrades at Nampa Wastewater Treatment Plant until June 3, 2019.

MOVED by Haverfield and SECONDED by Bruner to approve the Consent Agenda as presented; Regular Council Minutes of May 6, 2019 and Special Council Minutes of May 6, 2019; Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Minutes; Board of Appraisers Minutes; Airport Commission Minutes of January 14, 2019 and April 8, 2019; Golf Commission Minutes of April 16, 2019; Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes; Library Commission Minutes; Nampa Council on Aging Minute of April 8, 2019; The Nampa City Council dispenses with the three (3) reading rule of Idaho Code § 50-902 for all ordinances; final and preliminary plat approvals: 1) Carriage Hill West Subdivision No. 3, east of Midway Rd, between W Iowa Ave and Lake Lowell Ave. (A portion of the NW ¼ of Section 31 T3N R2W BM – 64 Single Family Residential lots on 25.03 acres, or 2.56 lots/gross acre) for Engineering Solutions, LLP, representing Toll Southwest, LLC (SPF-00088-2019); Authorize Public Hearings: 1) Zoning Map Amendment from RA (Suburban Residential) to RS-6 (Single Family Residential – 6000 sq. ft) for .7 acres or 30,368 sq. ft at 714 Smith Ave; Subdivision Short Plat approval for Smith Avenue Hideaway (2 single family detached lots and one duplex lot on .7 acre for 5.71 dwelling units per gross acre. A parcel of land being a portion of Lot 24 of Westview Subdivision, according to the plat filed in Book 4 at Page 31 recorded in the office of the Canyon County Recorder’s in the NW ¼ of Section 21 T3N R2W BM); and, Conditional Use Permit approval for 1 year, for a Duplex Dwelling at 714 Smith Avenue (An 80 ft x 120 ft or 9,525 sq. ft portion of the NW ¼ of Section 21 T3N R2W BM – proposed Lot 3, Block 1, Smith Avenue Hideaway), for Susan Schindler (ZMA-00105-2019, SPS-00019-2019, CUP-00133-2017); 2) Zoning Map Amendment from BC (Community Business) to IL (Light Industrial) for a Towing Business at 3315 Caldwell Blvd. (A .9 acre or 39,204 sq. ft parcel being Tax 4-A in Block 1, Portner Subdivision, in the NW ¼ Section 7 T3N R2W BM); and Recommendation for a Conditional Use Permit for a towing/impound yard business at 3315 Caldwell Blvd, in the IL zoning district for Byron Healy (ZMA-00106-2019); Authorize to Proceed with Bidding Process: 1) None; Authorization for execution of Contracts and Agreements: 1) Sign Task Order and Contract for Professional Services between the City of Nampa and Keller Associates for the South Tank rehabilitation project in the amount $31,930.00, Time and Materials Not to Exceed; Monthly Cash Report: 1) April 2019; Resolutions: 1) None; License Renewals for 2019: 1) Craft Lounge, 320 11th Ave S, Beer, Wine, Liquor; Outback Steakhouse, 2011 W Karcher Rd, on-premise Beer, Wine, Liquor; Rocco’s Roadhouse, 1911 1st St N, on-premise Beer, Wine, Liquor; Brick 29, 320 11th Ave S, on-premise Beer, Wine, Liquor; Campos on Lonestar, 135 Lonestar, off-premise
Item #2-1. – Buddy Poppies by the Veterans of Foreign Wars

Whereas, the annual distribution of Buddy Poppies by the Veterans of Foreign Wars of the United States has been officially recognized and endorsed by governmental leaders since 1922; and

Whereas, VFW Buddy Poppies are assembled by disabled veterans and the proceeds of this worthy fund-raising campaign are used exclusively for the benefit of disabled and needy veterans, and the widows and orphans of deceased veterans; and

Whereas, the basic purpose of the annual distribution of Buddy Poppies by the Veterans of Foreign Wars is eloquently reflected in the desire to “Honor the Dead by Helping the Living.”

Now Therefore, I, Debbie Kling, Mayor of the City of Nampa, Idaho, do hereby proclaim May 24, 25 and 26 as

“VFW Buddy Poppies Days”

In the City of Nampa. I urge the citizens of this community to recognize the merits of this cause by contributing to its support through your donations for Buddy Poppies on the day set aside for the distribution of these symbols of appreciation for the sacrifices of our honored dead. I also urge all patriotic citizens to wear a Buddy Poppy as mute evidence of our gratitude to the men and women of this country who have risked their lives in defense of the freedoms which we continue to enjoy as American citizens.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the City of Nampa to be affixed this 20th day of May in the year of our Lord two thousand nineteen.

Mayor Kling asked if there was any Nampa Residents wishing to speak on any agenda item were (5 persons limit):  
  • None
Mayor Kling asked if there was any Nampa Residents wishing to speak on any item that was not on the agenda (5 persons limit):

- Boy Scouts of America - Mr. Lynn Gunter – will reschedule later
- Lake Ridge Elementary 1st Graders – Bekah Graves – did a presentation on monarch butterflies and keeping the milk weed on the Nampa pathways to help preserve the monarch butterflies – the kids will be presenting at the school 2:30 to 3:30 at the school’s gymnasium
- Beth Ineck – We have been in contact with Rhino Development, they are a developer out of the Bay area of CA and have purchased Karcher Mall. They are looking at a complete rebuild of the project. They were at the International Council of Shopping Centers in Las Vegas this week and they have about 15 appointments with prospective tenants to go into Karcher Mall. They are looking at multi family housing to go on the back side – 10 acres that is parking lot

Mayor Kling’s and Council Comments

- Mayor Kling – U.S. Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) Idaho Operations Director Jim Werntz presented the prestigious PISCES Award to the City of Nampa for dedication to clean water infrastructure at a ceremony Mon., May 20, 2019 at Nampa’s Wastewater Treatment Plant.
- Mayor Kling gave a shout out to the Exchange Club for Parade America

(3) Agency/External Communications

Item #3-1. – Highway 16 Update - ITD - Amy Schroder

The Idaho Transportation Department has made a significant investment in the extension of Idaho 16 from Interstate 84 north to Idaho 44. This document provides background and an overview of the corridor study, and briefly describes the design refinements that are being advanced for public comment.

The Idaho Transportation Board will review these options at their regular business meeting Thursday, May 16, 2019 and determine what will be carried forward. This summary and the meeting presentation are informational in nature, no action is being requested by the Council.

1. Idaho 16, I-84 to ID 44 Corridor

The purpose of the Idaho 16 Corridor Project is to increase the transportation capacity of the Idaho state highway system within Ada and Canyon counties and to reduce north-south
travel times between I-84 and destinations north of the Boise River in the vicinity of the Idaho 16 and ID 44 intersection. The need for the project is related to three factors:

- **Regional Growth.** Proposed planned communities and rapid development in the communities of Emmett, Eagle, Star, Nampa, and Meridian are increasing travel demand on Idaho highways and surrounding regional roadways.
- **Regional Mobility and Circulation.** Current north-south routes connecting I-84 to ID 44 are not adequate to meet future travel demands of the Treasure Valley.
- **Congestion on North-South Arterials.** The limited number of river crossings between ID 44 and I-84 increases traffic congestion on the surrounding regional roadways.

The Idaho 16 project goals begin with providing solutions, which will help the Treasure Valley area accommodate its projected growth while balancing the area’s quality of life.

- Create a new state highway corridor that will be a component of enhancing the area’s transportation system to improve accessibility and connectivity to jobs, schools, and services; allow the efficient movement of people and goods.
- Establish a new state highway corridor providing new connectivity, while preserving the capacity of the regional roadway system.
- Develop a new state highway corridor that will enhance safety and security for its users.
- Create a new state highway corridor that will protect and preserve existing transportation systems and opportunities for expansion.
- Support economic development by providing a new state highway that aids in connecting communities, provides access to employment centers, and provides efficient movement of people, freight and services throughout the Treasure Valley.
- Contribute to improving the quality of life, through enhancing public health by developing a new state highway that will help lessen future environmental impacts, such as air quality.

In 2006, ITD began studying the segment of the Idaho 16 route from I-84 north to ID 44, Figure 1. A final environmental impact statement (EIS) was prepared in November 2010 and a record of decision (ROD) for this portion of the Idaho 16 corridor was approved by ITD and the Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) in April 2011. The new route begins at I-84 (MP 39.7), which is west of Ten Mile Interchange and east of Garrity Interchange. The new Idaho 16 route connects I-84 to ID 44, formulating the logical termini, and provides a new crossing over the Boise River. The selected alternative defined Idaho 16 as a limited access 4-lane divided highway (two lanes per direction) with full access interchanges at the following locations:
Accessibility to Idaho 16 will be prohibited for all other public or private access. Major east-west roadways will be grade-separated with Idaho 16. Access to properties disconnected by the new highway will be provided through a system of rural minor local roadways.

Construction of the Idaho 16 initial phase was completed in 2014. The initial phase provided 2.1 miles of new 4 lane highway between US 20/26 and ID 44, including a 1,730-foot-long bridge over the Boise River. This initial phase provided at-grade signalized intersections at US 20/26 and ID 44. The interchanges described in the EIS/ROD are planned for construction in a future phase of the Idaho 16 when travel demands warrant these improvements.

2. Idaho 16 Profile Alignment (Over versus Under)

The approved 2011 EIS/ROD proposed a preferred alternative for Idaho 16, in which the new highway’s profile alignment would be grade separated with bridges at east-west routes including US 20/26, ID 44 and four local roadways (Franklin Road, Cherry Lane, Ustick Road, and McMillian Road). The EIS/ROD’s preferred alternative proposed these six east-west roadways would be elevated and have bridges crossing over the new Idaho 16 highway. Through value engineering and alternatives analysis, staff recommends modifying the
preferred alternative to have the new highway’s profile alignment grade separated over these six east-west roadways. Figure 2 and 3 provide an example of the modifications at one local roadway. The recommendation is based on the following potential benefits resulting from the proposed modification:

- The modification lessens the potential environmental impacts associated with the project by reducing the limits of improvements to east-west local roadways.
- Minimizes impacts to accessibility of the east-west local roadways by eliminating the need to raise the profile of the local roadways over the new Idaho 16. This would reduce the need for right-of-way and construction of local roadways to provide new access.
- A reduction in the project’s new right-of-way for constructing east-west roadways over the new Idaho 16 estimated to reduce approximately 26 acres, with an estimated savings ranging between $1.5 and $1.9 million.
- A reduction in project costs to construct the east-west local roadways over the new Idaho 16. It is estimated to reduce approximately 1.1 miles of local roadways, with an estimated savings range between $16 and $18 million.
- The project costs for the future interchange build-out of US 20/26 and ID 44 would be less costly due to reductions in earthwork and grading for the interchanges.
- Minimizes potential impacts to the public and enhances safety during construction by allowing for more efficient construction sequencing and less complicated traffic control measures.

Environmental considerations for elevating Idaho 16 over the east-west roadways versus elevating the local roadways over Idaho 16, which include potential visual quality and noise affects, will be analyzed as part of the project’s EIS Re-Evaluation process. Staff does not anticipate significant adverse effects to the environment caused by the modification of taking Idaho 16 over the east-west local roads and highways.
Figure 2 - Idaho 16 Under Local Road, EIS/ROD Preferred Alternative

Figure 3 - Idaho 16 Over Local Road, Modified Alternative
3. Potential Right-of-Way Reductions

The approved 2011 EIS/ROD proposed a preferred alternative for Idaho 16, with a planned right-of-way corridor to accommodate potential future needs. Through value engineering and alternatives analysis efforts, staff has identified locations and areas where the planned right-of-way can potentially be reduced. The potential reduction from the planned right-of-way estimated in the EIS/ROD is approximately 100 to 130 acres. Table 1 provides a summary comparison of the areas for the planned right-of-way limits between the EIS/ROD and the proposed modified alternative. This reduction can be attributed to modifications to the I-84 and Franklin Road interchange configurations, the Ustick Road interchange configuration, and Idaho 16 going over the local roads. With the reductions identified as part of the modified alternative, the acquisition of the remaining Idaho 16 right-of-way is estimated to range between $100 million and $135 million. The right-of-way costs include the land acquisition price, administrative settlements, improvements, relocations costs, and risk-based cost contingencies for potential damages and legal actions.

The right-of-way for the project between US 20/26 and ID 44 was purchased as part of the initial phase, which constructed the 2.1 miles connecting US 20/26 and ID 44 with the new Boise River bridge. This includes most of the right-of-way for the future interchanges at US 20/26 and ID 44.

Table 1. Right-of-Way Comparison (Includes Total Takes and Un-economical Remainders)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planned Right-of-Way Limits (Estimated Area in Acres)</th>
<th>I-84 and Franklin Road interchange areas</th>
<th>UPRR to US 20/26 (including local roads)</th>
<th>Frontage/Backage Roads</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Idaho 16 EIS/ROD Alternative (Excludes Phase 1)</td>
<td>194</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proposed Modified Alternative I-84 Alternative 2</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. Interchange Type Analysis

Idaho 16 and ID 44 Interchange: The approved 2011 EIS/ROD proposed a preferred alternative for the Idaho 16 and ID 44 interchange consisting of folded diamond configuration with a loop ramp located in the northwest quadrant, as shown in Figure 4. The interchange was selected to accommodate the heavy westbound-to-southbound movement from ID 44. Through value engineering and alternatives analysis efforts, staff has validated this interchange configuration and recommends advancing it in the Re-Evaluation. The only modification is to elevate Idaho 16 over ID 44 to incorporate the benefits described in the Idaho 16 Profile Alignment (Over versus Under) section.
Idaho 16 and US 20/26 Interchange: The approved 2011 EIS/ROD proposed a preferred alternative for the Idaho 16 and US 20/26 interchange consisting of a folded diamond configuration with a loop ramp located in the southeast quadrant, as shown in Figure 5. The interchange was selected to accommodate the heavy eastbound-to-northbound movement from US 20/26. Through value engineering and alternatives analysis efforts, staff has validated this interchange configuration and recommends advancing it in the Re-Evaluation. The only modification is to elevate Idaho 16 over US 20/26 to incorporate the benefits described in the Idaho 16 Profile Alignment (Over versus Under) section.
Idaho 16 and Ustick Road Interchange: The approved 2011 EIS/ROD proposed a preferred alternative for the Idaho 16 and Ustick Road interchange consisting of a folded diamond configuration with the loop ramp located in the southeast quadrant, as shown in Figure 6. The interchange was configured in such a manner to minimize impacts to a historic property located northwest of Ustick and McDermott Roads. Through value engineering and alternatives analysis efforts, staff recommends modifying the interchange configuration to a tight diamond configuration, as shown in Figure 7. The tight diamond configuration minimizes impact to the historic property like the EIS/ROD alternative, provides acceptable traffic operations, enhances safety and reduces needed right-of-way by approximately 30 acres. The tight diamond configuration also provides better opportunities for interim project phasing. The proposed modified alternative will elevate Idaho 16 over Ustick Road providing the benefits described in the Idaho 16 Profile Alignment (Over versus Under) section.
5. Idaho 16/I-84 Interchange and Franklin Interchange Options
The Idaho 16 and I-84 systems interchange is near the Franklin Road interchange. Providing access to each of the routes results in close spacing of entrance and exits, which may degrade traffic operations and poses adverse safety situations. To help resolve these issues a system of ramp configurations that either avoid weaving issues via braided ramps or accommodate weaving through appropriately designed ramp segments is necessary. The approved 2011 EIS/ROD preferred alternative for the Idaho 16 and I-84 system interchange and the Franklin Road interchange consist of direct connecting ramps from Idaho 16 to I-84 and access to and from Franklin Road through a combination of loop ramps, as shown in Figure 8. The EIS/ROD preferred alternative also did not preclude a future southerly local road connection that would be part of a separate study.
Through value engineering and alternatives analysis efforts, staff's objective has been to identify alternative interchange configurations that maintain Franklin Road in its current location, provide full access between Idaho 16 and I-84/Franklin Road, and not precluding a future southerly connection. Staff has developed, compared and ranked multiple alternatives for this location. The top two ranked alternatives are shown in Figure 9 and 10 below. Staff is continuing to analyze traffic operations and safety elements associated with these two alternatives. The top-ranking alternative will be carried forward for public comment and incorporated into the EIS Re-Evaluation.
As described above in the section titled “Potential Right-of-Way Reductions”, a potential reduction in the planned right-of-way needed for the project is approximately 55 acres as a result of either of these modified alternatives for the Idaho 16/I-84 Interchange and Franklin Interchange. The two alternatives under consideration are estimated to require less capital investment as compared to the EIS/ROD preferred alternative. The initial construction cost can be reduced between 15 and 50 percent from the EIS/ROD preferred alternative as a result of the modified alternative for the Idaho 16/I-84 Interchange and Franklin Interchange. The two alternative configurations also provide better opportunities for interim project phasing.
Mayor and Council asked questions and made comments.

Fire Chief Kirk Carpenter read a letter from a fire department giving a shout out to Councilmember Rick Hogaboam for his help at a fire that burned a portion of Ashley Manor Memory Care center on May 10, 2019. He also gave a shout out for the assistance that the Nampa Police Department did in assisting with the situation.

I had the honor and privilege of promoting two new positions within our Fire Department replacing myself and Richard Davies. Battalion Chief Chris King was promoted to our Deputy Chief of Operations and Nick Adams will be mentoring with Chief Davies. We had multiple promotions today for company officer and battalion chief.

I think as a fire department take for granted our partnership with the PD, that is not normal to have police officers to do stuff like that for the fire department so that relationship I have the privilege of being a part of, but I think that I take that for granted. Thank you, Chief Huff, I appreciate your leadership, I appreciate the guys that put themselves at risk to make sure that our community is safe.
(4) Staff Communications

**Item #4-1.** Planning and Zoning Principal Planner Rodney Ashby presented the staff update to Council concerning storage units:

**Zoning Code Amendments**

- Clarify the Zoning Code:
  - Nampa Citizens and Developers
  - Nampa Planning & Zoning Staff
  - P&Z Commission
  - Mayor & City Council

- Update Content of the Zoning Code:
  - Storage Unit Standards
  - Alternative Residential Housing (mobile home parks, shipping container housing, tiny houses, etc.)
  - Mixed Use Development
  - In-fill Development
  - & others

**Storage Units**

- Increased Market Demand

- Concerns:
  - Visual impact on major Nampa Roads (arterials)
  - Consumption of designated industrial land
  - Limited economic benefit to community
Storage Unit Visual Impact on Arterials

- Long stretches of blank walls / Building materials

Nampa’s Design Standards:
- RP & BN Zones
- Setbacks
- Landscaping

Consumption of Designated Industrial Land
Mayor and Council asked questions and made comments.

(6) Public Hearings

Item #6-1. - Mayor Kling opened a public hearing for recommended increases to Wastewater Rates and Fees of 16.75%, Effective October 1, 2019 AND

Item #6-2. - Mayor Kling opened a public hearing for recommended increases to Wastewater Hookup Fees by Producer Price Index West (PPI-West) Index of 6.09%, Effective October 1, 2019.

Public Works Director Tom Points and Budget Analyst Jake Allen presented the following staff report:

FY 20 Wastewater Rate Increases
Commitment to our Customers

The City of Nampa's WWTP Goal is to:

- Provide exceptional service to our customers
- Preserve current infrastructure as the community continues to grow and provide economic opportunities
- Fund wastewater operations, maintenance, and infrastructure
- Remain transparent and offer cost-effective solutions
- Hold Nampa City's water to the highest standard in quality and safety
- Minimize our environmental footprint while working with our community to protect and enhance our water resource

Historical Review – Following the Facility Plan

- Which revenue strategy does the Council prefer?
  - Scenario A: 15.5% Annual Increases
  - Scenario B: 16.75% Annual Increases* Board of Appraisers recommendation

- Staff recommendation: Scenario B
Mitigates risk of not receiving all anticipated SRF loan funding (annual appropriations)

**Rate Increase Forecast**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Rate Increase</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>8.28%</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Monthly Residential Bill</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$24.47</td>
<td>$28.54</td>
<td>$33.31</td>
<td>$38.90</td>
<td>$45.40</td>
<td>$53.02</td>
<td>$61.87</td>
<td>$66.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.5% Median Monthly Household Income</th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Less than $5 increase

**Combined Monthly Water/Sewer Bills Comparison (2019)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Sewer</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Bend</td>
<td>$36.21</td>
<td>$59.89</td>
<td>$96.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUEZ Water/Boise</td>
<td>$23.10</td>
<td>$35.64</td>
<td>$58.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>$15.44</td>
<td>$41.41</td>
<td>$56.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pocatello (Metered)</td>
<td>$22.59</td>
<td>$30.55</td>
<td>$53.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coeur d'Alene</td>
<td>$13.40</td>
<td>$37.98</td>
<td>$51.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>$14.25</td>
<td>$34.88</td>
<td>$49.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Falls (Metered)</td>
<td>$31.12</td>
<td>$14.39</td>
<td>$45.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa (FY19, BOA Rec.)</td>
<td>$15.36</td>
<td>$28.54</td>
<td>$43.90</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Bills shown do not reflect findings from the cost-of-service analysis.
Cost of Service Shift

Cost of Service Historical Review

- How should the City of Nampa implement the COSA findings?
  - No phasing (move to full cost of service)
  - 2-year phase-in (50% of COS adjustment)
  - 5-year phase-in (20% of COS adjustment) * Board of Appraisers recommendation

Customer Class Definitions

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Customer Class</th>
<th>Example Customer Types</th>
<th># of Accounts</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE1 (BOD: 0 – 200 mg/L)</td>
<td>Laundromats &amp; car washes</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE2 (BOD: 200 – 400 mg/L)</td>
<td>Residential &amp; retail stores</td>
<td>27,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE3 (BOD: 400 – 600 mg/L)</td>
<td>Hospitals and daycares</td>
<td>66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4 (BOD: 600 – 800 mg/L)</td>
<td>Restaurants</td>
<td>155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE5 (BOD: 800 – 1,000 mg/L)</td>
<td>Other non-residential</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE6 (BOD: 1,000 – 1,500 mg/L)</td>
<td>None currently</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE7 (BOD: 1,500 – 2,000 mg/L)</td>
<td>Special permit</td>
<td>None</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Large industrial users</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FY19 Cost of Service Shift
Hookup Fee Historical Review

- How often should the City of Nampa update its hookup fees?
  - Annually? *Board of Appraisers recommendation
  - As part of system planning cycles?
  - Some other frequency?
- Should the City of Nampa adjust hookup fees annually for inflation between updates?

Wastewater Hookup Fees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Non-Industrial Hookup Fees</th>
<th>Current Fees (Eff. 10/1/18)</th>
<th>Proposed Fees (Eff. 10/1/19)</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collection Fee</td>
<td>$1,613</td>
<td>$1,711</td>
<td>+6.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Treatment Fee</td>
<td>$497</td>
<td>$527</td>
<td>+6.04%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE1 (BOD: 0 – 200 mg/L)</td>
<td>$1,144</td>
<td>$1,214</td>
<td>+6.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE2 (BOD: 200 – 400 mg/L)</td>
<td>$1,608</td>
<td>$1,706</td>
<td>+6.09%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE3 (BOD: 400 – 600 mg/L)</td>
<td>$2,071</td>
<td>$2,197</td>
<td>+6.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4 (BOD: 600 – 800 mg/L)</td>
<td>$2,946</td>
<td>$3,125</td>
<td>+6.08%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE5 (BOD: 800 – 1,000 mg/L)</td>
<td>$3,757</td>
<td>$3,986</td>
<td>+6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE6 (BOD: 1,000 – 1,500 mg/L)</td>
<td>$4,917</td>
<td>$5,217</td>
<td>+6.10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE7 (BOD: 1,500 – 2,000 mg/L)</td>
<td>$5,769,214</td>
<td>$6,120,559</td>
<td>+6.09%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Industrial Hookup Fees | per Million Gallons of Flow | $5,769,214 | $6,120,559 | +6.09% |
| per Pound of BOD       | $441                        | $468         | +6.12%     |
| per Pound of TSS       | $505                        | $536         | +6.14%     |
| per Pound of TKN       | $3,683                      | $3,907       | +6.08%     |
| per Pound of TP        | $164                        | $174         | +6.10%     |

Reflects 6.09% change in the PPI-West Construction Cost Index from Oct 2017 – Oct 2018

Fund Projection
Minimizing Impacts

- Asking for additional rate increases is a difficult decision
- We have challenged the wastewater team to evaluate potential savings
- Design Review Committee actively engaged in identifying savings
- Today's estimated savings $17 million to $25 million

Finding Efficiencies

The following are some potential cost savings from the original facility plan:
- Reuse requires less filtration
- Repurpose existing building instead of creating a new lab
- Inflationary savings by moving digester forward
- Co-thickening in existing build instead of new
# FY20 Rate Increases

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Existing Rates (2019)</th>
<th>2 of 5-Year Phase-In</th>
<th>% Increase</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All Customers Except Industrial Users:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monthly Base Rate (per Account)</td>
<td>$8.81</td>
<td>$10.22</td>
<td>15.96%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Volume Rates (per ccf of Water Use)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE1 (BOD: 0 – 200 mg/L)</td>
<td>$2.32</td>
<td>$2.77</td>
<td>19.36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE2 (BOD: 200 – 400 mg/L)</td>
<td>$2.79</td>
<td>$3.24</td>
<td>16.12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE3 (BOD: 400 – 600 mg/L)</td>
<td>$3.77</td>
<td>$4.56</td>
<td>20.91%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4 (BOD: 600 – 800 mg/L)</td>
<td>$4.43</td>
<td>$5.35</td>
<td>20.68%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE5 (BOD: 800 – 1,000 mg/L)</td>
<td>$5.54</td>
<td>$6.77</td>
<td>22.18%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE6 (BOD: 1,000 – 1,500 mg/L)</td>
<td>$6.71</td>
<td>$8.25</td>
<td>22.92%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE7 (BOD: 1,500 – 2,000 mg/L)</td>
<td>$8.13</td>
<td>$10.05</td>
<td>23.62%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Industrial User Rates:</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>per Million Gallons of Flow</td>
<td>$2,714.55</td>
<td>$3,101.22</td>
<td>14.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per Pound of BOD</td>
<td>$0.261</td>
<td>$0.323</td>
<td>23.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per Pound of TSS</td>
<td>$0.216</td>
<td>$0.273</td>
<td>26.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per Pound of TKN</td>
<td>$1.808</td>
<td>$2.246</td>
<td>24.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>per Pound of TP</td>
<td>$0.341</td>
<td>$0.591</td>
<td>73.26%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transaction Code</td>
<td>Description - WASTEWATER Rates &amp; Fees</td>
<td>Current Rate</td>
<td>Proposed Rate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>User Fees (per ccf of water use*)</td>
<td>$17.61</td>
<td>$20.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE1</td>
<td>Sewer Only, Bi-monthly Rate Per Account</td>
<td>$2.32</td>
<td>$2.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE2</td>
<td>Waste Strength BOD mg/l (0000-0200)*</td>
<td>$2.79</td>
<td>$3.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE3</td>
<td>Waste Strength BOD mg/l (0200-0400)*</td>
<td>$3.77</td>
<td>$4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4</td>
<td>Waste Strength BOD mg/l (0400-0600)*</td>
<td>$4.43</td>
<td>$5.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE5</td>
<td>Waste Strength BOD mg/l (0600-0800)*</td>
<td>$5.54</td>
<td>$6.77</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE6</td>
<td>Waste Strength BOD mg/l (0800-1000)*</td>
<td>$6.71</td>
<td>$8.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE7</td>
<td>Waste Strength BOD mg/l (1500-2000)*</td>
<td>$8.13</td>
<td>$10.05</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Industrial Rates**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Rate</th>
<th>Proposed Rate</th>
<th>Percent Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Industrial Flow (per million gallons)</td>
<td>$2,714.55</td>
<td>$3,101.22</td>
<td>14.24%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Industrial BOD (per pound)</td>
<td>$0.261</td>
<td>$0.323</td>
<td>23.69%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Industrial TSS (per pound)</td>
<td>$0.216</td>
<td>$0.273</td>
<td>26.30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Industrial TKN (per pound)</td>
<td>$1.808</td>
<td>$2.246</td>
<td>24.23%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Industrial TP (per pound)</td>
<td>$0.341</td>
<td>$0.591</td>
<td>73.26%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Industrial Capacity Optimization Fee**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Rate</th>
<th>Proposed Rate</th>
<th>Percent Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Industrial Flow (per million gal. of unused capacity)</td>
<td>$444.67</td>
<td>$444.67</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Industrial BOD (per pound of unused capacity)</td>
<td>$0.044</td>
<td>$0.044</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Industrial TSS (per pound of unused capacity)</td>
<td>$0.036</td>
<td>$0.036</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Industrial TKN (per pound of unused capacity)</td>
<td>$0.329</td>
<td>$0.329</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Industrial TP (per pound of unused capacity)</td>
<td>$0.076</td>
<td>$0.076</td>
<td>$ -</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Flat Sewer Rate User Fees (Note #1)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Rate</th>
<th>Proposed Rate</th>
<th>Percent Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SE1 Waste Strength BOD mg/l (0000-0200)*</td>
<td>$1,334.40</td>
<td>$1,592.17</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE2 Waste Strength BOD mg/l (0200-0400)</td>
<td>$62.10</td>
<td>$72.08</td>
<td>16%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE3 Waste Strength BOD mg/l (0400-0600)</td>
<td>$608.57</td>
<td>$734.95</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE4 Waste Strength BOD mg/l (0600-0800)</td>
<td>$585.80</td>
<td>$706.09</td>
<td>21%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE5 Waste Strength BOD mg/l (0800-1000)</td>
<td>$2,316.99</td>
<td>$2,829.69</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE6 Waste Strength BOD mg/l (1000-1500)</td>
<td>Note #2</td>
<td>Note #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SE7 Waste Strength BOD mg/l (1500-2000)</td>
<td>Note #2</td>
<td>Note #2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Other Fees**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Current Rate</th>
<th>Proposed Rate</th>
<th>Percent Change*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No Birch Service Area Latecomer Fee</td>
<td>$636.00</td>
<td>$635.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Septic Haulers (per 1000 gal - full load only)</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Septic Hauler License Fee (first truck)</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No Septic Hauler License Fee (each additional truck)</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>$13.00</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Customer Class Allocation

Current analysis indicates a shift in cost recovery from SE2 (residential / retail) to non-residential / industrial users.

Hookup Fee Methodology

Calculate fee “by dividing the net system replacement value by the number of users the system can support.” *Loomis v. City of Hailey*

\[
\text{Hookup Fee} = \frac{\text{Net System Replacement Value}^*}{\text{Existing System Capacity}}
\]

*Replacement cost less unfunded depreciation.*

Features:
- Simple, straightforward
- Requires less information
- Likely under-recovers future costs (regulatory changes, capacity expansion)
- Protects developers from wish lists

Sample 2019 Monthly Bill Impacts
Mayor and Council asked questions and made comments.

No one appeared in favor of or in opposition to the request.

**MOVED** by Hogaboam and **SECONDED** by Rodriguez to close the public hearing. Mayor Kling asked all in favor say aye with all Councilmembers present voting **AYE**. Mayor Kling declared the

**MOTION CARRIED**

**MOVED** by Skaug and **SECONDED** by Hogaboam to **approve** (item #6-1) the increases to Wastewater Rates and Fees of 16.75%, Effective October 1, 2019 AND (item #6-2) increases to Wastewater Hookup Fees by Producer Price Index West (PPI-West) Index of 6.09%, Effective October 1, 2019. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting **YES**. The Mayor declared the

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Item #3-3.** - Mayor Kling request that the public hearing for Wastewater Upgrades Phase 2 Project Delivery Method be continued to a date certain which would be June 3, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers.
MOVED by Rodriguez and SECONDED by Skaug to continue the public hearing to a date certain which would be June 3, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. in the Council Chambers. Mayor Kling asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. Mayor Kling declared the MOTION CARRIED

Item #6-4. - Mayor Kling opened a public hearing for Brownstone Estates Subdivision at 12203 W Karcher Rd. (14 Fourplex lots for a total of 56 multiple family dwelling units on 6.63 acres for 8.8 units per gross acre, and 94 single family detached dwellings on 24.36 acres for 3.85 units per gross acre – An approximate 30.8-acre parcel of land located in the NE ¼ Section 13 T3N R2W BM, Nampa), for Kent Brown, representing Providence Properties, LLC. (DAMO-00028-2019 and SPP-00039-2019).

a. zoning map amendment from RS-8.5 to RS-7 for approximately 25 acres, and zoning map amendment from RS-8.5 to RP for approximately 2 acres at 12203 W Karcher Rd (for land located in the NE ¼ Section 13 T3N R2W BM), for Kent Brown representing Providence Properties, LLC. (ZMA-00104-2019) AND

b. modification of annexation and zoning development agreements between Quantum Investments Realty, LLC and the City of Nampa, Recorded 02/08/2008 as Inst. No. 2008006946 and Inst. No.2008006947, for property located at 12203 W Karcher Rd, modifying Exhibit A – Legal descriptions, Exhibit B – Conceptual Plans, and Exhibit C – Conditions of Approval, to match a new site design and layout.

Kent Brown, 3161 East Springwood, Meridian presented the request.

Councilmembers asked the applicant questions.

Senior Planner Kristi Watkins presented the following staff report explaining that the request is for a rezone of a portion of land from RS-8.5 to RS-7 and expand the existing RP zone and Modification of a Development Agreement (land use contract) of Ordinance 3771 recorded on February 8, 2008 as Instrument# 2008006946 and Ordinance 3772 recorded on February 8, 2008 as Instrument# 2008006947 replacing with new Recitals, Conditions, Elevations and Preliminary Plat to convert the originally approved RP and RS 8.5 zoned development to RP & RS 7 zoned development for Providence Properties as applicant/Kent Brown pertaining to on parcel of land located at 12203 Karcher Road totaling some 30.53 acres, positioned in the NE ¼ of the NE¼ of Section 13, T3N, R3W, Boise Meridian, Canyon County, Nampa, also referred to as Parcel #R3279600000.

History:
Re-Zoning Conclusions of Law

10-2-3 (C) Annexations and/or Rezones/Zoning assignments must be reasonably necessary, in the interest of the public, further promote the purposes of zoning, and agree with the adopted Comprehensive Plan for the neighborhood.

Re-Zoning Findings of Fact

PERTAINING TO THE APPROXIMATELY 6.36 ACRES OF LAND REQUESTED TO BE ZONED TO RP AND THE 24.86 ACRES OF LAND REQUESTED TO BE ZONED TO RS7:

Zoning: Regarding Applicant’s Proposed/Desired Annexation and Zoning Assignment Request Staff finds:

1. Current Jurisdiction/Status:
The Property is currently within Nampa City; Property appears from aerial imagery to be clear of structures and to be relatively flat open ground; Property is either owned or optioned by the Applicant(s); and,

2. Surrounding Zoning:
North: Canyon County - AG - (Caldwell Impact Area - Residential Estates [Low Density Residential = 2 d.u./acre])
South: RS6 PUD (Single Family Residential -6,000 sq. ft minimum lot size)
East: Canyon County - AG
West: Canyon County - AG

3. Immediately Surrounding Land Uses:
Generally: All areas immediately adjacent to this property are currently used for agricultural purposes. The two (2) properties to the northeast across Karcher and across the Karcher/Midway intersection are the Brown Bus, bus terminal and a Chevron Convenience Store/Fuel Station.

4. Proposed Zoning:

**Pertaining to the RP Zoning expansion request:**
The original RP zoned area was 3.55 acres and is requested to be expanded to 6.36 acres in and around the original location as it fronts Karcher Rd. This RP (Residential Professional) district is designed to accommodate residential (including multi-unit structures/projects) uses, and professional office developments. It is intended to be a less intensive land use district than a standard commercial zone and may be used as a buffer between the same and single-family residential areas; and,

**Pertaining to the RS 7 Re-Zoning Request:**
The original RS 8.5 area was 27.02 acres and is requested that 24.86 acres be rezoned to the RS 7 (Single Family Residential - 7,000 sq. ft minimum lot size) district. This RS 7 district is designed to accommodate medium density single-family developments, 7,000 square foot lot sizes, and varied lot sizes with an average of 8,000 square feet allowing for some smaller infill lots; and,

5. Reasonable:
That it may be variously argued that consideration for [re]zoning the Property is reasonable given that: a) the City of Nampa has received an application to rezone the Property by amending its official zoning map by the Property owner or an Applicant having a valid, legal interest in the same; and, b) rezoning is a legally recognized legislative act long sanctioned under American administrative law; and, c) within the City of Nampa, zoning assignment is a long standing (and law sanctioned) practice; and, d) other lands in the vicinity of the Property have been zoned in such a way as to provide a transitional arrangement between commercial and single-family residential - whether viewed north south or east to west; and, e) the Property is eligible by law for consideration for rezoning; and, f) that the Applicant intends to develop the Property; and, g) city utility services are available to the Property (see aerial photo with utility lines displayed); and, h) emergency services are available to the Property; and,

6. Public Interest:
That Nampa has determined that it is in the public interest to provide multi use development opportunities and diverse land use types within its confines. Expressions of that policy are published in Nampa’s adopted Comprehensive/Master Plan, as well as embodied in its decisions to date regarding similar applications. Engineering has not called for a traffic impact study (TIS) to date for this proposal. The Applicant has presented argument(s) that a
market need exists for the land use product they are seeking to develop on the Property (see Applicant’s narrative attached hereto); and,

7. Promotion of Zoning Purpose(s):
That among the general (and Nampa endorsed) purposes of zoning is to promote orderly, systematic development and patterns thereof which preserve and/or enhance public health, safety and welfare. Included in our residential zoning regulations, therefore, are standards governing commercial development which pertain to allowable land uses, building setbacks, building aesthetics, provision of parking and service drives, property landscaping, etc. While a preliminary plat was included with the application, Staff notes that any site development will be regulated by, and through, the building permit review process and will force application of zoning laws [including those iterated in Section 10-1-19 of Nampa’s zoning ordinance which, which together with other zoning statutes govern building heights, setbacks, landscaping, parking lot layout and striping, lighting and design of buildings and the parking area, etc.] against any construction on the Property; and,

8. Services:
That utility and emergency services are/can be made available to the Property (see aerial photo with utility lines displayed and City of Nampa Engineering memorandum hereto attached); and,

Note:
The preceding general statements are offered as possible [preliminary] positive oriented findings and are not intended to be all inclusive or inarguable. They are simply provided to the Commission if the requested entitlements are recommended to Council for approval.

In summary, the Property may be zoned RP and RS 7, but nothing will [ultimately] force the Council to do so as it acts in its quasi-judicial capacity to decide on the proper land use zone/district to assign to the Property. Given the findings noted above, however, the expansion of the RP zoning and the rezone from RS 8.5 to RS 7 is certainly an "entertainable" request and is recommended for this property...

Development Agreement Modification

Criteria to guide the Commission in making a recommendation to Council regarding a proposed Development Agreement Modification, and to subsequently guide the Council in deciding/decision whether to allow a Development Agreement Modification, are absent from state statute or city ordinance. Thus, approving -- or not -- this application becomes a purely discretionary matter/decision on the part of the City of Nampa in reaction to this DA contract modification application. In other words, whether to recommend favorably to
the Nampa City Council that the change(s), as contemplated by the application that instigated this report, be approved or approved with some alterations is thus a subjective decision for the Commission to make.

Attached, is a copy of Ordinance 3771 recorded on February 8, 2008 as Instrument #2008006946 and Ordinance 3772 recorded on February 8, 2008 as Instrument #2008006947 which has, as a part thereof, the Development Agreement referenced by this report. The request is to replace the two (2) previous Development Agreements in their entirety with a newly formed Development Agreement more applicable to the proposed zones and development.

As the process of rezoning and Development Agreement modification is a two-step endeavor, the applicant will prepare a new Development Agreement document for Council’s review prior to the reading of the ordinance that will/would enact the Development Agreement Modification.

An approved Development Agreement, associated with an approved development plan, building style and type, and, density is already assigned to the Property (Ord. # 3771 & 3772). That entitlement runs [still] with the land. The present application before the Council proposes a change to the original Agreement, including replacing the approved concept site plan (i.e., parking lot and building layout, building design) with the four-plex layout (as shown in the preliminary plat) for the RP zoned portion of the property and elevations and minimum lot size requirements for the RS 7 zoned portion of the property.

Agency Comments regarding the Rezone, Development Agreement Modification and Preliminary Plat

a. Agency/City department comments have been received regarding this matter. Such correspondence as received from agencies or the citizenry regarding this application package [received by noon April 3, 2019] is hereafter attached.

1. An April 4, 2019, memorandum from the Nampa City Engineering Division, authored by Caleb LeClair indicates:
   a. License Agreements shall be obtained for improvements within Irrigation District Easements prior to construction drawing approval; and,
   b. A ROW permit shall be obtained from ITD for work within State HWY 55 ROW; and,
   c. A ROW permit shall be obtained from the City of Nampa for work within the Midland ROW; and,
d. An Erosion & Sediment Control Permit shall be obtained from the City of Nampa prior to construction; and,

e. Plat, access, drainage, water, sewer and pressure irrigation comments shall be addressed to obtain approval of construction drawings; and,

2. Submit the Traffic Impact Study to the Idaho Transportation Department for review; and,

3. Submit Idaho Transportation Department Traffic Impact Study comments to the City of Nampa Engineering Department and the Canyon Highway District #4 at the time of civil plan review; and,

4. ITD ROW Permit 3-18-380, applied for by the previous owner/applicant, was approved by Erika Bowen on May 26, 2016 for Karcher Rd and Midway Rd for a property zoned Commercial and Residential; and,

5. A March 8, 2019 memorandum from the Nampa City Engineering Division, GIS Section, authored by Alex Main indicating that there is a list of addressing/street naming comments/corrections required for the proposed Project; and,

6. A March 14, 2019 memorandum from the Nampa City Planner, Doug Critchfield regarding the landscape plan with the following comments:

   a. Page L2.0- Note #14 - Change 'City of Caldwell' to 'City of Nampa';
   b. Page L2.0 - Add Note: "Builder Contractor shall obtain a fencing permit from the Nampa Building Department prior to construction of any fencing."; and,

7. A March 12, 2019 email printout from the Nampa City Forestry Department authored by Carolynn Murray with the following comments:

   a. Please submit a plant list
   b. Class 1 trees shall be planted within 20’ center of center power poles
   c. No evergreens on public ROW including entrances to subdivisions; and,

8. A March 12, 2019 letter from the Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District authored by David Duvall indicating that they have no comment on the Project; and,

9. A March 11, 2019 memorandum from the Canyon Highway District# 4 authored by Chris Hopper, P.E., regarding access and traffic impacts on HWY 55 and the
request to review comments from ITD as it pertains to improvement of/along HWY 55; and,

10. A March 29, 2019 letter from Idaho Transportation Department, authored by Sarah Arjona, Development Services Coordinator indicating the following:

   a. At full build out the access point on SH-55 will be restricted to right-in, right-out.
   b. The proposed spacing for unsignalized intersections, does not currently meet IDAPA requirements.
   c. The Traffic Impact Study needs to provide justification for access onto the State Highway System.
   d. ITD reserves the right to make further comment upon review of the Traffic Impact Study, which had not been submitted to ITD at the time of this letter.
   e. Applicant shall contact ITD to determine if the current TIS addresses all access and traffic concerns.
   f. Idaho Code does not allow advertising with the ROW of any State Highway; and,

11. On February 27, 2019, Neil Jones with the Nampa Building Department made a note in the EnerGov permitting program indicating they will require a top of foundation wall or finish floor elevation, on the construction plans before the final plat will be approved; and,

12. Staff has not received commentary from any surrounding property owners or neighbors either supporting or opposing this request.

**Recommended Conditions of Approval**

Should the Commission vote to approve the Preliminary Plat request and recommend to the Nampa City Council that they approve the requested Rezone proposal and Development Agreement Modification(s) application, Staff would recommend that the Commission consider imposing the following Condition(s) of Approval against the requests/Applicant(s):

1. Provide a new Development Agreement document, to include RECITALS, CONDITIONS and EXHIBITS:
   a. Total Area to be zone RP and RS 7, legal descriptions,
   b. Intent for development layout, density, etc.,
   c. Elevations of Four Plex and Single-Family residential structures; and,
2. Provide revised street names as per memo from Alex Main; and,

3. Provide revised landscape plans as per memos from Planning and Forestry Departments; and,

4. Provide top of foundation wall or finish floor elevation, on the construction plans prior to final plat approval; and,

5. Provide Irrigation District License Agreements; and,

6. Apply for ROW and Erosion Control Permits with the City of Nampa; and,

7. Provide an approved ROW permit from ITD; and,

8. Any other condition(s) as the Commission concludes befit(s) the application package.

Councilmembers asked questions and made comments.

No one appeared in favor of the request.

Fire Chief Carpenter answered questions on response time.

Those appearing in opposition to the request were: Nancy Neuwelt, 12537 Deerbrush Court; Gayle Simmons, 16357 Meander Creek Way; Deborah Manning, 12573 Meander Creek Way; Erica Tremayne, 12536 Dakota Crossing Street; Emilee Douglas, 12572 Dakota Crossing Street; Carol Knemer, 12548 Dakota Crossing Street; David Manning, 12573 Deerbrush Court; Michael Hardin, 11947 Bonnie Lane; Dallas Budden, 12624 Slatestone Way; Edwin Budden, 12624 Slatestone Way; Matthew Tremayne, 12536 Dakota Crossing Street; Anthony Daniello, 12538 Deerbrush Court; Colleen George Osteanout, 12543 Toketee Street; Richard Hal, 1614 Arduce Avenue; Marilyn Dennis, 16137 Meander Creek Way; Erica Molendo, 12588 Algonquin Street.

Councilmembers asked questions and made comments.

Tom Points answered questions and made comments concerning the time frame for the upgrades to the highway in questions and impact fees.

City of Nampa Engineer, Daniel Badger, made comments on traffic.

Mayor and Councilmembers asked question of Fire Chief Carpenter.
The applicant presented a rebuttal to questions and comments made.

**MOVED** by Rodriguez and **SECONDED** by Hogaboam to **close** the public hearing. Mayor Kling asked all in favor say aye with all Councilmembers present voting **AYE**. Mayor Kling declared the

**MOTION CARRIED**

**MOVED** by Skaug and **SECONDED** by Haverfield to **approve the zoning map amendment** from RS-8.5 to RS-7 for approximately 25 acres, and zoning map amendment from RS-8.5 to RP for approximately 2 acres at **12203 W Karcher Rd** (for land located in the NE ¼ Section 13 T3N R2W BM), for **Kent Brown** representing **Providence Properties, LLC.** (ZMA-00104-2019) **AND modification of annexation and zoning development agreements** between Quantum Investments Realty, LLC and the City of Nampa, Recorded 02/08/2008 as Inst. No. 2008006946 and Inst. No.2008006947, for property located at 12203 W Karcher Rd, modifying Exhibit A – Legal descriptions, Exhibit B – Conceptual Plans, and Exhibit C – Conditions of Approval, to match a new site design and layout with staff recommendation and authorize the City of Nampa Attorney to draw the appropriate ordinance. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with Councilmembers Bruner, Hogaboam, Haverfield, Skaug voting **YES.** Councilmember Rodriguez, Levi voting **NO.** The Mayor declared the

**MOTION CARRIED**

**Item #6-5.** - Mayor Kling opened a public hearing for annexation and zoning to RS – 6 at **904 W Greenhurst Rd.** (A 1.92 acre or 80,376 sq. ft portion of the SW ¼ of Section 33 T3N R2W BM), for **Blake Wolf** for connection to city utilities and construction of single-family housing. (ANN-00114-2019).

Blake Wolf, 843 West Horizon Way presented the request.

Rodney Ashby presented the following staff report explaining that the request is for annexation and zoning to RS-6 (Single Family Residential – 6,000 sq. ft) for property located at 904 West Greenhurst Road for Wolf Building Co – Blake Wolf for connection to City of Nampa water and sewer services.

**General Information**

**Planning and Zoning History:** The applicant has requested annexation and zoning to connect the enclaved property to city water and sewer services in order to build multiple houses on the property. The Planning & Zoning Commission recommended approval of the annexation and zoning as applied, at their regularly scheduled public meeting on April 9,
Regular Council  
May 20, 2019  

2019. (see attached Action Letter).  **Status of Applicant:** Owner.  **Annexation Location:** 904 W Greenhurst and unnamed right-of-way (A portion of the SW ¼ of Section 33, T3N, R2W, BM).  **Proposed Zoning:** RS 6 (Single Family Residential – 6,000 sq., ft.).  **Total Size:** Approximately 1.92 acres or 80,376 sf.  **Existing Zoning:** County R1 (Single Family Residential).  **Comprehensive Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential.  **Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:**  
North - Herron Lateral; Enclaved Single Family Residential, County - R1; South - Enclaved Single Family Residential, County – R1; East- Enclaved Single Family Residential, County- R1; West- Single Family Residential, City- RA.  
**Applicable Regulations:** In order for a property to be annexed it must be contiguous with the city limits or be enclaved by other properties so annexed. The parcel connects with the city limits at its west and south boundaries. The parcel is part of a 13-parcel, 22.5-acre enclaved area.  **Existing Uses:** Rural residential parcel with single family dwelling, outbuildings, and landscaped yard.  

**Special Information**

**Public Utilities:** 12” water main in W Greenhurst Rd; 8” sewer main in W Greenhurst Rd just east of the property; 12” irrigation main in W Greenhurst Rd.  **Public Services:** Police and fire already service city incorporated areas near the location.  **Physical Site Characteristics:** Existing rural residential parcel with single family residence and landscaped yard.

**Transportation:** For the property to be developed, the unnamed right-of-way to the east of the property, will need to be developed as a city roadway with 44’ of right-of-way. City of Nampa Engineering has indicated the need for 2’ of additional right-of-way on the east side of the property to be able to access the property from W Greenhurst Rd.

**Correspondence:** Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District had no comment regarding annexation but cautioned that additional conditions will be necessary to protect the Heron Lateral at time of development (Exhibit/Page 8). No correspondence has been received from any area property owners or residents either opposing or supporting the request for annexation and zoning to RS 6.

**Staff Findings and Discussion**

From a land use standpoint, the location is shown on the comprehensive plan “future land use map” as being compatible with the zoning that has been requested. If the Nampa City Council approves of the requested annexation and zoning the following findings are suggested:
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1) The requested annexation parcel connects with the city limits along its west and south boundaries. The parcel is part of a 13-parcel 22.5-acre enclaved area.

2) The area can reasonably be assumed to be available for the orderly development of the city with the city limits having grown into the area and the adjacent lands have been annexed and developed.

3) The proposed zoning conforms with the city's comprehensive plan future land use map for medium density residential land use and is reasonably compatible with existing and proposed land uses in the area.

4) The property owner requested annexation and zoning to RS 6 to connect the property to city water and sewer service.

**Recommended Conditions of Approval**

Staff suggests the Nampa City Council approves of the Annexation and Zoning subject to the following engineering required conditions of approval:

1) Dedication of 50 ft of right-of-way starting from the centerline of W Greenhurst Rd for the entire W Greenhurst Rd frontage.

2) Dedication of 2 ft of approximately 355' of unnamed right-of-way, running north from W Greenhurst Rd along the eastern property line.

No one appeared in favor of or in opposition to the request.

MOVED by Hogaboam and SECONDED by Bruner to close the public hearing. Mayor Kling asked all in favor say aye with all Councilmembers present voting AYE. Mayor Kling declared the

MOTION CARRIED

MOVED by Bruner and SECONDED by Hogaboam to approve the annexation and zoning to RS – 6 at 904 W Greenhurst Rd. (A 1.92 acre or 80,376 sq. ft portion of the SW ¼ of Section 33 T3N R2W BM), for Blake Wolf for connection to city utilities and construction of single-family housing with staff conditions and authorize the Nampa City Attorney to draw the appropriate ordinance. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the

MOTION CARRIED

Page 39
Item #6-6. - Mayor Kling opened a **public hearing** for **annexation and zoning** to RS-7 at **2700 E Amity Ave.** (A .5 acre or 21,737 sq. ft portion of the SE ¼ of Section 26 T3N R2W BM and Tax 98110) for **Ricardo Reyes** for connection to City of Nampa utilities. (ANN-00115-2019).

Applicant was not in attendance

Rodney Ashby presented the following staff report explaining that the request is for annexation and zoning to RS-7 (Single Family Residential – 7,000 sq. ft) for property located at 2700 East Amity Avenue for Ricardo Reyes to have connection to city water and sewer services.

**General Information**

**Planning and Zoning History:** The applicant has requested annexation and zoning to connect the enclosed rural residential property to city water and sewer service. As part of the Amity Widening project, city utilities were stubbed to the property for this purpose. The Planning & Zoning Commission at their regularly scheduled public meeting recommended approval of annexation and zoning of this property (see attached Action Letter). **Status of Applicant:** Owner. **Annexation Location:** 2700 E. Amity Ave. (A portion of the SE ¼ of Section 26, T3N, R2W, BM and Tax 98110). **Proposed Zoning:** RS 7 (Single Family Residential – 7,000 sq., ft.). **Total Size:** Approximately .50 acre or 21,737 sf. **Existing Zoning:** County R1 (Single Family Residential). **Comprehensive Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential. **Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:** North- Enclaved Single Family Residential, County- R1; South- Enclaved Single Family Residential, County – R1 (2704 Amity) requested annexation and zoning to RS 7; East- Single Family Residential, City-RS 7; West- Enclaved Single Family Residential, County – R1. **Applicable Regulations:** In order for a property to be annexed it must be contiguous with the city limits or be enclosed by other properties so annexed. The parcel connects with the city limits at its east and south boundaries. The parcel is part of a 10-parcel, 12.6-acre enclosed area. **Existing Uses:** Residential parcel with single family dwelling and landscaped yard.

**Special Information**

**Public Utilities:** 12” water main in E. Amity Ave. 8” sewer main in E. Amity Ave. 12” irrigation main in E. Amity Ave. **Public Services:** Police and fire already service city incorporated areas near the location. **Physical Site Characteristics:** Existing rural residential parcel with single family residence and landscaped yard. **Transportation:** Access to the property is from E. Amity Ave. on a private drive. **Correspondence:** No correspondence has been received from any area property owners or residents either opposing or supporting the request for annexation and zoning to RS 7.
Staff Findings and Discussion

From a land use standpoint, the location is shown on the comprehensive plan “future land use map” as being compatible with the zoning that has been requested. If the Nampa City Council approves the requested annexation and zoning, the following findings are suggested:

1) The requested annexation parcel connects with the city limits along its east and south boundaries. The parcel is part of a 10-parcel 13.5-acre enclaved area.

2) The area can reasonably be assumed to be available for the orderly development of the city with the city limits having grown into the area and the adjacent lands have been annexed and developed.

3) The proposed zoning conforms with the city’s comprehensive plan future land use map for medium density residential land use and is reasonably compatible with existing and proposed land uses in the area.

4) The property owner requested annexation and zoning to RS 7 to connect the property to city water and sewer service.

Recommended Conditions of Approval

Staff suggests the Nampa City Council approve Annexation and Zoning, subject to the following engineering required conditions of approval:

1) Abandonment of the existing septic system will be accomplished under the guidelines established by Southwest District Health Department.

2) The City of Nampa shall be responsible for connecting meter to the existing stub and applicant’s plumber shall be responsible for connecting water and sewer services.

3) Standard connection fees for water and sewer services shall be paid prior to connecting to the city services.

4) With issuance of the plumbing permits, the residence will be disconnected from the existing shared well. Owners will retain the shared well for irrigation purposes.

No one appeared in favor of or in opposition to the request.
MOVED by Hogaboam and SECONDED by Haverfield to close the public hearing. Mayor Kling asked all in favor say aye with all Councilmembers present voting AYE. Mayor Kling declared the

MOTION CARRIED

MOVED by Hogaboam and SECONDED by Haverfield to approve for annexation and zoning to RS-7 at 2700 E Amity Ave. (A .5 acre or 21,737 sq. ft portion of the SE ¼ of Section 26 T3N R2W BM and Tax 98110) for Ricardo Reyes for connection to City of Nampa utilities with staff conditions and authorize the Nampa City Attorney to draw the appropriate ordinance. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the

MOTION CARRIED

Item #6-7. - Mayor Kling opened a public hearing for annexation and zoning to RD at 3500 E Greenhurst Rd. (A 1.33 acre or 57,913 sq. ft portion of the SW ¼ of Section 36 T3N R2W BM, in the SE ¼ of Section 26 T3N R2W BM) for Roberta Konzek (ANN-00117-2019).

Roberta Konzek, 723 Southside Boulevard presented the request.

Planning and Zoning Director Norm Holm presented the following staff report explaining that the request is for annexation and zoning to RD (Two-Family Residential) for property located at 3500 East Greenhurst Road for the purpose of splitting the parcel into 2 lots with the front .3-acre lot for a single-family dwelling and the back 1-acre lot for possible multiple family dwellings for Roberta Konzek.

General Information

Zoning & Planning History: The applicant purchased the property in 2007. It was zoned AG in the County. She converted the front single-family dwelling into a veterinary clinic via a CUP from the Canyon County and rented out the back manufactured home. She is requesting annexation to RD for the purpose previously stated. Status of Applicant: Owner. Annexation Location: 3500 E Greenhurst Rd. (A 1.33 acre or 57,913 sq. ft. portion of the S ½ of the SW ¼ of Section 36, T3N, R2W, BMSE ¼ SE ¼ of Section 26, T3N, R2W, BM). Proposed Zoning: RD (Two-Family Residential – 6,000 sq., ft.). Total Size: Approximately .95 acre or 41,491 sq. ft. Existing Zoning: County R2 (Medium Density Residential). Comprehensive Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential. Surrounding Land Use and Zoning: North- Multiple and Single Family Residential; City RD, Enclaved County AG; South- Single Family Residential; City RS6, Enclaved County AG; East- Rural Residential; Enclaved County AG; West- Rural Residential; Roadway RD, Enclaved County AG. Applicable Regulations: For a property to be annexed it must be contiguous with the city.
limits or be enclaved by other properties so annexed. The parcel connects with the city limits on its west (S. Lexis Way) and south (E. Greenhurst Rd.) The parcel is part of a 4-parcel approximate 3.5-acre enclaved area. **Existing Uses:** Rural residential parcel with single family dwelling (former veterinarian office use) and manufactured home.

**Special Information**

**Public Utilities:** 12” water main in E. Greenhurst Rd. 12” sewer main in E. Greenhurst Rd. 8” irrigation main in E. Greenhurst Rd. and S. Marcum Way near the parcel. **Public Services:** Police and fire already service city incorporated areas near the location. **Physical Site Characteristics:** Rural residential parcel with single family dwelling (former veterinarian office use) and manufactured home. **Transportation:** Access to the property is from E. Greenhurst Rd. **Correspondence:** No correspondence has been received from any area property owners or residents either opposing or supporting the request for annexation and zoning to RD.

**Staff Findings and Discussion**

From a land use standpoint, the location is shown on the comprehensive plan “future land use map” as being compatible with the zoning that has been requested. If the Planning & Zoning Commission recommends approval of the requested annexation and zoning the following findings are suggested:

1) The requested annexation parcel connects with the city limits on its west (S. Lexis Way) and south (E. Greenhurst Rd.) property lines. The parcel is part of a 4-parcel approximate 3.5-acre enclaved area.

2) The area can reasonably be assumed to be available for the orderly development of the city with the city limits having grown into the area and the adjacent lands have been annexed and developed.

3) The proposed zoning conforms with the city's comprehensive plan future land use map for medium density residential land use and is reasonably compatible with existing and proposed land uses in the area.

4) The property owner requested annexation and zoning to RD to split the parcel into 2 lots with the front .3-acre lot for a single-family dwelling and the back 1-acre lot for possible multiple family dwellings.

**Recommended Conditions of Approval**
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Staff suggests the Commission recommend approval of the Annexation and Zoning to the Nampa City Council subject to the following engineering required conditions:

1) Annexation will include 50 feet of right-of-way dedication along the E. Greenhurst Rd. frontage.

2) A cross access and utility easement will be necessary for the shared access and underground utilities running across the multiple properties easterly side.

No one appeared in favor of or in opposition to the request.

Those appearing with questions and concerns were: Ruben Santos, 3425 East Greenhurst Road.

The applicant presented a rebuttal to the concerns.

Mayor and Councilmembers asked questions.

MOVED by Bruner and SECONDED by Rodriguez to close the public hearing. Mayor Kling asked all in favor say aye with all Councilmembers present voting AYE. Mayor Kling declared the MOTION CARRIED

MOVED by Rodriguez and SECONDED by Bruner to approve the annexation and zoning to RD at 3500 E Greenhurst Rd. (A 1.33 acre or 57,913 sq. ft portion of the SW ¼ of Section 36 T3N R2W BM, in the SE ¼ of Section 26 T3N R2W BM) for Roberta Konzek with staff conditions and authorize communication to the fence owner and authorize the Nampa City Attorney draw the appropriate ordinance. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the MOTION CARRIED

Item #6-8. - Mayor Kling opened a public hearing for a variance to City of Nampa Zoning Ordinance Chapter 10-11-5-D.1. requiring 20 ft front yard setbacks in the RML (Limited Multiple Family Residential) zoning district for lots within the Timbercreek Subdivision No. 2, located west of S Powerline Rd and north of E Iowa Ave, within the RML zoning district. The applicants are requesting a Variance on the setbacks for the following lots: Lot 13A reduce the front setback from 20 ft to 10 ft; Lots 14A, 14B, 14C and 14D reduce the front setbacks from 20 ft to 6 ft; Lots 16A, 16B, 16C and 16D – reduce the front setbacks from 20 ft to 11.79 ft; and, Lots 17A, 17B, 17C and 17D – reduce the front setbacks from 20 ft to 11.79 ft. The applicants state they are requesting the Variance in order to maintain the character
of the buildings as laid out in the amended and approved Concept Plan – because all infrastructure and easements are already in place, for Timbercreek Partners, LLC. (VAR-00071-2019)

Dennis Fermayne, 6382 Stateline Road, Freedom, Wyoming, presented the request.

Norm Holm presented the following staff report explaining that the request is for a Variance of Section 10-11-5 D. allowing a Front Yard Setback of 10’ for Lot 13A, a Front Yard Setback of 6’ for Lots 14A, 14B, 14C, and 14D, and a Front Yard Setback of 11.79’ for Lots 16A, 16B, 16C, 16D, 17A, 17B, 17C, and 17D rather than the required 20’ Front Yard Setback for the purpose/applicant explanation - The owner/applicant states they are requesting the variances in order to maintain the character of the buildings as laid out in the amended and approved concept plan, and not utilize a different building plan or reduce the number of units, because all infrastructure and easements are already in place located in the Timbercreek Subdivision No. 2 for Timbercreek Partners LLC.

**General Information**

**Status of Applicant:** Owner. **Existing Zoning:** RML (Limited Multiple-Family Residential). **Location:** West of S. Powerline Road and north of E. Iowa Avenue, Timbercreek Subdivision No. 2 (Lot 15, Block 1 of Timbercreek Subdivision No. 1 Amended, book 46, page 24 and a portion of the NE ¼ of Section 34, T3N, R2W, BM). **Size of Properties:** Size of each lot is as shown on the approved final Plat for Timbercreek Subdivision No. 2. **Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:** North- Residential, RD (Two Family Residential); South- Residential, RML (Limited Multiple-Family Residential); East- Residential, RML (Limited Multiple-Family Residential); Residential, RD (Two Family Residential). **Comprehensive Plan Designation:** High Density Residential

**Applicable Regulations**

10-24-1: [Variance] Purpose:

The Nampa City Council is empowered to grant variances to prevent or to lessen practical development difficulties, unique site circumstances and unnecessary physical, geographical hardships inconsistent with the objectives of zoning as would result from a literal interpretation and enforcement of certain bulk or quantifiable regulations prescribed by zoning ordinance.

A variance shall not be considered a right or special privilege but may be granted to an applicant only upon a showing of undue hardship because of: a) special characteristics applicable to the site which deprive it of privileges commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity, and b) the variance is not in conflict with the public interest. Hardships must result from special site characteristics relating to the size, shape or
dimensions of a site or the location of existing structures thereon, from geographic,
topographic or other physical conditions, or from population densities, street locations or
traffic conditions or other unique circumstances.

Variances are not intended to allow something that others do not have a permitted right to
do. The purpose of a variance is to provide fair treatment and to see that individuals are not
penalized because of site characteristics beyond their control. (Ord. 2140; amd. Ord. 2978)

10-24-2: Actions:

A. Granting of Variance Permit: The council may grant a variance permit with respect to
requirements for fences and walls, site, area, width, frontage, depth, coverage, front yard,
rear yard, side yards, outdoor living area, height of structures, distances between
structures or landscaped areas as the variance was applied for or in modified form if,
based on application, investigation and evidence submitted, the council concludes the
following:

1. Literal interpretation and enforcement of the regulation would result in practical
difficulty or unnecessary physical hardship inconsistent with the objectives of the
zoning ordinance.
2. There are extraordinary or unique site characteristics applicable to the property
involved or to the intended use of the property which do not apply generally to other
properties classified in the same zoning district.
3. Literal interpretation and enforcement of the regulation would deprive the applicant
of privileges enjoyed by the owners of other properties classified in the same zoning
district.
4. The granting of the variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege
inconsistent with the limitations on other properties classified in the same zoning
district.
5. The granting of the variance will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or
welfare or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

10-11-5: PROPERTY AREA, WIDTH AND YARD REQUIREMENTS: (RML Zone)
D. Minimum Property Structure and Parking Front Yard (Setback): Shall be twenty feet (20’)
wide/deep...

Special Information

Transportation/Access: Each parcel has direct access on the common drive/parking areas
with subdivision access from the South Powerline road arterial.

Narrative/Comments
To justify a variance request, an applicant must argue successfully to the Council that there are aspects of their property that physically, topographically, or, otherwise based on code requirements, puts them at a disadvantage in trying to accomplish what they wish (e.g., develop their land) in comparison to like properties. And where a site is clear of obstructions, easily or already flat graded (i.e., not adversely, topographically affected by a river, a highway or a mountain in the way, etc.), and, is of minimal dimensions per zoning code to be “buildable”, then it is difficult to argue that a hardship is present that is not brought on by the applicant’s proposed design.

If the Nampa City Council believes that there is no real topographical hardship associated with a variance application, then the applicant must argue that there is a “unique site circumstance” enough to justify their request. In the past, variances have been issued on a case by case basis where a unique situation could be determined to exist.

The Nampa City Council must determine if this request qualifies as a unique site circumstance providing the required justification for approval. The Nampa City Council is at liberty to either approve or deny. Either decision should not be construed as setting precedent, but consistency in the community/neighborhood and between applications is a desirable goal when dealing with case.

**Staff supports the applicants requested setback variances based on maintaining the character of the buildings as laid out in the amended and approved concept plan, and not utilizing a different building plan or reduce the number of units, because all infrastructure and easements are already in place, and that this constitutes a unique site circumstance and recommends that if the Nampa City Council votes to approve the front setback variances for the affected lots it be based upon the required findings of Section 10-24-2 of the Nampa City Code.**

**Recommended Conditions of Approval**

Should the Nampa City Council vote to approve the requested Variance, staff recommends the following condition be applied:

1) The applicant shall comply with all applicable requirements as may be imposed by city divisions/departments appropriately involved in the review of this request as the Variance approval shall not have the effect of abrogating requirements from those city divisions/departments.

Councilmembers asked questions.

No one appeared in favor of or in opposition to the request.
Applicant presented a rebuttal.

MOVED by Haverfield and SECONDED by Rodriguez to close the public hearing. Mayor Kling asked all in favor say aye with all Councilmembers present voting AYE. Mayor Kling declared the

MOTION CARRIED

MOVED by Hogaboam and SECONDED by Rodriguez to approve the variance to City of Nampa Zoning Ordinance Chapter 10-11-5-D.1. requiring 20 ft front yard setbacks in the RML (Limited Multiple Family Residential) zoning district for lots within the Timbercreek Subdivision No. 2, located west of S Powerline Rd and north of E Iowa Ave, within the RML zoning district. The applicants are requesting a Variance on the setbacks for the following lots: Lot 13A reduce the front setback from 20 ft to 10 ft; Lots 14A, 14B, 14C and 14D reduce the front setbacks from 20 ft to 6 ft; Lots16A, 16B, 16C and 16D – reduce the front setbacks from 20 ft to 11.79 ft; and, Lots 17A, 17B, 17C and 17D – reduce the front setbacks from 20 ft to 11.79 ft. The applicants state they are requesting the Variance in order to maintain the character of the buildings as laid out in the amended and approved Concept Plan – because all infrastructure and easements are already in place, for Timbercreek Partners, LLC with staff conditions. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the

MOTION CARRIED

❖ (2) Proclamation ❖

Item #2-2. – National Public Works Week

Whereas, public works professionals focus on infrastructure, facilities, and service that are of vital importance to sustainable and resilient communities and to the public health, high quality of life and well-being of the people of the City of Nampa; and

Whereas, these infrastructure, facilities and services could not be provided without the dedication efforts of public works professionals, who are engineers, managers and employees at all levels of government and the private sector, who are responsible for rebuilding, improving and protecting our nation’s transportation, water supply, water treatment and solid waste systems, public buildings, and other structures and facilities essential for our citizens; and

Whereas, it is in the public interest for the citizens, civic leaders and children in the City of Nampa to gain knowledge of and to maintain a progressive interest and understanding of the importance of public works and public works programs in their respective communities; and
Whereas, the year 2019 marks the 59th annual National Public Works Week sponsored by the American Public Works Association/Canadian Public Works Association be it now.

Now Therefore, I, Debbie Kling, Mayor of the City of Nampa, Idaho, do hereby proclaim the week of May 19-25, 2019 as

“National Public Works Week”

I urge all citizens to join with representatives of the American Public Works Association/Canadian Public Works Association and government agencies in activities, events and ceremonies designed to pay tribute to our public works professionals, engineers, managers and employees and to recognize the substantial contributions they make to protecting our national health, safety, and quality of life.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the City of Nampa to be affixed this 20th day of May in the year of our Lord two thousand nineteen.

(4) Staff Communications

Item #4-2. – Public Works Director Tom Points presented a staff report to update the council on current projects as follows:

National Public Works Week – This year, and since 1960, National Public Works Week will be celebrated by cities nationwide the week of May 19. The City of Nampa will be calling attention to the importance of Nampa’s unique, full-service Public Works Department (PWD). Staff have planned a week of scheduled events that include a hands-on activities fair for 166 Nampa students at the Street Division yard on Thursday, May 23, as well as a coloring and drawing contest for all Nampa students. A PWD employee appreciation picnic is also scheduled for Tuesday, May 21, from 11:30 a.m. to 1:00 p.m. at the Lions Park picnic shelter. The Mayor and Nampa City Council members, as crucial leaders in our community, are personally invited to the staff picnic to celebrate PWD’s continued dedication to the City of Nampa.

Indian and Mason Creeks Floodplain Study - West Consultants, Inc., (WEST) is proceeding with the Nampa City’s requested Indian and Mason Creeks Floodplain Study, which is currently about 20 percent complete, to evaluate the Indian and Mason Creeks drainage basins. Site visits are also being scheduled with Nampa’s underlying irrigation districts for WEST and city staff to review canal/drain operations and how they impact flows in Indian and Mason Creeks. The site visits are anticipated to occur in early June. Additionally, staff is coordinating meetings with adjacent jurisdictions to identify information and/or studies that could benefit the city and to hopefully develop partnerships to further advance the
reduction of the floodplain through our communities. Staff has also began evaluating and collecting data on the Indian and Mason Creeks drainage above the New York Canal.

The schedule of events in the Indian and Mason Creeks Floodplain Study is as follows:

- Fiscal Year 2019: Data collection, concept report, and culvert restriction analysis
- Fiscal Year 2020: Drainage basin hydrologic modeling
- Fiscal Years 2020-2021: Request Federal Emergency Management Agency (FEMA) map revision, FEMA public comment, open house, and final determination

**Street Division Chip Sealing Campaign** - The Nampa City’s Street Division will begin its annual chip sealing campaign in Zone D on June 3. A press release was issued on May 13 notifying Nampa citizens. A list of affected roadways and a map was included (see Exhibit A). The Street Division website will be updated with work progress, along with any weather-related delays. Crews will hang door hangers to notify individual property owners when chipping is to occur on their street. With mild weather and a little luck, Street staff hopes to complete chipping, fog sealing, paint and thermoplastic applications by early August.

**Funding Plan Presentation to Canyon County Highway District** –

- The future of Nampa’s transportation system is at a critical juncture with an estimated $17 million-dollar annual deficit for transportation funding

- Public Works created a multiphase transportation funding strategy to:
  - **Improve Safety, System Reliability and Economic Vitality by Funding the Transportation Capital Improvement Plan (CIP) in 10-15 Years**: This plan will fund the priority capital projects identified in the Draft 2019 Transportation Master Plan that will widen lanes, expand intersections and enhance safety. The improvements support a Level of Service (LOS) D on major roadways and intersections (LOS A-No Congestion; LOS F-Gridlock). If no action is taken, major intersections will deteriorate to a LOS F by 2035, impacting congestion, freight and public safety
  - **Improve Overall Roadway Condition by Funding the Pavement Management Program in 10-15 Years**: This plan is a first step in improving the overall pavement condition of city streets. The average state of Nampa’s asphalt streets will be in a failed condition by 2030 if no funding changes are made. Funding the Pavement Management Program will apply lower cost maintenance treatments to extend the usable life of roadways and make the best use of limited maintenance and repair resources
• This plan provides a roadmap to fund transportation improvements which will reduce congestion, improve maintenance, enhance safety and contribute to the economic prosperity of our city. The goals of this plan are outlined below:
  o Phase I started with increasing growth-related impact fees (approved by Council in March fiscal year 2019) and requesting a 1% incremental tax increase
  o Phase II requires regional support to implement vehicle registration fees in Canyon County. The plan requires approval by a county-wide majority vote and agreement between highway districts and cities. A yes vote could yield nearly $2.5 million annually to Nampa
  o Public Works staff presented the plan at the April 18, 2019, meeting of the Canyon County Highway Districts. In attendance were representatives of Nampa Highway District No. 1, Notus Parma Highway District No. 3, Golden Gate Highway District, and Canyon Highway District No. 4
  o Next steps will be to negotiate a memorandum of understanding between highway districts and cities within Canyon County, defining the amount and distribution of proposed registration fee increases. This plan is designed to:
    o **Provide Hope**: The plan is attainable and can be accomplished within 10-15 years without depleting resources for other critical city needs
    o **Be Equitable**: Multiple funding options are proposed, sharing responsibility amongst all those using the system
    o **Be Incremental**: Funding increases will be steady and affordable over a 10-15-year period, minimizing impacts to taxpayers. Once funding levels are achieved, smaller increases will commence to maintain the system

**Library Square Traffic Update (Fiscal Year 2019)** - In 2010, transportation planners and engineers from consulting agencies, Idaho Transportation Department (ITD), and the City of Nampa began examining ways to improve traffic safety and congestion problems around a one-block area, now referred to as the Library Square Block

The primary challenge is moving two state highways through a downtown business corridor; (1) State Highway 45 (27,000 cars per day), and (2) I-84 Business Loop (16,000 cars per day)

In 2013, URS Engineering, Horrocks Engineers, and Nampa City staff recommended a one-way alternative be constructed along with the Library Square Block improvements. Council authorized the one-way traffic pattern
In 2017, Nampa City staff, in partnership with Paragon Consulting, conducted a follow-up analysis to determine the effectiveness of the one-way design. The analysis recommended traffic striping changes on northbound 12th Avenue (between 2nd and 3rd Streets South) which has since led to improved efficiency and safety.

Some suggestions were proposed in 2018 to improve efficiency around the Library Square Block. Staff conducted a traffic update which evaluated the current crash data, signal timing, and striping configurations. Short-term and long-term improvements are outlined in the attached Library Square Traffic Update (FY19) PowerPoint presentation.
Managing SH45 and I-84B
Freight and Traffic Volumes

Congestion and Traffic Delays-
Public Concerns

Existing Configuration not
Sustainable with Growth

High Accident Location

Why One-way Option?
- Most efficient to move large state highway traffic volumes through one block offset
- Offers decreased congestion for SH-45 through traffic
- Capacity for higher volumes as growth occurs
- Reduced impact points and less severe accidents
Why One-way Option?
Reduced Impact Points

11th Ave & 2nd St

Two-way - 20 Vehicle Conflicts

One-way - 7 Vehicle Conflicts

Why One-way Option?
Reduced Travel Times Compared to Two-way Streets

Challenges-Citizen Concerns

- Designed as a throughway for State Highway Traffic, not a downtown retail corridor
- Intersection at 12th Ave & 2nd St constrained
- Driver Confusion/Navigation Challenges
  - 2nd & 3rd St. S. traffic must navigate around the block to go north or south.

Crash History Comparison
Four Short-term Efficiency Adjustments

1. Restripe southbound 11th Avenue at 1st Street
   a. Reduce congestion and lane navigation challenges

2. Allow right hand turns (yield) on red from 11th Avenue South northbound to 3rd Street South eastbound
   a. Change red arrow bulbs to solid red
b. Add signage

Four Short-term Efficiency Adjustments

3. Add second right turn lane on 3rd Street South
   a. Reduce delay for southbound SH 45 through traffic
   b. The City of Nampa owns ROW
Four Short-term Efficiency Adjustments

4. Signal Timing Update
   a. Current plan based on 2012 data
   b. Budget for 2020

Short-term Efficiency Improvements Cost Estimate

- Design for Options 1-4: $36,600
- To NDC on 5/21/19 to request design funding
- Construction and Signal Timing Estimate $200,000-$250,000
  - Seek funding from multiple sources including ITD, NDC and PWD Street Division maintenance. ITD may participate in design or signal timing on state route.

Long-term Options
Regular Council  
May 20, 2019  

To reduce freight and regional traffic through the downtown corridor. . .
  • Downtown Traffic Alternatives Analysis adopted by Nampa Development Corporation in 2011.
  • Subsequent SH-45 Realignment Concept Plan authorized by Council in 2012.
  • Realignment Benefit Cost Study beginning in FY19.

✧ (5) New Business ✧

Item #5-1. – The following Resolution was presented:

Fire Chief Kirk Carpenter presented a staff report explaining that the Nampa Fire department was approved to replace the SCBA Air Compressor and fill station that is located at Fire Station 1 in the 2018-19 budget year. This replacement took place in Feb. and the old compressor was moved down to our training center and was installed in place of our oldest compressor that we no longer have use for. Current value of the compressor is approx. $2500 - $3000.

We are requesting to donate the compressor removed from our Training Center to the Horseshoe Bend Fire Department. The department received new packs through a grant several years ago, and currently cannot fill their Air Packs to the designed capacity due to the condition and age of their current compressor.

We have arraigned with the vendor who sold us our new compressor system to also help Horseshoe Bend Fire and they have committed to moving the system, installing it, and provide an initial maintenance at no cost to assist with our efforts in "Paying it Forward".

A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND NAMPA CITY COUNCIL, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF IDAHO, AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN CITY PROPERTY. (Fire Department)

MOVED by Skaug and SECONDED by Rodriguez to pass the resolution as presented. Mayor Kling asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the resolution passed, numbered it 24-2019 and directed the clerk to record it as required.

MOTION CARRIED

Item #5-2. - Mayor Kling presented the request to authorize the Mayor to sign a contract with CenturyLink for Text to 911 service.

Dispatch Supervisor Carmen Boeger presented a staff report explaining that the Viper Phone System in Nampa Dispatch is a stand-alone system that delivers 911 calls, along with the
address and phone number of the landline calls. The phone system also delivers longitude/latitude information for 911 calls from cell phone. Non-emergency calls connect to dispatch through the Data Tel phone system, through the HNPSB phone tree, into the Viper.

The Viper System was installed new when we moved into the PSB in 2012. Because of age and our need for Text-to-911, it is due for a major upgrade and this was anticipated. The total amount necessary for the upgrade was not known at the time of the budgeting process, but we've been working with the industry partners and Nampa I.T. for several months for the best fit, eliminating anything unnecessary. Additionally, we worked with Nampa City Attorney, Marin Erickson, and the contract was returned with her approval.

This purchase request is for a phone system upgrade, which will then allow the addition of Text-to-911, which is also included in the total cost. Text-to-911 is a feature we do not currently have in Nampa. With the Viper upgrade, the Text-to-911 will deliver through our phone system, not an additional, unattached device that dispatchers would have to learn and manage. Making this extra work relatively seamless was a consideration in this decision. Our hope of having the new feature included in the phone system the dispatchers already know, a straightforward, easier addition.

The total upgrade cost will be approximately $230,000 out of our $736,000 fund balance.

MOVED by Bruner and SECONDED by Rodriguez to authorize the Mayor to sign a contract with CenturyLink for Text to 911 service. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the MOTION CARRIED

Item #5-3 - Mayor Kling presented the request to allow use of on-lot individual septic systems for the subject property with the following conditions: 1. The subdivision is limited to six (6) total buildable lots, including the two existing home sites, with a minimum allowable lot size of 1-acre. 2. All new homes hook up to available city water and pressure irrigation. 3. Septic systems are located to provide required separation to any existing and new city water infrastructure.

Tom Points presented a staff report explaining that the property owners of 700 and 701 W. Mariah Avenue, Nampa, Idaho have made a request to the City of Nampa Engineering Division to allow the use of on-lot individual septic systems for a subdivision of land consisting of six (6) total buildable lots on approximately 7.5 acres (Parcels R2299401000, R22994010A0, & R2299500000). The following facts are associated with this request.
The subject property is bounded by Nampa City limits on the north, east, and west sides. City of Nampa utility services are available directly adjacent to the property (See Exhibit A).

- 8” water main along the west boundary in Mariah Ave and Miranda Ave.
- 3” and 6” pressure irrigation main along the north, east, and west boundaries.
- 8” sewer main along the west boundary in Mariah Ave and Miranda Ave. The existing sewer main in both streets is very shallow (less than 3’ deep) making gravity connection infeasible.

The property owners split the property in 2017 to create the three existing parcels for the purpose of constructing two home sites. At that time, the Nampa Engineering Division staff informed the property owners that additional subdivision would not be supported without annexation into the City of Nampa. Two houses have since been constructed with individual well and septic.

On April 12, 2019, the Nampa Engineering Division received a notice from Canyon County Development services to review Preliminary and Final Plat application for the subject property (Promised Land Subdivision), since the property is in the City of Nampa Impact Area. The proposed subdivision consists of six (6) buildable lots, including the two existing homes, with a minimum lot size of 1.01 acres. Nampa Engineering Division staff responded on April 26, 2019 recommending the property annex into the City of Nampa and connect to available utilities instead of subdividing through the County (see Exhibit B).

On May 3, 2019, Mr. Nicholas Babak, one of the property owners, met with Nampa Engineering Division staff to discuss options to move forward with the subdivision within the City of Nampa given the sewer constraints. Three options for providing sewer service were presented:

1. Utilize individual lot grinder pumps and force mains to pump sewer to the gravity manholes in Mariah Ave and Miranda Ave.
2. Extend sewer from Woodland Drive to the east via a directional bore between two lots. The sewer is approximately 9-feet deep in this location.
3. Given the proposed lots are all greater than 1-acre in size, and the Southwest District Health Department has already approved individual septic for the proposed subdivision (see Exhibit C), request Nampa City Council to allow the development to use on-lot individual septic systems within city limits.

The property owner requested the Nampa Engineering Division pursue Nampa City Council approval for the use of on-lot individual septic systems.

The Nampa Engineering Division does not oppose the use of on-lot individual septic systems given the following facts and conditions:

1. All proposed lots are greater than 1-acre in size.
2. Southwest District Health has reviewed the proposed subdivision and approved the use of individual septic systems (Exhibit C).
3. Direct gravity connection to the adjacent city sewer to the west is not feasible due to the shallow depth.

MOVED by Bruner and SECONDED by Rodriguez for approval to allow use of on-lot individual septic systems for the subject property with the following conditions: the subdivision is limited to six (6) total buildable lots, including the two existing home sites, with a minimum allowable lot size of 1-acre and All new homes hook up to available City of Nampa water and pressure irrigation and Septic systems are located to provide required separation to any existing and new City of Nampa water infrastructure and The property is annexed into the city limits. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the

MOTION CARRIED

Item #5-4. - Mayor Kling presented the request to authorize the Mayor to sign a Change Order #1 in the amount of $85,342.55 to address construction overages encountered during project construction.

Nampa City Engineer, Daniel Badger, presented a staff report explaining that the Engineering, as part of the FY18 Public Works Asset Management Program, identified 2nd Street South between 12th & 16th Avenues as a failed roadway and 3rd Street South between 12th & 16th Avenues as poor condition likely not to survive seven (7) years until the asset management zone is being addressed again. Both needed reconstruction (see exhibit "A", Vicinity Map).

The project added the following improvements within downtown:
- New asphalt surfacing and pedestrian ramps
- Streetscape amenities at intersections including; brick paver sidewalk, decorative streets lights, benches, planters and garbage receptacles
- Water, pressure irrigation, storm water and electrical utility upgrades.

During design and construction many changes and unknowns were encountered ranging from design changes to upgrade wall street alley bulb outs for future pedestrian crossing facilities to a degraded water main that needed replaced.

Though Idaho Materials and Construction worked diligently to complete the project on time; the City of Nampa, HDR inspection staff, and Idaho Materials and Construction identified that the contractor exceeded contractual construction time by 13 total days.
Construction overages were in the amount of $104,842.55, of this $63,833.00 were associated with the water main replacement. Liquidated damages due to exceeding contract time were assessed in the amount of $19,500.00

In order to pay the contractor for construction services, a total change order must be approved for $85,342.55. (See exhibit “B”, Change Order #1)

The $85,342.55 will be funded from waterworks contingency in the amount of $63,833.00 and the cancelled Greenhurst Rd. Rebuild (Juniper to Sunnyridge) project in the amount of $21,509.55.

The total project costs are:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$242,951.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Engineering and Inspection Estimate</td>
<td>$291,885.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>$2,362,782.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,897,619.48</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Engineering Division has managed the 2nd & 3rd Streets South Rebuild Project and recommend approving a change order for $85,342.55 to pay for construction overages due to unknowns and changes that were encountered during construction.

**MOVED** by Haverfield and **SECONDED** by Hogaboam to **authorize** the **Mayor** to **sign Change Order #1** in the amount of **$85,342.55** to address construction overages encountered during project construction. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Council Members present voting **YES**. The Mayor declared the **MOTION CARRIED**

**Item #5-5.** - Mayor Kling presented the request to **authorize** the **Mayor** to **sign MOU** with **NDC** for the Noble Drain Trunk Sewer design work and **authorize** the **Mayor** to **sign task order** for professional services with **JUB Engineers** for the Noble Drain Trunk Sewer in the amount of $170,264 (T&M N.T.E.) (Reviewed and Approved by Legal)

Tom Points presented a staff report explaining that at the NDC’s March meeting they requested staff to provided them with scope of work to have the Noble Drain Trunk Sewer designed from the intersection of Northside Boulevard and Ustick Road west to Midland Boulevard.
Regular Council  
May 20, 2019

Staff worked with JUB Engineers to prepare a scope of work for these design services (see attached Scope of Work).

At the NDC’s April meeting they authorized proceeding with the design work by JUB in the amount of $170,264.

Because the selection of JUB was from the Nampa City’s On-Call list and not through a Request for Qualifications administered by NDC, their attorney has requested that the City of Nampa execute the task order with JUB and NDC will reimburse the City of Nampa for the cost of the design work.

The Nampa City’s and NDC’s attorneys have reviewed the MOU and recommend approval.

Engineering has reviewed the MOU and Scope of Work and recommend approval. **MOVED** by Rodriguez and **SECONDED** by Skaug to authorize the **Mayor** to **sign MOU** with NDC for the Noble Drain Trunk Sewer design work and **authorize the Mayor to sign task order** for professional services with JUB Engineers for the Noble Drain Trunk Sewer in the amount of **$170,264** (T&M N.T.E.). The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting **YES**. The Mayor declared the **MOTION CARRIED**

**Item #5-6.** - Mayor Kling presented the request for appointment of the alternate voting delegate for Association of Idaho Cities June Conference.

**MOVED** by Bruner and **SECONDED** by Rodriguez to **appoint Councilwomen Levi as the alternate voting delegate for the Association of Idaho Cities** June conference. The Mayor asked all in favor say aye with all Councilmembers present voting **AYE**. The Mayor declared the **MOTION CARRIED**

**Item #5-7.** - Mayor Kling presented the request to **authorize the Mayor and Public Works Director** to sign a **Task Order** for Scope of Work for Consultant Services with Stantec for Nampa Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase II Upgrades Project Group D-Primary Digester No. 5 and Related Facilities Design. (Reviewed and Approved by Legal)

Deputy Public Works Director Nate Runyan presented a staff report explaining that the Nampa Wastewater Program is beginning design and construction activities for Phase II Upgrades at the Nampa Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP). The Phase II Upgrades are proposed to be constructed in five project groups. The first of these groups is Project Group
D which includes the construction of Primary Digester No. 5 and related facilities. Project Group D will begin construction in January 2020 versus the original plan of 2024.

In February 2018, Nampa City Council approved the WWTP Facility Plan, which identified the need for a fifth primary anaerobic digester and replacement of the waste gas flare in Phase II Upgrades.

In September 2018 the City of Nampa renewed its Professional Services Agreement with Stantec Consulting Services, Inc., (Stantec) to perform professional services for the WWTP Phase I Upgrades Project Group C - New Anaerobic Digester. These services included Primary Digester No. 2 structural retrofits evaluation and the final design of Primary Digester No. 4.

This evaluation produced a preferred investment strategy for the WWTP primary digesters including construction of Primary Digester No. 5 in fiscal year 2020. The Facility Plan construction year was originally 2024. By accelerating construction of Primary Digester No. 5, inflationary savings of $2.8 million are estimated.

Staff recommends Stantec perform professional services for Project Group D - Primary Digester No. 5 and Related Facilities Design given their specific expertise, knowledge, and performance on Primary Digester No. 4.

Staff has negotiated a scope and fee with Stantec for design services for Project Group D (see Exhibit A). The primary elements are as follows:

- Design of Primary Digester No. 5 and related facilities including civil, electrical, instrumentation and controls, mechanical and structural design.
- Design of new waste gas flare, relocation of the existing waste gas flare and associated facilities.
- Preparation of Class 3 Opinion of Probable Construction Costs and schedule and sequencing plan for construction.
- Support Public Works Department staff with the City of Nampa Building Department permitting and Idaho Department of Environmental Quality review process.

The Wastewater Division fiscal year 2019 budget for Project Group D is $500,000. This budget was set before the scope of Project Group D was fully defined. The current Phase II Upgrades budget includes $1,081,000 for the design of Project Group D.

City of Nampa staff and Stantec have agreed upon a scope and fee in the amount of $549,500.00 T&M NTE (time and material not to exceed). The fee for this work is significantly lower than the budgeted amount as a result of the efficiencies inherent with using a consistent design team.
MOVED by Rodriguez to authorize the Mayor and Public Works Director to sign Task Order for Scope of Work with Stantec for the Nampa Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase II Upgrades Project Group D - Primary Digester No. 5 and Related Facilities Design in the amount of $549,500.00 T&M NTE.

MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF SECOND

MOVED by Haverfield and SECONDED by Rodriguez to authorize the Mayor and Public Works Director to sign Task Order for Scope of Work with Stantec for the Nampa Wastewater Treatment Plant Phase II Upgrades Project Group D - Primary Digester No. 5 and Related Facilities Design in the amount of $549,500.00 T&M NTE. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the Motion Carried.

Item #5-8. – The following Resolution was presented:

A RESOLUTION OF THE NAMPA CITY COUNCIL, CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO, IMPLEMENTING INCREASES IN THE SERVICE FEES CHARGED BY THE CITY OF NAMPA FOR WASTEWATER RATES AND USER FEES.

MOVED by Bruner and SECONDED by Rodriguez to pass the resolution as presented. Mayor Kling asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the resolution passed, numbered it 25-2019 and directed the clerk to record it as required.

MOTION CARRIED

Item #5-9. – The following Resolution was presented:

A RESOLUTION OF THE NAMPA CITY COUNCIL, CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO, IMPLEMENTING INCREASES IN SERVICE FEES CHARGED BY THE CITY OF NAMPA FOR WASTEWATER HOOKUP FEES.

MOVED by Hogaboam and SECONDED by Rodriguez to pass the resolution as presented. Mayor Kling asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the resolution passed, numbered it 26-2019 and directed the clerk to record it as required.

MOTION CARRIED

Item #5-10. – The following Ordinance was read by title:
AN ORDINANCE DETERMINING THAT CERTAIN LANDS, COMMONLY KNOWN AS **2700 E. AMITY AVENUE**, COMPRISING APPROXIMATELY 0.5 ACRES, MORE OR LESS, LAY CONTIGUOUS TO THE NAMPA CITY LIMITS, COUNTY OF CANYON, STATE OF IDAHO, AND THAT SAID LANDS SHOULD BE **ANNEXED** INTO THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO, AS PART OF THE RS 7 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL – WITH A "REQUIRED PROPERTY AREA" OF AT LEAST 7,000 SQUARE FEET) ZONE; DECLARING SAID LANDS BY PROPER LEGAL DESCRIPTION AS DESCRIBED BELOW TO BE A PART OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO; DIRECTING THE CITY OF NAMPA ENGINEER AND PLANNING AND ZONING DIRECTOR TO ADD SAID PROPERTY TO THE OFFICIAL MAPS OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO; REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, ORDERS OR PARTS THEREOF IN CONFLICT HEREWITH; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE; AND, DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE CITY OF NAMPA TO FILE A CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDINANCE AND MAP OF THE AREA TO BE ANNEXED WITH CANYON COUNTY, STATE OF IDAHO AND THE IDAHO STATE TAX COMMISSION, PURSUANT TO IDAHO CODE, SECTION 63-215. (Applicant Richardo Reyes)

The Mayor declared this the first reading of the Ordinance.

Mayor Kling presented a request to pass the preceding Ordinance under suspension of rules.

MOVED by Haverfield and SECONDED by Skaug to **pass** the preceding Ordinance under suspension of rules. Mayor Kling asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the ordinance duly passed, numbered it **4437** and directed the Clerk to record it as required.

MOTION CARRIED

✈️ (7) Unfinished Business ✈️

Item #7-1. – The following Ordinance was read by title:

AN ORDINANCE DETERMINING THAT CERTAIN LANDS, COMMONLY KNOWN AS AN **UNADDRESSED PARCEL LYING SOUTH OF CHERRY LANE** BETWEEN TEN LANE AND MIDLAND BOULEVARD, COMPRISING APPROXIMATELY 21.395 ACRES, MORE OR LESS, LAY CONTIGUOUS TO THE NAMPA CITY LIMITS, COUNTY OF CANYON, STATE OF IDAHO, AND THAT SAID LANDS SHOULD BE **ANNEXED** INTO THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO, AS PART OF THE HC (HEALTHCARE) ZONE; DECLARING SAID LANDS BY PROPER LEGAL DESCRIPTION AS DESCRIBED BELOW TO BE A PART OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO; DIRECTING THE NAMPA CITY ENGINEER AND PLANNING AND ZONING DIRECTOR TO ADD SAID PROPERTY TO THE OFFICIAL MAPS OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO; REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, ORDERS OR PARTS THEREOF IN CONFLICT HEREWITH; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE; AND, DIRECTING THE CLERK OF
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THE CITY OF NAMPA TO FILE A CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDINANCE AND MAP OF THE AREA TO BE ANNEXED WITH CANYON COUNTY, STATE OF IDAHO AND THE IDAHO STATE TAX COMMISSION, PURSUANT TO IDAHO CODE, SECTION 63-215.  (Applicant Land Group representing St. Luke’s Regional Medical Center LTD)

The Mayor declared this the first reading of the Ordinance.

Mayor Kling presented a request to pass the preceding Ordinance under suspension of rules.

MOVED by Levi and SECONDED by Bruner to pass the preceding Ordinance under suspension of rules.  Mayor Kling asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the ordinance duly passed, numbered it 4438 and directed the Clerk to record it as required.

MOTION CARRIED

❖ (8) Pending Ordinances (Postponed Due to Lack of Supporting Documentation) ❖

8-1. 1st reading of ordinance for Annexation and Zoning to Light Industrial at 58 and 0 N. Kings Rd. for construction of Storage Units (A combined 3.87 acre or 168,577 sq. ft. portion of the South Half of the NW ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 24, T3N, R2W, BM) for Cody Lane-Trek Investment Group (PH was 9-17-2018)

8-2. 1st reading of ordinance for Annexation and Zoning to RD (Two-Family Residential) for Mattingly Creek Subdivision at 2008 W. Orchard Ave. (A 3.5-acre portion of the SE ¼ of the SW ¼ of Section 17, T3N, R2W, BM – 11 Two Unit Single Family Residential Attached lots on 3.5 acres for a total of 22 dwelling units on 3.5 acres or 6.29 dwelling units/gross acre) for Pontifex Capital, LLC represented by Bob Taunton, Taunton Group LLC (ANN 105-18) (PH was 1-22-2019)

8-3. 1st reading of ordinance for modification of an Annexation and Zoning Development Agreement (Ord. 3554 – Instr. # 200629961) between BB One LLC and the City of Nampa by amending Exhibit B - Commitments and Conditions, and introducing an Exhibit C - Preliminary Plat for Laguna Farm Apartments pertaining to Parcel #R3041700000 (1652 Idaho Center Blvd.) a 24.53-acre property in a GB2 (Gateway Business 2) zoning district in Government Lot 1 and the NE ¼ of the NW ¼ of Section 7, T3N, R1W, BM - for Kent Brown representing FIG Laguna Farms LLC (DAMO 027-18) (PH was 2-4-2019)

8-4. 1st reading of ordinance for Annexation and Zoning to BC at 0 Star Rd (Parcel R3036301200) on the south side of Ustick Road, east of Star Road, for access to city utilities for a mixed-use development. (A 4.72-acre parcel situated in the NW ¼ Section 5 T3N R1W BM, Tax 99106 in Lot 4) for Matt Garner representing JABR, LLC (Justin Reynolds and Alan Bean). (ANN-00112-2019) (PH was 4-15-2019)
(9) Executive Session

Item #9-1. - Mayor Kling presented the request to adjourn into Motion to Adjourn into Executive Session Pursuant to Idaho Code 74-206 (1) (c) To acquire an interest in real property which is not owned by a public agency.

Item #9-2. - Mayor Kling presented the request to adjourn into Motion to Adjourn into Executive Session Pursuant to Idaho Code 74-206 (1) (b) To consider the evaluation, dismissal or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, or public school student.

MOVED by Hogaboam and SECONDED by Rodriguez to adjourn into executive session at 10:38 p.m. pursuant to Idaho Code 74-206 (1) (c) To acquire an interest in real property which is not owned by a public agency and Idaho Code 74-206 (1) (b) To consider the evaluation, dismissal or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, or public school student. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the

MOTION CARRIED

MOVED by Skaug and SECONDED by Hogaboam to conclude the executive session at 11:05 p.m. during which discussion was held regarding Idaho Code 74-206 (1) (c) To acquire an interest in real property which is not owned by a public agency and Idaho Code 74-206 (1) (b) To consider the evaluation, dismissal or disciplining of, or to hear complaints or charges brought against, a public officer, employee, staff member or individual agent, or public school student. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the

MOTION CARRIED

MOVED by Skaug and SECONDED by Hogaboam to adjourn the meeting at 11:06 p.m. The Mayor declared the

MOTION CARRIED

Passed this 3rd day of June 2019.

____________________________________
MAYOR

ATTEST:

____________________________________
NAMPA CITY CLERK
Chairman McGrath called the meeting to order at 6:47 p.m.

Approval of Minutes: Sellman motioned and Hutchings seconded to approve the Minutes of the April 23, 2019 Planning and Zoning Commission meeting. Motion carried.

Report on Council Actions. No City Council representative present to report on City Council actions.
- Principal Planner Ashby advised City Council had approved all the applications recommended by the Planning Commission during their May 6, 2019 meeting.

Chairman McGrath proceeded to the business item on the agenda.

Business Item No. 1:
Subdivision Final Plat Approval for Carriage Hill West Subdivision No. 3, east of Midway Rd, between W Iowa Ave and Lake Lowell Ave. (A portion of the NW ¼ of Section 31 T3N R2W BM – 64 Single Family Residential lots on 25.03 acres, or 2.56 lots/gross acre) for Engineering Solutions, LLP, representing Toll Southwest, LLC (SPF-00088-2019).

Principal Planner Ashby:
- Ashby indicated the Carriage Hill West Subdivision No. 3 Final Plat, comprising 25 acres, with 64 buildable lots and 13 common lots, within an RS-7 zoning district.
- Ashby referred to the Staff Report and noted the comments from the Boise Board of Control, dated April 23, 2019, regarding the Thacker Lateral.
- Ashby referred to the requirements listed in the 4 page Memorandum from the Nampa Engineering Division, dated May 6, 2019, authored by Caleb LaClair.
- Staff recommends Carriage Hill West Subdivision No. 3 be approved subject to the applicant/developer complying with the conditions listed in the Staff Report.
- Chairman McGrath inquired how water rights would be obtained for a parcel of land that was not so entitled.
- Badger replied the entire property was within the Boise-Kuna Irrigation District, however, it appeared that everything above the Thacker Lateral did not have surface water rights. There were a couple of wells on the site, formerly used for farming, that they are looking at coordinating with the City – and noted there were existing water rights for those wells.
Sellman motioned and Kropp seconded to recommend to City Council approval of the Final Plat for Carriage Hill West Subdivision No. 3, for 64 Single Family Residential lots on 25.03 acres, located east of Midway Rd between W Iowa Ave and Lake Lowell Ave, for Engineering Solutions, LLP, representing Toll Southwest, LLC, subject to:

1. Generally, Applicant/Development shall:
   - Comply with all City department/division or outside agency requirements pertinent to this matter. This is to include any extant but applicable conditions from prior approvals for this subdivision as iterated in correspondence on file with the City pertaining to the approved Preliminary Plat of/for Carriage Hill West Subdivision.
   - More specifically, comply with requirements/conditions listed in the following item(s) of correspondence (unless waived and/or later amended by the agency providing the comments):

2. Specifically:
   a) Comply with requirements listed in the April 30, 2019 email from Nampa Parks Superintendent, Cody Swander, requiring a ten (10) ft wide sidewalk (Urban Connector) be constructed along Midway Road for the length of the development in accordance with the City of Nampa Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.
   b) Comply with the requirement(s) listed in the April 23, 2019 letter from Boise Project Board of Control regarding the Thacker Lateral, authored by Thomas Ritthaler.
   c) Comply with the requirements listed in the May 6, 2019 memorandum from the City of Nampa Engineering Division authored by Caleb LaClair, P.E.
   d) Comply with the requirement(s) listed in the April 30, 2019 memorandum from the City of Nampa Engineering Division, GIS Section, authored by Craig Wilbur.

3. Correct any spelling, grammar and punctuation and numbering errors that may be evident on the plat face and/or in the proposed Project plat development notes.

Motion carried.

Chairman McGrath proceeded to the public hearing items on the agenda at 7:00 p.m.

Public Hearing No. 1:

a) Zoning Map Amendment from RA (Suburban Residential) to RS-6 (Single Family Residential – 6000 sq ft) for .7 acres or 30,368 sq ft at 714 Smith Ave;

b) Subdivision Short Plat approval for Smith Avenue Hideaway (2 single family detached lots and one duplex lot on .7 acre for 5.71 dwelling units per gross acre. A parcel of land being a portion of Lot 24 of Westview Subdivision, according to the plat filed in Book 4 at Page 31 recorded in the office of the Canyon County Recorder, in the NW ¼ of Section 21 T3N R2W BM); and,

c) Conditional Use Permit approval for 1 year, for a Duplex Dwelling at 714 Smith Avenue (An 80 ft x 120 ft or 9,525 sq ft portion of the NW ¼ of Section 21 T3N R2W BM – proposed Lot 3, Block 1, Smith Avenue Hideaway), for Susan Schindler (ZMA-00105-2019, SPS-00019-2019, CUP-00133-2017)

Susan Schindler of 714 Smith Ave, Nampa – the applicant:

- Ms Schindler explained that as a tribute to her father, who had built some duplexes, she wanted to build a duplex on the property.
- After researching, Ms Schindler determined it would be best to develop 3 lots – a flag lot with a shared driveway and an existing house on the front parcel.
- The plan, continued Ms Schindler, was to build a single family home on the second lot and a duplex on the back/third lot.
- Both the single family home and the duplex, stated Ms Schindler, would be single story structures.
- The single family home would be a basic craftsman style home, explained Ms Schindler, and the duplex would reflect a similar single story design.

Principal Planner Ashby:

- Ashby reviewed the three actions before the Commission: The recommendation to City Council for the Zoning Map Amendment from RA to RS-6, a recommendation to City Council for the three lot Subdivision Short Plat; and a decision on the Conditional Use Permit for the single level duplex on the northern lot.
• Ashby indicated the location of the subject property, surrounded by RS-6 zoning designation. The zoning change to RS-6 for the subject property would be consistent with the surrounding zoning and the Comprehensive Plan Future Land Use Map.
• Ashby reviewed the history of the subject property and noted the property was split from Lot 24 of Westview Subdivision in 2002.
• The applicant was also requesting approval of the Conditional Use Permit for a one year time frame (the standard CUP is approved for a 6 month time period – and an extension can be requested) in order to allow time to secure financing, select a builder, general contractor, and complete infrastructure such as utilities and paving of the shared driveway.
• The requested RS-6 zoning, explained Ashby, would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan designation of Medium Density Residential. Water and sewer services are available from Smith Ave, and pressurized irrigation is already stubbed to the property.
• Ashby indicated the layout of the subject property, with the access on the east side from a common drive, 20 ft wide, with a turnaround on the northermost lot.
• The southern lot, continued Ashby, has an existing home and garage.
• Ashby reviewed the Staff Report regarding the Zoning Map Amendment, Short Plat, and Conditional Use Permit for the proposed duplex.
• According to Ashby, the requested Zoning Map Amendment, Short Plat would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan to encourage infill development.
• Ashby reviewed the suggested conditions of approval.
• Kehoe inquired if there was a fence along the east side of the property along the proposed shared driveway.
• Ashby replied there was currently fencing along the back of the property and a retaining wall and fencing along the east.
• Ashby referred to the Memorandum from the Engineering Division regarding requiring a structural engineer to inspect the retaining wall and provide analysis of the wall; and proposed drainage swale.

Chairman McGrath proceeded to public testimony.
No public comment forthcoming.

Kehoe motioned and Sellman seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

Kehoe motioned and Sellman seconded to recommend to City Council a Zoning Map Amendment from RA to RS-6 for 714 Smith Ave, for Susan Schindler, subject to:
1. Generally, the Applicant/Development shall:
   a) Comply with all City department/division or outside agency requirements pertinent to this matter.
2. Specifically, the Applicant/Development shall:
   a) Remove the Patmore Ash (Fraxinus Pennsylvana “Patmore”) from the landscape plans and select an approved species.
   b) Provide a cross access agreement specifically naming each parcel, before the City Council public hearing. The agreement shall either include maintenance of the common drive and utilities shared by all property owners, or shall note that when a property is sold separately from the others, a maintenance agreement shall be procured at that time.
   c) Comply with all conditions stated by the City of Nampa Engineering Division letter dated April 19, 2019
Motion carried.

Kehoe motioned and Sellman seconded to recommend to City Council approval of the Short Plat Subdivision for Smith Avenue Hideaway, 2 single family detached lots and one duplex lot located at 714 Smith Avenue, on .7 acres for 5.71 dwelling units per gross acre, a portion of Lot 24 of Westview Subdivision for Susan Schindler, subject to:
1. Generally, the Applicant/Development shall:
   a) Comply with all City department/division or outside agency requirements pertinent to this matter.
2. Specifically, the Applicant/Development shall:
a) Remove the Patmore Ash (Fraxinus Pennsylvania “Patmore”) from the landscape plans and select an approved species.
b) Provide a cross access agreement specifically naming each parcel, before the City Council public hearing. The agreement shall either include maintenance of the common drive and utilities shared by all property owners, or shall note that when a property is sold separately from the others, a maintenance agreement shall be procured at that time.
c) Comply with all conditions stated by the City of Nampa Engineering Division letter dated April 19, 2019

Motion carried.

Kehoe motioned and Sellman seconded to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a duplex for 714 Smith Avenue, for a one year (12 month) approval time (to allow work to commence on the duplex), for the proposed duplex lot at Lot 3, Block 1 of Smith Avenue Hideaway, at 714 Smith Avenue, for Susan Schindler, subject to:

1. Generally, the Applicant/Development shall:
b) Comply with all City department/division or outside agency requirements pertinent to this matter.

2. Specifically, the Applicant/Development shall:
a) Remove the Patmore Ash (Fraxinus Pennsylvania “Patmore”) from the landscape plans and select an approved species.
b) Provide a cross access agreement specifically naming each parcel, before the City Council public hearing. The agreement shall either include maintenance of the common drive and utilities shared by all property owners, or shall note that when a property is sold separately from the others, a maintenance agreement shall be procured at that time.
c) Comply with all conditions stated by the City of Nampa Engineering Division letter dated April 19, 2019

Motion carried.

Public Hearing No. 2:
Conditional Use Permit for a Commercial Day Care in an RA (Suburban Residential) zoning district at 1127 E Greenhurst Rd. (A .94 acre or 40,946 sq ft parcel being a portion of Government Lot 1 in the NE ¼ Section 3 T3N R2W BM), for Maria Varela, dba Loly’s Daycare (CUP-00134-2019).

Chairman McGrath proceeded to public hearing.

Maria Varela of 1610 W Teton Avenue, Nampa – the applicant:
- Ms Varela stated she had purchased the subject property to start her commercial daycare business
- According to Ms Varela, she had operated a family daycare business in her home for 18 years.
- Ms Varela explained she wanted to enlarge her daycare business and had purchased the commercial daycare and property at 1127 E Greenhurst, and planned to operate the commercial daycare.
- In response to a question from Chairman McGrath, Ms Varela stated the previous license for the daycare did not transfer to her and she had to apply for her own daycare license. Ms Varela confirmed she was not connected in any way with the previous owner.
- Kehoe inquired if the previous owner would be working in any capacity at the subject daycare and Ms Varela confirmed the previous owner would not be working in any capacity at the subject daycare.

Doug Critchfield – Senior Planner:
- Critchfield advised a daycare had been operating on the subject property since September 1998, as Cowpoke Country Daycare.
- The applicant, Ms Varela, had acquired the daycare business and the property effective April 1, 2019, and the operator of the previous daycare was no longer involved with the business.
- With the cancellation of the previous Conditional Use Permit, all of the previous conditions required at that time have been re-applied to the subject daycare.
• The commercial daycare, added Critchfield, would be caring for up to 86 children. The daycare was located in a park setting, surrounded by park, the Skyview High School, and the Church Seminary building. The residential area is located on the north side of E Greenhurst Rd.
• The operation of the subject business in that type of setting, added Critchfield, was actually very fitting.
• No correspondence had been received for or against the C-U-P, stated Critchfield.
• Critchfield added staff had been to the site and determined the conditions applied to the previous daycare were still intact.
• One change has been required by the Building Department regarding ADA access.
• Additionally, other departments had been to the site to determine Code Compliance.
• The operation of the daycare, stated Critchfield, would be limited to the hours of 6:45 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on weekdays, and any expansion for more children would require approval of the Planning and Zoning Commission, via a new Conditional Use Permit application.
• Critchfield advised the applicants would be required to maintain any regulatory permitting licensures or operational procedures as required by law.
• The Engineering Division reviewed the trip generation for the daycare and determined they had no concerns in terms of traffic on Greenhurst Rd and the operation of the daycare.

Chairman McGrath proceeded to public testimony.

Jorge Varela of 1610 W Teton Ave, Nampa – was in favor of the application but did not wish to speak.

Sellman motioned and Kehoe seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

Sellman motioned and Kehoe seconded to approve the Conditional Use Permit for a daycare at 1127 E Greenhurst Rd for Maria Varela, subject to:

1. All requirements of all City Departments for occupancy/use of the property for a commercial daycare/preschool business for up to 86 children shall be satisfied prior to operation of the business.
2. The front door access shall be made ADA accessible per Building Department requirements.
3. The hours of operation for the daycare to be limited to 6:45 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. on weekdays.
4. Any expansion of the daycare to be approved by the Planning and Zoning Commission.
5. The circular driveway to serve as a pick-up and drop-off location for persons bringing to and picking up children from the daycare and not be used as long term parking by either clients or employees.
6. The owner maintains all regulatory permitting, licensures and operational procedures as required by law.
7. The Conditional Use Permit is granted only to the owner, Maria Varela, for 1127 E Greenhurst Rd only, for the duration of the use and shall not be transferable to any other location.
Motion carried.

Public Hearing No. 3:
a) Zoning Map Amendment from BC (Community Business) to IL (Light Industrial) for a Towing Business at 3315 Caldwell Blvd. (A .9 acre or 39,204 sq ft parcel being Tax 4-A in Block 1, Portner Subdivision, in the NW ½ Section 7 T3N R2W BM); and
b) Recommendation for a Conditional Use Permit for a towing/impound yard business at 3315 Caldwell Blvd, in the IL zoning district, for Byron Healy (ZMA-00106-2019).

Chairman McGrath proceeded to public hearing.

Byron Healy of 3315 Caldwell Blvd – the applicant:
• Mr Healy stated he has been running a towing business out of the subject property and only just found out that it was not zoned correctly for a towing business, and had therefore requested the Rezone to IL.
Principal Planner Ashby:
- Ashby indicated the location of the subject property, south of Caldwell Blvd.
- The subject property, noted Ashby, was located adjacent to the IL zoning district and the Rezone to IL would be consistent with the Comprehensive Plan.
- The applicant had been operating the towing company from the subject location, stated Ashby, under the name of Code Red Towing.
- A towing/impound company, stated Ashby, was allowed in the Light Industrial zoning district only with the approval of a Conditional Use Permit.
- Ashby advised the applicants had not been advised they would also need approval of a Conditional Use Permit, as well as the Rezone to IL. Therefore, the Commission should address the Rezone to IL as well as a recommendation to City Council for the Conditional Use Permit.
- The applicants towing company, continued Ashby, was on a rotation basis with the Nampa Police Department to service requirements of the NPD, and in order to compete for that rotation they are required to have an approved Conditional Use Permit.
- Ashby noted letters had been received recommending approval of the Rezone from Edgar M Thrift, Jr, of 1550 Prospect Ave, Capitola, Ca, dated May 3, 2019, owner of the building in front of the subject property.
- McGrath inquired about the Idaho Transportation Department comments regarding requirement of a Cross Access Agreement.
- Discussion followed regarding a Cross Access Agreement.

City Engineer Badger:
- Badger advised that while ITD’s concern was a valid concern it was not necessarily the City’s or the State’s place to police. Badger noted there was a historical use by the subject property for access, however, it would be advantageous to clean that issue up.
- Badger noted ITD had since responded and advised they had received positive comments regarding the Cross Access Agreement.

Chairman McGrath proceeded to public testimony.
No public comment forthcoming.

Sellman motioned and Kehoe seconded to close public hearing. Motion carried.

Sellman motioned and Garner seconded to recommend to City Council approval of the Rezone from BC to IL for 3315 Caldwell Blvd for Byron Healy, subject to:
1. Compliance with all City/department/division or outside agency requirements pertinent to this matter.
Motion carried.

Sellman motioned and Kehoe seconded to recommend to City Council approval of a Conditional Use Permit for a Towing/Impound Yard at 3315 Caldwell Blvd, for Byron Healy.
1. Compliance with all City/department/division or outside agency requirements pertinent to this matter.
Motion carried

Meeting adjourned at 7:40 p.m.

Norman L Holm, Planning Director ______________________ __________________________
:s:sm
Authorization to Advertise Notice of Public Hearing for Increase to Fiscal Year 2020 Domestic Water Rates and Fees Increase

- In 2018, City Council adopted a cost of service (COS) study rate analysis implementing a 5-year phase approach in water rates and fees increases (see Exhibit A)

- On July 16, 2018, City Council adopted an increase of 9.00% for domestic water rates and fees, effective January 1, 2019, for fiscal year 2019. The average increase per household is less than $1.56 per month

- The rate analysis defines the revenue requirements needed to cover expenses that will be incurred in the future for maintenance, fire flow, storage, and supply
  - The City of Nampa has aging infrastructure that needs replaced before emergency repairs are needed (see Exhibit B)
    - The City of Boise and Suez Water have recently had issues with brown water being distributed to some of its users because of aged infrastructure
  - Construction costs have increased due to new tariffs on steel and other materials, resulting in a 20% cost increase for several City projects

- The Public Works Rate Forecasts (see Exhibit C) and Water Funding Slope (see Exhibit D) were presented and discussed at the March 6, 2019, Board of Appraisers (BOA) meeting

- Staff recommended the following domestic water rates and fees for fiscal year 2020:
  - 9.00% increase, as established in the 2018 COS study rate analysis, effective October 1, 2019 (see Exhibit E)
  - The BOA motioned and seconded to recommend City Council approval of said recommendation

- The proposal is coming forward at this time to allow for sufficient public notification through utility bills, between the proposed public hearing date of July 1, 2019, and the anticipated effective date of October 1, 2019

- Staff requests a public hearing to increase recommended water rates and fees

REQUEST: Authorize advertisement of Monday, July 1, 2019, public hearing to present recommended fiscal year 2020 increases to water rates and fees of 9.00%, effective October 1, 2019, as established in the 2018 COS study rate analysis.
Scenario A: Smoothed Water Rate Increase

Domestic Water Utility Revenue Requirement Forecast

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY18</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Annual Rate Increase</td>
<td>0.00%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Monthly Residential Bill @ 7 ccf</td>
<td>$14.10</td>
<td>$15.36</td>
<td>$16.74</td>
<td>$18.08</td>
<td>$19.50</td>
<td>$20.86</td>
<td>$22.32</td>
<td>$23.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5% Median Monthly Household Income(^1)</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
<td>$51.51</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\)Based on 2016 MHI of $41,210.
# PUBLIC WORKS RATE FORECASTS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rate Forecast</th>
<th>FY19</th>
<th>FY20</th>
<th>FY21</th>
<th>FY22</th>
<th>FY23</th>
<th>FY24</th>
<th>FY25</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wastewater % Increase</strong></td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>16.75%</td>
<td>8.28%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wastewater Avg. Residential Bill</strong></td>
<td>$28.54</td>
<td>$33.31</td>
<td>$38.90</td>
<td>$45.40</td>
<td>$53.02</td>
<td>$61.87</td>
<td>$66.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic Water % Increase</strong></td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>9.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>8.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>7.00%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Domestic Water Avg. Residential Bill</strong></td>
<td>$15.36</td>
<td>$16.74</td>
<td>$18.08</td>
<td>$19.50</td>
<td>$20.86</td>
<td>$22.32</td>
<td>$23.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrigation % Increase</strong></td>
<td>3.88%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>4.50%</td>
<td>3.50%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
<td>3.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Irrigation Avg. Residential Bill</strong></td>
<td>$119.47</td>
<td>$124.85</td>
<td>$130.46</td>
<td>$136.33</td>
<td>$141.11</td>
<td>$145.34</td>
<td>$149.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Streets % Increase</strong></td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
<td>1.00%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Avg. Property Tax Increase</strong></td>
<td>$10.50</td>
<td>$21.00</td>
<td>$31.50</td>
<td>$42.00</td>
<td>$52.50</td>
<td>$63.00</td>
<td>$73.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Trash % Increase</strong></td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
<td>3.75%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL ANNUAL $ INCREASE</strong></td>
<td>$97.79</td>
<td>$107.70</td>
<td>$120.15</td>
<td>$132.10</td>
<td>$147.86</td>
<td>$98.06</td>
<td>$703.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Amounts shown as monthly billing
2 Amounts shown as a yearly billing
3 Pavement Condition/Congestion
4 Annual Increase Over 6 Years

---

**Estimated LOS**

- B
- C

---

**Exhibit C**
Exhibit D

Water Funding Slope
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## City of Nampa Fee Change Request Form

### Effective Date: 10/01/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trans Code</th>
<th>New Fee Description</th>
<th>Current Rate</th>
<th>Proposed Rate</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Residential 5/8&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$19.66</td>
<td>$21.43</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Residential 3/4&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$19.66</td>
<td>$21.43</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Residential 1&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$19.66</td>
<td>$21.43</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Residential 1 1/2&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$28.56</td>
<td>$31.13</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Residential 2&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$42.06</td>
<td>$45.85</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Residential 3&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$102.53</td>
<td>$111.76</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Residential 4&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$141.73</td>
<td>$154.49</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Non-Residential 5/8&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$23.63</td>
<td>$25.76</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Non-Residential 3/4&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$23.63</td>
<td>$25.76</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Non-Residential 1&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$23.63</td>
<td>$25.76</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Non-Residential 1 1/2&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$33.95</td>
<td>$37.01</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Non-Residential 2&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$48.83</td>
<td>$53.22</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Non-Residential 3&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$109.90</td>
<td>$119.79</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Non-Residential 4&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$153.38</td>
<td>$167.18</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Non-Residential 6&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$268.66</td>
<td>$292.84</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Non-Residential 8&quot; Meter Base Charge</td>
<td>$405.37</td>
<td>$441.85</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Non-Residential Volume Charge (per ccf)</td>
<td>$1.18</td>
<td>$1.29</td>
<td>9.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Residential Volume Charge - Block 1 (0-700 ccf)</td>
<td>$0.06</td>
<td>$0.06</td>
<td>3.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Residential Volume Charge - Block 2 (701-1400 ccf)</td>
<td>$1.00</td>
<td>$1.09</td>
<td>9.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Residential Volume Charge - Block 3 (1401 ccf and above)</td>
<td>$1.30</td>
<td>$1.42</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Outside City Limits Services</td>
<td>2x City Rates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Comments on Competitiveness of New Rate

The proposed rates represent an increase of 9% over current rates; rates are rounded to the nearest cent as per the 2018 cost of service analysis.

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

For operations, maintenance, and systematic replacement of water supply and infrastructure in order to continue to provide continuous and reliable utility services.
Authorization to Advertise Notice of Public Hearing for Increase to Fiscal Year 2020 Domestic Water Hookup Fees

- On July 16, 2018, City Council adopted an increase by the ENR Index rate at 5.00%, effective October 1, 2018, for fiscal year 2019

- To avoid additional significant hookup fee increases in the future, staff believes adjusting fees annually by an index is appropriate

- On March 6, 2019, Public Works Department staff proposed the following index options to the Board of Appraisers (BOA) to recommend increases to fiscal year 2020 water hookup fees:
  A. ENR\(^1\) (Engineering News-Record) increase of 3.39% (average increase from October 2017 to October 2018) (see Exhibit A)
  B. PPI-West\(^2\) (Producer Price Index) increase of 6.09% (average increase from October 2017 to October 2018) (see Exhibit B)
  C. No increase

- Staff recommended the PPI-West increase of 6.09%, for domestic water hookup fees, effective October 1, 2019, to slow rate increase projection
  - The BOA motioned and seconded to recommend to City Council approval of said recommendation

- Staff requests a public hearing to increase recommended water hookup fees

REQUEST: Authorize advertisement of Monday, July 1, 2019, public hearing to present recommended fiscal year 2020 increases to water hookup fees by PPI-West Index rate of 6.09%, effective October 1, 2019.

Footnote #1: ENR Construction Cost Index is a common construction index for comparing pricing over time. The index uses labor, concrete, steel and other construction materials, whereas the CPI uses consumer goods pricing to index for comparing pricing over time.

Footnote #2: PPI-West Construction Cost Index is a common construction index for comparing pricing over time. The index uses new nonresidential construction costs. This index is based upon regions, one being the West region.
# City of Nampa
## Fee Change Request Form

**Department**: Public Works - Water - Domestic Hookup Fees  
**Effective Date**: 10/01/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trans Code</th>
<th>New Fee?</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current Fees</th>
<th>Proposed Fees</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Est Annual Dollar Incr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hookup Fee - Domestic Water Base (per EDU)</td>
<td>$1,034.00</td>
<td>$1,069.00</td>
<td>3.38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hookup Fee - Domestic Water Fire Flow (per EPU)</td>
<td>$145.00</td>
<td>$150.00</td>
<td>3.45%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1&quot; Meter Connection Fee</td>
<td>$463.00</td>
<td>$479.00</td>
<td>3.46%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.5&quot; Meter Connection Fee</td>
<td>$679.00</td>
<td>$702.00</td>
<td>3.39%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2&quot; Meter Connection Fee</td>
<td>$865.00</td>
<td>$894.00</td>
<td>3.35%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1&quot; Domestic Service Line Fee</td>
<td>$1,495.00</td>
<td>$1,546.00</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.5&quot; Domestic Service Line Fee</td>
<td>$1,876.00</td>
<td>$1,940.00</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2&quot; Domestic Service Line Fee</td>
<td>$2,405.00</td>
<td>$2,487.00</td>
<td>3.41%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments on Competitiveness of New Rate**

Increase based on changes in the ENR (Engineering News Record) Construction Cost Index from October 2017 - October 2018 (3.39% increase), with fees rounded to whole dollars.

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

Fee increase needed for systematic replacement of domestic water system infrastructure to provide continuous and reliable utility services.

Hookup fees shall apply to all new connections (and change of use for existing connections) occurring on or after October 1, 2019.
**City of Nampa**

**Fee Change Request Form**

**Department:** Public Works - Water - Domestic Hookup Fees

**Effective Date:** 10/01/2019

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trans Code</th>
<th>New Fee?</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Current Fees</th>
<th>Proposed Fees</th>
<th>Percent Change</th>
<th>Est Annual Dollar Incr</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hookup Fee - Domestic Water Base (per EDU)</td>
<td>$1,034.00</td>
<td>$1,097.00</td>
<td>6.09%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>Hookup Fee - Domestic Water Fire Flow (per EFU)</td>
<td>$145.00</td>
<td>$154.00</td>
<td>6.21%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1&quot; Meter Connection Fee</td>
<td>$463.00</td>
<td>$491.00</td>
<td>6.05%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.5&quot; Meter Connection Fee</td>
<td>$679.00</td>
<td>$720.00</td>
<td>6.04%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2&quot; Meter Connection Fee</td>
<td>$865.00</td>
<td>$918.00</td>
<td>6.13%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1&quot; Domestic Service Line Fee</td>
<td>$1,495.00</td>
<td>$1,586.00</td>
<td>6.09%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>1.5&quot; Domestic Service Line Fee</td>
<td>$1,876.00</td>
<td>$1,990.00</td>
<td>6.08%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No</td>
<td>2&quot; Domestic Service Line Fee</td>
<td>$2,405.00</td>
<td>$2,552.00</td>
<td>6.11%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments on Competitiveness of New Rate**

Increase based on changes in the PPI - West (Producer Price Index) Construction Cost Index from October 2017 - October 2018 (6.09% increase), with fees rounded to whole dollars.

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

Fee increase needed for systematic replacement of domestic water system infrastructure to provide continuous and reliable utility services.

Hookup fees shall apply to all new connections (and change of use for existing connections) occurring on or after October 1, 2019.
CONSENT TO BID
Indian Creek Pathway Extension Taffy to Peppermint
Key No. 20141
(As approved in the FY19 budget)

- Engineering Division has made a request to the Community Planning Association of Southwest Idaho (COMPASS) for additional funding to address the estimated project overages. COMPASS recommended granting additional funds to the project in the amount of $52,000 on 5/22/2019, which will increase total funding to $587,355.

- In 2016 the City was awarded Federal funding through the Transportation Alternatives Program (TAP) to extend the Indian Creek multi-use pathway from Taffy Drive to Peppermint Drive.

- The TAP program targets projects that advance mobility, safety, and economic opportunity.

- The project will fill a critical gap in the City’s multi-use pathway system. The improvements include 633’ of 10’ wide asphalt pathway along Indian Creek (between Taffy Dr & Peppermint Dr), slope stabilization, (see Exhibit A, Vicinity Map).

- The project is recognized as high priority in the City of Nampa Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan.

- The State/Local Agreement for the Indian Creek Pathway Extension project was executed between the City and the State for design and construction in 2017. Funding in the amount of $535,355 is planned for the project. The City if responsible for 7.34% match and any overages that may be incurred.

- TO Engineers, Inc. was tasked to perform the design and contract bid support for a total amount of $95,475.00.

- Indian Creek Pathway Extension Taffy to Peppermint has an approved FY19 budget of $535,355. Below is an estimated project cost based on the engineer’s estimate for construction.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 95,475.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Construction</td>
<td>$ 424,676.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Construction Engineering &amp; Inspection</td>
<td>$ 51,450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 571,601.72</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Award of the bid will not be brought forward until a funding source for any overage is identified and secured.

- TO Engineers, Inc. has provided an engineer’s estimate and the Engineering Division recommends authorization of the formal bidding process.
REQUEST: Council authorize the Engineering Division to proceed with the formal bid process for the Indian Creek Pathway Extension (Taffy to Peppermint), Key No. 20141.
Indian Creek Pathway Extension
Taffy to Peppermint

Project Location

Exhibit A

For illustrative purposes only.

5/10/2019
RELEASE OF LOT SALE AND LOT IMPROVEMENT DELAY AGREEMENT
CANYON CREEK SUBDIVISION NO. 2
(Reviewed and Approved by Legal)

• The Developer of Canyon Creek Subdivision No. 2 entered into a Lot Sale and Lot Improvement Delay Agreement for a portion of the Final Plat. The agreement was recorded on 2/26/2019 as Instrument No. 2019-007829 in the records of Canyon County, Idaho.

• This agreement allowed the developer to record the Final Plat for the subdivision prior to improvements being completed on a portion of the subdivision phase. This agreement restricts the sale of lots within the portion affected by the agreement.

• Improvements are complete on Lots 1 through 11, Block 8; Lots 1 through 5 and 19 through 21, Block 7; and Lots 30 through 48, Block 1 of Canyon Creek Subdivision No. 2 (“Future Development Area” per Exhibit B). Completion of common area landscaping and Can Ada Road paving are remaining; however, the Developer has issued bonding in the form of Letter of Credit for these items in accordance with Nampa City Code. The Developer is scheduled to complete the Can Ada Road paving by May 29, with landscaping to be complete by mid-June.

• The developer has requested staff procure Council authorization to release the Lot Sale and Lot Improvement Delay Agreement on these lots.

• The release of the Lot Sale and Lot Improvement Delay Agreement allows the developer to sell and pull building permits on these lots.

• With the release of these lots, all lots within Canyon Creek Subdivision No. 2 are complete.

• The Engineering Division has inspected the outstanding construction items associated with these lots and found them to be complete. Engineering recommends releasing the Lot Sale and Lot Improvement Delay Agreement.

• Legal has reviewed the standard release document language.

REQUEST: Council authorization for the Mayor to sign the Release of Lot Sale and Lot Improvement Delay Agreement (Exhibit A) for Lots 1 through 11, Block 8; Lots 1 through 5 and 19 through 21, Block 7; and Lots 30 through 48, Block 1 of Canyon Creek Subdivision No. 2.
EXHIBIT A

RELEASE AND SATISFACTION OF AGREEMENT

FOR CANYON CREEK SUBDIVISION #2

The City of Nampa hereby acknowledges that the Lot Sale and Lot Improvement Delay Agreement recorded as Instrument No. 2019-007829 in the records of Canyon County, Idaho, is fully satisfied and is hereby released and discharged. This document shall be recorded to show the release of the non-development agreement upon the property as recorded.

Dated this ____ day of________________, ________.

CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO,

By __________________________
Debbie Kling
Mayor

ATTEST:

_____________________________
City Clerk

STATE OF IDAHO )

) ss.

County of Canyon )

On this ______ day of ______________, 2019, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared Debbie Kling and Deborah Rosin, known to me to be the Mayor and City Clerk, respectively, of the City of Nampa, Idaho, a municipal corporation, who executed the foregoing instrument, or the persons that executed the instrument on behalf of said corporation and acknowledged to me that such corporation executed the same.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed by official seal, the day and year in this certificate first above written.

________________________________
Notary Public in and for the State of Idaho
Residing at _______________________
My commission expires _______________
TASK ORDER AMENDMENT
GREENHURST ROAD REBUILD – MIDLAND TO JUNIPER
(As approved in FY19 Budget)

- The Engineering Division, as part of the Public Works Asset Management Program, identified Greenhurst Road (from 600 feet east of Midland Boulevard to Juniper Street) to be reconstructed in FY18. (see Exhibit A)

- The Wilson Drain culvert is located on Greenhurst Rd between 12th Avenue Road and Sunnybrook Drive and is the lowest rated culvert in Asset Management Zone D. Combining the culvert project with a road rebuild project eliminates redundant work and saves the City money on mobilization costs.

- The result of the project will be a consistent street section with pedestrian and drainage improvements that increase function and mobility in the near term while aligning with the future intersection project at Midland and Greenhurst.

- Paragon Consulting, Inc.’s original Scope of Work provided design services in the amount of $163,110.

- Due to difficulties finding qualified applicants to hire that can provide construction engineering and inspection services in house, Engineering has requested assistance from Paragon Consulting to provide construction engineering and inspection services for the construction of Phase II of the project.

- Phase II estimated start date is June 10, 2019 and substantial completion date is August 9, 2019.

- Paragon Consulting, Inc. has provided a scope of work and labor estimate to provide construction engineering and inspection services for phase two of the project. (see Exhibit B)

- Funding for construction engineering and inspection services (CE&I) is $200,000. Below is a list of services and associated costs for Paragon Consulting to provide CE&I services on the Greenhurst Road Rebuild project.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Engineering Support (T.O. Amendment A)</td>
<td>$ 24,825.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Assistance (T.O. Amendment B)</td>
<td>$ 15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E. &amp; I. Services (T.O. Amendment C)</td>
<td>$ 28,980.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CE&amp;I CONTRACT</strong></td>
<td><strong>$ 68,805.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- If task order amendment is approved the estimated Greenhurst Road Rebuild project costs as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Design</td>
<td>$ 163,110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R/W Acquisitions</td>
<td>$ 25,555.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimated Construction</td>
<td>$ 2,262,887.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C.E. &amp; I. Services (T.O. Amendment A-C)</td>
<td>$ 68,805.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
**TOTAL PROJECT COSTS**  $2,520,357.23

- Project funding:
  
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Approved FY18 Streets</td>
<td>$163,110.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved FY 19 Streets Greenhurst Road (Midland to Juniper)</td>
<td>$1,820,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved FY 19 Water Greenhurst Road (Midland to Juniper)</td>
<td>$75,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved FY19 Streets (Juniper to Sunnyridge)</td>
<td>$500,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approved FY19 Streets Contingency</td>
<td>$139,603.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FY19 Roadway Bridge Tax Reduction</td>
<td>$(177,356.00)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL FUNDING**  $2,520,357.23

**REQUEST:** Authorize Mayor and Public Works Director to sign Task Order Amendment with Paragon Consulting, Inc. to provide construction engineering and inspection services for the Greenhurst Rebuild – Midland to Juniper project in the amount of $28,980.00 (T&M N.T.E.)
SCOPE OF WORK
FOR
CITY OF NAMPA
GREENHURST ROAD REBUILD (MIDLAND BOULEVARD TO JUNIPER STREET)
TASK ORDER AMENDMENT 3
(PHASE 2 CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING & INSPECTION SERVICES)
CITY OF NAMPA PROJECT NO. PW80018009
CITY OF NAMPA TASK ORDER NO. PW80018009-C
MAY 14, 2019

Prepared By:
Paragon Consulting, Inc.
157 W. 4th Street
Kuna, Idaho 83634

Project Manager:
Joe Barton, P.E.
(208) 921-8486
Scope of Work

Date: May 14, 2019
Task Order Number: PW80018009-C
Project Number: PW80018009
Project Name: Greenhurst Road Rebuild (Midland Boulevard to Juniper Street)
Consultant Company Address:
   Paragon Consulting, Inc.
   157 W. 4th Street
   Kuna, ID 83634
Consultant Project Manager/Contact Information:
   W. Joe Barton, P.E.
   (208) 921-8486 (Cell)
   jbarton@paragonfbk.com
Contract Amount: $28,980.00 (T/M NTE)
Duration: October 10, 2017 thru September 30, 2019 (720 Calendar Days) – no change from original agreement

Project Description and Assumptions:
The City of Nampa has identified Greenhurst Road (Midland Blvd. to Juniper St.) for a reconstruction project. In addition to the roadway reconstruction, the project includes pedestrian ramps, sidewalk fill-in connections, provisions for future pedestrian or traffic signals, drainage/irrigation upgrades, waterline upgrades, utility coordination/relocation and improvements identified in the Bike & Pedestrian Master Plan & Transportation Master Plan.

The City completed the majority of the Construction Engineering & Inspection for Phase 1 of the Project (from 12th Avenue Road to Juniper) using City staff.

The City has requested that Paragon provide Construction Engineering & Inspection for Phase 2 of the Project (from east of Midland Boulevard to 12th Avenue Road). Phase 2 Construction is scheduled for 60 calendar days according to the Contractor’s construction contract.

This Scope of Work Amendment No. 3 covers anticipated additional services for Construction Engineering & Inspection during the Phase 2 Construction and project closeout.
1. Project Management

1.1. **Budget and Tracking** – Paragon will provide monthly progress report(s), detailing expenditures per task to date, percent of budget spent and percent complete. Monthly progress report(s) will be submitted with monthly invoice(s).

2. Design Services – N/A

3. Bid Administration and Support – N/A

4. Construction Engineering & Inspection Services

4.1. **Construction Progress Meetings** – Paragon will schedule biweekly progress meetings (every two weeks), prepare agendas, and administer the meetings.

4.2. **Construction Inspection** – Paragon will observe construction activities as needed and/or requested by City. Construction Inspection includes the following major tasks:

- **Site Inspections** – Daily site inspections will be completed as appropriate for the progression of the Contractor’s work and reports will be prepared to record the Contractor’s activities on the site, weather conditions, data relative to questions of change orders, field orders, or changed conditions, site visitors, daily activities, decisions, observations in general, and specific observations in more detail as in the case of observing test procedures. Contractor inspections, tests, and approvals required by the Contract Documents will be received and reviewed.

- **Identify and Recommend Corrections** – Any omissions, substitutions, defects and deficiencies in the work of the Contractor will be identified and documented with recommendations reported to the City. Change Orders and Work Change Directives will be prepared as appropriate. It is assumed that a maximum of two Change Orders and two Work Change Directives will be required for Phase 2 construction.

- **Pay Quantity Collection** – Pay quantities and quantity measurements will be checked for accuracy and prepared for processing for payment to the Contractor.

4.3. **Filing & Records Verification** – Project files will be maintained for Phase 2 construction. Copies of important or requested information will be forwarded to the City. An on-going process of periodic checks of the files will occur during the Project to ensure that all records are being accurately kept and the filing system is up to date. Major tasks under this scope of work item include:

- **Progress Estimate Preparation** – For each scheduled progress estimate, documentation will be prepared for and presented to the City. Progress Estimates will contain the quantities and justification for each bid item payment with a summary sheet showing the amounts to be paid.
• Materials Certifications – Certifications, as required by bid item, will be requested for all materials incorporated into the Project. No materials will be accepted for payment until the certifications are received and reviewed for acceptance. Minimum Testing Requirements (MTR’s) submitted by the Contractor will be reviewed and approved.

• Contract Submittal Review – Paragon will provide Contractor Shop Drawing and submittal coordination and review. It is anticipated that each submittal will have an initial submittal for review and a final submittal for approval.

4.4. Contractor Requests for Information – Paragon will respond to questions by the City and the Contractor as needed to evaluate issues encountered during construction.

4.5. Property Owner Coordination – Paragon will assist the City with property owner notifications along the project. Paragon will prepare exhibits and mailers for use by the City and the Contractor. Distribution of public mailers and flyers will be by the City.

4.6. Record Drawings – Paragon will receive record drawing information from the Contractor. The record drawing information will be reviewed for conformance with the design. Record information will be sketched over the original design and provided to the City for review. Following the final revisions to the record drawings, Paragon will provide record drawings as follows: one (1) CD with plans in PDF format and AutoCAD (2014 compatible) files.

Minor construction changes may be shown directly on the PDF of the design plans. Significant changes will be incorporated into the AutoCAD files and provided to the City in an AutoCAD file.

Project Schedule
The Project schedule will be in accordance with the original Task Order, from October 10, 2017 thru September 30, 2019.

Cost of Services
Services will be on a time and materials not-to-exceed (NTE) basis.

- Project Management $540.00
- Construction Engineering Support & EOR $28,440.00

Total Cost of Services: $28,980.00

Attached is the labor estimate and cost summary (see attached “Exhibit A”).

Attachments:

- Exhibit A – Labor Estimate
Task Order Review Checklist

Project: Greenhurst Road Rebuild Project

Date: May 14, 2019

SOW should contain the following information:

1) Name of Project  Yes ☒ No ☐
2) Name of Firm  Yes ☒ No ☐
3) Contact Name and Number  Yes ☒ No ☐
4) Current Date  Yes ☒ No ☐
5) Page Numbers  Yes ☒ No ☐
6) Outline of task(s) to be provided  Yes ☒ No ☐
   a) PM, Design, Bid, Construction  Yes ☒ No ☐
7) Project Schedule  Yes ☒ No ☐
   a) Milestone Dates and Cost Estimates at PM (Preliminary Design Portion), Design, Bid, Construction  Yes ☒ No ☐
8) Cost of Service  Yes ☒ No ☐
   a) (fee for services to be noted "Time and Material Not to Exceed")
9) Any Key Understandings to be noted  Yes ☒ No ☐
10) Cover letter with the correct contact information  Yes ☒ No ☐
Greenhurst Road Rebuild (Midland Boulevard to Juniper Street)
Project Number: PW80018009
Task Order Number: PW80018009-C
City of Nampa

A. SUMMARY ESTIMATED LABOR-HOURS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Labor Category</th>
<th>Labor-Hours</th>
<th>Hrly Rate</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1  Project Manager</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>$135.00</td>
<td>$4,590.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2  Engineer</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>$110.00</td>
<td>$22,770.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3  PLS</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>$120.00</td>
<td>-</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4  CADD</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$1,620.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL LABOR COST = $28,980.00

PARAGON TOTAL $28,980.00

B. SUB-CONSULTANTS & EXPENSES

| 1 |  | $ | - |

SUB-CONSULTANT & EXPENSE TOTAL $-

TOTAL = $28,980.00

TIME AND MATERIALS NOT TO EXCEED
# Greenhurst Road Rebuild (Midland Boulevard to Juniper Street)
**Project Number:** PW80018009  
**Task Order Number:** PW80018009-C  
**City of Nampa**

## 1 PROJECT MANAGEMENT

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Order</th>
<th>Total L-Hrs</th>
<th>PM L-Hrs</th>
<th>Engineer L-Hrs</th>
<th>PLS L-Hrs</th>
<th>CADD L-Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Budget &amp; Tracking</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL - PROJECT MANAGEMENT** (HOURS): 4  
**TOTAL - PROJECT MANAGEMENT** (LABOR COST): $540.00

## 4 CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING & INSPECTION SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Order</th>
<th>Total L-Hrs</th>
<th>PM L-Hrs</th>
<th>Engineer L-Hrs</th>
<th>PLS L-Hrs</th>
<th>CADD L-Hrs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction Progress Meetings</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Inspection</td>
<td>151</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Filing &amp; Records Verification</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contractor Requests for Information</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner Coordination</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Record Drawings</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTAL - EOR (HOURS)**: 255  
**TOTAL - EOR (LABOR COST)**: $28,440.00
Exhibit A: Greenhurst Reconstruction, Midland Blvd to Juniper St

Lake Lowell Ave
W Cactus St
Greenhurst Reconstruction, Midland Blvd to Juniper St
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Project Location

Project Location

not to scale
8/16/2017
TASK ORDER AMENDMENT
Zone F Annual Domestic Water Pipeline Replacement Project
(As approved in the FY19 budget)

• The Engineering Division, as part of the Public Works Asset Management Program, identified the following deteriorated or undersized water lines to be replaced in asset management zone F. (see Exhibit A)

• The project will address known issues identified within the Water Master Plan as well as undersized water main identified by the City of Nampa Waterworks Division. In total the design will replace approximately 3,800 feet of water main and appurtenances.

• The project was to be designed in house in FY19, unfortunately due to difficulty finding qualified engineering candidates Engineering requests additional consultant design services to deliver the projects for construction in FY20.

• City Council approved a task order for Parametrix, Inc. to provide survey and CAD support for City in house design for $33,210.

• Engineering requested Parametrix, Inc. provide a task order amendment to provide a scope of work to provide design of the project, assist with bidding and construction for support services for the $93,519.00 (see Exhibit B). With the addition of these design services the project remains within the allotted budget of $153,736.

• The total estimated costs for the the project are:

  Estimated Design $ 126,729.00
  Estimated Construction $ 700,000.00
  Estimated Construction Engineering and Inspection $ 80,000.00
  Total estimated costs $ 906,723.00

• Engineering Division has reviewed the Scope of Work and Labor Estimate and recommends approval.

REQUEST: Authorize Mayor and Public Works Director to sign Task Order Amendment and Contract for Professional Services between the City of Nampa and Parametrix, Inc. for the Zone F Annual Domestic Water Pipeline Replacement project in the amount $ 93,519.00, Time and Materials Not to Exceed.
Zone F Annual Pipeline Replacement

Exhibit A

For illustrative purposes only.

11/19/2018
Zone F Annual Pipeline Replacement
Pipeline between 12th Ave Rd & S Olive St

For illustrative purposes only.

11/19/2018

Project Location

Exhibit A
SCOPE OF WORK

ZONE F ANNUAL PIPELINE REPLACEMENT
(AGREEMENT #2)

Prepared for

CITY OF NAMPA

Date: May 6, 2019
Task Order Number: PW80019016
Project Number: PWWA200002
Parametrix Company Address: Parametrix
7761 W. Riverside Drive
Suite 201
Boise, Idaho 83714
www.Parametrix.com

Parametrix Contact: Dave Meldrum
208.898.0012
dmeldrum@Parametrix.com

Contract Amount: Time and Material Not to Exceed $93,519
Total Duration: 14 months
The City of Nampa (City) has selected Parametrix to prepare construction plans and bidding documents and to assist with bidding for part of the annual pipeline replacement project. This scope of services includes providing design services for two (2) segments of existing water main lines in southeast Nampa, Zone F, to be replaced and/or re-routed as follows:

- **Segment 1 – Between 12th Avenue Road & South Olive Street (1,600LF+/-)**
  - An existing water main located along 14th Street South and the alleyway between 12th Avenue Road and South Olive Street, from 11th Avenue South to East Sherman Avenue.

- **Segment 2 – Amity Avenue Pipeline, across NNU, Ph2 (2,200LF+/-)**
  - An existing water main located along East Amity Avenue, from 12th Avenue Road to South Maple Street, then a proposed water main along South Maple Street to the easterly extension of East Bird Avenue, easterly, adjacent to the southerly end of the NNU campus soccer field, to South Juniper Street, across the Elijah Drain and northerly along South Juniper Street to East Amity Avenue.

**Reference Material**

Parametrix will utilize and refer to the following reference information provided and developed in the first phase of this project to assist with development of the project. The City will assist Parametrix, as needed, to provide this information.

- GIS data
- Latest ortho-rectified aerial photography
- Utility facility maps

**Key Assumptions**

- Drawings will be developed using AutoCAD and will reference ISPWC specifications.
- Parametrix will provide graphics needed for public communications and will assist City staff with public involvement efforts, if needed.
- Parametrix will provide RFI responses during construction.
- Project duration will be a total of fourteen (14) months - seven (7) months for project design and construction documents and an additional seven (7) months for bid and construction support.

**Key Milestones**

- Notice to Proceed: June 3, 2019
- Preliminary Design (30%): August 2, 2019
- Final Design (95%): November 15, 2019
- PS&E Submittal (100%): December 13, 2019
- Ongoing construction support: February thru June 2020

**Implied Terms**

In order to avoid confusing repetition of expressions in this Scope of Work, it is provided that whenever anything is to be required, directed, specified, authorized, furnished, given, designated, permitted, reserved, approved, disapproved, accepted, or rejected, it shall be understood as if the expression were followed by the words “by the City of Nampa PM” or “to the City of Nampa PM”.

Whenever anything is to be performed, designed, computed, calculated, analyzed, determined, evaluated, surveyed, obtained, established, contacted, estimated, investigated, prepared, developed,
delivered, collected, and/or recorded, it shall be understood as if the expression were followed by the words “by Parametrix” or “to Parametrix”.

**City Standards**

The project shall utilize standard surveying practices and principles.

The following software and formats shall be utilized for the prosecution of work and documents as applicable:

- AutoCAD Civil 3D for CADD drawing files - Format: DWG (2016)
- MS Excel for spreadsheets - Format: XLSX
- MS Word for word processing - Format: DOCX
- MS Project for scheduling - Format: MPP

**Documents**

All documents shall be submitted to the City in unbound paper copy and/or electronic formats via email (or FTP) to the City of Nampa PM, unless otherwise noted or approved. Paper copies will be assembled with a single spring clip in the upper left corner, unless otherwise noted or approved. Electronic documents will be submitted in their native format and/or Adobe Acrobat PDF format.

Document revisions, additions, or modifications to an approved document at the request of the City, will be completed as a supplement to the original agreement.

---

1 **PROJECT MANAGEMENT**

1.1 **Kick Off Meeting**

Parametrix will prepare the agenda, schedule, and conduct a project kick-off meeting with CITY staff to discuss the project objectives, approach, schedule, available information, etc. Parametrix will prepare the meeting summary.

**PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES**

- Prepare for and conduct the kick-off meeting
- Prepare the meeting summary

**ASSUMPTIONS**

- Two (2) Parametrix representatives will attend the kick-off meeting
- Meeting will be a maximum duration of one (1) hour

1.2 **Council Meeting (Not Required)**

Parametrix assumes that there will be no need to attend a City Council meeting for this project.

1.3 **City Meetings/Coordination**

Parametrix will schedule and attend regular progress and miscellaneous meetings with City staff.

Parametrix will regularly communicate and coordinate with the City’s Project Manager as needs arise on the project. This communication will usually be via email and/or phone calls.

**PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES**

- Schedule and attend progress and miscellaneous meetings
- Regular email/phone call coordination with the City
**ASSUMPTIONS**
- City will schedule and provide facility for progress meetings
- Two (2) progress and miscellaneous meetings are assumed
- Meetings are assumed to be an average maximum duration of two (2) hours

### 1.4 Budget and Tracking

Parametrix will provide project management and project controls to ensure adequate resources are assigned to the project; manage the schedule and budget; perform earned value analysis; and perform schedule tracking updates.

**PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES**
- Monthly project status report, submitted with invoice.

### 1.5 Public Involvement and Property Owner Coordination

Parametrix understands that the City of Nampa (or another consultant) will take the lead on all public involvement efforts. Parametrix will assist in this effort by providing graphics to the City for public communication materials. Parametrix will support City staff with additional public involvement efforts, as needed. Parametrix has allocated 20 hours to provide additional support, if requested.

**PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES**
- Prepare up to two (2) graphics for flyer to be sent to home and business owners

**ASSUMPTIONS**
- City (or separate consultant) will prepare and deliver flyer to home and business owners
- Additional work will be provided as a part of a supplemental agreement

### 2 Design Services

#### 2.1 Surveying and Mapping (Already Completed)

A topographic base map and digital terrain model (DTM) were prepared under a previous agreement. The base map includes utility and right-of-way (ROW) information. Additional survey, if needed, will be provided as a part of a supplemental agreement.

#### 2.2 Preliminary Design (30%)

##### 2.2.1 Geotechnical Investigation (Not Included)

A geotechnical investigation is not anticipated to be required for this project.

##### 2.2.2 Preliminary Layout

Parametrix will review the project location, topographic mapping, and utility information to evaluate preliminary layouts for each of the pipeline replacements. Parametrix will lay out a proposed location for the water line that will meet City and ISPWC requirements and specifications. The following items will be considered in laying out the initial placement of the water lines.

- Utility impacts and conflicts
- Impacts to home owners
- Impacts to NNU facilities
• Disruptions of service
• Construction costs
• Availability of right-of-way
• Traffic impacts

Parametrix will show proposed waterline improvements on roll plots. The plots will show the pipeline design features and surveyed topographic linework on an aerial photo background in plan view only. The intent of this work product is to gain concurrence on location and approach before advancing the design.

**PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES**

• Preliminary Plan Layout roll plots depicting proposed pipeline replacement locations

**ASSUMPTIONS**

• Due to the relatively flat terrain at the project site, the vertical alignment will be assumed to be a non-controlling component at the concept level of design. For this reason, the preliminary layouts will only include plan view linework for review.

### 2.3 **Final Design (95%)**

The intent of the Final Design effort will be to further refine and develop the preliminary design. Plans are intended to be complete and ready for the City’s final review. This work includes preparing the title sheet, plan and profile sheets, detail sheets, and traffic control sheets. Plans will be prepared for 22x34 sheets, but all deliverables will be half-sized at 11x17.

#### 2.3.1 **Final Pipeline Design**

Based on the comments received during the preliminary, the final pipeline design for each segment will be completed. The final design will include detailed horizontal and vertical pipeline alignments and alley and roadway surface repairs. Impacted utilities will be identified on the plan sheets.

#### 2.3.2 **Erosion and Sediment Control (ESC)**

Parametrix will identify proposed ESC measures on the plan and profile sheets. It is anticipated that the project will disturb more than 1-acre of ground and therefore a Stormwater Pollution Prevention Plan (SWPPP) will be required for the project. It is anticipated that the contractor will be responsible for preparing a SWPPP document to meet the City’s and EPA’s requirements.

#### 2.3.3 **Construction Staging/Traffic Control Plan**

The contractor will be responsible for developing their own construction staging and traffic control plans. As part of the Construction Drawings, typical situations will be depicted that can be applied to the project. The drawings will provide the contractor with enough direction to develop their own plans suitable to the City. It is assumed that the alleyway between 14th Street South and Sherman Ave. may be completely closed one block at a time during construction.

#### 2.3.4 **Specifications**

Provide special provisions that modify the Idaho Standards for Public Works Construction (ISPWC) and the City of Nampa Supplemental Provisions as needed.
The construction contract specifications will require the Contractor to obtain and pay for all fees associated with the City of Nampa Storm Drain permit, City of Nampa Right-of-way Encroachment permit, and the ITD Right-of-Way Encroachment permit.

2.3.5 **Final Design Submittal**

This task includes performing an internal quality control review of all deliverables and preparing the submittal documents. Parametrix will deliver five (5) bond paper copies and one pdf for all Final Design deliverables.

**Products and Deliverables**
- 11” x 17” Final Design plans (15 sheets)
  - Title Sheet
  - Final Plan and Profile Sheets at 40 scale (10 sheets), with ROW & ESC
  - Final Pipeline Details (2 sheets)
  - Final Traffic Staging/Traffic Control Details (2 sheet)
- Final Design Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Estimate
- Final Design Specifications

**Assumptions**
- City will review the Final Design Submittal and provide comments within two (2) weeks of submittal
- Project will be applicable for coverage under the NPDES Construction General Permit, with contractor prepared SWPPP
- City will perform the QLPE review and approval
- Contractor will provide detailed traffic control plan and staging plan

2.3.6 **Final Design Review Meeting**

City will review the plans and provide comments to Parametrix prior to the meeting. Parametrix will compile comments on a comment/response sheet. Parametrix will attend the Final Design Review meeting to discuss review comments. City will make final decisions for conflicting review comments. Parametrix will complete the comment/response sheet after the Final Design Review meeting and submit to the City.

**Products and Deliverables**
- Two (2) Parametrix representatives will attend the review meeting
- Comment/response sheet (pdf).

**Assumptions**
- City will complete the review and provide comments within two (2) weeks of receiving the Final Design Submittal.
- City will schedule and host review meeting.
- Two (2) hour review meeting, including travel time.

2.4 **PS&E Design (100%)**

2.4.1 **PS&E Documents**

Parametrix will incorporate comments from the Final Design review meeting and ROW negotiations into final stamped construction plans, specifications, and opinion of probable construction cost estimate.
This task includes performing an internal quality control review of all deliverables and preparing the submittal documents.

**PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES**
- One (1) set of paper bond originals, ten (10) sets of paper bond copies, pdf
- 11” x 17” Final Design plans (15 sheets)
  - Title Sheet
  - PS&E Plan and Profile Sheets at 40 scale (10 sheets), with ROW & ESC
  - PS&E Pipeline Details (2 sheets)
  - PS&E Traffic Staging/Traffic Control Details (2 sheet)
- Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Estimate.
- Specifications

**ASSUMPTIONS**
- See Final Design Submittal assumptions

2.5 **Engineer’s Opinion of Probable Construction Costs**
Parametrix will prepare an Engineer’s Opinion of Probable Construction Cost estimate at each of the three deliverables (Preliminary, Final Design, and PSE). Quantities will be updated as appropriate for each deliverable.

**PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES**
- Engineer’s Opinion of Probable Construction Cost Estimate for each deliverable.

**ASSUMPTIONS**
- Estimate will be based on recent published construction bids for other projects within the Treasure Valley and will include contingency amounts.

2.6 **Utility Coordination**
Parametrix will notify the private utilities (power, communications, gas) of the impending construction activities, will provide a copy of the Final Design and PS&E plans when appropriate.

**PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES**
- Provide Final Design and PS&E Plans to Utility Companies.

**ASSUMPTIONS**
- City personnel may be needed to help facilitate some coordination with individual utilities
- All utility agreements, if needed, will be prepared by the City
- Parametrix effort will be limited to a total of 8 hours for this task.

2.7 **Irrigation District Coordination**
Parametrix will assist the City in coordinating with Nampa Meridian Irrigation District (NMID) to address the crossing of the Elijah Drain on the NNU campus. Parametrix will prepare and submit the crossing agreement application, as it is anticipated that a license agreement may be required. Parametrix will assist the City in tracking the license agreement and help move the agreement along to expedite authorization and recording.
PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES
- Assist City in preparing an irrigation license agreement between the City and NMID

ASSUMPTIONS
- Parametrix will not review the language of the agreement. The City’s attorney and staff will be responsible for the contents of the agreement.
- Parametrix effort will be limited to a total of 12 hours for this task.

3  BID ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT

3.1  Bid Documents
Parametrix will prepare ten (10) sets of bid documents and plans to be distributed by the City during the bid process. The bid documents will include updating all the City’s standard inserts to include into the package.

PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES
- Ten (10) sets of Bid Documents (11x17 plans and specs)

ASSUMPTIONS
- Paper copies of full-sized construction plans will not be provided for the bid documents. The Contractor will be required to print/produce the full-sized plans if they desire the larger size.

3.2  Pre-Bid Meeting
Parametrix will prepare an agenda and conduct a meeting with City staff and interested parties to discuss the project, answer questions, etc. Parametrix will record meeting minutes and transmit to the City within one business day.

PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES
- Schedule and attend the Pre-Bid Meeting
- Prepare the meeting summary

ASSUMPTIONS
- City will provide the location/room for the Pre-Bid Meeting
- One (1) Parametrix representative will attend the meeting
- Meeting will be a maximum duration of one (1) hour

3.3  Bid Administration and Support
Parametrix will review bid comments, prepare addendum, and advise the City on bid inquiries. Once bids are received, Parametrix will assist the City in reviewing bids.

PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES
- Address questions and prepare bid addendum (if required)
- Prepare bid summary

ASSUMPTIONS
- A maximum of one (1) bid addendum will be issued
• A maximum of ten (10) total labor hours will be budgeted for this task. Additional work will be provided as a part of a supplemental agreement
• Attendance at the Bid Opening is not required.

4 CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING SUPPORT

Parametrix understands that the City or their on-call CE&I consultant will observe all construction activities. This will include administering the contract for construction, monitoring the Contractor’s performance, and closing out the contract for construction.

4.1 PRE-CONSTRUCTION MEETING

The City will utilize their on-call CE&I consultant to manage construction. The on-call CE&I consultant will schedule the pre-construction meeting, prepare the agenda, sign-in sheet, and administer the meeting. Parametrix will attend this meeting to answer questions.

PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES
• One (1) Parametrix representative will attend the meeting

ASSUMPTIONS
• City and the City’s on-call CE&I Consultant will schedule, organize, and lead the Pre-Construction Meeting
• Meeting will be a maximum duration of one (1) hour

4.2 CONSTRUCTION SUPPORT

All Contractor product submittals and RFI’s will be to the City’s on-call CE&I consultant. The City will forward any submittals and RFI’s that they want Parametrix to address. All responses to product submittals and RFI’s by Parametrix will be directed to the City’s on-call CE&I consultant with a copy to the City. The City will be responsible to distribute the submittals and RFI’s to any other stakeholders or interested entities.

PRODUCTS AND DELIVERABLES
• As requested, review and respond to product submittals, shop drawings, and/or RFI’s up to eight (8) total labor hours of effort
• Provide additional on-call construction support up to twelve (12) total labor hours, as requested by City

ASSUMPTIONS
• Parametrix’s review of shop drawings, samples, and submittals shall be for general conformance with the design concept and general compliance with the requirements of the contract for construction and is not a guarantee that the work covered by the shop drawings, samples, and submittals is free of errors, inconsistencies, or omissions.
• This task will be performed as an on-call, as-requested service directed by the City and/or the City’s on-call CE&I consultant. This task will be invoiced on a time and materials basis.
• The total effort for this task is limited to the effort shown in Parametrix’s contract estimate. Additional work will be provided as a part of a supplemental agreement.
4.3 **Record Documents**

Record Documents will incorporate marked-up construction drawings, addenda, change orders, and other data that show significant changes made during construction. The City or the CE&I consultant will be responsible for providing this information to Parametrix and resolving any conflicting mark-ups. Parametrix does not warrant the accuracy or completeness of field markups or survey information provided by the Contractor or by others. Parametrix is not responsible for any unauthorized reuse or alteration of project documents.

**PROJECT DELIVERABLES**
- One (1) CD with Record Drawings in PDF and AutoCAD format
- Three (3) print copies of Plans (11x17)

5 **Additional Services**

5.1 **Contingency Amount**

Parametrix will assist the City of Nampa to perform tasks related to this project that have not yet been defined. Parametrix has provided a budget amount for this work. No effort or expense will be billed against this budget without explicit direction and documentation from the City Project Manager.

**Products and Deliverables**
- To be determined

**Assumptions**
- Provide additional support up to twenty-four (24) total labor hours, as directed by City

### Cost Estimate Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Section</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>$12,425</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>Design Services</td>
<td>$65,670</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>Bid Administration &amp; Support</td>
<td>$6,542</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>CE&amp;I</td>
<td>$5,862</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>Additional Services</td>
<td>$2,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Direct Expenses</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total** $93,519
### Zone F Annual Pipeline Replacement

May 6, 2019

#### A1 Parametrix Labor

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Staff</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Loaded Rate</th>
<th>Labor Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>$225.00</td>
<td>$14,625.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Engineer</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>$172.00</td>
<td>$24,252.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>$100.00</td>
<td>$16,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planner</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>$115.00</td>
<td>$690.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>$111.00</td>
<td>$34,632.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tech Aide</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$74.00</td>
<td>$2,220.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal 723 $93,319.00

#### B1 Expenses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Estimated Amount</th>
<th>Unit Cost</th>
<th>Estimated Expense</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Direct Expenses (printing, misc)</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
<td>n/a</td>
<td>$200.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Subtotal $200.00

TOTAL AGREEMENT AMOUNT $93,519.00
# Zone F Annual Pipeline Replacement

## Project Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Sr. Engineer</th>
<th>Engineer</th>
<th>Planner</th>
<th>Tech Aide</th>
<th>Sub Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kick Off Meeting</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Council Meeting (Not Required)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Meetings/Coordination</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Budget and Tracking</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Involvement &amp; Owner Coordination</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Support</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Project Management**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

## Design Services

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>Work</th>
<th>Sr. Engineer</th>
<th>Engineer</th>
<th>Planner</th>
<th>Tech Aide</th>
<th>Sub Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Surveying and Mapping (Completed)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design (30%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geotechnical Investigation (Not Included)</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Layout</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design (95%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Pipeline Design</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plan and Profile Sheets (10 sheets)</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>155</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Detail Sheets (2 sheets)</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erosion &amp; Sediment Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Staging/Traffic Control Plan</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specifications</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Submittal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC Review &amp; Revisions (15 Sheets)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submittal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Review Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment Matrix</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E Design (100%)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update Plans Final Design Review (15 Sheets)</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>94</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QC Review &amp; Revisions (15 Sheets)</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>36</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submittal</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineer's Opinion of Probable Construction Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preliminary Design Submittal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Final Design Submittal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PS&amp;E Submittal</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation District Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prepare Agreement and Coordination</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Subtotal Design Services**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th>16</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>529</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Zone F Annual Pipeline Replacement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Sr. Engineer</th>
<th>Engineer</th>
<th>Planner</th>
<th>Tech</th>
<th>Tech Aide</th>
<th>Sub Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>3 BID ADMINISTRATION AND SUPPORT</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.1 Bid Documents</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2 Pre-Bid Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3 Bid Administration and Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Bid Administration and Support</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>4 CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND INSPECTION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.1 Pre-Construction Meeting</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2 Construction Support</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Construction Engineering and Inspection</strong></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>5 ADDITIONAL SERVICES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.1 Contingency Amount</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal Additional Services</strong></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Grand Total</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>169</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>312</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>723</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
I-84 Middleton Overpass Design Update/I-84 Widening Project (Nampa to Caldwell)

- Phase II of the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) I-84 Widening Project, from the Karcher Interchange in Nampa to the Franklin Road Interchange in Caldwell, is underway. The improvements are part of a major roadway project addressing needs on I-84 from Nampa to Caldwell. The work is expected to improve safety, address congestion and benefit the regional economy for many years.

- As part of the Phase II improvements, ITD is working with City staff to complete the design for the Middleton overpass. The existing structure will be demolished and replaced with a new overpass with bike lanes, sidewalk and travel lanes.

- Current and future design options are proposed. The current proposed construction plan includes bike lanes, sidewalk facilities, and a two-lane option that is projected to meet capacity needs until 2045. The proposed section is shown below (changes recommended by City staff in red):

![Middleton Overpass Design Update Diagram]

- The long-term option is the full build of Middleton Road according to City standards as shown below:

![Full Build Middleton Road Diagram]
• ITD will pay for the cost of the current two-lane proposal, but not the full build out. Expanding the two-lane to the full build out option would be an additional $4 to $6 million dollars at the City’s expense

• Widening of Middleton in this area is not in the City’s Transportation Master Plan Capital Improvement Project (CIP) list

I-84 Business Loop (Homedale Road to Karcher Road)

• ITD has been in communications with Caldwell and Nampa to turn over portions of the I-84 Business Loop (I-84B) to the respective local jurisdictions (see Exhibit A)

• A draft agreement is in place between ITD and Caldwell to take over all of the Nampa Caldwell Boulevard within their city limits (See Exhibit A). ITD will pay Caldwell $2.4M to offset for personnel and maintenance start-up costs. This portion would start at SH-19, include the full couplet through Caldwell, and end at Homedale Road (the city limit). The agreement has been approved by Caldwell City Council and will be presented to the ITD Board in June 2019

• The Caldwell agreement leaves a dead-end section of I-84B from Karcher Road to Homedale Road in Nampa. ITD initiated conversation with Nampa to turn this portion of I-84B over to the City of Nampa

• Engineering staff is in preliminary negotiations with ITD. Initial conversations include the following:
  o In exchange for Nampa taking over .73 miles of I-84B from Homedale Road to Karcher Road, ITD will take back jurisdiction of one (1) mile of Northside Boulevard from I-84 to 2nd Street South. This section of Northside includes three bridge structures over Union Pacific Railroad, Indian Creek and Phyllis Canal
  o If Northside is turned over to ITD it would help to further the City’s goal to realign SH-45 (12th Avenue South) around downtown; potentially using 7th Street South and connecting to Northside. ITD’s partnership in funding the SH-45 realignment environmental study is a desire of the City
  o The City submitted a Local Highway Safety Grant application in fiscal year 2018 to install a signal at Northside and 4th Street North. In addition, the grant included rebuilding the adjacent Broadmore Bridge over Indian Creek. ITD completing this signal project is of interest to the City
  o Caldwell Boulevard includes approximately 250,000 more square feet of asphalt than the section of Northside. Maintenance of the increase asphalt is of concern to the City

• Public Works staff intends to continue negotiating a draft agreement with ITD. Initial feedback from Council is requested
Engineering Division Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Projects Plan

- In fiscal year 2018, Engineering Division staff presented a workforce plan for the engineering/capital projects that identifies organizational strategies that will save the City professional services costs over the next five years. A combination of in-house and outsourced services is proposed to deliver the following goals:
  - Improve level of service and lower consulting costs by adding in-house construction inspection, civil engineering design, planning and public involvement capacity. Hire additional staff to complete approximately 20-30% of civil engineering design/public involvement and 60% of construction engineering inspection services in-house within five years
  - Deliver 100% of capital projects in the designated funding year

- The Fiscal Year 2019 Project Delivery Dashboard (see Exhibit B), dated June 3, 2019, provides an update on the workforce plan efforts and a list of capital improvement projects scheduled for this fiscal year

- Key elements of the fiscal year 2019 capital projects plan are summarized as follows:
  - **Hire additional staff to reduce outsourced consulting costs:** Engineering will hire one engineer in training (EIT), one contract administrator, and one part-time public involvement professional. According to the five-year work force plan, a total of nine in-house staff will be added. Generally, an in-house employee can save the City up to 40% of what a consultant would cost
  - **Current Staffing Summary:** Due to recent promotions within Engineering, the division is understaffed. Caleb LaClair, Assistant City Engineer, has recently been hired fulltime to oversee development, and Tiffany McCree, Public Involvement Coordinator, has been hired part-time to assist with public outreach and involvement. Staff have attempted to hire two additional staff engineers; unfortunately, due to difficulty finding qualified engineering candidates no hires have been made
  - **Utilize Increased In-house Staff to Design, Inspect and Conduct Public Involvement Services for Some Projects:** By fiscal year 2023, Engineering Division’s goal is to provide approximately 20-30% of civil engineering design/public involvement and 60% of construction engineering inspection services in-house. For the first year of the plan, the goal is for in-house staff to complete approximately 11% of the civil engineering design/public involvement and 43% of inspection services. The percentage of work in-house will increase annually as the number of staff grows and experience/efficiency increases
  - **List of Fiscal Year 2019 Streets, Wastewater, Water (Domestic) and Water (Pressure Irrigation) Projects and Schedule:** Engineering will strive to deliver 100% of the 61 total design and construction projects within the fiscal year 2019 funding year. Total capital funding is $19,744,111
To meet the goal of 100% delivery of capital projects in the designated funding year, Engineering staff has begun to obtain scopes of work for projects that cannot be completed with internal staffing due to difficulty finding qualified applicants.

By utilizing in-house resources for design and inspection, as well as staffing savings this fiscal year due to not being able to hire qualified applicants, staff have provided an estimated $442,810 in project savings, exceeding the fiscal year goal of $400,000.
Fiscal Year 2019
Project Delivery Dashboard

Mid Third Quarter
June 3, 2019 Council Meeting
2019 Capital Improvement Projects

- 25 major projects
- $19M in value
Goal: 100% Constructed in Fiscal Year

“What gets measured gets done”
FY18 Project Dashboard
(Last Year Comparison)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>First Quarter</th>
<th>Second Quarter</th>
<th>Third Quarter</th>
<th>Fourth Quarter</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Percent Designed</td>
<td>51%</td>
<td>84%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Awarded</td>
<td>43%</td>
<td>72%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Percent Constructed</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>38%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Greenhurst Road Rebuild $125,000
Failed Pipe at Isaiah & Midway $50,000
Aerial Sewer Replacements $40,200
Grant Applications $20,000
Pump Maintenance $10,000
Staffing Savings $197,610

Total project savings of $442,810
Project Management Team

Daniel Badger, P.E.
City Engineer

Clemente Salinas, P.E.
Asst City Eng/Projects

Samuel McClellan, P.E.

Mark David, Project Manager

Krystal Budke, EIT

Nicole Fletcher, EIT
Questions?

Greenhurst Road Rebuild – Phase I
BID AWARD
HUGH NICHOLS PUBLIC SAFETY BUILDING
PHASE 2 CONCRETE REPAIR AND WATERPROOFING PROJECT
THE CITY OF NAMPA, FACILITIES DEVELOPMENT
(As approved in the FY19 budget)

- Facilities Development has identified the need to repair damaged and spalling concrete at the parking garage in the Hugh Nichols Public Safety Building, and new waterproofing to seal and protect. The project is to be funded by Facilities Development. The expenditure was approved as part of the 2019 budget for an amount of $240,000.00. The $240,000 is coming from two accounts: $125,000 was included in the Facilities Development Capital Projects Account and $115,000 was rolled over from the FY18 Budget and included in the Facilities Development Buildings Account for this Project.

- Documents have been reviewed and approved by Legal.

- The cost of the project will be $175,487. The remaining budget amount will be used for design services and construction contingency.

- The Proposer provides all management, supervision, labor, materials, supplies, and equipment, and will plan, schedule, coordinate and assure effective performance of all services described herein. Summarily they will repair damaged and spalling concrete at the parking garage in the Hugh Nichols Public Safety Building, and provide new waterproofing to seal and protect.

- Facilities Development procured bids for the project using a Formal Bid Process. A pre-bid walk through was conducted at the project site on April 23, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. A Public Bid Opening was held on May 9, 2019 at 2:00 p.m.

- A total of four (4) bids were received on May 9, 2019.

- Repaircrete, LLC appeared to be the low bidder, however during the regular review process it was discovered that they did not hold the required Idaho State Public Works License. The bid was rejected since it was not fully responsive to the requirements of the Notice to Bid.

- The apparent low bid was received from Consurco, Inc.

- Contractor will be required to provide necessary bonds, insurance and other documents before the agreement can be executed and the Notice to Proceed issued.

REQUEST: Council award bid, and authorize Mayor Kling to sign contract with Consurco, Inc. for the HNPSB Phase 2 Concrete Repair and Waterproofing Project not to exceed the contract amount of $175,487.
# Bid Tabulation Sheet  
**HNPSB Phase 2 Concrete Repair and Waterproofing Project**  
**Bid Opening - May 9, 2019**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bidder</th>
<th>Addendum No. 1</th>
<th>Addendum No. 2</th>
<th>Bid Bond</th>
<th>Base Bid</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Repaircrete, LLC</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$ 153,344.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Winspear Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$ 255,999.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consurco, Inc.</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>$ 175,487.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Specialty Systems</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>$ 410,649.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

*Note: The table above lists the bidders along with their Addendum approvals and base bid amounts.*/
AGREEMENT made as of the Twenty-eighth day of May in the year Two Thousand Nineteen
(In words, indicate day, month and year.)

BETWEEN the Owner:
(Name, legal status, address and other information)

City of Nampa
411 3rd Street South
Nampa, Idaho 83651
Telephone Number: 208.468.4416

and the Contractor:
(Name, legal status, address and other information)

Consurco, Inc.
621 E. King St., Suite 150 Meridian, ID 83642
Telephone Number: (844) 780-7853

for the following Project:
(Name, location and detailed description)

Phase 2 Concrete Repair and Waterproofing Project for City of Nampa
Hugh Nichols Public Safety Building
820 2nd Street South
Nampa, ID 83651
Repair damaged and spalling concrete at the parking garage in the Hugh Nichols Public Safety Building, and provide new waterproofing to seal and protect.

The Architect:
(Name, legal status, address and other information)

KPFF Consulting Engineers
412 E. Park Center Blvd, Suite 204
Boise, ID 83706
Telephone Number: 208.336.6985

The Owner and Contractor agree as follows.
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EXHIBIT A INSURANCE AND BONDS

ARTICLE 1 THE CONTRACT DOCUMENTS
The Contract Documents consist of this Agreement, Conditions of the Contract (General, Supplementary, and other Conditions), Drawings, Specifications, Addenda issued prior to execution of this Agreement, other documents listed in this Agreement, and Modifications issued after execution of this Agreement, all of which form the Contract, and are as fully a part of the Contract as if attached to this Agreement or repeated herein. The Contract represents the entire and integrated agreement between the parties hereto and supersedes prior negotiations, representations, or agreements, either written or oral. An enumeration of the Contract Documents, other than a Modification, appears in Article 9.

ARTICLE 2 THE WORK OF THIS CONTRACT
The Contractor shall fully execute the Work described in the Contract Documents, except as specifically indicated in the Contract Documents to be the responsibility of others.

ARTICLE 3 DATE OF COMMENCEMENT AND SUBSTANTIAL COMPLETION
§ 3.1 The date of commencement of the Work shall be:
(Check one of the following boxes.)

[ ] The date of this Agreement.
[ ] A date set forth in a notice to proceed issued by the Owner.
[ ] Established as follows:
(Insert a date or a means to determine the date of commencement of the Work.)

If a date of commencement of the Work is not selected, then the date of commencement shall be the date of this Agreement.

§ 3.2 The Contract Time shall be measured from the date of commencement of the Work.

§ 3.3 Substantial Completion
§ 3.3.1 Subject to adjustments of the Contract Time as provided in the Contract Documents, the Contractor shall achieve Substantial Completion of the entire Work:
(Check one of the following boxes and complete the necessary information.)

[X] Not later than Twenty-One (21) calendar days from the date of commencement of the Work.

[ ] By the following date:

§ 3.3.2 Subject to adjustments of the Contract Time as provided in the Contract Documents, if portions of the Work are to be completed prior to Substantial Completion of the entire Work, the Contractor shall achieve Substantial Completion of such portions by the following dates:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Portion of Work</th>
<th>Substantial Completion Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

§ 3.3.3 If the Contractor fails to achieve Substantial Completion as provided in this Section 3.3, liquidated damages, if any, shall be assessed as set forth in Section 4.5.

ARTICLE 4 CONTRACT SUM

§ 4.1 The Owner shall pay the Contractor the Contract Sum in current funds for the Contractor's performance of the Contract. The Contract Sum shall be One Hundred Seventy-five Thousand Four Hundred Eighty-seven Dollars and Zero Cents ($175,487.00), subject to additions and deductions as provided in the Contract Documents.

§ 4.2 Alternates

§ 4.2.1 Alternates, if any, included in the Contract Sum:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

§ 4.2.2 Subject to the conditions noted below, the following alternates may be accepted by the Owner following execution of this Agreement. Upon acceptance, the Owner shall issue a Modification to this Agreement. (Insert below each alternate and the conditions that must be met for the Owner to accept the alternate.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

§ 4.3 Allowances, if any, included in the Contract Sum:

(Identify each allowance.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Price</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

| General Contingency Allowance | Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000.00) |

§ 4.4 Unit prices, if any:

(Identify the item and state the unit price and quantity limitations, if any, to which the unit price will be applicable.)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Units and Limitations</th>
<th>Price per Unit ($0.00)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

§ 4.5 Liquidated damages, if any:

(Insert terms and conditions for liquidated damages, if any.)

Two Hundred Fifty Dollars ($250) per day for each calendar day of delay

§ 4.6 Other:

(Insert provisions for bonus or other incentives, if any, that might result in a change to the Contract Sum.)
ARTICLE 5  PAYMENTS

§ 5.1  Progress Payments

§ 5.1.1 Based upon Applications for Payment submitted to the Architect by the Contractor and Certificates for Payment issued by the Architect, the Owner shall make progress payments on account of the Contract Sum to the Contractor as provided below and elsewhere in the Contract Documents.

§ 5.1.2 The period covered by each Application for Payment shall be one calendar month ending on the last day of the month, or as follows:

§ 5.1.3 Provided that an Application for Payment is received by the Architect not later than the Twenty-Fifth day of a month, the Owner shall make payment of the amount certified to the Contractor not later than the Tenth day of the following month. If an Application for Payment is received by the Architect after the application date fixed above, payment of the amount certified shall be made by the Owner not later than Thirty (30) days after the Architect receives the Application for Payment.

(Federal, state or local laws may require payment within a certain period of time.)

§ 5.1.4 Each Application for Payment shall be based on the most recent schedule of values submitted by the Contractor in accordance with the Contract Documents. The schedule of values shall allocate the entire Contract Sum among the various portions of the Work. The schedule of values shall be prepared in such form, and supported by such data to substantiate its accuracy, as the Architect may require. This schedule of values shall be used as a basis for reviewing the Contractor’s Applications for Payment.

§ 5.1.5 Applications for Payment shall show the percentage of completion of each portion of the Work as of the end of the period covered by the Application for Payment.

§ 5.1.6 In accordance with AIA Document A201™–2017, General Conditions of the Contract for Construction, and subject to other provisions of the Contract Documents, the amount of each progress payment shall be computed as follows:

§ 5.1.6.1 The amount of each progress payment shall first include:

.1 That portion of the Contract Sum properly allocable to completed Work;

.2 That portion of the Contract Sum properly allocable to materials and equipment delivered and suitably stored at the site for subsequent incorporation in the completed construction, or, if approved in advance by the Owner, suitably stored off the site at a location agreed upon in writing; and

.3 That portion of Construction Change Directives that the Architect determines, in the Architect’s professional judgment, to be reasonably justified.

§ 5.1.6.2 The amount of each progress payment shall then be reduced by:

.1 The aggregate of any amounts previously paid by the Owner;

.2 The amount, if any, for Work that remains uncorrected and for which the Architect has previously withheld a Certificate for Payment as provided in Article 9 of AIA Document A201–2017;

.3 Any amount for which the Contractor does not intend to pay a Subcontractor or material supplier, unless the Work has been performed by others the Contractor intends to pay;

.4 For Work performed or defects discovered since the last payment application, any amount for which the Architect may withhold payment, or nullify a Certificate of Payment in whole or in part, as provided in Article 9 of AIA Document A201–2017; and

.5 Retainage withheld pursuant to Section 5.1.7.

§ 5.1.7 Retainage

§ 5.1.7.1 For each progress payment made prior to Substantial Completion of the Work, the Owner may withhold the following amount, as retainage, from the payment otherwise due:

(Insert a percentage or amount to be withheld as retainage from each Application for Payment. The amount of retainage may be limited by governing law.)

Five percent (5%)
§ 5.1.7.1.1 The following items are not subject to retainage:
(Insert any items not subject to the withholding of retainage, such as general conditions, insurance, etc.)

§ 5.1.7.2 Reduction or limitation of retainage, if any, shall be as follows:
(If the retainage established in Section 5.1.7.1 is to be modified prior to Substantial Completion of the entire Work, including modifications for Substantial Completion of portions of the Work as provided in Section 3.3.2, insert provisions for such modifications.)

§ 5.1.7.3 Except as set forth in this Section 5.1.7.3, upon Substantial Completion of the Work, the Contractor may submit an Application for Payment that includes the retainage withheld from prior Applications for Payment pursuant to this Section 5.1.7. The Application for Payment submitted at Substantial Completion shall not include retainage as follows:
(Insert any other conditions for release of retainage upon Substantial Completion.)

§ 5.1.8 If final completion of the Work is materially delayed through no fault of the Contractor, the Owner shall pay the Contractor any additional amounts in accordance with Article 9 of AIA Document A201–2017.

§ 5.1.9 Except with the Owner’s prior approval, the Contractor shall not make advance payments to suppliers for materials or equipment which have not been delivered and stored at the site.

§ 5.2 Final Payment
§ 5.2.1 Final payment, constituting the entire unpaid balance of the Contract Sum, shall be made by the Owner to the Contractor when
.1 the Contractor has fully performed the Contract except for the Contractor’s responsibility to correct Work as provided in Article 12 of AIA Document A201–2017, and to satisfy other requirements, if any, which extend beyond final payment; and
.2 a final Certificate for Payment has been issued by the Architect.

§ 5.2.2 The Owner’s final payment to the Contractor shall be made no later than 30 days after the issuance of the Architect’s final Certificate for Payment, or as follows:

§ 5.3 Interest
Payments due and unpaid under the Contract shall bear interest from the date payment is due at the rate stated below, or in the absence thereof, at the legal rate prevailing from time to time at the place where the Project is located.
(Insert rate of interest agreed upon, if any.)

12.00 % per annum

ARTICLE 6 DISPUTE RESOLUTION
§ 6.1 Initial Decision Maker
The Architect will serve as the Initial Decision Maker pursuant to Article 15 of AIA Document A201–2017, unless the parties appoint below another individual, not a party to this Agreement, to serve as the Initial Decision Maker.
(If the parties mutually agree, insert the name, address and other contact information of the Initial Decision Maker, if other than the Architect.)
§ 6.2 Binding Dispute Resolution
For any Claim subject to, but not resolved by, mediation pursuant to Article 15 of AIA Document A201–2017, the method of binding dispute resolution shall be as follows:
(Check the appropriate box.)

[ ] Arbitration pursuant to Section 15.4 of AIA Document A201–2017

[ X ] Litigation in a court of competent jurisdiction

[ ] Other (Specify)

If the Owner and Contractor do not select a method of binding dispute resolution, or do not subsequently agree in writing to a binding dispute resolution method other than litigation, Claims will be resolved by litigation in a court of competent jurisdiction.

ARTICLE 7 TERMINATION OR SUSPENSION
§ 7.1 The Contract may be terminated by the Owner or the Contractor as provided in Article 14 of AIA Document A201–2017.

§ 7.1.1 If the Contract is terminated for the Owner’s convenience in accordance with Article 14 of AIA Document A201–2017, then the Owner shall pay the Contractor a termination fee as follows:
(Insert the amount of, or method for determining, the fee, if any, payable to the Contractor following a termination for the Owner’s convenience.)

§ 7.2 The Work may be suspended by the Owner as provided in Article 14 of AIA Document A201–2017.

ARTICLE 8 MISCELLANEOUS PROVISIONS
§ 8.1 Where reference is made in this Agreement to a provision of AIA Document A201–2017 or another Contract Document, the reference refers to that provision as amended or supplemented by other provisions of the Contract Documents.

§ 8.2 The Owner’s representative:
(Name, address, email address, and other information)

Brian Foster
310 13th Avenue South
Nampa, ID 83651
Telephone Number: (208) 468-4416

Email Address: fosterb@cityofnampa.us

§ 8.3 The Contractor’s representative:
(Name, address, email address, and other information)

Tim Ling
621 E. King St., Suite 150 Meridian, ID 83642
§ 8.4 Neither the Owner’s nor the Contractor’s representative shall be changed without ten days’ prior notice to the other party.

§ 8.5 Insurance and Bonds
§ 8.5.1 The Owner and the Contractor shall purchase and maintain insurance as set forth in AIA Document A101™–2017, Standard Form of Agreement Between Owner and Contractor where the basis of payment is a Stipulated Sum, Exhibit A, Insurance and Bonds, and elsewhere in the Contract Documents.

§ 8.5.2 The Contractor shall provide bonds as set forth in AIA Document A101™–2017 Exhibit A, and elsewhere in the Contract Documents.

§ 8.6 Notice in electronic format, pursuant to Article 1 of AIA Document A201–2017, may be given in accordance with AIA Document E203™–2013, Building Information Modeling and Digital Data Exhibit, if completed, or as otherwise set forth below:
(If other than in accordance with AIA Document E203–2013, insert requirements for delivering notice in electronic format such as name, title, and email address of the recipient and whether and how the system will be required to generate a read receipt for the transmission.)

§ 8.7 Other provisions:

ARTICLE 9 ENUMERATION OF CONTRACT DOCUMENTS
§ 9.1 This Agreement is comprised of the following documents:
.1 AIA Document A101™–2017, Standard Form of Agreement Between Owner and Contractor
.2 AIA Document A101™–2017, Exhibit A, Insurance and Bonds
.3 AIA Document A201™–2017, General Conditions of the Contract for Construction
.4 AIA Document E203™–2013, Building Information Modeling and Digital Data Exhibit, dated as indicated below:
(Insert the date of the E203-2013 incorporated into this Agreement.)

.5 Drawings

Number | Title | Date
---|---|---
S1.0 | General Notes | April 2, 2019
S2.0 | Level 3 Joint Route and Seal Plan | April 2, 2019
S2.1 | Level 3 Waterproofing Plan | April 2, 2019
S3.0 | Details | April 2, 2019

.6 Specifications

Section | Title | Date | Pages
---|---|---|---
Refer to attached Table of Contents Exhibit

.7 Addenda, if any:

Number | Date | Pages
---|---|---
Addendum No. 1 | 4-29-19 |
Addendum No. 2 5-6-19

Portions of Addenda relating to bidding or proposal requirements are not part of the Contract Documents unless the bidding or proposal requirements are also enumerated in this Article 9.

8 Other Exhibits:
(Check all boxes that apply and include appropriate information identifying the exhibit where required.)

[ ] AIA Document E204™-2017, Sustainable Projects Exhibit, dated as indicated below:
(Insert the date of the E204-2017 incorporated into this Agreement.)

[ ] The Sustainability Plan:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

[ ] Supplementary and other Conditions of the Contract:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Document</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Nampa Document in Project Manual</td>
<td>Supplementary Conditions</td>
<td>April 2, 2019</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9 Other documents, if any, listed below:
(List here any additional documents that are intended to form part of the Contract Documents. AIA Document A201™-2017 provides that the advertisement or invitation to bid, Instructions to Bidders, sample forms, the Contractor’s bid or proposal, portions of Addenda relating to bidding or proposal requirements, and other information furnished by the Owner in anticipation of receiving bids or proposals, are not part of the Contract Documents unless enumerated in this Agreement. Any such documents should be listed here only if intended to be part of the Contract Documents.)

This Agreement entered into as of the day and year first written above.

OWNER (Signature)
Debbie Kling, Mayor
(Printed name and title)

CONTRACTOR (Signature)
Tim Ling
(Printed name and title)
Additions and Deletions Report for
AIA® Document A101™ – 2017

This Additions and Deletions Report, as defined on page 1 of the associated document, reproduces below all text the author has added to the standard form AIA document in order to complete it, as well as any text the author may have added to or deleted from the original AIA text. Added text is shown underlined. Deleted text is indicated with a horizontal line through the original AIA text.

Note: This Additions and Deletions Report is provided for information purposes only and is not incorporated into or constitute any part of the associated AIA document. This Additions and Deletions Report and its associated document were generated simultaneously by AIA software at 18:07:53 ET on 05/22/2019.

PAGE 1

AGREEMENT made as of the Twenty-eighth day of May in the year Two Thousand Nineteen

... 

City of Nampa
411 3rd Street South
Nampa, Idaho 83651
Telephone Number: 208.468.4416

...

Consurco, Inc.
621 E. King St., Suite 150 Meridian, ID 83642
Telephone Number: (844) 780-7853

...

Phase 2 Concrete Repair and Waterproofing Project for City of Nampa
Hugh Nichols Public Safety Building
820 2nd Street South
Nampa, ID 83651
Repair damaged and spalling concrete at the parking garage in the Hugh Nichols Public Safety Building, and provide new waterproofing to seal and protect.

...

KPFF Consulting Engineers
412 E. Park Center Blvd, Suite 204
Boise, ID 83706
Telephone Number: 208.336.6985

PAGE 2

[X] A date set forth in a notice to proceed issued by the Owner.

PAGE 3

[X] Not later than Twenty-One (21) calendar days from the date of commencement of the Work.
§ 4.1 The Owner shall pay the Contractor the Contract Sum in current funds for the Contractor's performance of the Contract. The Contract Sum shall be One Hundred Seventy-five Thousand Four Hundred Eighty-seven Dollars and Zero Cents ($175,487.00), subject to additions and deductions as provided in the Contract Documents.

... General Contingency Allowance Five Thousand Dollars ($5,000.00) ... Refer to attached Unit Price Schedule from Bid form

Two Hundred Fifty Dollars ($250) per day for each calendar day of delay

PAGE 4

§ 5.1.3 Provided that an Application for Payment is received by the Architect not later than the Twenty-Fifth day of a month, the Owner shall make payment of the amount certified to the Contractor not later than the Tenth day of the following month. If an Application for Payment is received by the Architect after the application date fixed above, payment of the amount certified shall be made by the Owner not later than Thirty (30) days after the Architect receives the Application for Payment.

... §

PAGE 5

12.00 % per annum

PAGE 6

[X] Litigation in a court of competent jurisdiction

... Brian Foster
310 13th Avenue South
Nampa, ID 83651
Telephone Number: (208) 468-4416

Email Address: fosterb@cityofnampa.us

... Tim Ling
PAGE 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Title</th>
<th>Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>S1.0</td>
<td>General Notes</td>
<td>April 2, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2.0</td>
<td>Level 3 Joint Route and Seal Plan</td>
<td>April 2, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S2.1</td>
<td>Level 3 Waterproofing Plan</td>
<td>April 2, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S3.0</td>
<td>Details</td>
<td>April 2, 2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refer to attached Table of Contents
Exhibit
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Date</th>
<th>Pages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Addendum No. 1</td>
<td>4-29-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Addendum No. 2</td>
<td>5-6-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

City of Nampa Document in Project Manual
Supplementary Conditions

Debbie Kling, Mayor
Tim Ling
Certification of Document's Authenticity
AIA® Document D401™ – 2003

I, J. Gregory Toolson, hereby certify, to the best of my knowledge, information and belief, that I created the attached final document simultaneously with its associated Additions and Deletions Report and this certification at 18:07:53 ET on 05/22/2019 under Order No. 8246944995 from AIA Contract Documents software and that in preparing the attached final document I made no changes to the original text of AIA® Document A101™ - 2017, Standard Form of Agreement Between Owner and Contractor where the basis of payment is a Stipulated Sum, as published by the AIA in its software, other than those additions and deletions shown in the associated Additions and Deletions Report.

(Signed)

(Title)

(Dated)
May 14, 2019

Brian Barlow
RepairCrete, LLC
P.O. Box 561
Draper, UT 84020

RE: Phase 2 Concrete Repair and Waterproofing Project (Hugh Nichols Public Safety Building)

Dear Mr. Barlow,

Thank you for your response to the above referenced Bid. This letter is to notify you that the City of Nampa is rejecting your bid. Although you submitted the low bid for this project, the bid was not fully responsive to the requirements of the Notice for Bids. The Notice for Bids required contractors submitting bids to have a valid Idaho Public Works Contractors License, since your company does not hold such a license the City cannot accept the bid.

Thank you for your interest in meeting the needs of the City of Nampa. Your participation in the process is appreciated.

Sincerely,

Brian Foster, CBO, FMP, CFM
Facilities Management Superintendent
Facilities Development
May 13, 2019

Mr. Brian Barlow, Manager
RepairCrete, LLC
P.O. Box 561
Draper, Utah 84020

Re: Phase 2 Concrete Repair and Waterproofing Project (Hugh Nichols Public Safety Building)

Dear Mr. Barlow:

Our office represents the City of Nampa, Idaho. Your company recently submitted a bid to participate in the HNPSB Phase 2 Concrete Repair and Waterproofing Project. When notified that you would not be selected as the successful bidder on this project, you questioned that decision. I write to formally notify you that you will not be selected, and to provide a written explanation as to why.

On page 2 of the Notice for Bids related to this project, it states: “All Contractors submitting bids are required to have a valid Idaho Public Works Contractors License and to include the license number on the Bid Form.” You submitted a bid in response to that Notice for Bids. On May 9, 2019, at 2:00 pm, the four bids received by the city were opened. Your company was the apparent low bidder. However, on May 10, 2019, as part of the city’s regular review process, it was discovered that your company did not, in fact, hold the requisite Public Works License.

Idaho Code § 54-1902 provides that it is unlawful for any person to engage in the business or act in the capacity of a “public works contractor” within the state of Idaho, without “first obtaining and having a license” issued pursuant to Chapter 19, Title 54, of the Idaho Code. Acting in the capacity of a “public works contractor” includes submitting a proposal to act in said capacity. See Idaho Code § 54-1901(2)(b). While a few narrow statutory exemptions to this general rule exist, none appear to apply under the circumstances.

To award your company the bid in this matter would have violated Idaho law. In fact, any contract entered into between a city and a contractor without a valid Public Works License has been held by the Idaho Supreme Court to be both illegal and unenforceable. Barry v. Pacific West Constr., Inc., 103 P.3d 440, 140 Idaho 827 (Idaho 2004). Furthermore, as quoted above, possession of that Public Works License was a specific requirement for all persons desiring to submit a bid in response to the Notice for Bids. Accordingly, your bid was not fully responsive to the requirements of that notice.
In summary, the City of Nampa had no choice but to reject your bid. Should you be interested in submitting a bid in response to future notices or RFPs, the city would be happy to consider your bids, so long as your company first obtain all licenses necessary to complete the solicited work.

Thank you for your understanding.

HAMILTON, MICHAELSON & HILTY, LLP

AARON L. SEABLE

cc: Brian Foster
May 31st, 2019

TO: City Council
   Deborah Kling, Mayor

FROM: Douglas Racine, Director of Finance

REFERENCE: Fiscal Year 2019 Budget Amendment 1, Resolution 27

The proposed budget amendment is funded primarily using unassigned fund balances in the General Fund and by restricted fund balances in other funds that are available to be applied to this budget amendment. These balances have accumulated as of the close of fiscal 2018.

The total unassigned fund balance in the General Fund amounted to $13,211,894 at the close of fiscal 2018. This amendment calls for $3,231,337 to be used for funding, leaving $9,980,557 remaining in General Fund’s unassigned fund balance.

The total General Fund request is comprised of $3,261,337 from existing fund balances and $963,546 from lease proceeds related to the acquisition of two fire trucks in fiscal 2019, and is detailed below:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/ Division</th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Proposed Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Development</td>
<td>Fund Balance - Purchase of First Interstate Bank Building</td>
<td>$2,533,822</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Development</td>
<td>Fund Balance - Utility Costs for the remainder of Fiscal Year 2018-2019</td>
<td>49,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Development</td>
<td>Fund Balance - Capital Improvements to First Interstate Bank Building HVAC/Roof</td>
<td>477,746</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Development</td>
<td>HNPSB facility repairs due to flooding</td>
<td>125,375</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Rollover - Appropriates Funds for Travel and Training</td>
<td>5,870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning and Zoning</td>
<td>Rollover - Funds Legal Fees</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>Fund Balance - Appropriates additional funds for the annual audit</td>
<td>39,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Funded from existing General Fund Balances</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,261,337</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa Fire Dept.</td>
<td>Lease Purchase of two Fire Trucks</td>
<td>963,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>General Fund Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,224,883</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The proposed Street Fund budget requests, inclusive of Stormwater, amount to $1,136,178. These requests are funded in total using the available restricted unassigned fund balance in the Street Fund. Equipment purchases comprise $80,000 of the total. Various intersection improvements account for $82,832 and $574,114 is earmarked for infrastructure replacement. In the non-capital expenditure category $120,299
will be spent on a Transportation Masterplan for future projects and $58,843 will be expended on paving management. In the Stormwater Management Program, $140,090 will be spent on the installation of new catch basins, manholes, ponds, and stormwater mainline improvements.

The Street Fund finished FY 2018 with a restricted, but unassigned fund balance of $8,235,995. The FY 2019 Budget used $904,564 of the ending unassigned balance to help fund the Budget. This proposal will draw upon an additional $1.1M, leaving an available balance of $6,195,253.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/ Division</th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Proposed Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>STREET FUND</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance - Purchase of a snowplow and sander</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance - Purchase of water tank for the water truck chassis</td>
<td>50,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance - Intersection Improvement – Round About at Ustick</td>
<td>47,505</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance - Intersection Improvement – Traffic Signal at 39th and Comstock</td>
<td>27,801</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance - Intersection Improvement – SH45 ped crossing on 12th</td>
<td>7,526</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance - Building Improvement – Restroom renovation</td>
<td>80,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance - Infrastructure – 2nd &amp; 3rd Street rebuild including pavement, new sidewalk, new gutter, new irrigation and water lines</td>
<td>574,114</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance - Infrastructure - annual project to install new catch basins, ponds, stormwater mainline, etc.</td>
<td>140,090</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance - Study – Transportation needs Masterplan</td>
<td>120,299</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fund Balance - Paving – Greenhurst Road</td>
<td>58,843</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Street Fund/Stormwater Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,136,178</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
$253,000 to upgrade or replace existing software and hardware necessary to maintain uninterrupted Network services. Approval of the request would leave $208,019 remaining in the Fund for future use.

The operation of the City’s Parks and Recreation Program is comprised of several funds and a diverse revenue stream including fees for service, support from property tax revenues, grants, donations, and other miscellaneous revenues. The spending increase proposed in the budget amendment is made possible using the remaining balance in the Grants/Donations Fund accrued to Parks and Recreation and from the transfer of $100,000 from the available fund balance of the Capital Projects Fund. The $139,000 will be used for installing irrigation and seeding the Orah Brandt Park and for improvements at the Amity Dog Park.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/ Division</th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Proposed Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION CENTER</td>
<td>Buildings – Boiler replacement</td>
<td>$63,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings – Restroom renovation</td>
<td>36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings – Entrance Construction</td>
<td>113,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECREATION CENTER FUND</td>
<td>Equipment – Provides funding for weight room, cardio equipment, etc</td>
<td>476,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recreation Center Fund Total</td>
<td>$688,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 FEE FUND</td>
<td>Capital Acquisition or Upgrade to 911 Emergency Communications System</td>
<td>253,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRANTS AND CONTRACTS</td>
<td>Capital Improvements – This request funds various land improvements including irrigation and seeding the Orah Brandt Park</td>
<td>139,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Special Revenue Fund Total</td>
<td>$1,080,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Capital Projects consists of two Funds; The Developmental Impact Fee Fund (DIF) and Capital Projects Fund (CPF). The Developmental Impact Fee Fund is authorized by State Statute in Chapter 87, Title 82. The purpose is to provide resources for necessary capital investments for the expansion of recreational, transportation, public works, and public safety services due to residential and commercial development within the City’s Impact Area. The funds must be used for capital investment only as State Law prohibits the use of these funds for planning or operations and maintenance activities. The Capital Projects Fund accounts for financial resources restricted, committed, or assigned for capital projects in the City’s Governmental Funds. These resources may be used for the acquisition or construction of capital assets.

The restricted balance in the DIF amounted to $4,194,351 at the close of Fiscal Year 2018. $1,527,440 was made available at the commencement of Fiscal 2019 to fund planned projects. This budget amendment proposes to expend an additional $672,000 to be funded by the use of $72,000 of the remaining balance in the fund, and, an increased forecast in the collection of fees during the remainder of Fiscal 2019. Sans consideration of any increase in fee revenue, the remaining balance in the DIF available for future use is $2,594,911.

The Capital Projects Funds closed the prior fiscal year with a balance of $1,739,653. At the start of Fiscal Year 2019, $599,230 was earmarked to continue funding capital investments. $100,000 is requested in the budget amendment to be transferred to the Grants and Contracts Fund to continue the capital improvement initiatives at the Orah Brandt Park as well as accumulate the record of expenditure in one fund.
Currently, the City operates four Enterprise Funds. Three of the Funds are public utilities for Water inclusive of Irrigation, Sewer, and Sanitation. The fourth Fund accounts for the collection and expenditure of fees related to residential and commercial property development such as building permits, inspections, and plan reviews.

The Water Fund derives its revenues from furnishing potable water to its customers, water meter connection fee, and waterline installation fees. Money is expended for operations and maintenance of the system, capital improvements, and expansion/replacement of the System’s infrastructure. The Water Fund closed Fiscal Year 2018 with an available fund balance of $11,119,297. $1,168,663 was committed toward the Fiscal Year 2019 Budget. The amendment proposes to use an additional $773,685 for improvements to the system’s infrastructure and for the purchase of needed equipment. If the proposals are approved, approximately $9.2 million will remain in available fund balance.

Sewer Fund revenues accrue from handling wastewater for 24,000 residential customers, 3,200 commercial customers and 10 industrial customers. These service fee collections along with collections along hookup fees pay for then cost of operations, maintenance and required capital investment. The Fund closed the prior fiscal year with an available fund balance of $18,089,387. The Fiscal 2019 Budget estimated included $13,977,690 of ending fund balance to applied toward current year operations. An additional $2,866,661 is proposed to be used from fund balance to pay for additional capital investment in the Sewer Fund. This will leave approximately $1.3 million available in the fund balance.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department/ Division</th>
<th>Budget Request</th>
<th>Proposed Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>ENTERPRISE FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water Fund</td>
<td>Infrastructure – Well 5 Replacement</td>
<td>$133,506</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure – Well 16 waste line</td>
<td>143,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure – Irrigation main line</td>
<td>13,539</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>construction</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure – Irrigation pump</td>
<td>257,508</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>at Locust Lane</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure – Aerial Irrigation line</td>
<td>45,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>replacement</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment – Dump truck</td>
<td>180,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Water Fund Total</td>
<td>$773,685</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer Fund</td>
<td>Wastewater Information Management System (WIMS)</td>
<td>$2,040</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Buildings – Completion of Solids Handling</td>
<td>551,774</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Building &amp; Equipment</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure – Anerobic Methane Digestor</td>
<td>774,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Improvements – Lift Station Upgrades</td>
<td>529,846</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment – Pumps</td>
<td>5,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Infrastructure – Underground pipe replacement</td>
<td>828,292</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Equipment repair</td>
<td>4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sewer Fund Total</td>
<td>$2,866,661</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ENTERPRISE FUNDS’ TOTAL</td>
<td>$3,640,346</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
RESOLUTION NO. 27-2019

AN AMENDED ESTIMATE OF EXPENSES AND REVENUES OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO FOR THE FISCAL PERIOD BEGINNING OCTOBER 1, 2018 TO AND INCLUSIVE OF SEPTEMBER 30, 2019, AND NOTICE OF PUBLIC HEARING ON THE PROPOSED BUDGET BY THE CITY COUNCIL.

WHEREAS, Section 50-1002 Idaho Code, requires the City Council, prior to passing the annual appropriation ordinance, to estimate the probable amount of money necessary for all purposes during the fiscal year end and;

WHEREAS, a proposed amendment to the budget has been prepared that includes an estimate of expenses and revenues for the fiscal year October 1, 2018 through and including September 30, 2019;

THEREFORE, it is hereby ordered by the City Council that this classification and estimate be entered into the minutes of the Council of the City of Nampa and the City Clerk be directed to cause the same to be published in the Idaho Press Tribune, a newspaper published in said City and having a general circulation therein.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENERAL FUND</th>
<th>ORIGINAL BUDGET</th>
<th>PROPOSED CHANGES</th>
<th>AMENDED BUDGET</th>
<th>ENTERPRISE &amp; SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City Clerk</td>
<td>$340,430</td>
<td></td>
<td>$340,430</td>
<td>911 Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>520,684</td>
<td></td>
<td>520,684</td>
<td>Airport</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>408,512</td>
<td></td>
<td>408,512</td>
<td>Cemetery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>2,717,055</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,717,055</td>
<td>Civic Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Development</td>
<td>1,797,135</td>
<td>3,186,467</td>
<td>4,983,602</td>
<td>Development Services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>1,025,871</td>
<td>39,000</td>
<td>1,064,871</td>
<td>Family Justice Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>14,214,742</td>
<td>963,546</td>
<td>15,178,288</td>
<td>Idaho Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>2,937,793</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,937,793</td>
<td>Library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>518,791</td>
<td></td>
<td>518,791</td>
<td>Nampa Recreation Center</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>1,559,760</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,559,760</td>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>1,152,640</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,152,640</td>
<td>Golf</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor &amp; Council</td>
<td>583,989</td>
<td>5,870</td>
<td>589,859</td>
<td>Sanitation Collection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>660,010</td>
<td>30,000</td>
<td>690,010</td>
<td>Street</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>25,549,779</td>
<td></td>
<td>25,549,779</td>
<td>Utility Billing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Admin</td>
<td>522,311</td>
<td></td>
<td>522,311</td>
<td>Wastewater</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Management</td>
<td>1,326,508</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,326,508</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>55,836,010</td>
<td>4,224,883</td>
<td>60,060,893</td>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| GRANT FUNDS            | $11,187,913     | $164,500         | $11,352,413    |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CAPITAL &amp; DEBT SERVICE FUNDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric Franchise Fees/Capital Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Impact Fees</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO Bond Debt Service</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**GRAND TOTAL** $172,079,657 $10,808,906 $182,888,563
## ESTIMATED REVENUES

### PROPERTY TAXES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General Fund</td>
<td>$32,882,364</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2,197,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>1,999,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streets</td>
<td>1,767,360</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>198,916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>113,437</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL NON-EXEMPT</strong></td>
<td><strong>39,159,703</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Exempt Property Taxes (GO Bond)</td>
<td><strong>2,927,462</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL PROPERTY TAXES</strong></td>
<td><strong>42,087,165</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### STATE REVENUE SHARING

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>7,457,984</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal Property Tax Replacement</td>
<td>534,151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intergovernmental</td>
<td>6,885,448</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>14,877,583</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### CHARGES FOR SERVICES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>449,015</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>92,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>592,451</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>3,052,962</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf Courses</td>
<td>2,295,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Center</td>
<td>3,046,312</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>25,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa Recreation Center</td>
<td>3,225,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>390,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation/Trash Collection</td>
<td>10,293,050</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Billing</td>
<td>1,165,524</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>14,385,493</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>13,815,737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$52,858,844</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FRANCHISE FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Electric Franchise</td>
<td>$970,109</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gas Franchise</td>
<td>$722,751</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$1,692,860</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### OTHER FEES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>911 Fees</td>
<td>944,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Contracted Services</td>
<td>6,806,143</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Impact Fee</td>
<td>1,558,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Licenses &amp; Permits</strong></td>
<td><strong>3,437,250</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>12,745,695</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRANTS & DONATIONS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>524,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>594,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### FINES & FORFEITURES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>General</strong></td>
<td>524,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Library</strong></td>
<td>70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>594,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### TRANSFERS & FUND BALANCE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transfers In</td>
<td>12,528,047</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transfers out</td>
<td>(255,500)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fund Balance</strong></td>
<td>21,944,531</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>34,472,578</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$9,245,361</strong></td>
<td>43,717,939</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### MISCELLANEOUS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lease Proceeds -Fire Department</td>
<td>963,546</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest Earnings</td>
<td>593,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td>371,669</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>965,530</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$963,546</strong></td>
<td>1,929,076</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### GRAND TOTAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>$172,079,657</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>$10,808,907</strong></td>
<td><strong>$182,888,564</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FUND</td>
<td>2017 Actual Expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GENERAL FUND</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City Clerk</td>
<td>266,708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>421,852</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>443,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Engineering</td>
<td>1,579,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Development</td>
<td>1,600,812</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>850,563</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>11,892,391</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Government</td>
<td>3,455,947</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Resource</td>
<td>429,152</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>2,197,766</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Legal</td>
<td>922,122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mayor &amp; Council</td>
<td>497,313</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Rec Admin</td>
<td>358,719</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning &amp; Zoning</td>
<td>522,129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>20,220,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Works Admin</td>
<td>390,042</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Management</td>
<td>1,202,631</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td><strong>47,251,685</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ENTERPRISE &amp; SPECIAL REVENUE FUNDS</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 Fees</td>
<td>1,347,584</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>471,696</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cemetery</td>
<td>267,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civic Center</td>
<td>1,443,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Services</td>
<td>2,185,190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Family Justice Center</td>
<td>294,195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Idaho Center</td>
<td>4,752,503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Library</td>
<td>2,063,140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa Recreation Center</td>
<td>2,742,611</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks &amp; Recreation</td>
<td>2,967,915</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Golf</td>
<td>2,079,462</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitation Collection</td>
<td>9,815,827</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Street &amp; Traffic</td>
<td>10,017,780</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility Billing</td>
<td>1,075,854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wastewater</td>
<td>22,631,530</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>13,417,149</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workers Comp Fund</td>
<td>64,378</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>77,637,494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grants &amp; Donations</td>
<td>4,385,177</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects &amp; Debt Service Funds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Projects</td>
<td>1,352,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development Impact Fees</td>
<td>3,244,820</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GO Bond Debt Service</td>
<td>2,696,150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL</strong></td>
<td>7,293,794</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TRANSFERS &amp; FUND BALANCE (Net)</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miscellaneous</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lease Proceeds</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td>136,568,150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Amount from property tax

I, Deborah Rosin, City Clerk of the City of Nampa, Idaho do hereby certify that this is a true and correct statement of the amended expenditures and revenues for the fiscal year 2018-2019. Citizens are invited to attend the budget hearing on June 17, 2019 at 7:00 p.m. and have the right to provide written or oral comments concerning the entire City Budget. The amended City budget may be reviewed in detail in the Nampa Finance Office at City Hall, 411 Third Street South during regular hours, 8:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m.

**PASSED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO, THIS 3RD DAY OF JUNE, 2019.**

**APPROVED BY THE MAYOR AND THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO, THIS 3RD DAY OF JUNE, 2019.**

Approved:

_________________________
Mayor

Attest:

_________________________
City Clerk
NDC TERM MODIFICATION REQUEST

NDC Board of Commissioners is cordially requesting Mayor and City Council consider a modification to Ordinance 4304 specifying Expiration of Terms of individual commissioners.

Specifically requesting terms be changed to expire at the end of the fiscal year, September 30.

This aligns the commission acting with the fiscal calendar allowing new members to have several months of learning prior to discussing approving a new budget. Allows current members to complete the budgeting and levy prior to changes on the commission.

Certainly there will be appointments at any time as vacancies occur, but a known expiration date change will serve well for whose terms expire and new member appointed at the regular timeframes.

Formal action was approved at the NDC meeting April 16, 2019 to submit this request.

Respectfully,

David Bills
NDC Chairman
ORDINANCE NO. ______

AN ORDINANCE ENACTED BY THE NAMPA CITY COUNCIL, ADJUSTING THE EXPIRATION DATES FOR THE TERMS OF THE CURRENT BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS OF THE NAMPA DEVELOPMENT CORPORATION FOR THE PURPOSE OF MAKING THEM CONSISTENT WITH THE AGENCY’S FISCAL YEAR, AND PROVIDING CLARIFICATION AS TO HOW FUTURE MEMBERS OF THE BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS WILL BE APPOINTED TO FILL VACANCIES ON THE BOARD, IN ACCORDANCE WITH IDAHO CODE § 50-2006; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, ORDERS AND PARTS THEREOF, IN CONFLICT HEREWITH.

WHEREAS, on March 20, 2017, the Nampa City Council passed, and the Mayor approved Ordinance No. 4304, which ordinance, in accordance with the then newly amended provisions of Idaho Code § 50-2006(b)(3), terminated the previously existing Nampa Development Corporation (“NDC”) Board of Commissioners, being the Nampa City Council, and appointed a new Board of Commissioners made up of five commissioners, only two of which were members of the Nampa City Council;

WHEREAS, the Board of Commissioners of NDC has requested that the Nampa City Council take action to adjust the individual term expiration dates of its members to allow each such term to expire on September 30 of the year in which said term was set to expire, rather than June 1 of said year, in order to align those terms with NDC’s fiscal year, which change will both allow future members of the board to serve for several months before being required to participate in the discussion and approval of an annual budget, and which will prevent the termination of an experienced board member’s term during or just prior to the time in which budgets are regularly finalized and approved; and

WHEREAS, The Nampa City Council desires to provide a clear and preferred method for the filling of all future vacancies on the Board of Commissioners of NDC.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED by the Mayor and Council of the City of Nampa, County of Canyon, State of Idaho:

Section 1. The current makeup of the NDC Board of Commissioners, as presently constituted, is hereby APPROVED, CONFIRMED and/or REAFFIRMED, with the following, newly adjusted term expiration dates, set forth below in the chronological order in which said terms will now be set to expire:
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name of Commissioner</th>
<th>(New) Term Expiration Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a) RANDY HAVERFIELD</td>
<td>September 30, 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nampa City Council member)</td>
<td>or, upon the date he ceases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to serve as a member of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nampa City Council, if sooner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b) DAVID BILLS</td>
<td>September 30, 2020</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c) GRANT MILLER</td>
<td>September 30, 2021</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d) DARL BRUNER</td>
<td>September 30, 2022</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Nampa City Council member)</td>
<td>or, upon the date she ceases</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>to serve as a member of the</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Nampa City Council, if sooner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(e) CLAUDIA DINA</td>
<td>September 30, 2023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Section 2.** In the event of a vacancy in the NDC Board of Commissioners resulting from the death, resignation or removal of a member from said Board, or in the event of a vacancy resulting from the expiration of a member’s term, said vacancy shall be filled by nomination of the Mayor, with the advice and consent of the Nampa City Council. Any vacancy for a seat on the Board of Commissioners previously held by a member of the Nampa City Council shall be filled by a member of the Nampa City Council. Any vacancy for a seat on the Board of Commissioners previously held by a person who is not a member of the Nampa City Council, shall be filled by a person who is not a member of the Nampa City Council.

**Section 3.** This ordinance shall be in full force and effect from and after its passage, approval, and publication, according to law.

**Section 4.** This ordinance is hereby declared to be severable. If any portion of this ordinance is declared invalid by a court of competent jurisdiction, the remaining provisions shall continue in full force and effect and shall be read to carry out the purposes of the ordinance before the declaration of partial invalidity.

**Section 5.** All ordinances, resolutions, orders and parts thereof in conflict herewith are repealed.
PASSED BY THE COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO, this 3rd day of June, 2019.

APPROVED BY THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO, this 3rd day of June, 2019.

ATTEST:

________________________________________
Mayor Deborah Kling

________________________________________
City Clerk, Deborah Rosin,
(or Deputy)
At the time of Publication This Item Had no Supporting Documentation
At the time of Publication This Item Had no Supporting Documentation
UTILITY WAIVER HEARING
Middleton Road & Lone Star Road Intersection Improvement
(Key No. 20613)

- The intersection of Middleton Road and Lone Star Road serves a growing population and the adjacent Lone Star Middle School. From 2011-2015 there has been one fatal crash approaching the intersection and one Type A serious injury crash involving a student walking to school at the intersection. Improving the intersection from a four-way stop to a signal improves capacity and safety for commuters and pedestrians.

- Keller Associates was hired to provide design services for the project.

- As part of the design, utility plans were completed that identify public utilities within the roadway right of way that may or may not be impacted with the proposed improvements. Emails have been sent to the public utilities that have facilities within the roadway right of way to give them an opportunity to review and comment on the utility plans as well as make plans for relocation of their infrastructure if needed.

- Emails were sent on 5/15 to the following utility companies (See Exhibit A)
  - Cable One
  - Intermountain Gas Company
  - CenturyLink

- Keller Associates is working specifically with Idaho Power on a utility agreement as their utilities must be moved to accommodate the intersection improvements throughout the project limits.

- Because we have not received the waivers from the utility companies the City must hold a hearing to allow them to express their comments on the project.

- Engineering staff is working on calling each of the utility companies to ensure their comments are addressed.
At the time of Publication This Item Had no Supporting Documentation
DISPOSAL OF VARIOUS VEHICLE AND EQUIPMENT ASSETS

- The Fleet Master Plan was adopted by Council in fiscal year 2016. According to that plan, Fleet Services has identified vehicles and various other tools and equipment items for disposal.

- Fleet Staff requests the following items be declared as surplus property:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item</th>
<th>Serial Number</th>
<th>Estimated Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#659 '93 Hyster '60' Forklift, 1,267 Hrs. - Wastewater</td>
<td>H177B45065A</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#645 '98 Sullivan D210Q Air Compressor, 1,854 hrs. - Wastewater</td>
<td>15660A</td>
<td>$1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#361 '00 Ford F350 Work Truck, 82,077 mi. - Water</td>
<td>1FDSX34L2YEE01294</td>
<td>$4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1005 '05 Honda ST1300P Patrol Bike, 39,972 mi. - Police</td>
<td>JH2SC51775M300103</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1014 '07 Honda ST1300P Patrol Bike, 58,140 mi. - Police</td>
<td>JH2SC51707M500114</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1015 '07 Honda ST1300P Patrol Bike, 42,685 mi. - Police</td>
<td>JH2SC51707M500131</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#385 '05 Ford F350 Work Truck, 106,646 mi. - Water</td>
<td>1FDSF34Y95EB15629</td>
<td>$4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1191 '03 Ford Crown Victoria NPD Volunteer, 159,025 mi. - Police</td>
<td>2FAHP71W13X174861</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1193 '03 Ford Crown Victoria NPD Volunteer, 129,452 mi. - Police</td>
<td>2FAHP71W43X174885</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5588 '91 Chevrolet C3500 Foresters Lift Truck, Unknown mi. - Parks</td>
<td>1GBKC34N6MJ110434</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Description</td>
<td>VIN</td>
<td>Cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#1219 '06 Ford Crown Victoria Patrol K9, 153,000 mi. - Police</td>
<td>2FAHP71W56X144380</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#929 '93 Kawasaki Mule UTV, 1,575 hrs. - Fleet</td>
<td>JK1AFCB10PB501036</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Amber Light Bars X 4 – Retied/Obsolete Warning Bars</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drop-In Pickup Bed Liner</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jacobson Mower Cab – Removed to Correct Overheating Issue</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11,500lb. Vehicle Lift – Arm Locks Failed, Lift was Replaced</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5155 '03 Grasshopper 225, 2,030 hrs. – Parks (mower has been scavenged for parts over several years)</td>
<td>5315541</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$26600</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

- Disposal falls within Public Works Fleet Services guidelines for funding, acquisition, maintenance, replacement and disposal of City fleet assets
- Fleet Services Division, and disposal team, recommend disposal
- All proceeds to be returned to the general fund

**REQUEST:**

1) By Resolution, declare the equipment as outlined above as surplus property.
2) Dispose of identified surplus property as identified by staff (see Exhibit 1).
RESOLUTION NO. 27-2019

A RESOLUTION OF THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, A MUNICIPAL CORPORATION OF IDAHO, AUTHORIZING THE DISPOSITION OF CERTAIN CITY PROPERTY. (Fleet Department)

WHEREAS, the City Council has authorized and passed Resolution No. 25-2015, implementing City policy to declare personal property surplus and to provide for its disposal through sale, transfer, recycling, discarding, destruction, or exchange; and

WHEREAS, the City Clerk of the City of Nampa has proposed for disposal of certain property that the City no longer has use for; and

WHEREAS the approval for the disposal of the below listed property has been obtained from the City Attorney or his designee, and is in compliance with City policy.

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, AS FOLLOWS:

1. That the attached listed property shall be disposed of under the direction and supervision of the City Clerk, and in accordance with City policy.

2. The staff of the City of Nampa is hereby authorized to take all necessary steps to carry out the authorization provided by this Resolution.


APPROVED BY THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO, THIS 3RD DAY OF JUNE, 2019.

Approved:

Mayor Debbie Kling

ATTEST:

City Clerk
# CITY OF NAMPA
# DEPARTMENT PROPERTY DISPOSAL REQUEST

Permission is hereby requested to dispose of the following personal property declared surplus by the Council. Disposal will be in a manner meeting the best interests of the City and in accordance with Idaho Code and City Resolution No. _____.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Disposal Method Code</th>
<th>Use Category</th>
<th>Qty.</th>
<th>Description of Item</th>
<th>Cond. Code</th>
<th>Estimated Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#659 Hyster ‘60’ H177B45065A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$1500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#645 Sullivan D210Q 15660A</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$1200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#361 Ford F350 1FDSX34L2YEE01294</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#1005 Honda ST1300P JH2SC51775M300103</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#1014 Honda ST1300P JH2SC51707M500114</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#1015 Honda ST1300P JH2SC51707M500131</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#385 Ford F350 1FDSF34Y95EB15629</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$4500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#1191 Ford Crown Victoria 2FAHP71W13X174861</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#1193 Ford Crown Victoria 2FAHP71W43X174885</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#5588 Chevrolet C3500 1GBKC34N6MJ110434</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$2500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#1219 Ford Crown Victoria 2FAHP71W56X144380</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$1000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#929 Kawasaki Mule JK1AFCB10PB501036</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Amber Light Bars X 4</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Drop-In Pickup Bed Liner</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>Jacobson Mower Cab</td>
<td>F</td>
<td>$200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11,500lb. Vehicle Lift</td>
<td>R</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>02</td>
<td>Fleet</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>#5155 Grasshopper 225 5315541</td>
<td>U</td>
<td>$150</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Disposal Method Codes:

01 Transfer to another agency or department
02 Public Sale (Auction or sealed bid)
03 Leased property turned back
04 Recycle or sell for scrap
05 Unusable – ship to local dumpsite
06 Other: _____________________________

Condition Codes:

E Excellent
G Good
F Fair
R Repairable
U Unusable

Requesting Department: Fleet

Requesting Person Name (Print): Douglas Adams

Received By: _____________________________

Date Received: May 22, 2019
TASK ORDER
NEW WATER TANK DESIGN
(As Approved in FY2019 Budget)

- An evaluation of the existing elevated water tank at 11th Avenue North and I-84 has been completed and the design alternative of removal of the tank and replacement with a 1.5 million gallon ground level tank was approved by Council in 2018.

- Approval of the façade treatment of the tank was approved by Council on May 6, 2019.

- Keller Associates has completed the preliminary engineering report for the new tank, well 8 and north booster station.

- Keller Associates has prepared an amended scope of work to proceed with the final design work for these elements.

- Engineering has reviewed the attached scope of work and recommends approval.

- Construction of the new tank, well 8 and north booster facilities is anticipated to start in FY2020 and be completed in FY2021.

- FY19 budget for the New Water Tank design is $634,184.00

REQUEST: Authorize Mayor and Public Works Director to sign Amended Task Order for Professional Services between the City of Nampa and Keller Associates, Inc. for the Elevated Tank Replacement Study in the amount of $499,405.00, Time and Materials Not to Exceed.
# Eagle Water Tank Replacement

## Man Hour Estimate

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task Description</th>
<th>Principal / Chief Engineer</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Structural Engineer I</th>
<th>Structural Engineer II</th>
<th>Electrical Engineer</th>
<th>Specific of Technician Electrical Engineer I</th>
<th>Civil Engineer</th>
<th>Surveyor / Technician</th>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>Admin</th>
<th>Direct Costs / Sub-Consultants</th>
<th>TOTAL</th>
<th>Comments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General project administration</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public outreach support</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td></td>
<td>$9,650</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Total</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Additional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Additional Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Well Hole Design and Construction Support</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well hole predesign</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well hole final design</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well hole bidding</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Well hole discharge permitting</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursable</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Total</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Final Design of Tank, Well and Booster Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1 30% Design</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.1 Survey &amp; Base Mapping</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.2 Geotechnical &amp; Environmental Testing</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$14,424</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.3 30% tank and site design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.4 30% pipeline design</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.5 30% well, booster, SCADA design</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.6 30% cost estimate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1.6 30% review meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2 Final Design of Well and Booster Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.1 60% tank and site design</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.2 90% tank and site design</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% pipeline design</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% well, booster, SCADA design</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>16</td>
<td>22</td>
<td></td>
<td>22</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% cost estimate</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>90% review meeting</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address City comments</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Submit to DEQ</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.2.3 100% Plans and Specifications</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task Total</td>
<td>3049</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>290</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td>77</td>
<td>114</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>440</td>
<td>88</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Project Total:** $499,485
Background Data:

a. Effective Date of Owner-Consultant Agreement: October 2, 2017
b. Effective Date of this Amendment: April 22, 2019
c. Owner: City of Nampa
e. Keller PM: James Bledsoe P.E. (208) 288-1992
f. Project: Elevated Water Tank Replacement Study City #PW80018011 (KA # 213041-016)

Nature of Amendment:

The City would like to move forward with replacements of the existing booster station and Well 8 that will be on the same tank site as the replacement tank for the existing elevated water tank. This amendment includes final design of the 1.5 MG prestressed ground level water tank, onsite site improvements, drilling of a new Well to replace the existing Well No. 8, and construction of a new facility to house the new Well 8 pump and booster station facilities. The water tank is anticipated to include a concrete roof and architectural features to improve tank aesthetics that are consistent with concepts already provided to the City. The well and booster facilities are anticipated to be completed nearby on the same site. Demolition plans for the existing tank, booster, and well facilities are also included.

The project also includes design of a watermain from the tank site, for approximately 570 feet southwest along 11th Avenue North. Additionally, pipeline improvements are anticipated to include the replacement of two failed sections of overflow pipeline, approximately 860 feet in length, located just downstream of the existing tank, located within an existing easement, adjacent to the ITD right-of-way, and a second location that runs across the golf course, beginning north of the interstate and running to the existing outfall. Specifications for the existing tank abandonment and SCADA and telemetry improvements will also be provided. Funding for the final design and construction improvements is anticipated to be provided by the Owner.

Description of Modifications:

Modify the name of the project to better reflect the existing tank components:

Elevated Water Tank, Well 8, and Booster Station Replacement

Modify Task 1—Project Management and Meetings to include:

Project management services through final design (assumed to be 12 months), support at two additional public meetings, and support for public survey to be conducted by the City. Design review meetings are included under the design tasks.

Modify Task 4—Additional Services to include:

Establish an additional services budget for the final design. These services are anticipated to include out of scope elements, including but not limited to additional water system modeling, additional public meetings, additional permit support, and exploratory field work.

Add Task 5 – Well Production Hole Design, Bidding, and Construction:

The Consultant intends to use Brockway Engineering to assist in providing the following services:
5.1. **Well Hole Pre-Design**: Consultant will provide the following services as part of the preliminary design of a potable water municipal well:

5.1.1. Review well records and published hydrogeologic data.

5.1.2. Participate in on-site inspection with IDEQ and City staff.

5.1.3. Prepare a concept design of the proposed well hole design for the proposed site based on available data. No test well is anticipated to be completed as part of this effort. The Well is anticipated to be substantially similar to and located in close proximity to the existing Well No. 8. It is assumed that Well 8 will be retained as a monitoring well and capped.

5.1.4. Provide the proposed well hole design information to the Owner and participate in a conference call to review any Owner comments regarding the design.

5.1.5. Prepare design report for IDEQ submittal including aquifer hydrogeology, site conditions, and well design features. It is assumed no significant site contamination sources or setback encroachments are present.

5.2. **Well Hole Final Design**: Provide well hole construction documents including: drawings, specifications, cost estimate, construction contract documents, and bidding documents. A single submittal will be made at a 90% level of completion for the Owner’s review before the final design documents are produced. 100% documents will incorporate comments received from the Owner. The drawings and specifications will be submitted to the Owner and IDWR for approval. Scope assumes that the well pump test water can be discharged to the existing tank overflow pipeline.

5.3. **Well Hole Bidding**: The following services will be provided for the well hole bidding:

5.3.1. The well hole will be bid separate from the rest of the project. Consultant will address questions during bidding, and issue needed addendums. No pre-bid meeting is anticipated.

5.3.2. **Bidding, Publishing, and Administration**: Consultant will provide ten (10) hard copies and one electronic copy (PDF format) of the bid documents to the Owner. Bid plans will be produced at reduced size (8½”x11” or 11”x17”). Consultant will provide bid administration services to coordinate the bid process with the Owner and prepare addenda when necessary during the bid process to clarify bidding requirements. No pre-bid meeting is assumed. Legal notice for advertisement of bid will be prepared by and paid for by the Owner. Plans and addenda will be distributed by the Owner.

5.3.3. **Bid Opening and Award**: Consultant will review the bid abstract prepared by the Owner, review bidder qualifications, if necessary, and provide a recommendation for contract award to Owner.

5.3.4. For budgeting purposes, one bid process was assumed. Additionally, it is not anticipated that Consultant staff will prepare staff reports or attend a City council meeting to discuss award of the bid.

5.4. **Permitting**:

5.4.1. Review water right status and point of diversion coverage. No water right transfer application is anticipated.

5.4.2. Prepare and submit a drilling permit application to IDWR, and coordinate with IDWR.
5.4.3. Coordinate with irrigation district for discharge agreement and for replacing the existing outfall pipe within the canal. Owner to provide legal review. Scope does not include legal descriptions for easements.

5.5. **Construction:** The following services will be provided during the well hole construction:

5.5.1. Attend preconstruction meeting.

5.5.2. **Submittal Review:** Consultant will review contractors’ submittals to check that proposed materials generally conform to the specifications. Copies of reviewed submittals will be submitted to the Owner for future Owner reference. Submittal reviews will include specified materials. It is anticipated that the Owner will review traffic control, erosion and sediment control, and construction testing (i.e. flow and pressure tests).

5.5.3. Respond to requests for information and provide plan and specification clarification.

5.5.4. Review change orders and work change directives.

5.5.5. **Well Hole Construction Administration/Periodic Observation:** Services during construction of the well hole will include general administration support services to the Owner. Construction observation during the well drilling is anticipated to be completed over three calendar days and will focus on the screen setting and well sealing. Based on review of the drill log, well cuttings, and geophysical log, a final design for the well will be provided to the Contractor.

5.5.6. **Pump Test:** Based on data obtained during the drilling process including estimate of well yield by the driller, Consultant will design a pumping test protocol including minimum pump performance, pump setting, final well development, data to be collected, and anticipated duration of step test and final production testing. It is anticipated that level monitoring during testing will include pumping well, old Well #8 and Well #12, if possible. Consultant will assist in the test setup, provide continuous onsite support during the final well development and step test and will collect data on pump yield and drawdown during this period. Consultant will not provide continuous onsite support for the long-term production test. Consultant will assist with the test wrap-up, measure well recover, assist with WQ sampling.

5.5.7. **Well Completion Report:** Consultant will prepare a well completion report describing the lithology encountered, final well design, anomalous conditions, results of the pumping test, and recommended pump design flow and total dynamic head. Meet with the Owner to review findings and discuss final production well pump recommendations.

5.6. **Reimbursables:** A budget of $4,000 has been set aside for the laboratory fees (full parameter suite for initial public water supply source), drilling permit fee, and gradation analyses.

**Add Task 6, Final Design of Tank, Well and Booster Facilities**

Prepare civil, mechanical, electrical, controls, architectural, and structural design drawings for the demolition of the existing elevated tank, capping of Well 8, and demolition of the North Booster Station, and for the construction of the prestressed concrete tank, booster station, and Well 8 replacement facilities. The design is anticipated to include an onsite shallow overflow pond and connection to the existing overflow piping that discharges to the Phyllis Canal. Prepare project specifications, including front-end documents, special provisions, and technical specifications. A single set of bid documents will be prepared for the tank, well facilities, and booster facilities.
6.1  **30% Design:** Consultant will complete the following services as part of 30% design:

6.1.1. **Topographic Survey and Temporary Construction Benchmarks:** Consultant will complement previous survey efforts with additional topographic survey of the offsite piping corridors.

Consultant will research record documents in Canyon County to establish existing right-of-way widths and for use in the Monument Preservation of existing monuments (pursuant to Idaho Code 55-1613 and 54-1234) to be referenced on the Construction Plans. Consultant will utilize the Nampa G.I.S. mapping to approximately place property lines horizontal, and vertical control will be based on City of Nampa control available on the City’s website. Consultant will establish temporary bench marks at the well site and at approximately 500-foot intervals along the irrigation pipeline corridor to be used for construction.

Consultant will coordinate with Dig-Line for the purpose of requesting field locates and maps of subject utilities such as gas, power, telephone, storm drainage, cable T.V., street lighting, traffic signals, irrigation, and other utilities that respond to the request for utility locate. Utilities depicted on the plans as a result of this task will not be verified and must be field verified, located, and protected by the contractor during construction.

6.1.2. **Geotechnical Analysis and Environmental Testing:** Provide geotechnical investigation for the proposed site. Include up to four borings (two deep, up to 50 feet in depth for tank and two 10-foot deep for pump building). Prepare a geotechnical report that includes groundwater depth estimates, material characterization, lab testing results, and recommended design criteria (lateral earth pressures, backfill procedures, soil infiltration rates based on soil classification, and bearing capacity). Borings will be backfilled at completion of exploration and surfaces will be left in rough but relatively level conditions. Excavated soils will be left onsite.

Environmental testing is anticipated to be limited to asbestos and lead testing. The Owner will assist in gathering samples and providing access. No confined space entry or special equipment for access is included in this budget. Provide report summarizing findings and sample results.

6.1.3. **30% Tank Design:** Consultant will advance the architectural drawings and design to a 30% design plans. Complete preliminary tank structural calculations, freeboard requirements, mixing alternatives, and identify design details to review with the Owner. Advance concept to include site plan, overflow basin sizing, tank mixing and access concepts. Scope and budget excludes computational fluid dynamic (CFD) modeling to evaluate tank mixing. Prepare concept design for demolition of existing tank.

6.1.4. **30% Pipeline Design:** Consultant will use the survey data, and Owner and utility-provided mapping information to prepare a basemap of the existing pipeline corridor. Prepare preliminary well house location and the water pipeline alignment and provide preliminary layout exhibits to the Owner’s review.

6.1.5. **30% Well and Booster Facility Design:** The well and booster facility improvements are anticipated to be housed in a single building and will require demolition of existing facilities. The Consultant will preliminarily size pumps, update the 10% concept mechanical layout and develop 30% plan sections showing the proposed improvements. Prepare concept plan for demolition of existing well and booster facilities.
6.1.6. **30% Cost Estimate:** Consultant will provide an updated opinion of probable cost.

6.1.7. **30% Design Review Meeting:** Consultant will attend a kick-off meeting with the Owner for the purposes of obtaining project information and to receive any general direction that the Owner may have with respect to proceeding with the well house and pipeline alignment. At this time, the Owner will provide the Consultant with the information pertaining to any design related requirements.

### 6.2 Final Design

Final design of the well house and water pipeline will be completed by Consultant consistent with State Public Drinking Water Regulations and direction from the Owner. Consultant will prepare civil, mechanical, electrical and control, architectural, and structural design plans and specifications for the construction of the well and tank facilities.

Consultant will perform design drafting in AutoCAD/Revit for the construction plans which will include the Owner’s standard notes, vicinity maps, sheet indexes, north arrows, scale, topography, pipe size, type, fitting, surface repair, crossing requirements, property lines, easements, found monuments and property corners, land ownerships from Nampa GIS, survey control, pay limits, and special details necessary for a biddable product. Drafting will be completed on 22”x34” sheets, ANSI standard size “B” sheets (50% and 90% review sets of drawings will be 11”x17”). Final design drawings to include plan views only, except where complexities warrant a detail showing a profile.

6.2.1. **60% Plans:** Consultant to complete 60% plan and submit a review set of plans to the Owner. Update cost estimate and meet with Owner to receive comments and discuss plans.

6.2.2. **90% Plans and Specifications:** Upon 90% completion of the plans and specifications, Consultant will submit a review set of plans to the City for review. Project erosion and sediment control plans general specifications will be provided and the contractor will be required to submit final sediment and erosion control plans to the City at the time of construction. Final specifications will include traffic control constraints, and it is anticipated that traffic control plans will be prepared by the Contractor. Design will include SCADA and communication requirements. Consultant will utilize the City’s existing front-end construction documents (bid advertising, instructions to bidders, bid forms, bid bonds, insurance requirements, agreements, general provisions, and supplemental conditions). The Consultant will update the cost estimate and meet with the City to receive comments and discuss plans. Comments will be addressed in an updated set that will be submitted to the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality for agency review and approval.

6.2.3. **100% Plans and Specifications:** Consultant will address permitting agency review comments into a final set of stamped plans and specifications. Prepare an updated opinion of probable cost using the bid schedule developed for the project. Since Consultant has no control over the cost of labor, materials, equipment, or services furnished by others, or over the contractor’s methods of determining prices, or over competitive bidding or market conditions, the Consultant does not guarantee that proposals, bids, or actual construction cost will not vary from opinions of probable construction cost prepared by the Consultant.
6.2.4. **Design Assumptions:** Owner will need to provide legal and risk review/support for the project, as well as provide timely reviews of review sets. Erosion and Sediment Control plans and Traffic Control plans will be prepared by the Contractor. The City’s front-end documents will be used. Project will provide minimal landscaping of the site. Consultant may rely on information provided in the Geotechnical Report. Design assumes Consultant will provide SCADA integration and programming assistance during construction. No additional environmental permitting services will be required.

**Compensation Summary:**

A breakdown of the anticipated project budget is outlined in the following table. While individual subtask budgets may be exceeded, the total budget will not be exceeded without written approval from the Owner.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task</th>
<th>Previous Breakdown</th>
<th>This Amendment</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1: Project Management</td>
<td>$14,315.00</td>
<td>$27,590.00</td>
<td>$41,905.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2: Tank Siting Evaluation</td>
<td>$110,563.50</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$110,563.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 Well 16 Evaluation</td>
<td>$50,975.00</td>
<td>--</td>
<td>$50,975.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4: Additional Services</td>
<td>$382.50</td>
<td>$20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,382.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 5: Well Hole Design and Construction Support</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$61,041.00</td>
<td>$61,041.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 6: Final Design of Tank, Well and Booster Facilities</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>$390,854.00</td>
<td>$390,854.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$176,236.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$499,405.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$675,721.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Schedule:**

Well design is anticipated to be completed within 45 days of approval. Bidding will follow as soon as agency approvals are obtained. Construction is anticipated to be over a 60-day period, with the final completion report completed 30 days later (once water quality test results are obtained). Final design of the tank, well house, and booster facility improvements are anticipated to be completed six months after the completion of the well report.
Idaho Transportation Department Right-of-Way Acquisition of City of Nampa Cemetery Property for Interstate 84 Karcher Interchange to Franklin Boulevard Interchange Project (Reviewed and Approved by Legal Counsel)

- The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) is designing improvements to Interstate 84 between the Karcher Interchange and Franklin Boulevard Interchange in Nampa. The improvements are part of a major project addressing the needs on I-84 from Nampa into Caldwell. The work is expected to improve safety, address congestion and benefit the regional economy for many years.

- Right-of-way acquisition to widen the I-84 project corridor is underway.

- ITD submitted a property acquisition proposal to the City to purchase 3,316 square feet of Nampa’s cemetery property adjacent to I-84 (see Exhibit A, Vicinity Maps).

- The property is undeveloped, and the Parks Department has no current plans for expansion in that area.

- Nampa Parks, and Public Works Departments staff, and the City’s legal counsel reviewed the proposal and recommend acceptance of the offer of $5,204 ($1.56 SqFt).

- Pursuant to Idaho Code § 67-2323, the City is authorized to convey the property to ITD (i.e., another “government body”), so long as the terms of the conveyance are set forth in a “written agreement” prior to the conveyance. Because the property is worth less than $10,000, the conveyance may occur without the “notice and a hearing,” which would have been required had the property had a value in excess of $10,000.

- Of note, at least four City Council members must approve of this transaction. A vote of 3-3 by the Council would constitute disapproval of the transaction (i.e., the Mayor could not cast a deciding vote) per Idaho Code § 67-2324.

- With time being of essence for this project, staff respectfully requests the Mayor and/or Public Works Director be duly authorized by Council to execute, as the City’s duly authorized agents, any and all necessary Real Estate Acquisition Agreement(s), Claim for Payment, Memorandum of Contract, Right-of-Way Contract and Warranty Deed (see Exhibit B, Contract Documents).

**REQUEST:** Authorize Mayor and/or Public Works Director to execute any necessary documents pertaining to the ITD Right-of-Way acquisition of City of Nampa Cemetery Property.
City of Nampa Koherlawn - Parcel 38
6th St. N.
Nampa, Idaho
Photo Map
March 22, 2019

THE CITY OF NAMPA
Attn: Daniel Badger
411 3rd Street S
Nampa ID 83651

RE: Project No. A020(315), I-84, KARCHER IC TO FRANKLIN BLVD, NAMPA
Key No. 20315
Parcel No. 38
Parcel ID No. 50916

Dear Mr. Badger:

The Idaho Transportation Department has programmed the above referenced project for construction, and the right of way acquisition phase is now under way.

The amount of new right of way needed from your property is outlined below. A qualified and licensed real estate appraiser appraised the property and established the fair market value at $5,204.00. The just compensation offered is based on recent sales of comparable property in the area. A qualified review appraiser made a review and analysis of the Appraisal Report, and the offer to purchase your property is detailed as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>3,316.00</td>
<td>$4,642.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$562.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST COMPENSATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,204.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONSIDERATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,204.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

I have enclosed an acquisition packet containing the following items:

Right of Way Contract
Warranty Deed
Claim for Right of Way Payment
Memorandum of Contract of Sale
Project Plan Sheet(s)
Acquisition Brochure
Appraisal Report
Advice of Rights Form
The warranty deed and attached legal description identify the property being acquired and the interests therein. The Right of Way Contract shows the breakdown of the just compensation offered. If this offer is satisfactory, please sign and complete the original documents and forms accordingly. Once fully executed, a copy of the Right of Way Contract will be forwarded to you for your records.

I have enclosed a return envelope for your use when returning the documents. Once I receive the documents from you, I will process them for payment. Normal processing takes about 30 to 60 days. If there are other parties of interest such as liens or mortgages on your property, the necessary clearances will have to be obtained prior to making the acquisition payment. This can cause some delay, but generally does not present a problem. The State will obtain the clearances, title insurance and pay closing and recording fees. In addition, the State has contracted with Alliance Title & Escrow Corp. to act as our closing agent. Funds for the amount of the acquisition will be sent to Alliance Title & Escrow Corp. to hold for the closing.

If you have questions concerning this transaction, please contact me at (208) 334-8404 or by email at scotty.johnson@itd.idaho.gov. I look forward to hearing from you soon.

Sincerely,

Scotty Johnson
Senior Right of Way Agent

Enclosures
RIGHT OF WAY CONTRACT
Idaho Transportation Department

Project No. A020(315)
Parcel No. 38
Parcel ID No. 50916
Key No. 20315
County Canyon

THIS AGREEMENT is made this ____ day of ______________, 2019 between
STATE OF IDAHO, IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD, by and through the IDAHO
TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT, by its Division of Engineering Products and Plans
Administrator or the authorized representative ("DEPPA"), herein called "STATE," and
THE CITY OF NAMPA, herein called "GRANTOR."

NOW THEREFORE, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. State shall pay Grantor and lienholder(s), if any, such sums of monies as are set
out below. Grantor agrees to pay all taxes and assessments due and owing, including
taxes owing for the year in which this transaction closes. Payment to Grantor pursuant
to this Agreement is contingent upon Grantor demonstrating clear title to the property
identified above through use of documents acceptable to State and the title company
being utilized by State for this Project. Grantor shall execute and deliver to State a
notarized instrument of conveyance corresponding to the interest being acquired.

2. This contract shall not be binding unless and until executed by the DEPPA.

3. The parties have herein set out the whole of their agreement, the performance of
which constitutes the entire consideration for the grant of said right-of-way and shall
relieve State of all future claims or obligations on that account or on account of the
location, grade and construction of the proposed highway.

4. Grantor represents that to the best of Grantor’s knowledge no hazardous
materials have been stored or spilled on the subject property during Grantor’s
ownership or during previous ownerships at least insofar as Grantor has observed or
has been informed. In the alternative, if Grantor has knowledge of storage or spill of
hazardous materials on the subject property, that information is set out below. This sale
is conditional upon full disclosure of any such information.

5. Grantor hereby grants State and/or its designated contractor a “Temporary Right-
of-Entry” for unexpected and currently unforeseen incidents related to the construction
of the Project. For example, the Temporary Right-of-Entry allows State and/or its
designated contractor to enter upon the remainder of Grantor’s property to retrieve
materials, equipment, debris, etc. related to the construction of the Project that might
encroach upon Grantor’s property. State and/or its designated contractor shall inform
Grantor of the need to exercise the Temporary Right-of-Entry before entering upon the
remainder of Grantor's property. Said Temporary Right-of-Entry shall terminate upon
the completion of the Project.

6. Grantor agrees to give State legal and physical possession of the property herein
being purchased by State upon Closing or upon Grantor's receipt of payment,
whichever is later.

7. In consideration of the interests being conveyed by Grantor, State shall pay
Grantor as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Sq. Ft.</th>
<th>Acres</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>3,316.00</td>
<td>0.076</td>
<td>$4,642.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$562.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST COMPENSATION</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,204.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TOTAL CONSIDERATION $5,204.00

The Parties have had sufficient opportunity to consult with legal counsel of their
own choice. This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts, each
counterpart may be delivered originally or by electronic transmission, and all such
executed and delivered counterparts taken together will constitute one original
agreement.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement the day and year first above written.

STATE:

IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT: Recommended for Approval

By: ________________________________
    AMY REVIS, District Engineer

By: ________________________________
    SCOTTY JOHNSON
    Senior Right of Way Agent

Approved for Division of Engineering Products and Plans Administrator

On _____________________________ 2019

By: ________________________________
    JUSTIN POND
    Right-of-Way Program Manager

GRANTOR:

THE CITY OF NAMPA

By: ________________________________
    Title: ________________________________
    Printed Name: __________________________

By: ________________________________
    Title: ________________________________
    Printed Name: __________________________

By: ________________________________
    Title: ________________________________
    Printed Name: __________________________

ATTEST:

By: ________________________________
    Title: ________________________________
    Printed Name: __________________________
CLAIM FOR PAYMENT
REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS

Project No. A020(315)  Key No. 20315  Program No. E183440
Parcel No. 38  Parcel Identification No. 50916

The undersigned have an interest in the agreed settlement amount as specified in that certain Right of Way Contract dated ________________________, by and between the State of Idaho, Idaho Transportation Board, by and through the Idaho Transportation Department and the undersigned. PAYMENTS MADE ON BEHALF OF TRANSFEROR WILL BE REPORTED UNDER TRANSFEROR’S TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER WHICH SHALL BE COLLECTED BY THE TITLE COMPANY LISTED.

That agreed settlement amount specified in the Right of Way Contract shall be paid as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Address</th>
<th>TIN</th>
<th>Payment Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Title &amp; Escrow Corp.</td>
<td>820481163</td>
<td>$5,204.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380 East Parkcenter Blvd. Suite 105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise, ID 83706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On behalf of:
THE CITY OF NAMPA
411 3rd Street S
Nampa, ID 83651

TRANSFEROR(S) SIGNATURE(S)
We hereby certify that the foregoing claim is just and correct, that the amount claimed is legally due after allowing all just credits, and that no part of same has been previously paid.

THE CITY OF NAMPA

By: ________________________________  By: ________________________________
Title: ______________________________
Printed Name: _______________________

ATTEST:

By: ________________________________  By: ________________________________
Title: ______________________________
Printed Name: _______________________

DEPARTMENT USE ONLY

I hereby certify that the above Transferor(s) are entitled to the amount claimed above by virtue of transferring ownership or interest in real property to the State of Idaho and have examined the supporting data and recommend payment of the amount claimed.

Recommended: _________________________  Approved: _________________________
Right of Way Agent  Authorized Supervisor
WARRANTY DEED

THIS INDENTURE is made this _____ day of ______________, 2019, by and between

THE CITY OF NAMPA ("Grantor") and the STATE OF IDAHO, IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD,
by and through the IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT ("Grantee"), whose address is
3311 West State Street, Boise, Idaho 83703.

WITNESSETH: That Grantor, for value received, does, by these presents, grant, bargain,
sell and convey unto Grantee the following described real property situated in the County of
CANYON, State of Idaho, to-wit:

SEE EXHIBIT A ATTACHED HERETO
AND BY THIS REFERENCE MADE A PART HEREOF.
Together with all appurtenances, easements and rights of way.

Containing approximately 0.076 acres.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the said property with its appurtenances unto said Grantee, and
Grantee's successors and assigns forever. Grantor does hereby covenant to and with Grantee,
that Grantor is the owner in fee simple of said property; that said property is free from all
cumbrances, EXCEPT those to which this conveyance is expressly made subject and those
made, suffered or done by Grantee; and subject to reservations, restrictions, dedications,
easements, right of way and agreements (if any) of record, and general taxes and assessments
(including irrigation and utility assessments, if any) for the current year, which are not yet due
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and payable, and that Grantor will warrant and defend the same from all lawful claims whatsoever.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Grantor has hereunto set its hand and seal the day and year first above written.

GRANTOR:

THE CITY OF NAMPA

By: ____________________________
Title: __________________________
Printed Name: ____________________

By: ____________________________
Title: __________________________
Printed Name: ____________________

ATTEST:

By: ____________________________
Title: __________________________
Printed Name: ____________________

RECORD AT THE REQUEST OF THE STATE OF IDAHO
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On this __ day of ____________, 2019, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared ________________, ________________, and ________________, known or identified to me to be the ________________, ________________, and ________________, respectively, of THE CITY OF NAMPA, who executed the instrument on behalf of THE CITY OF NAMPA and acknowledged to me that such municipality executed the same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year in this certificate first above written.

______________
Notary Public for IDAHO
Residing at __________________
My commission expires __________________
EXHIBIT A

PARCEL No. 38
Fee Acquisition

A parcel of land located in the SE1/4 of the NW1/4 of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, Boise Meridian, Canyon County, Idaho, being more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at the Quarter Section corner common to Sections 15 and 16, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, Boise Meridian, Canyon County, Idaho, located 1019.37 feet Rt. from Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1846+06.97, from which the Section corner common to Sections 9, 10, 15 and 16 bears N.00°23'44"E., 2648.30 feet; thence,

A) N.00°23'44"E., 674.85 feet, located 349.24 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1846+06.29; thence,

B) S.89°36'16"E., 1324.13 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, located 192.88 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1859+21.16; thence,

1) N.00°23'44"E., 43.12 feet, located 150.06 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1859+16.06; thence,

2) S.82°50'54"E., 70.26 feet, located 150.03 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1859+86.33; thence,

3) S.18°41'54"E., 46.84 feet, located 192.17 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1860+06.77; thence,

4) N.83°17'41"W., 85.62 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING: 0.076 total acres.

SUBJECT TO: all Record Documents.
EXHIBIT SKETCH PARCEL 38

LOCATED IN A PORTION OF SECTION 15,
TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 2 WEST, BOISE MERIDIAN, CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO
2018

SECTION CORNER
16 15

PARCEL 38

NAMPA CEMETARY

LINE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>BEARING</th>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>N00°23'44&quot;E</td>
<td>43.12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>S82°50'54&quot;E</td>
<td>70.26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>S18°41'54&quot;E</td>
<td>46.84'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>N83°17'41&quot;W</td>
<td>85.62'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

EXHIBIT A

T-O ENGINEERS
2471 S. TITANIUM PLACE
MERIDIAN, IDAHO 83642-6703
PHONE: (208) 323-2288
FAX: (208) 323-2399
E-FLR: 2015-ROW EXHIBITS.DWG
DATE: DEC. 2018
JOB: 17018
MEMORANDUM OF CONTRACT OF SALE

This MEMORANDUM OF CONTRACT OF SALE is made and entered into as of the ___ day of ________________, 2019, by and between THE CITY OF NAMPA ("Grantor"), and the STATE OF IDAHO, IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD, by and through the IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT ("Grantee"), whose address is 3311 West State Street, Boise, Idaho 83703.

Grantor owns that certain real property located in the County of CANYON, State of Idaho, which is more particularly described as follows ("Property"): SEE EXHIBIT A ATTACHED HERETO AND BY THIS REFERENCE MADE A PART HEREOF. Together with all appurtenances.

Fee Acquisition containing approximately 0.076 acres.

NOW, THEREFORE, Grantor declares as follows:

Grantor agrees to sell the Property to Grantee and Grantee agrees to purchase the same from Grantor upon all the terms and conditions set forth in that certain Right of Way Contract by and between Grantor and Grantee dated as of the ___ day of ________________, 2019.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Grantor has hereunto set its hand and seal the day and year first above written.

GRANTOR:
THE CITY OF NAMPA

By: ________________________________
Title: ______________________________
Printed Name: _______________________  

By: ________________________________
Title: ______________________________
Printed Name: _______________________  

ATTEST:
By: ________________________________
Title: ______________________________
Printed Name: _______________________  

STATE OF IDAHO  )
County of CANYON  )

On this ____ day of _____________, 2019, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared ____________________, ____________________, and ____________________, known or identified to me to be the ____________________, ____________________, and ____________________, respectively, of THE CITY OF NAMPA, who executed the instrument on behalf of THE CITY OF NAMPA and acknowledged to me that such municipality executed the same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year in this certificate first above written.

______________________________
Notary Public for IDAHO

Residing at ________________________

My commission expires ____________________
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Grantee has hereunto set its hand and seal the day and year first above written.

GRANTEE:

STATE OF IDAHO, IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD,
by and through the IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

By: ________________________________
    JUSTIN POND
    Right of Way Program Manager

State of IDAHO )
    ) ss.
County of ADA )

On this _____ day of __________, 2019, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared JUSTIN POND, known or identified to me to be Right of Way Program Manager for the State of Idaho, Idaho Transportation Board, the person whose name is subscribed to the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged to me that he executed the same on behalf of the STATE OF IDAHO, IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year in this certificate first above written.

______________________________
Notary Public for IDAHO.
Residing at _______________________
My commission expires ____________
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EXHIBIT A

PARCEL No. 38
Fee Acquisition

A parcel of land located in the SE1/4 of the NW1/4 of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, Boise Meridian, Canyon County, Idaho, being more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at the Quarter Section corner common to Sections 15 and 16, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, Boise Meridian, Canyon County, Idaho, located 1019.37 feet Rt. from Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1846+85.97, from which the Section corner common to Sections 9, 10, 15 and 16 bears N.00°23'44"E., 2648.30 feet; thence,

A) N.00°23'44"E., 674.85 feet, located 349.24 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1846+06.29; thence,

B) S.89°36'16"E., 1324.13 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, located 192.88 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1859+21.16; thence,

1) N.00°23'44"E., 43.12 feet, located 150.06 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1859+16.06; thence,

2) S.82°50'54"E., 70.26 feet, located 150.03 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1859+86.33; thence,

3) S.18°41'54"E., 46.84 feet, located 192.17 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1860+06.77; thence,

4) N.83°17'41"W., 85.62 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING: 0.076 total acres.

SUBJECT TO: all Record Documents.
EXHIBIT SKETCH PARCEL 38

LOCATED IN A PORTION OF SECTION 15,
TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 2 WEST, BOISE MERIDIAN, CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO
2018

LINE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>BEARING</th>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>N00°23'44&quot;E</td>
<td>43.12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>S82°50'54&quot;E</td>
<td>70.26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>S18°41'54&quot;E</td>
<td>46.84'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>N83°17'41&quot;W</td>
<td>85.62'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAMPA CEMETARY

T-O ENGINEERS
2471 S. TITANIUM PLACE
MERIDIAN, IDAHO 83642-6703
PHONE: (208) 323-2288  FAX: (208) 323-2399
RIGHT OF WAY CONTRACT
Idaho Transportation Department

Project No.  A020(315)
Parcel No.  38
Parcel ID No.  50916
Key No.  20315
County  Canyon

THIS AGREEMENT is made this ___ day of __________, 2019 between
STATE OF IDAHO, IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD, by and through the IDAHO
TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT, by its Division of Engineering Products and Plans
Administrator or the authorized representative ("DEPPA"), herein called "STATE," and
THE CITY OF NAMPA, herein called "GRANTOR."

NOW THEREFORE, the parties hereto agree as follows:

1. State shall pay Grantor and lienholder(s), if any, such sums of monies as are set
out below. Grantor agrees to pay all taxes and assessments due and owing, including
taxes owing for the year in which this transaction closes. Payment to Grantor pursuant
to this Agreement is contingent upon Grantor demonstrating clear title to the property
identified above through use of documents acceptable to State and the title company
being utilized by State for this Project. Grantor shall execute and deliver to State a
notarized instrument of conveyance corresponding to the interest being acquired.

2. This contract shall not be binding unless and until executed by the DEPPA.

3. The parties have herein set out the whole of their agreement, the performance of
which constitutes the entire consideration for the grant of said right-of-way and shall
relieve State of all future claims or obligations on that account or on account of the
location, grade and construction of the proposed highway.

4. Grantor represents that to the best of Grantor’s knowledge no hazardous
materials have been stored or spilled on the subject property during Grantor’s
ownership or during previous ownerships at least insofar as Grantor has observed or
has been informed. In the alternative, if Grantor has knowledge of storage or spill of
hazardous materials on the subject property, that information is set out below. This sale
is conditional upon full disclosure of any such information.

5. Grantor hereby grants State and/or its designated contractor a “Temporary Right-
of-Entry” for unexpected and currently unforeseen incidents related to the construction
of the Project. For example, the Temporary Right-of-Entry allows State and/or its
designated contractor to enter upon the remainder of Grantor’s property to retrieve
materials, equipment, debris, etc. related to the construction of the Project that might
encroach upon Grantor’s property. State and/or its designated contractor shall inform
Grantor of the need to exercise the Temporary Right-of-Entry before entering upon the
remainder of Grantor’s property. Said Temporary Right-of-Entry shall terminate upon the completion of the Project.

6. Grantor agrees to give State legal and physical possession of the property herein being purchased by State upon Closing or upon Grantor’s receipt of payment, whichever is later.

7. In consideration of the interests being conveyed by Grantor, State shall pay Grantor as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type</th>
<th>Size</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land</td>
<td>3,316.00</td>
<td>0.076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Improvement</td>
<td></td>
<td>$562.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JUST COMPENSATION</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,204.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL CONSIDERATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,204.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Parties have had sufficient opportunity to consult with legal counsel of their own choice. This Agreement may be executed in any number of counterparts, each counterpart may be delivered originally or by electronic transmission, and all such executed and delivered counterparts taken together will constitute one original agreement.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the parties have executed this Agreement the day and year first above written.

STATE:

IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT:
Recommended for Approval

By: ___________________________
   AMY REVIS, District Engineer

By: ___________________________
   SCOTTY JOHNSON
   Senior Right of Way Agent

Approved for Division of Engineering
Products and Plans Administrator

On _______________________, 2019

By: ___________________________
   JUSTIN POND
   Right-of-Way Program Manager

GRANTOR:

THE CITY OF NAMPA

By: ___________________________
   Title: _______________________
   Printed Name: ______________

By: ___________________________
   Title: _______________________
   Printed Name: ______________

By: ___________________________
   Title: _______________________
   Printed Name: ______________

ATTEST:

By: ___________________________
   Title: _______________________
   Printed Name: ______________
THIS INDENTURE is made this _____ day of ______________, 2019, by and between
THE CITY OF NAMPA ("Grantor") and the STATE OF IDAHO, IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD,
by and through the IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT ("Grantee"), whose address is
3311 West State Street, Boise, Idaho 83703.

WITNESSETH: That Grantor, for value received, does, by these presents, grant, bargain,
sell and convey unto Grantee the following described real property situated in the County of
CANYON, State of Idaho, to-wit:

SEE EXHIBIT A ATTACHED HERETO
AND BY THIS REFERENCE MADE A PART HEREOF.
Together with all appurtenances, easements and rights of way.

Containing approximately 0.076 acres.

TO HAVE AND TO HOLD the said property with its appurtenances unto said Grantee, and
Grantee's successors and assigns forever. Grantor does hereby covenant to and with Grantee,
that Grantor is the owner in fee simple of said property; that said property is free from all
encumbrances, EXCEPT those to which this conveyance is expressly made subject and those
made, suffered or done by Grantee; and subject to reservations, restrictions, dedications,
easements, right of way and agreements (if any) of record, and general taxes and assessments
(including irrigation and utility assessments, if any) for the current year, which are not yet due
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and payable, and that Grantor will warrant and defend the same from all lawful claims whatsoever.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Grantor has hereunto set its hand and seal the day and year first above written.

GRANTOR:

THE CITY OF NAMPA

By: ____________________________________
Title: ___________________________________
Printed Name: ___________________________

By: ____________________________________
Title: ___________________________________
Printed Name: ___________________________

ATTEST:

By: ____________________________________
Title: ___________________________________
Printed Name: ___________________________

By: ____________________________________
Title: ___________________________________
Printed Name: ___________________________
On this _____ day of _____________, 2019, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared ____________________, ____________________, and ____________________, respectively, of THE CITY OF NAMPA, who executed the instrument on behalf of THE CITY OF NAMPA and acknowledged to me that such municipality executed the same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year in this certificate first above written.

___________________________________
Notary Public for IDAHO
Residing at __________________________
(SEAL)
My commission expires ____________________
Canyon County, Idaho
I-84, Northside Blvd. to Franklin Blvd.
Project No. A020(315)
Key No. 20315
Page 1 of 1

December 18, 2018
Assessor's Parcel No. R3123700000
Parcel ID No. 50916
3,316 Sq. Ft. (0.076 Acres)

PARCEL No. 38
Fee Acquisition

A parcel of land located in the SE1/4 of the NW1/4 of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, Boise Meridian, Canyon County, Idaho, being more particularly described as follows:

COMMENCING at the Quarter Section corner common to Sections 15 and 16, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, Boise Meridian, Canyon County, Idaho, located 1019.37 feet Rt. from Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1846+85.97, from which the Section corner common to Sections 9, 10, 15 and 16 bears N.00°23'44"E., 2648.30 feet; thence,

A) N.00°23’44”E., 674.85 feet, located 349.24 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1846+06.29; thence,

B) S.89°36’16”E., 1324.13 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING, located 192.88 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1859+21.16; thence,

1) N.00°23’44”E., 43.12 feet, located 150.06 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1859+16.06; thence,

2) S.82°50’54”E., 70.26 feet, located 150.03 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1859+86.33; thence,

3) S.18°41’54”E., 46.84 feet, located 192.17 feet Rt. from said Interstate 84 Project Centerline Station 1860+06.77; thence,

4) N.83°17’41”W., 85.62 feet to the POINT OF BEGINNING.

CONTAINING: 0.076 total acres.

SUBJECT TO: all Record Documents.
EXHIBIT SKETCH PARCEL 38
LOCATED IN A PORTION OF SECTION 15,
TOWNSHIP 4 NORTH, RANGE 2 WEST, BOISE MERIDIAN, CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO
2018

LINE TABLE

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>LINE</th>
<th>BEARING</th>
<th>DISTANCE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>L1</td>
<td>N00°23'44&quot;E</td>
<td>43.12'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L2</td>
<td>S82°30'54&quot;E</td>
<td>70.26'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L3</td>
<td>S18°41'54&quot;E</td>
<td>46.84'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L4</td>
<td>N83°17'41&quot;W</td>
<td>85.62'</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

NAMPA CEMETARY
Integra Realty Resources
Boise

Appraisal of Real Property

City of Nampa Koherlawn - Parcel 38
Vacant Land
6th St. N.
Nampa, Canyon County, Idaho 83687
Client Reference: K20315/Project Number A020(315)

Prepared For:
Idaho Transportation Department

Effective Date of the Appraisal:
March 4, 2019

Report Format:
Appraisal Report – 2288 Report Format

IRR - Boise
File Number: 163-2019-0032
City of Nampa Koherlawn - Parcel 38
6th St. N.
Nampa, Idaho
March 20, 2019

Mr. Justin Pond  
Program Manager, Right of Way  
Idaho Transportation Department  
3311 State Street  
Boise, ID 83707

SUBJECT: Market Value Appraisal  
City of Nampa Koherlawn - Parcel 38  
6th St. N.  
Nampa, Canyon County, Idaho 83687  
Client Reference: K20315/Project Number A020(315)  
IRR - Boise File No. 163-2019-0032

Dear Mr. Pond:

In accordance with our scope of work agreement, Integra Realty Resources – Boise is pleased to submit the accompanying appraisal of the referenced property. The purpose of the appraisal is to develop an opinion of the market value as is of the fee simple interest in the property rights being acquired.

Property and Appraisal Problem Synopsis

The subject and larger parcel of this report is a triangular parcel totaling 20.31 acres (884,704 SF). The larger parcel is owned by City of Nampa and functions as a cemetery. The site is not subject to any existing zoning ordinances. The right-of-way requirement is from a vacant area at the north portion of the property, 500+ feet from the nearest burial plots; the cemetery is not affected by the proposed Project and is therefore not included in our valuation analysis. As will be discussed, the highest and best use of the site as vacant would be industrial development. To value the land, we utilize sales of industrial sites.

The city own an additional 17.16-acre site directly to the southeast of the subject, which is part of the cemetery and has the same assessor parcel number as the subject larger parcel. This, however, is not included within the larger parcel, as it is divided by a railroad and is not affected by proposed right-of-way. There is also a 2.09-acre, rectangular parcel located to
the west of the subject larger parcel that is contiguous with the existing cemetery. This parcel is owned by the City of Nampa, but is not included as part of the larger parcel as it would further increase the atypical shape of the larger parcel, and would most likely be developed with an independent use if the subject were vacant.

We are not aware of any other parcels contiguous with, or even reasonably proximate to, the subject tax parcel that are under the same ownership. Neither are we aware of any other parcels that are operated with and economically linked to the defined subject tract. As such, we are not aware of any other parcels that should be considered in the process of the larger parcel determination. Thus, the larger parcel is a single parcel measuring 20.31 acres.

Prior Services Disclosure
USPAP requires appraisers to disclose to the client any other services they have provided in connection with the subject property in the prior three years, including valuation, consulting, property management, brokerage, or any other services. We have not performed any services, as an appraiser or in any other capacity, regarding the property that is the subject of this report within the three-year period immediately preceding acceptance of this assignment.

Value Conclusions
By reason of our investigations and analyses, our estimate of market value for the property rights to be acquired or disposed, based upon our independent appraisal and the exercise of our professional judgment, as of an effective date of March 4, 2019, is set forth as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Conclusion</th>
<th>Interest Appraised</th>
<th>Date of Value</th>
<th>Value Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Value As Is</td>
<td>Fee Simple</td>
<td>March 4, 2019</td>
<td>$5,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraordinary Assumptions and Hypothetical Conditions
The value conclusions are subject to the following extraordinary assumptions that may affect the assignment results. An extraordinary assumption is uncertain information accepted as fact. If the assumption is found to be false as of the effective date of the appraisal, we reserve the right to modify our value conclusions.

1. None necessitated
Respectfully submitted,

**Integra Realty Resources - Boise**

Dustin Hough  
Senior Analyst  
Certified General Real Estate Appraiser  
Idaho Certificate # CGA-4897  
Telephone: 208.342.2500  
Email: dhough@irr.com

Robin Brady, MAI  
Director  
Certified General Appraiser  
Idaho Certificate # CGA-3208  
Telephone: 208-342-2500, ext. 203  
Email: rbrady@irr.com
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Google Earth Aerials
The perimeter of the subject’s larger parcel has been outlined in green.
Assessor’s Parcel Map

The perimeter of the subject’s larger parcel has been outlined in red.

Assessed Value Table

Real estate taxes and assessments for the current tax year are shown in the following table. Note that, because it is city-owned, the subject is tax-exempt:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax ID</th>
<th>Land</th>
<th>Improvements</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R3123700000</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Zoning Map

The subject parcel is not zoned. Because it is owned by the city and has been used as a cemetery for over 100 years (far predating the modern zoning code), there has never been a need for the city to impose typical zoning regulations on the subject.
Legal Description

File No. 420997

Exhibit *A*

Parcel 1:

Part of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, of the Boise Meridian, Canyon County, State of Idaho, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at a point 600 feet North of the Southeast corner of the Southwest Quarter of Section 15, running thence

West 185 feet; thence

North 467 feet; thence

East 183 feet; thence

South 467 feet to the Place of Beginning.

Parcel 2:

Part of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, of the Boise Meridian, Canyon County, State of Idaho, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at a point 600 feet North of the Southwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, running thence

East 233 feet; thence

North 467 feet; thence

West 233 feet; thence

South 467 feet to the Place of Beginning.

Parcel 3:

Part of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, of the Boise Meridian, Canyon County, State of Idaho, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at a point 541 feet North of the Southwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, thence running

North 259 feet; thence

East 233 feet; thence

North 467 feet; thence

West 233 feet; thence

North 248 feet to the Northwest corner of the Southwest Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of said Section 15; thence

East to the right of way of the Idaho Central Railroad;

Thence in a Southwesterly direction along said right of way to a point at the intersection of said right of way with the line of the extension of the Southwest side of Sixth Street North, thence

Northwesterly along the said line of said Street to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel 4:

A strip of piece of land lying and being in the Southwest Quarter of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West of the Boise Meridian, Canyon County, State of Idaho, more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the center or half section line through said Section 15, 440 and 8/100 feet to the right of way of the Idaho Northern Railway; thence

Southwesterly along the East side of the right of way of the Idaho Northern Railway to the Southwest corner of the City of Nampa Cemetery; thence

East to the East line of the said Southwest Quarter of Section 15; thence

South along said line 702 and 73/100 feet; thence

Northwesterly direct to the Southwest corner of said cemetery; thence

East to the East line of said Southwest Quarter of Section 15; thence

North along said line to the Place of Beginning.
Parcel 5:

All that piece or parcel of land situate within the Village of Nampa Cemetery fence particularly described as follows:
Commencing at a point 1067 feet North of the Southwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, Boise Meridian, Canyon County, State of Idaho; thence
North 109 feet; thence
West 230 feet; thence
South 576 feet; thence
East 43 feet; thence
North 497 feet; thence
East 185 feet to the Place of Beginning.

Parcel 6:

Beginning at a point 391 feet North of the Southwest corner of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West of the Boise Meridian, Canyon County, Idaho; running thence
North to a point where the Idaho Northern Railroad right of way intersects the West line of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 15; thence in a Southeasterly direction along said right of way to a point where the said right of way intersects the East line of 5th Street North in the City of Nampa extended; thence in a Northwesterly direction along the said east line of said 5th Street North to the Place of Beginning.
Project Plans

Overview

City of Nampa Koherlawn - Parcel 38
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel No.</th>
<th>Parcel Acre No.</th>
<th>Record Owner</th>
<th>Total Ownership</th>
<th>Right of Way</th>
<th>Remander</th>
<th>Easement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12</td>
<td>50901</td>
<td>AMALGAMATED SUGAR CO LLC</td>
<td>69.660 0.329 0.00</td>
<td>69.660 0.329 0.00</td>
<td>0.924 0.056</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13</td>
<td>50902</td>
<td>AMALGAMATED SUGAR CO LLC</td>
<td>27.390 0.559 0.00</td>
<td>27.390 0.559 0.00</td>
<td>0.452 0.043</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>50903</td>
<td>LAYNE OF IDAHO INC</td>
<td>3.100 0.223 0.00</td>
<td>3.100 0.223 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15</td>
<td>50904</td>
<td>TREASURE VALLEY ENTERPRISES LLC</td>
<td>8.220 0.646 0.00</td>
<td>8.220 0.646 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16</td>
<td>50905</td>
<td>JACKSONS FOOD STORES INC</td>
<td>5.210 0.063 0.00</td>
<td>5.210 0.063 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17</td>
<td>50906</td>
<td>KIRPA HOSPITALITY LLC</td>
<td>1.170 0.235 0.00</td>
<td>1.170 0.235 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18</td>
<td>50907</td>
<td>JACKSONS FOOD STORES INC</td>
<td>1.010 0.072 0.00</td>
<td>1.010 0.072 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19</td>
<td>50908</td>
<td>ID IND TV INC</td>
<td>0.380 0.004 0.00</td>
<td>0.380 0.004 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>KITRY CHANNEL 12</td>
<td>0.690 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.690 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>ID IND TV INC</td>
<td>0.540 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.540 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>ID IND TV INC</td>
<td>0.630 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.630 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>VINEYARD AT BORADMORE II LP</td>
<td>0.170 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.170 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>BENCHMARK PACIFIC PERRIS LP</td>
<td>1.890 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>1.890 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>AGEXQUITY LLC</td>
<td>4.070 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>4.070 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26</td>
<td>50909</td>
<td>MAVERIX INC</td>
<td>2.410 0.013 0.00</td>
<td>2.410 0.013 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27</td>
<td>50910</td>
<td>COMMERCIAL NET LEASE REALTY LP</td>
<td>0.650 0.052 0.00</td>
<td>0.650 0.052 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>28</td>
<td>50911</td>
<td>GROMJI LLC</td>
<td>0.980 0.041 0.00</td>
<td>0.980 0.041 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>29</td>
<td>50912</td>
<td>SUNDOWNER INC</td>
<td>1.410 0.139 0.00</td>
<td>1.410 0.139 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>HAR HAR HAR LLC</td>
<td>1.630 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>1.630 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>50913</td>
<td>KISSLER ENTERPRISES LP</td>
<td>3.810 0.228 0.00</td>
<td>3.810 0.228 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31</td>
<td>50913</td>
<td>KISSLER ENTERPRISES LP</td>
<td>1.060 0.091 0.00</td>
<td>1.060 0.091 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>32</td>
<td>50914</td>
<td>SUNDOWNER INC</td>
<td>4.300 0.870 0.00</td>
<td>4.300 0.870 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33</td>
<td>50915</td>
<td>WELTER LEONARD W 1983 TRUST</td>
<td>9.550 1.159 0.00</td>
<td>9.550 1.159 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>34</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>GIBRITH GLORIA JEAN</td>
<td>2.370 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>2.370 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>35</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>UNION PACIFIC RAILROAD</td>
<td>10.860 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>10.860 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>36</td>
<td>50920</td>
<td>THORNTON GALLUP LLC</td>
<td>5.010 0.023 0.00</td>
<td>5.010 0.023 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>37</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>TWIN ISLANDS LLC</td>
<td>4.820 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>4.820 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>38</td>
<td>50916</td>
<td>NAMPA CEMETARY</td>
<td>20.310 0.076 0.00</td>
<td>20.310 0.076 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>39</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>MASON CREEK (BUREAU OF RECLAMATION)</td>
<td>3.757 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>3.757 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40</td>
<td>50918</td>
<td>HOFF COMPANIES INC</td>
<td>11.420 0.319 0.00</td>
<td>11.420 0.319 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41</td>
<td>50919</td>
<td>SYNGENTA SEEDS INC</td>
<td>0.880 0.217 0.00</td>
<td>0.880 0.217 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>42</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>GARY HICLOTT</td>
<td>14.030 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>14.030 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>43</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>RICHARD PHILLIPS &amp; ROLAND YAN AUER</td>
<td>3.520 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>3.520 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>M GUTHRIE LLC</td>
<td>3.810 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>3.810 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>45</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>M GUTHRIE LLC</td>
<td>3.750 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>3.750 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>46</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>JERI R INDUY &amp; JERRY INDUY</td>
<td>1.590 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>1.590 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>47</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>JERI R INDUY &amp; JERRY INDUY</td>
<td>1.910 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>1.910 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>48</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>SHILO INN-NAMPA SUITES LLC</td>
<td>2.340 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>2.340 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>49</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>NAMPA HOSPITALITY GROUP LLC</td>
<td>1.510 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>1.510 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>J J HESS LLC</td>
<td>1.180 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>1.180 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51</td>
<td>INFO ONLY</td>
<td>STATE OF IDAHO DIVISION OF HIGHWAYS</td>
<td>0.390 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.390 0.00 0.00</td>
<td>0.00 0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Subject
Legal Description—Fee Acquisition

A metes and bounds legal description of the acquisition requirement was provided by our client, and is presented following:
Photo Map
Project Photographs

The following photos were taken by Robin Brady, MAI, on March 4, 2019. Photos of the proposed acquisition are presented following. The yellow line demarks the location of the proposed ROW and the red line shows the property boundaries.

Photo 1 - View looking east at the proposed ROW from the northwest boundary of the subject.
Photo 2 - View looking north at the proposed ROW from the northern portion of the subject.

Photo 3 – View looking west at the proposed ROW from the northeast boundary of the subject.
Photo 4 - View looking south to the cemetery. Area is not affected by the Project.
ITD 2288 Report

Appraisal Report

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Parcel ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20315</td>
<td>A020(315)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Property Owner's Name
City of Nampa

Address
411 3rd Street S
Nampa, ID 83651

Client's Name and Intended User's Name

Purpose and Intended Use of Appraiser's Opinions and Conclusions

The purpose of the appraisal is to develop an opinion of market value of the real property to be acquired as a result of the Project. The intended use of the appraisal is to assist the Client in the contemplated acquisition of a portion of the subject property.

Fee simple

Purpose of Requirement
Total Ownership 20.310
Area Required (Fee) 0.078
Permanent Easement Required 0
Temporary Easement Required 0
Type of Access Control (Before and After)
Before: no access control on 6th St N. After unchanged.

Sale History

Year of Sale | Seller's Name          | Buyer's Name | Sales Price |
-------------|------------------------|--------------|-------------|
1927         | George and Harriet Moore | City of Nampa | $           |
2019         |                        |              | $           |
2020         |                        |              | $           |

Date of Inspection and Invitation

I offered Daniel Badger, who is the representative of City of Nampa, an opportunity to accompany me on my inspection of this property by ☐ personal contact ☐ telephone ☒ letter on 2/14/19 (date). This invitation was ☐ accepted ☒ declined. The telephone number of the owner or representative contacted is 208-469-6469.

I personally inspected the subject property on date 2/14/19.
**Definition of Market Value:** The definition from UASFA (Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions), as follows shall be used: “Market value is the amount in cash, or on terms reasonably equivalent to cash, for which in all probability the property would have sold on the effective date of the appraisal, after a reasonable exposure time on the open competitive market, from a willing and reasonably knowledgeable seller to a willing and reasonably knowledgeable buyer, with neither acting under any compulsion to buy or sell, giving due consideration to all available economic uses of the property at the time of the appraisal.”

**Description of Subject Property** 
(Identify and provide a summary description of the real property, personal property, or tangible items appraised, such as location, physical features, area, city and neighborhood data, legal use, economic property characteristics, zoning and flood hazard statement, if applicable. Identify any personal property, trade fixtures, or intangible items that are not real property and if they are or are not part of this appraisal.)

The subject parcel is a triangular site which contains 20.31 acres (854,704 SF). The site is currently an existing cemetery. The cemetery is not affected by the proposed Project. Primary access to the site is along the southwest boundary from 6th Street North, a thoroughfare. The subject is partially visible from the Interstate and is not directly accessible. The site is generally level and at street grade with no drainage, environmental, easement restrictions, or ground stability issues reported or observed. All utilities are to the site.

The subject is not zoned. Surrounding uses are primarily light industrial, and industrial synergy is high. For the purposes of this analysis, the highest and best use of the subject, as if vacant, is light industrial use.

**Scope of Work**
Identify the problem to be solved (extent of property identification, extent of tangible property inspection)

The appraisal problem to be solved is derivation of an opinion of market value for property rights to be acquired as a result of a contemplated right-of-way project.

Robin Brady, MAI, inspected the subject property on March 4, 2019. This included a detailed inspection of the frontage area of the parcel along the north boundary that is to be affected by the contemplated Project, the taking of photographs and an inventory of apparent site improvements in the Project area.

We identified the subject through Project right-of-way plans, ownership information and a title commitment provided by the client, a legal description of the requirement area provided by the client, online GIS records, and other sources. We assembled information about the characteristics of the property that are relevant to its probable highest and best use and its market value.

Identify the type and extent of data research performed
Research of the most similar sales of properties was completed so that an estimate of value by the sales comparison approach could be made. We verified comparable market data with one or more of the following: Buyer, seller, listing agent or broker, selling agent or broker, or a third party involved in the transaction (listing coordinator or office manager for a brokerage, etc.); MLS records; county GIS records; and title company records (deed verifications, etc.).
Identify the type and extent of analyses applied to arrive at opinions or conclusions. We use only the sales comparison approach to develop an opinion of land value for the subject. This approach is applicable to the subject because there has been a reasonably active market for similar properties, and sufficient sales data is available for analysis.

**Summarize information analyzed, methods and techniques employed, and the reasoning that supports the analyses, opinions, and conclusions.** Give reason for exclusion of the sales comparison approach, cost approach, or income approach.

The sales comparison approach is developed to estimate underlying land value as vacant. The income approach is not a relevant valuation approach because to the best of our knowledge, the subject has no arms-length, long-term lease(s) in place and a typical buyer is not going to value this type of property using an income approach analysis. Because we do not value the improvements, the cost approach is not applicable.

**Description of Area to be Acquired, Remainder, Access Control Issues and Summary of Appraisal Problem**
The area to be acquired (referred to as the "fee requirement") is one strip of land at the north boundary that fronts Interstate 84. The requirement totals 0.076 acres (3,316 SF). The property will not be encumbered by a temporary or permanent easement. There will no change to the subject's access as a result of the Project.

**Discussion of Improvements** ITD does not require valuation of "unaffected improvements", i.e., houses, buildings, etc. not damaged.

The subject is improved with a cemetery, which is not affected by the proposed Project and is therefore not included in our valuation analysis. Improvements in the right-of-way area that will be affected by the Project include 46.84 linear feet of wire fencing. Contractor bids are $20 per linear foot for wire fencing replacement. Entrepreneurial incentive (EI) to undertake the replacement is estimated at 10%. The fencing is in poor condition and the exact age cannot be determined. Based on our inspection, depreciation is estimated at -50%. The net depreciation is estimated at 40% and therefore the net depreciated replacement cost of $12 PLF will be applied.

**Present analysis of physically possible, legally permissible, financially feasible, and maximally productive both as if "vacant" and as if "improved" for the larger parcel.**
The highest and best use is light-industrial. See Valuation Addendum 1 for details.

**Additional Discussion**
Our larger parcel conclusion is provided in Addendum 2.

### Comparative Analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale No.</th>
<th>Sales Price</th>
<th>Sales Price Per Sq Ft</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Sales Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>$2,352,240</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td></td>
<td>Dec-14</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

See valuation Addendum 3

**Indicated Adjusted Unit Value of Subject**

<p>| $1.34 |  |  |  |
|-------|  |  |  |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Number</th>
<th>Project Number</th>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Parcel ID Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20315</td>
<td>A020(315)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>50916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sale No. 2**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sales Price</th>
<th>Sales Price Per</th>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Sales Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Oct-16</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

See valuation Addendum 3

**Indicated Adjusted Unit Value of Subject**

$1.38

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale No. 3</th>
<th>Sales Price</th>
<th>Sales Price Per</th>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Sales Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1,732,899</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>May-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

See valuation Addendum 3

**Indicated Adjusted Unit Value of Subject**

$1.40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale No. 4</th>
<th>Sales Price</th>
<th>Sales Price Per</th>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Sales Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$924,000</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Sep-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

See valuation Addendum 3

**Indicated Adjusted Unit Value of Subject**

$1.66

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Sale No. 5</th>
<th>Sales Price</th>
<th>Sales Price Per</th>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Sales Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$750,000</td>
<td>$1.66</td>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Nov-18</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Discussion**

See valuation Addendum 3

**Indicated Adjusted Unit Value of Subject**

$1.53

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Final Correlation of Value**

$1,238,695

**Final Conclusion of Subject Unit Value**

$1.40

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ac</th>
<th>Sq Ft</th>
<th>Parcel</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>✔️</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Valuation of Requirement or Total Parcel

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subtotal</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$4,642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Perm Easement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Temp Easement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Key Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20315</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Improvements Within Requirement (If Any)**

- 46.84 linear feet of wire fencing @ $12 PFL

\[
\text{Total} = 46.84 \times 12 = 562
\]

**Loss in Value to Remainder (Severance/Minor Damages, Access Control Explanation)**

None

\[
\text{Total} = 0
\]

**Cost to Cure Items (Explain and Support)**

None

\[
\text{Total} = 0
\]

**Total Fair Market Value** $5,204

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Signature</th>
<th>Effective Date of Appraisal</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Signature]</td>
<td>3/4/2019</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Report Date: 3/20/2019

Comments: See following addendums for additional details
Other Attachments or References (As Applicable)

- [ ] In box indicates required in report  
- [X] In box indicates include if applicable
- Letter of transmittal
- Appraiser's certification
- R/W plans sheet or map
- Assumptions and limiting conditions
- Qualifications of appraiser
  - Numbered subject photos (with project lines, location map, and labeled with date and photographer) and interior photos, if affected
- Assessor's valuation (must include category and value per category) and plat map
- Legal description
- Zoning information
- Comparable sales location map and sufficient directions
- Numbered photos of comparables (location map and labeled with date and photographer)
- Title report (if supplied)
- [X] Supporting bids, if applicable
- [X] Salvage value estimate of affected improvements, if applicable
- [X] Sign identification, photograph(s), and location, if applicable
- [X] Floor plan sketch, if applicable
- [X] Sketch of property showing improvements, if applicable
- [X] Fixture inventory (ITD 5204), if applicable
- [X] Identify tenant-owned property and ownership within R/W requirement, if applicable
- [X] Economic rent information of impacted improvements and rental history, if applicable
- [X] Property owner advice of rights form
- [ ] Other

Insert additional information/displays as necessary after this page.
Addendum 1—Highest and Best Use

As Vacant
The highest and best use of the subject as vacant land is light industrial. This opinion is supported as follows:

Legally Permissible
The subject is “unzoned” and owned by the City of Nampa. Thus, there are currently no legal restrictions on the site imposed by zoning laws. That said, if the subject were vacant (i.e., if the cemetery ceased operations and was relocated), the city would undoubtedly zone the property. The most prevalent zone in the immediate area is light-industrial, including the parcels adjacent to the north, east, and west of the subject. Thus, the most likely zoning for the subject, if it were vacant and available for development, would be Light Industrial.

Additionally, to our knowledge, there are no legal restrictions such as easements or deed restrictions that would effectively limit the use of the property.

Physically Possible
The site is triangular in shape, which limits development options; however, the site is large enough to support industrial development and is adjacent to a railroad line. The synergy surrounding the subject site is of an industrial nature, with light-industrial use to the east, west and north of the subject. Additionally, the location along Interstate-84, and availability of utilities, suggest the property would be well-situated for industrial use. The Interstate frontage and proximity to a rail line and industrial uses makes the property relatively undesirable from a residential perspective.

Financially Feasible
Based on our analysis of the market, there is strong demand for light-industrial uses. According to Thornton Oliver Keller, a leading commercial real estate sales and management company in the Boise market, industrial vacancy as of December 2018 was at 2.93% with average asking rental rates of $0.60 per square foot per month. The subject site is located with some Interstate-84 visibility in an area with high existing light industrial synergy. The subject has access to 6th St N. It appears that development of the subject with a light-industrial use would result in a value commensurate with its cost. Therefore, a light-industrial use is considered to be financially feasible.

Maximally Productive
There does not appear to be any reasonably probable use of the site that would generate a higher residual land value than light-industrial use.

Conclusion
Light-industrial use is the only use that meets the four tests of highest and best use. Therefore, it is concluded to be the highest and best use of the subject as vacant.

As Improved
The subject is improved as a cemetery, which is not consistent with the highest and best use as if vacant. However, considering the high cost of relocating the cemetery operation, and the relative
abundance of affordable light-industrial land, the highest and best use, as improved, is continued cemetery use.

**Most Probable Buyer Profile**
The most probable buyer is in our opinion, a non-profit cemetery operator. The most probable buyer as vacant is in our opinion, an industrial developer.
Addendum 2—Larger Parcel Determination

Larger parcel determination has two stages – external to the subject and internal to it – each having three tests to be considered:

- Unity of ownership or beneficial control
- Contiguity or reasonable proximity
- Integration of highest and best use

Consideration of Other Parcels

The subject is owned by City of Nampa. The current ownerships own an additional 17.16-acre site directly to the southeast of the subject, which is part of the cemetery. This, however, is not included within the larger parcel as it is divided by a railroad, not affected by the Project, and would most likely be developed with an independent use if the subject were vacant. There is also a 2.09-acre, square-shaped separate legal parcel located to the west of the subject larger parcel that is contiguous with the existing cemetery. This parcel is owned by the City of Nampa and is not included as part of the larger parcel as it would further increase the atypical shape of the larger parcel and would most likely be developed with an independent use if the subject were vacant.

We are not aware of any other parcels contiguous to or even reasonably proximate to the subject tax parcel that are under the same ownerships. Neither are we aware of any other parcels that are operated with and economically linked to the defined subject tract. As such, we are not aware of any other parcels that should be considered in the process of the larger parcel determination.

Consideration of Intra-Parcel Divisions

By definition, the first two tests of highest and best use are predetermined when considering an intra-parcel division. Thus, the only remaining question is whether there is any reasonable and logical basis for there being more than one larger parcel within the boundaries of the defined subject parcel, a consideration often dictated by market evidence for what is selling (what there is evidence of demand for), the character of neighboring parcels, physical and legal constraints on division, etc.

The defined subject parcel falls within the range of parcel sizes and overall attributes of other parcels in its immediate neighborhood, including the data set of comparables used in the following valuation. As noted, the property exists as one saleable tax lot. The subject is reasonably sized for the local market place, and due to its triangular shape, further dividing it could limits its development potential. Thus, there is no obvious rationale for consideration of more than one larger parcel for valuation purposes.
Addendum 3—Land Valuation Addendum

To develop an opinion of the subject’s land value, as if vacant and available to be developed to its highest and best use, we utilize the sales comparison approach. Our search for comparable sales focused on transactions within the following parameters:

Location: Nampa and Caldwell
Size: 9 AC to 40 AC
Use: Industrial
Transaction Date: 2014 to present

For this analysis, we use price per square foot as our unit of comparison because market participants typically compare sale prices and properties on these terms.
## Summary of Land Comparables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>3/4/19</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comparable</td>
<td>City of Nampa Koherlawn - Parcel 38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project / Name</td>
<td>Nampa, ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Number</td>
<td>2014046381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>6th St. N.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, ST</td>
<td>Nampa, ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor Parcel No.</td>
<td>R3123700000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Use</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seller</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Date</td>
<td>3/4/2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>$2,352,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Price</td>
<td>$2,352,240</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Cash to Seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Site Area (AC)</td>
<td>20.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Site Area (AC)</td>
<td>20.310</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Site (SF)</td>
<td>884,704</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Per AC</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Per SF</td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Triangular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>All Available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Unzoned</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Type</td>
<td>Confirmed-Broker</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Date</td>
<td>Feb-18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Source</td>
<td>Thornton Oliver Keller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivations / Circumstances / Conditions of Sale</td>
<td>Purchased for assemblage</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

Subject property. Property is adjacent to the east (behind) Treasure Valley Marketplace, but has no arterial visibility and is otherwise surrounded by industrial uses. Purchased by Amalgamated Sugar (an adjacent user) for water storage.
## Summary of Land Comparables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Comparable</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Land Sale 2</td>
<td>Land Sale 3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project / Name</td>
<td>414 N 21st Ave</td>
<td>525 N Broadmore Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recording Number</td>
<td>2015038903</td>
<td>2017020636</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Location</td>
<td>414 N 21st Ave.</td>
<td>525 N Broadmore Way</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, ST</td>
<td>Caldwell, ID</td>
<td>Nampa, ID</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor Parcel No.</td>
<td>R35373000000, 1100, 1200, 1300</td>
<td>R130340130</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Use</td>
<td>Mixed-Use</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seller</td>
<td>Smeed Memorial Trust Foundation</td>
<td>Lets Golf LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>21st &amp; Chicago, LLC</td>
<td>Agequity LLC</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Date</td>
<td>10/1/2015</td>
<td>5/15/2017</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Sale (years)</td>
<td>3.42</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,732,899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Price</td>
<td>$1,400,000</td>
<td>$1,732,899</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Cash to Seller</td>
<td>Cash to Seller</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Site Area (AC)</td>
<td>21.200</td>
<td>25.920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Site Area (AC)</td>
<td>21.200</td>
<td>25.920</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Site (SF)</td>
<td>923,472</td>
<td>1,129,075</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Per AC</td>
<td>$66,038</td>
<td>$66,856</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Per SF</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>All available</td>
<td>All Available</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Caldwell M-1</td>
<td>Not zoned</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Type</td>
<td>Confirmed-Seller Broker</td>
<td>Confirmed-Buyer</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Date</td>
<td>Feb-18</td>
<td>Feb-19</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Source</td>
<td>Lowell Rowley, Brandt Agency</td>
<td>Jon Brennan</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivations / Circumstances / Conditions of Sale</td>
<td>Assumed typical</td>
<td>Typical</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

- **Land Sale 2**: An industrial-zoned site on the NEC of Chicago St. & 21st Ave. Located in an industrial/service-commercial area, with good Interstate access. The central portion of the site is being developed with an assisted living facility.

- **Land Sale 3**: Undeveloped land, which was previously a golf course and subdivided into smaller parcels for commercial use. The property has good access to Interstate 84. The land was not zoned at the time of sale. The buyer plans to develop the parcel for light industrial development. The buyer indicated that the parcel is an irregular-shaped parcel, however, did not impact the purchase price.
# Summary of Land Comparables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Effective Date</th>
<th>Land Sale 4</th>
<th>Land Sale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Date</td>
<td>Madison Avenue Land</td>
<td>Karcher Industrial Land</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City, ST</td>
<td>Nampa, ID</td>
<td>Nampa, ID</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assessor Parcel No.</td>
<td>R31829011B0</td>
<td>R3102001400, R3102001300, &amp; R3102001000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intended Use</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
<td>Industrial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seller</td>
<td>I 84 Industrial Park LLC</td>
<td>Robert E &amp; Betty J Schaefer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Buyer</td>
<td>Welter Leonard M 1983 Trust</td>
<td>L and L Properties, LLC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Date</td>
<td>9/29/2017</td>
<td>11/30/2018</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age of Sale (years)</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sale Price</td>
<td>$624,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjustments</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Analysis Price</td>
<td>$624,000</td>
<td>$750,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Terms</td>
<td>Cash to seller</td>
<td>Cash to seller</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gross Site Area (AC)</td>
<td>9.550</td>
<td>10.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Site Area (AC)</td>
<td>9.550</td>
<td>10.250</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Usable Site (SF)</td>
<td>415,998</td>
<td>446,490</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Per AC</td>
<td>$65,340</td>
<td>$73,171</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Price Per SF</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shape</td>
<td>Rectangular</td>
<td>Irregular</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Topography</td>
<td>Level</td>
<td>Level</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilities</td>
<td>All available</td>
<td>All available</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Zoning</td>
<td>Nampa IL</td>
<td>Nampa IL</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Type</td>
<td>Confirmed - RB</td>
<td>Confirmed - JPN</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Date</td>
<td>Feb-19</td>
<td>Feb-19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confirmation Source</td>
<td>Brian Watt - Rocky Mtn. Property Mgmt.</td>
<td>Jason Knorpp - KW Commercial</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivations / Circumstances / Conditions of Sale</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inspection Date</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Comments**

- **Land Sale 4**: Purchased in 2017 with part of the I-84 Industrial park to the south, but this portion of the sale was specifically for the land. Brian Watt stated they paid $1.50 per square foot for the vacant site and it was bought to build an industrial spec space.

- **Land Sale 5**: Sale included a block constructed office building and a single-family residence. Buyers intent was to use the site as yard storage for their excavation company and build a shop. Agent was unsure if the buyer’s intent was to build a new shop or convert the block building into the specified use. The single-family residence had severe deferred maintenance and was basically a tear down. The agent did not know if the buyer allocated any value towards either structure but said their main purpose to purchase the site was for use of the land.
Summary of Sales
Analysis and Adjustment of Sales
The sales are compared to the subject and adjusted to account for material differences that affect value.

Price Adjustments
No adjustments are applicable.

Property Rights Conveyed
All sales were of fee simple estates and no adjustments are applicable.

Financing Adjustment
All of the sales were reported to be cash or cash equivalent and no adjustments are applicable.

Conditions of Sale
All sales were reported to be transacted with typical conditions of sale and no adjustments are applicable.

Market Conditions Adjustments
All sales are industrial properties in the Boise MSA. The comparable sales range from 2014 to 2018, a period of noticeable improvement in the local commercial real estate market. Thus, we adjust the comparables by 4.0 percent per year for market conditions.

Location

Area Growth/Demographics
The subject and sales were considered similar as they were located in Nampa and Caldwell, thus no adjustment was needed.

Neighborhood Homogeneity
Sales 1, 2, 4 and 5 are located in areas with similar industrial synergy as the subject and no adjustments were required. Sale 3 has superior retail/commercial/industrial synergy and is adjusted downward 15% for superior neighborhood homogeneity comparative to the subject.

Physical Attributes

Traffic Count/Exposure
The subject is visible from eastbound Interstate-84, which affords it superior visibility. Sales 2, 3, and 5 do not have Interstate visibility, but are located along busy thoroughfares and no adjustments are applied. Sale 1 does not have Interstate visibility, nor is it located along a busy thoroughfare. We adjust this sale up 5%. Sale 4 has interstate visibility from eastbound Interstate-84 and no adjustment is applied.
**Access/Ingress & Egress**
The subject has access along 6th St N., a major thoroughfare. Sales 1, 2, 3 and 5 have good access to major thoroughfares and no adjustments are applied. Sale 4 has circuitous access and is adjusted upward 15%.

**Parcel Shape/Configuration**
Sales 3, 4 and 5 have irregular shapes and no adjustments are applied. Sales 1 and 2 are rectangular and are not constrained by their shapes. These sales are adjusted downward 10%.

**Site Topography**
No adjustments were required.

**Rail**
The subject is adjacent to rail. Market participants interviewed for this assignment indicated that rail would not add value to the subject, as the subject’s size would attract typical industrial users that are unlikely to utilize rail. Additionally, market participants familiar with the subject indicated the triangular shape of the subject would limit rail utilization. Rail is noted to add value and is attractive to regional buyers, who prefer much larger sites with rail access. No adjustments are applied.

**Economic Attributes**
No adjustments were necessitated for this factor of comparison.

**Zoning & Entitlements**
The subject has no zoning. Sale 3 had no zoning at the time of sale and no adjustment is applied. The remaining sales were zoned at the time of sale and are adjusted downward 10%.

**Lump Sum/Other**
No adjustments were required for this category.

**Adjustment Grid**
Prior to an adjustment for size, the adjustments applied to this point are summarized as follows:
## Land Sales Adjustment Grid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Land Name</th>
<th>Land Sale 1</th>
<th>Land Sale 2</th>
<th>Land Sale 3</th>
<th>Land Sale 4</th>
<th>Land Sale 5</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ten Lane Land</td>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>414 N 21st Ave</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>525 N Broadmore Way</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison Avenue Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Karcher Industrial Land</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Adjusted Price/ SF

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### A) Property Rights Conveyed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### B) Financing Terms

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### C) Conditions of Sale

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.33</td>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
<td>$1.50</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### D) Market Conditions (Time)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age of Sale (months)</th>
<th>Total Adjustment</th>
<th>Adjusted Price/SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dec-14</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Oct-15</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td>$1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>May-17</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sep-17</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td>$1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nov-18</td>
<td>16.72%</td>
<td>$1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### E) Location

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Area Growth/Demographics</th>
<th>Neighborhood Homogeneity</th>
<th>Offsites &amp; Externalities</th>
<th>Net Adjustment</th>
<th>Adjusted Price/SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1.59</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1.70</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### F) Physical Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Major Corner / Minor / Interior Siting</th>
<th>Traffic Count / Exposure</th>
<th>Access/Ingress &amp; Egress</th>
<th>Parcel Shape/Configuration</th>
<th>Site Topography</th>
<th>Net Adjustment</th>
<th>Adjusted Price/SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>0%</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### G) Economic Attributes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted Price/SF</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### H) Zoning & Entitlements

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted Price/SF</th>
<th>$1.34</th>
<th>$1.38</th>
<th>$1.40</th>
<th>$1.66</th>
<th>$1.53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H) Subtotal Adjustments E-H</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Price/SF</td>
<td>$1.34</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$1.66</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### I) Lump Sum / Other Adj.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted Price/SF</th>
<th>$1.34</th>
<th>$1.38</th>
<th>$1.40</th>
<th>$1.66</th>
<th>$1.53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H) Subtotal Adjustments E-H</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Price/SF</td>
<td>$1.34</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$1.66</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### J) Parcel Size AC

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted Price/SF</th>
<th>$1.34</th>
<th>$1.38</th>
<th>$1.40</th>
<th>$1.66</th>
<th>$1.53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H) Subtotal Adjustments E-H</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Price/SF</td>
<td>$1.34</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$1.66</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Gross Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Adjusted Price/SF</th>
<th>$1.34</th>
<th>$1.38</th>
<th>$1.40</th>
<th>$1.66</th>
<th>$1.53</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H) Subtotal Adjustments E-H</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>-20%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adjusted Price/SF</td>
<td>$1.34</td>
<td>$1.38</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
<td>$1.66</td>
<td>$1.53</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Net Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gross Adjustments</th>
<th>Net Adjustments</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14%</td>
<td>-9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22%</td>
<td>-15%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31%</td>
<td>0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11%</td>
<td>-10%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Minimum Maximum

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.35</td>
<td>$1.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.52</td>
<td>$1.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$1.46</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### After All Adjustments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$1.34</td>
<td>$1.66</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Parcel Size

The last adjustment category in the preceding grid has not yet been analyzed – the adjustment for parcel size. Experience indicates that price per square foot tends to decrease as parcel size increases. As shown in the following graph, there is a good trend shown in parcel size relationship evident in the comparable land sales, taking into account all of the above adjustments:

Similarly, adjusted overall price tends to increase with parcel size, but at a decreasing rate:
Sale Reconciliation and Unit Value Conclusion

Overall, the adjusted indications range from $1.34 per square foot to $1.66 per square foot. Based on the parcel size trendline, a parcel of the subject’s size (20.31 acres) would be achieve a value of approximately $1.40 per square foot range. Primarily weighting the indications Sale 2 (which is most similar to the subject in parcel size), and the trendline developed from the comparable array, we conclude to a unit value of $1.40 per square foot.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Apraisal Premise</th>
<th>Interest Appraised</th>
<th>Date of Value</th>
<th>Unit Value Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Value</td>
<td>Fee Simple</td>
<td>3/4/2019</td>
<td>$1.40</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Value Conclusions

By reason of our investigations and analyses, our estimate of market value for the property rights to be acquired or disposed, based upon our independent appraisal and the exercise of our professional judgment, as of an effective date of March 4, 2019 is set forth as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appraisal Premise</th>
<th>Interest Appraised</th>
<th>Date of Value</th>
<th>Value Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Market Value As Is</td>
<td>Fee Simple</td>
<td>March 4, 2019</td>
<td>$5,204</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraordinary Assumptions and Hypothetical Conditions

The value conclusions are subject to the following extraordinary assumptions that may affect the assignment results. An extraordinary assumption is uncertain information accepted as fact. If the assumption is found to be false as of the effective date of the appraisal, we reserve the right to modify our value conclusions.

1. The right-of-way plans provided us reflect the final plans and scope of the project (that they will not materially change, in regard to the overall Project, or its impact on the subject property).

The value conclusions are based on the following hypothetical conditions that may affect the assignment results. A hypothetical condition is a condition contrary to known fact on the effective date of the appraisal but is supposed for the purpose of analysis.

1. None necessitated

Jurisdictional Exception as to Exposure and Marketing Time

It is noted that, contrary to USPAP Standards Rule 1-2(c), the definition of market value under UASFLA does not call for the estimate of value to be “linked” to a specific “exposure time” estimate, but merely that the property be exposed on the open market for a “reasonable” length of time, given the character of the property and its market. Therefore, our estimate of market value is not “linked” to a specific exposure or marketing time. Thus, the UASFLA Jurisdictional Exception is invoked for the omission of exposure time and marketing period as required under USPAP.
# Appraiser Certification

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Name</th>
<th>City of Nampa – Parcel 38</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project No./Key No.</td>
<td>A020(315) / 20315</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Number</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parcel Identification</td>
<td>50916</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Owner’s Name</td>
<td>City of Nampa</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Address of Owner</td>
<td>411 3rd Street S, Nampa, ID 83651</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

We certify that, to the best of our knowledge and belief, as of March 4, 2019:

1. The statements of fact contained in this report are true and correct.
2. The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions are limited only by the reported assumptions and limiting conditions, and are our personal, impartial, and unbiased professional analyses, opinions, and conclusions.
3. We have no present or prospective interest in the property that is the subject of this report and no personal interest with respect to the parties involved.
4. We have not performed any services, as an appraiser or in any other capacity, regarding the property that is the subject of this report within the three-year period immediately preceding acceptance of this assignment.
5. We have no bias with respect to the property that is the subject of this report or to the parties involved with this assignment.
6. Our engagement in this assignment was not contingent upon developing or reporting predetermined results.
7. Our compensation for completing this assignment is not contingent upon the development or reporting of a predetermined value or direction in value that favors the cause of the client, the amount of the value opinion, the attainment of a stipulated result, or the occurrence of a subsequent event directly related to the intended use of this appraisal.
8. Our analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, in conformity with the Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal practice as well as applicable state appraisal regulations.
9. The reported analyses, opinions, and conclusions were developed, and this report has been prepared, in conformity with the Code of Professional Ethics and Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice of the Appraisal Institute.
10. The use of this report is subject to the requirements of the Appraisal Institute relating to review by its duly authorized representatives.
11. Dustin Hough and Robin Brady, MAI, made a personal inspection of the property that is the subject of this report.
12. No one provided significant real property appraisal assistance to the person(s) signing this certification.

13. We have experience in appraising properties similar to the subject and are in compliance with the Competency Rule of USPAP.

14. As of the date of this report, Robin Brady, MAI, has completed the continuing education program for Designated Members of the Appraisal Institute.

Additional Right-of-Way/UASFLA Items

1. That Dustin Hough and Robin Brady, MAI personally inspected the subject parcel (area affected by the Project), and the Project corridor.

2. That we understand our appraisal is to be used in connection with the acquisition of right-of-way for, or disposition of surplus property resulting from, a highway project to be undertaken by the Idaho Transportation Department.

3. That we have, in making said appraisal, where appropriate, disregarded any decrease or increase in the market value of the real property prior to the date of valuation caused by the subject Project for which said property is being acquired, or by the likelihood that the property would be acquired for such Project. Additional discussion regarding the Project and property values is found under Scope of Work.

4. That such appraisal has been made in conformity with the appropriate State of Idaho laws, regulations, policies, and procedures applicable to appraisal of right-of-way for such purposes; and that to the best of our knowledge no portion of the value assigned to such property consists of items that are non-compensable under established law.

5. That we have no direct or indirect, present or contemplated future personal interest in any benefit from the acquisition or disposition of the property appraised.

6. That we have not revealed the findings and results of such appraisal to anyone other than the client, or until required to do so by due process of law, or until we are released from this obligation by having publicly testified as to such findings.

7. The appraisal was developed and the appraisal report was prepared in conformity with the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions;

8. The appraisal was developed and the appraisal report prepared in conformance with the Appraisal Standards Board’s Uniform Standards of Professional Appraisal Practice and complies with USPAP’s Jurisdictional Exception Rule when invoked by Section 1.2.7.2 of the Uniform Appraisal Standards for Federal Land Acquisitions; and

9. The appraiser has made a physical inspection of the property appraised and that the property owner, or his/her designated representative, was given the opportunity to accompany the appraiser on the property inspection.
10. That the estimate of market value of the property rights as of March 4, 2019 is set forth following, as based on our independent appraisal and the exercise of our professional judgment:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appraisal Premise</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Market Value As Is</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Extraordinary Assumptions and Hypothetical Conditions

The value conclusions are subject to the following extraordinary assumptions that may affect the assignment results. An extraordinary assumption is uncertain information accepted as fact. If the assumption is found to be false as of the effective date of the appraisal, we reserve the right to modify our value conclusions.

1. The right-of-way plans provided us reflect the final plans and scope of the project (that they will not materially change, in regard to the overall Project, or its impact on the subject property).

The value conclusions are subject to the following extraordinary assumptions that may affect the assignment results. An extraordinary assumption is a condition contrary to known fact on the effective date of the appraisal but is supposed for the purpose of analysis.

1. None necessitated
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Assumptions and Limiting Conditions

This appraisal and any other work product related to this engagement are limited by the following standard assumptions, except as otherwise noted in the report:

1. The title is marketable and free and clear of all liens, encumbrances, encroachments, easements and restrictions. The property is under responsible ownership and competent management and is available for its highest and best use.

2. There are no existing judgments or pending or threatened litigation that could affect the value of the property.

3. There are no hidden or undisclosed conditions of the land or of the improvements that would render the property more or less valuable. Furthermore, there is no asbestos in the property.

4. The revenue stamps placed on any deed referenced herein to indicate the sale price are in correct relation to the actual dollar amount of the transaction.

5. The property is in compliance with all applicable building, environmental, zoning, and other federal, state and local laws, regulations and codes.

6. The information furnished by others is believed to be reliable, but no warranty is given for its accuracy.

This appraisal and any other work product related to this engagement are subject to the following limiting conditions, except as otherwise noted in the report:

1. An appraisal is inherently subjective and represents our opinion as to the value of the property appraised.

2. The conclusions stated in our appraisal apply only as of the effective date of the appraisal, and no representation is made as to the effect of subsequent events.

3. No changes in any federal, state or local laws, regulations or codes (including, without limitation, the Internal Revenue Code) are anticipated.

4. No environmental impact studies were either requested or made in conjunction with this appraisal, and we reserve the right to revise or rescind any of the value opinions based upon any subsequent environmental impact studies. If any environmental impact statement is required by law, the appraisal assumes that such statement will be favorable and will be approved by the appropriate regulatory bodies.

5. Unless otherwise agreed to in writing, we are not required to give testimony, respond to any subpoena or attend any court, governmental or other hearing with reference to the property without compensation relative to such additional employment.

6. We have made no survey of the property and assume no responsibility in connection with such matters. Any sketch or survey of the property included in this report is for illustrative purposes only and should not be considered to be scaled accurately for size. The appraisal covers the
property as described in this report, and the areas and dimensions set forth are assumed to be correct.

7. No opinion is expressed as to the value of subsurface oil, gas or mineral rights, if any, and we have assumed that the property is not subject to surface entry for the exploration or removal of such materials, unless otherwise noted in our appraisal.

8. We accept no responsibility for considerations requiring expertise in other fields. Such considerations include, but are not limited to, legal descriptions and other legal matters such as legal title, geologic considerations such as soils and seismic stability; and civil, mechanical, electrical, structural and other engineering and environmental matters. Such considerations may also include determinations of compliance with zoning and other federal, state, and local laws, regulations and codes.

9. The distribution of the total valuation in the report between land and improvements applies only under the reported highest and best use of the property. The allocations of value for land and improvements must not be used in conjunction with any other appraisal and are invalid if so used. The appraisal report shall be considered only in its entirety. No part of the appraisal report shall be utilized separately or out of context.

10. Neither all nor any part of the contents of this report (especially any conclusions as to value, the identity of the appraisers, or any reference to the Appraisal Institute) shall be disseminated through advertising media, public relations media, news media or any other means of communication (including without limitation prospectuses, private offering memoranda and other offering material provided to prospective investors) without the prior written consent of the persons signing the report.

11. Information, estimates and opinions contained in the report and obtained from third-party sources are assumed to be reliable and have not been independently verified.

12. Any income and expense estimates contained in the appraisal report are used only for the purpose of estimating value and do not constitute predictions of future operating results.

13. If the property is subject to one or more leases, any estimate of residual value contained in the appraisal may be particularly affected by significant changes in the condition of the economy, of the real estate industry, or of the appraised property at the time these leases expire or otherwise terminate.

14. Unless otherwise stated in the report, no consideration has been given to personal property located on the premises or to the cost of moving or relocating such personal property; only the real property has been considered.

15. The current purchasing power of the dollar is the basis for the values stated in the appraisal; we have assumed that no extreme fluctuations in economic cycles will occur.

16. The values found herein are subject to these and to any other assumptions or conditions set forth in the body of this report but which may have been omitted from this list of Assumptions and Limiting Conditions.

17. The analyses contained in the report necessarily incorporate numerous estimates and assumptions regarding property performance, general and local business and economic
conditions, the absence of material changes in the competitive environment and other matters. Some estimates or assumptions, however, inevitably will not materialize, and unanticipated events and circumstances may occur; therefore, actual results achieved during the period covered by our analysis will vary from our estimates, and the variations may be material.

18. The Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA) became effective January 26, 1992. We have not made a specific survey or analysis of the property to determine whether the physical aspects of the improvements meet the ADA accessibility guidelines. We claim no expertise in ADA issues, and render no opinion regarding compliance of the subject with ADA regulations. Inasmuch as compliance matches each owner’s financial ability with the cost to cure the non-conforming physical characteristics of a property, a specific study of both the owner’s financial ability and the cost to cure any deficiencies would be needed for the Department of Justice to determine compliance.

19. The appraisal report is prepared for the exclusive benefit of the Client, its subsidiaries and/or affiliates. It may not be used or relied upon by any other party. All parties who use or rely upon any information in the report without our written consent do so at their own risk.

20. No studies have been provided to us indicating the presence or absence of hazardous materials on the subject property or in the improvements, and our valuation is predicated upon the assumption that the subject property is free and clear of any environment hazards including, without limitation, hazardous wastes, toxic substances and mold. No representations or warranties are made regarding the environmental condition of the subject property. Integra Realty Resources – Boise, Integra Realty Resources, Inc., Integra Strategic Ventures, Inc. and/or any of their respective officers, owners, managers, directors, agents, subcontractors or employees (the “Integra Parties”), shall not be responsible for any such environmental conditions that do exist or for any engineering or testing that might be required to discover whether such conditions exist. Because we are not experts in the field of environmental conditions, the appraisal report cannot be considered as an environmental assessment of the subject property.

21. The persons signing the report may have reviewed available flood maps and may have noted in the appraisal report whether the subject property is located in an identified Special Flood Hazard Area. We are not qualified to detect such areas and therefore do not guarantee such determinations. The presence of flood plain areas and/or wetlands may affect the value of the property, and the value conclusion is predicated on the assumption that wetlands are non-existent or minimal.

22. Integra Realty Resources – Boise is not a building or environmental inspector. Integra Boise does not guarantee that the subject property is free of defects or environmental problems. Mold may be present in the subject property and a professional inspection is recommended.

23. The appraisal report and value conclusions for an appraisal assume the satisfactory completion of construction, repairs or alterations in a workmanlike manner.

24. It is expressly acknowledged that in any action which may be brought against any of the Integra Parties, arising out of, relating to, or in any way pertaining to this engagement, the appraisal reports, and/or any other related work product, the Integra Parties shall not be
responsible or liable for any incidental or consequential damages or losses, unless the
appraisal was fraudulent or prepared with intentional misconduct. It is further acknowledged
that the collective liability of the Integra Parties in any such action shall not exceed the fees
paid for the preparation of the appraisal report unless the appraisal was fraudulent or
prepared with intentional misconduct. Finally, it is acknowledged that the fees charged herein
are in reliance upon the foregoing limitations of liability.

25. Integra Realty Resources – Boise, an independently owned and operated company, has
prepared the appraisal for the specific intended use stated elsewhere in the report. The use of
the appraisal report by anyone other than the Client is prohibited except as otherwise
provided. Accordingly, the appraisal report is addressed to and shall be solely for the Client’s
use and benefit unless we provide our prior written consent. We expressly reserve the
unrestricted right to withhold our consent to your disclosure of the appraisal report or any
other work product related to the engagement (or any part thereof including, without
limitation, conclusions of value and our identity), to any third parties. Stated again for
clarification, unless our prior written consent is obtained, no third party may rely on the
appraisal report (even if their reliance was foreseeable).

26. The conclusions of this report are estimates based on known current trends and reasonably
foreseeable future occurrences. These estimates are based partly on property information,
data obtained in public records, interviews, existing trends, buyer-seller decision criteria in the
current market, and research conducted by third parties, and such data are not always
completely reliable. The Integra Parties are not responsible for these and other future
occurrences that could not have reasonably been foreseen on the effective date of this
assignment. Furthermore, it is inevitable that some assumptions will not materialize and that
unanticipated events may occur that will likely affect actual performance. While we are of the
opinion that our findings are reasonable based on current market conditions, we do not
represent that these estimates will actually be achieved, as they are subject to considerable
risk and uncertainty. Moreover, we assume competent and effective management and
marketing for the duration of the projected holding period of this property.

27. All prospective value opinions presented in this report are estimates and forecasts which are
prospective in nature and are subject to considerable risk and uncertainty. In addition to the
contingencies noted in the preceding paragraph, several events may occur that could
substantially alter the outcome of our estimates such as, but not limited to changes in the
economy, interest rates, and capitalization rates, behavior of consumers, investors and
lenders, fire and other physical destruction, changes in title or conveyances of easements and
deed restrictions, etc. It is assumed that conditions reasonably foreseeable at the present
time are consistent or similar with the future.

28. The appraisal is also subject to the following:
Extraordinary Assumptions and Hypothetical Conditions

The value conclusions are subject to the following extraordinary assumptions that may affect the assignment results. An extraordinary assumption is uncertain information accepted as fact. If the assumption is found to be false as of the effective date of the appraisal, we reserve the right to modify our value conclusions.

1. The right-of-way plans provided us reflect the final plans and scope of the project (that they will not materially change, in regard to the overall Project, or its impact on the subject property).

The value conclusions are based on the following hypothetical conditions that may affect the assignment results. A hypothetical condition is a condition contrary to known fact on the effective date of the appraisal but is supposed for the purpose of analysis.

1. None necessitated
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CGA-48937
Number
04/26/2020
Expires

Integra Realty Resources
Boise

RiverWalk Center
1661 W. Shoreline Drive, Suite 200
Boise, ID 83702

T 208.342.2500
F 208.342.2220

www.irr.com

dhough@irr.com – 208.342.2500
Experience
2015 to Present: Integra Realty Resources – Boise | Director
2011 to 2015: Integra Realty Resources—Boise | Senior Analyst
2008 to 2011: Integra Realty Resources—Boise | Analyst

Actively engaged in real estate valuation, consulting, underwriting, and development since 2001. Extensive experience with all major property types, including retail, office, multifamily, industrial.
Specialties include:
- Complex Commercial Properties: examples include regional malls, high-rise office buildings, mixed-use developments, LIHTC apartments (conventional and senior), HUD multifamily appraisals.
- Special-Use Properties: including surgery centers, medical office, convenience stores, auto dealerships, carwashes, hotels, golf courses, self-storage, churches, schools, mobile home parks.
- Market Studies: for proposed projects, including LIHTC applications, HUD loans, conventional loans.

Other specialized experience includes:
- Right-of-Way: recent examples include corridor projects for a new highway bypass in Council, Idaho and a proposed 30-mile power line with dozens of access roads in Caribou County, Idaho.
- Litigation
- Tax appeals
- Appraisal Review

Prior work experience includes:
Independent Consulting; 2004-2008: services included market studies, development and marketing programs, financial analyses, economic studies for entitlements, and other advisory services. Areas of specialty included senior housing, low-income housing, resort and hospitality, urban condominiums, retail, and fiscal and economic impact studies.

DBSI; Boise, Idaho; 2004-2008: Closed over $20 million in land acquisitions; managed over $100 million in real estate development projects; underwrote over $350 million of commercial real estate acquisition and development projects. DBSI was a real estate firm with over $2 billion in assets.

Avamere Health Services; Portland, Oregon; 2003-2004: Underwrote and co-managed over $50 million in real estate developments and acquisitions; helped raise over $40 million in debt and equity capital. Avamere is a regional developer and operator of over 30 senior housing facilities.

Hobson Real Estate Advisors; Portland, Oregon; 2001-2003: Completed over two dozen real estate consulting assignments, including development market studies, highest and best use studies, feasibility studies, development master plans, demand analyses, and financial pro forma analyses. Clients included public jurisdictions, developers, investors, lenders, and property owners.

Professional Activities & Affiliations
MAI Designated Member: Appraisal Institute (AI)

Licenses
Idaho, Certified General Appraiser, CGA-3208, Expires January 2020

Education
- University of Missouri, 1999-2001; MBA, finance and real estate; 4.0 GPA.
- University of Missouri, 1994-1998; BA, economics and political science; 4.0 GPA.
- Completed over 400 hours of professional appraisal coursework through Appraisal Institute, American Society of Farm Managers & Rural Appraisers, and other providers.

Other Experience
Appraisal Institute, Southern Idaho Chapter: President (2016), Vice President (2015), Treasurer (2010-2013)

rbrady@irr.com - 208.342.2500
Robin Brady, MAI

State Licenses and Certifications

Bureau of Occupational Licenses
Department of Self Governing Agencies
The person named has met the requirements for licensure and is entitled
under the laws and rules of the State of Idaho to operate as a(n)
CERTIFIED GENERAL APPRAISER
ROBIN BRADY
1661 W SHORELINE DR STE 200
BOISE ID 83702

Kelley Packer
Chief, B.O.L.

CGA-3208
Number

01/20/2020
Expires

rbrady@irr.com - 208.342.2500
About IRR

Integra Realty Resources, Inc. (IRR) provides world-class commercial real estate valuation, counseling, and advisory services. Routinely ranked among leading property valuation and consulting firms, we are now the largest independent firm in our industry in the United States, with local offices coast to coast and in the Caribbean.

IRR offices are led by MAI-designated Senior Managing Directors, industry leaders who have over 25 years, on average, of commercial real estate experience in their local markets. This experience, coupled with our understanding of how national trends affect the local markets, empowers our clients with the unique knowledge, access, and historical perspective they need to make the most informed decisions.

Many of the nation's top financial institutions, developers, corporations, law firms, and government agencies rely on our professional real estate opinions to best understand the value, use, and feasibility of real estate in their market.

Local Expertise...Nationally!

irr.com
Property Owner Advice of Rights Form

PROPERTY OWNER
ADVICE OF RIGHTS FORM
In accordance with Idaho Code 7-711A, 7-711, and 54-4105(5)

(1) The State of Idaho, Idaho Transportation Department, by and through the
Idaho Transportation Board, (State) has the power under the constitution and the
laws of the state of Idaho and the United States to take private property for public
use. This power is generally referred to as the power of "eminent domain" or
condemnation. The power can only be exercised when:

a) The property is needed for a public use authorized by Idaho law;
b) The taking of the property is necessary to such use;
c) The taking must be located in the manner which will be most compatible
with the greatest public good and the least private injury.

(2) The State must negotiate with the property owner in good faith to purchase
the property sought to be taken and/or to settle with the owner for any other
damages which might result to the remainder of the owner's property.

(3) The owner of private property to be acquired by the State is entitled to be paid
for any diminution in the value of the owner's remaining property which is caused
by the taking and the use of the property taken proposed by the condemning
authority. This compensation, called "severance damages," is generally
measured by comparing the value of the property before the taking and the value
of the property after the taking. Damages are assessed according to Idaho
Code.

(4) The value of the property to be taken is to be determined based upon the
highest and best use of the property.

(5) If the negotiations to purchase the property and settle damages are
unsuccesful, the property owner is entitled to assessment of damages from a
court, jury or referee as provided by Idaho law.

(6) The owner has the right to consult with an appraiser of the owner's choosing
at any time during the acquisition process at the owner's cost and expense.

(7) The State shall deliver to the owner, upon request, a copy of all appraisal
reports concerning the owner's property prepared by the State. Once a complaint
for condemnation is filed, the Idaho rules of civil procedure control the disclosure
of appraisals.

(8) In some cases authorized by Idaho Code a value estimate can be substituted
for an appraisal. A value estimate is an accepted and legally approved method
to value property when the compensation for the requirement is $10,000 or less.
All value estimates are reviewed and approved by an Idaho certified general real
estate appraiser. A value estimate must be provided to an owner. If an owner
does not accept a value estimate, he is entitled to an appraisal by an agent of the
Idaho Transportation Department. Requests for an appraisal in lieu of a value
estimate should be submitted to the Idaho Transportation Department within 35
days of receipt of this notice and sent to: Idaho Transportation Department,
Right-of-way Section, Attn: Appraisal Coordinator, P.O. Box 7129, Boise, Idaho
83707.
(9) The owner has the right to consult with an attorney at any time during the acquisition process. In cases in which the State condemns property and the owner is able to establish that just compensation exceeds the last amount timely offered by the State by ten percent (10%) or more, the condemning authority may be required to pay the owner’s reasonable costs and attorney’s fees. The court will make the determination whether costs and fees will be awarded.

(10) The form contemplated by this section shall be deemed delivered by United States certified mail, postage prepaid, addressed to the person or persons shown in the official records of the county assessor as the owner of the property. A second copy will be attached to the appraisal at the time it is delivered to the owner.

(11) If the State desires to acquire property pursuant to this chapter, the State or any of its agents or employees shall not give the owner any timing deadline as to when the owner must respond to the initial offer which is less than thirty (30) days. A violation of the provisions of this subsection shall render any action pursuant to this chapter null and void.

(12) Nothing in this section changes the assessment of damages set forth in section 7-711, Idaho Code.

(13) If a business has been in existence for five years or more and is owned by a party whose lands are being condemned and the business is located on those lands or upon adjoining lands owned or held by the same party, then the owner of the business may be entitled to damages to the business. (A tenant, business owner does not qualify.) A business owner has the right to consult with an attorney.

The business owner has the burden of making a claim by sending it certified mail return receipt requested to the Idaho Transportation Department, Legal Section, P.O. Box 7129, Boise, Idaho 83703 no later than 90 days after service of the summons and complaint for condemnation on the property owner. The business damages claim must be clearly segregated from a claim for property damages and cannot duplicate damages paid for land or for severance damages. The business owner, a CPA, or a business damage expert, must prepare the claim. The claim must include an explanation of the nature, extent and monetary amount of damages and be supported by copies of federal and state income tax returns, state sales tax returns, balance sheets, profit and loss statements and any other records relied upon for five preceding years.

No business damages will be awarded if the loss can reasonably be prevented by a relocation of the business or by taking steps that a reasonably prudent person would take. No business damages will be paid for temporary business interruption due to construction.
Title Report

Transaction identification data for reference only:
Issuing Agent: Alliance Title & Escrow Corp
Issuing Office: 945 W. Emerald Street, Suite 120, Boise, ID 83704
Loan ID Number: Customer Reference Number: 20315-1-84 / Proj. 180122 / Parcel # 38
Issuing Office File Number: 420997
Property Address: 0 8th Street, Nampa, ID 83686
Revision Number: ______

SCHEDULE A

1. Commitment date: December 27, 2018 at 7:30 AM

2. Policy or Policies to be issued:
   (a) 2006 ALTA® Owner’s Policy [X] Standard [ ] Extended
       Amount: Premium: $0.00

   Proposed insured: Idaho Transportation Department

   (b) 2006 ALTA® Loan Policy [ ] Standard [ ] Extended
       Amount: Premium: $0.00

   Endorsements:
   Proposed insured:

3. The estate or interest in the Land described or referred to in this Commitment is FEE SIMPLE

4. Title to the FEE SIMPLE estate or interest in the Land is at the Commitment Date vested in:
   The Board of Trustees of the Village of Nampa and their successor’s in trust, Parcel 1 and 2 and The Village of Nampa (municipal corporation), Parcel 3 and The City of Nampa, a municipal corporation, Parcel 4 and The Village of Nampa, Parcel 5 and The City of Nampa, Parcel 6

5. The Land is described as follows:
   See Attached Exhibit ‘A’

Old Republic National Title Insurance Company

[Signature]

Authorized Signatory
Exhibit ‘A’

Parcel 1:

Part of the Southeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, of the Boise Meridian, Canyon County, State of Idaho, more particularly described as follows:
Commencing at a point 500 feet North of the Southeast corner of the Southwest Quarter of Section 15, running thence
West 185 feet; thence
North 467 feet; thence
East 185 feet; thence
South 467 feet to the Place of Beginning.

Parcel 2:

Part of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, of the Boise Meridian, Canyon County, State of Idaho, more particularly described as follows:
Commencing at a point 600 feet North of the Southwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, running thence
East 233 feet; thence
North 467 feet; thence
West 233 feet; thence
South 467 feet to the Place of Beginning.

Parcel 3:

Part of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, of the Boise Meridian, Canyon County, State of Idaho, more particularly described as follows:
Commencing at a point 341 feet North of the Southwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, thence running
North 259 feet; thence
East 233 feet; thence
North 467 feet; thence
West 233 feet; thence
North 248 feet to the Northwest corner of the Southwest Quarter of the Southeast Quarter of said Section 15; thence
East to the right of way of the Idaho Central Railroad;
Thence in a Southwesterly direction along said right of way to a point at the intersection of said right of way with the line of the extension of the Southwest side of Sixth Street North, thence
Northwesterly along the said line of said Street to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel 4:

A strip of piece of land lying and being in the Southwest Quarter of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West of the Boise Meridian, Canyon County, State of Idaho, more particularly described as follows:
Beginning at the Northeast corner of said Southwest Quarter of Section 15; thence running
West on the center of half section line through said Section 15, 440 and 98/100 feet to the right of way of the Idaho Northern Railroad;
thence
Southeasterly along the East side of the right of way of the Idaho Northern Railway to the Southwest corner of the City of Nampa Cemetery; thence
East to the East line of the said Southwest Quarter of Section 15; thence
South along said line 702 and 73/100 feet; thence
Northwesterly direct to the Southwest corner of said cemetery; thence
North to the Northwest corner of said cemetery; thence
East to the East line of said Southwest Quarter of Section 15; thence
North along said line to the Place of Beginning.
Addenda

Parcel 5:

All that piece or parcel of land situate within the Village of Nampa Cemetery fence particularly described as follows:
Commencing at a point 1067 feet North of the Southwest corner of the Southeast Quarter of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West, Boise Meridian, Canyon County, State of Idaho; thence North 109 feet; thence West 230 feet; thence South 576 feet; thence East 45 feet; thence North 467 feet; thence East 185 feet to the Place of Beginning.

Parcel 6:

Beginning at a point 191 feet North of the Southwest corner of the Northeast Quarter of the Southwest Quarter of Section 15, Township 3 North, Range 2 West of the Boise Meridian, Canyon County, Idaho; running thence North to a point where the Idaho Northern Railroad right of way intersects the West line of the Southeast Quarter of the Northwest Quarter of said Section 15; thence in a Southeasterly direction along said right of way to a point where the said right of way intersects the East line of 6th Street North in the City of Nampa extended; thence in a Northwesterly direction along the said east line of said 6th Street North to the Place of Beginning.
SCHEDULE B - SECTION I
REQUIREMENTS

The following requirements must be met:

1. The Proposed Insured must notify the Company in writing of the name of any party not referred to in this Commitment who will obtain an interest in the Land or who will make a loan on the Land. The Company may then make additional Requirements or Exceptions.
2. Pay the agreed amount for the estate or interest to be insured.
3. Pay the premiums, fees, and charges for the Policy to the Company.
4. Documents satisfactory to the Company that convey the Title or create the Mortgage to be insured, or both, must be properly authorized, executed, delivered, and recorded in the Public Records.
5. The Proposed Policy Amount(s) must be increased to the full value of the estate or interest being insured, and any additional premium must be paid. An Owner’s policy shall be issued for not less than (1) the amount of the current sales price of the land and any existing improvements appurtenant thereto, or (2) if no sale is to be made, the amount equal to the value of the land and any existing improvements at the time of issuance of the policy. A Loan policy shall be for not less than (a) the full principal amount of the indebtedness secured by the insured mortgage and may include up to 20% in excess thereof to cover foreclosure costs, etc., or (b) if the indebtedness is secured by other collateral, then for not less than the unencumbered value of the land or the amount of the loan, whichever is the lesser. Proposed Policy Amount(s) will be revised and premiums charged consistent therewith when the final amounts are approved.

Note No. 1: We find no activity in the past 24 months regarding transfer of title to subject property. We note the following transfer of title to subject property:
Warranty Deed
Grantor: Frederick B Kohler, a single man
Grantee: The Board of Trustees of the Village of Nampa, and their successors in trust
Recorded: January 20, 1894
Book 15 Pages 167
Affects: Parcel 1

Note No. 2: We find no activity in the past 24 months regarding transfer of title to subject property. We note the following transfer of title to subject property:
Warranty Deed
Grantor: Martha J Manner
Grantee: The Board of Trustees of the Village of Nampa, and their successors in trust
Recorded: January 20, 1894
Book 15 Pages 168
Affects: Parcel 2
Note No. 3: We find no activity in the past 24 months regarding transfer of title to subject property. We note the following transfer of title to subject property:
Warranty Deed
Grantor: Mary E McGee and James A. McGee
Grantee: The Village of Nampa (municipal corporation)
Recorded: May 25, 1899
Book 20 Page 190
Affects: Parcel 3

Note No. 4: We find no activity in the past 24 months regarding transfer of title to subject property. We note the following transfer of title to subject property:
Warranty Deed
Grantor: Washington L. Draper, by F.S. Kohier, his attorney in fact
Grantee: The City of Nampa, a municipal corporation
Recorded: October 16, 1907
Instrument No.: 17838, Book 44 Page 360
Affects: Parcel 4

Note No. 5: We find no activity in the past 24 months regarding transfer of title to subject property. We note the following transfer of title to subject property:
Warranty Deed
Grantor: Washington L. Draper
Grantee: The Village of Nampa
Recorded: October 16, 1907
Instrument No.: 17839, Book 44 Page 361
Affects: Parcel 5

Note No. 6: We find no activity in the past 24 months regarding transfer of title to subject property. We note the following transfer of title to subject property:
Warranty Deed
Grantor: George H. Moore and Harriet M. Moore, his wife
Grantee: The City of Nampa
Recorded: August 10, 1927
Instrument No.: 157798, Book 110 Page 357
Affects: Parcel 6

Note No. 7: Taxes, including any assessments collected therewith, for the year shown below are paid:
Amount: $0.00
Year: 2018
Parcel No.: R31237000 0

Note No. 8: This Company reserves the right to add additional requirements upon receipt of the details of this transaction.

Note No. 9: In the event this transaction fails to close and this commitment is cancelled a fee will be charged complying with the state insurance code.

Note No. 10: According to the available County Assessor’s Office records, the purported address of said land is:
0 6th Street, Nampa, ID 83686

A copy of our Privacy Policy is available on our website at www.alliancetitle.com/About/Privacy-Policy or via email, or paper format upon request. Please contact your Title Officer if you would like to request a copy of our Privacy Policy.
SCHEDULE B - SECTION II

EXCEPTIONS

This commitment does not republish any covenant, condition, restriction, or limitation contained in any document referred to in this commitment to the extent that the specific covenant, condition, restriction, or limitation violates state or federal law based on race, color, religion, sex, sexual orientation, gender identity, handicap, familial status, or national origin.

The Policy will not insure against loss or damage resulting from the terms and provisions of any lease or easement identified in Schedule A, and will include the following Exceptions unless cleared to the satisfaction of the Company:

1. Any defect, lien, encumbrance, adverse claim, or other matter that appears for the first time in the Public Records or is created, attaches, or is disclosed between the Commitment Date and the date on which all of the Schedule B, Part I—Requirements are met.
2. Rights or claims of parties in possession not shown by the public records.
3. Any encroachment, encumbrance, violation, variation, or adverse circumstance affecting the Title that would be disclosed by an accurate and complete land survey of the Land.
4. Easements, or claims of easements, not shown by the public records.
5. Any lien, or right to a lien, for services, labor, or material heretofore or hereafter furnished, imposed by law and not shown by the public records.
6. (a) Unpatented mining claims; (b) reservations or exceptions in patents or in Acts authorizing the issuance thereof; (c) water rights or easements appurtenant to water rights, claims or title to water, whether or not the matters excepted under (a), (b), or (c) are shown by the public records.
7. Taxes or special assessments which are not shown as existing liens by the public records of any taxing authority that levies taxes or assessments on real property or by the public records. Proceedings by a public agency which may result in taxes or assessments, or notices of such proceedings, whether or not shown by the records of such agency or by the public records.
8. Taxes, including any assessments collected therewith, for the year 2019 which are a lien not yet due and payable.
9. Special assessments, if any, for the City of Nampa.
10. Levies and assessments of the Nampa Meridian irrigation District, and the rights, powers and easements of said district as by law provided.
11. Ditch, road and public utility easements as the same may exist over said premises.
12. Rights of the public in and to that portion of the premises lying within 6th Street North.
13. Right-of-way for Phyllis Canal East Lateral and the rights of access thereto for maintenance of said canal.
14. Easements, reservations, notes and/or dedications as shown on the official plat of Kohler Lawn Cemetery.
15. Easements, reservations, notes and/or dedications as shown on the official plat of Kohler Lawn Cemetery Annex.
16. Easements, reservations, notes and/or dedications as shown on the official plat of a replat of a portion of Kohler Lawn Cemetery Section ‘T’.
17. Easements, reservations, notes and/or dedications as shown on the official plat of niche Columbarium: No. 1.

18. Easements, reservations, notes and/or dedications as shown on the official plat of niche Columbarium: No. 2.

19. Easements, reservations, notes and/or dedications as shown on the official plat of niche Columbarium: No. 3.

   Book: 1 of Patents at Page: 219
   Official Records: Canyon County.
   Affects: Parcels 2 and 3

   Book: 3 of Patents at Page: 435
   Official Records: Canyon County.
   Affects: Parcels 1, 4, 5 and a portion of 6.

   Book: 3 of Patents at Page: 590
   Official Records: Canyon County.
   Affects: A portion of Parcel 6

23. The provisions contained in Deed, Recorded: January 20, 1894,
   Book 15 of Deeds Page 167
   As follows: Said premises to be used as a city cemetery and when they shall cease to be so used they shall revert back to the grantor.
   Affects: Parcel 1

24. The provisions contained in Deed, Recorded: January 20, 1894,
   Book 15 Page 168
   As follows: Said premises to be used as a city cemetery and when they shall cease to be so used they shall revert back to the grantor.
   Affects: Parcel 2

25. The provisions contained in Deed, Recorded: October 16, 1907,
   Instrument No.: 17839 Book 44 of Deeds Page 361
   As follows: One cemetery lot shall be reserved for F.S. Kohler.
   Affects: Parcel 5

26. Terms, provisions, covenants, conditions, definitions, options, obligations and restrictions, contained in a document
   Purpose: Right of way deed to Idaho Northern Railway Company
   Recorded: February 19, 1900
   Book 21 Page 292

27. Terms, provisions, covenants, conditions, definitions, options, obligations and restrictions, contained in a document
   Purpose: Right of way deed to Idaho Northern Railway Company
   Recorded: December 30, 1901
   Book 21 Page 636
28. Negative easements, conditions, restrictions, and access rights contained in the deed to the State of Idaho.
   Recorded: May 20, 1964
   Instrument No.: 550598
   Affects: Part of Parcel 6

29. Agreement and the terms and conditions contained therein
   Between: Pioneer Irrigation District
   And: City of Nampa
   Purpose: Utility License Agreement
   Recorded: January 16, 2018
   Instrument No.: 2018-001882

30. Conditions, limitations, obligations and rights arising or existing by reason of dedication of said premises
    as a cemetery.

31. Rights of sepulcher in burial lots in said cemetery by reason of sale, conveyance or designation or
    appropriation to any person or family.

32. Restrictions imposed by law regarding the sale and disposition of said land.

33. Easements over any of the named or unnamed streets, roads, alleys, walks, paths, parks or parkways
    shown on the plat of said cemetery.

END OF SCHEDULE B

This page is only a part of a 2015 ALTA® Commitment for Title Insurance. This Commitment is not valid without the Notice; the Commitment to Issue Policy; the Commitment Conditions; Schedule A, Schedule B, Part I—Requirements; and Schedule B, Part II—Exceptions.
# Assessment Data

## City of Nampa Koherlawn - Parcel 38

### Parcel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel Number</th>
<th>Site Address</th>
<th>Current Total Assessed Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31237000 0</td>
<td>3 E TM 5 N IA ID, NA</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Owner Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner Name</th>
<th>Mailing Address</th>
<th>Transfer Date</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>NAMPA CITY OF KOHERLAWN</td>
<td>411 S RD ST S NAMPA ID 03651</td>
<td>08/04/2010</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Deed Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Deed Book/Page</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>31237000 0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Location / Description

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tax District</th>
<th>Section &amp; Plat</th>
<th>Legal Desc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>002-00</td>
<td></td>
<td>1534 NW 253' SE TX 738', SE 85' N OF 6TH ST &amp; E OF R R, S 85' E OF 6TH ST &amp; W OF RR LESS HWY</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Parcel Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Class Code</th>
<th>Neighborhood Code</th>
<th>Neighborhood Factor</th>
<th>Street / Road Code</th>
<th>Topography</th>
<th>Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EB1 Exempt property</td>
<td>10E</td>
<td>00</td>
<td>A</td>
<td>Level Ground</td>
<td>Water</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Sewer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Natural Gas</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Rolling</td>
<td>Electricity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Swampy</td>
<td>Sidewalk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Alley</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Assessment Information

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Current Land Value</th>
<th>Current Imp. Value</th>
<th>Current Total Assessed Value</th>
<th>Commercial Land</th>
<th>Commercial Imp.</th>
<th>Commercial Total</th>
<th>Dwelling Value</th>
<th>Farmland Value</th>
<th>Adjustment Factor</th>
<th>Average Value / Acree</th>
<th>Appraised Date</th>
<th>Reason For Change</th>
<th>Prior Land Value</th>
<th>Prior Imp. Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>2013/01/01</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

City of Nampa Koherlawn - Parcel 38
Contractor Bid

Commercial Residential Investments Corp.
RCE-14452
P.O. BOX 6024
Boise, ID. 83707
208.602.6213
www.crichtoncontractor.com

Contractor #

Date: February 27, 2019

Project: ITD - Nampa

Client: Integra Realty Resources – Boise - Robin Brady
1661 W. Shoreline Dr. Ste. 200
Boise, ID. 83702
208.342.2500 ext. 203
rbrady@irr.com

Parking Lot
- Asphalt Paving $2. psf
- Concrete Paving & Prep $15. psf
- Parking stripes $20. each & bumpers $225. each
- Concrete Curb $30 psf
- Gravel Paving $9 psf

Fencing
- Chain Link $32. Pfl
- Wire $20. Pfl
- Barbed Wire $10. Pfl
- Razor Wire $10 Pfl

Landscaping
- Grass $4. Psf
- Landscape Rock $3. Psf

All material is guaranteed to be as specified and the work to be performed in accordance with the drawings and specifications submitted for the said work and completed in a workmanlike manner. This Proposal covers only the work noted on the previous pages. It does not include any unforeseen issues or extra work.

Any alteration or deviation from the said specifications involving extra costs will be due and payable and will become an extra charge over and above the proposal. All agreements contingent upon accidents or delays beyond our control. This Proposal may be cancelled anytime by said client. If Proposal is cancelled there will be a 10% charge of the original amount due immediately upon such action.

Proposal is valid for 15 days

City of Nampa Koherlawn - Parcel 38
CLAIM FOR PAYMENT
REAL ESTATE TRANSACTIONS

Project No. A020(315)  Key No. 20315  Program No. E183440
Parcel No. 38  Parcel Identification No. 50916

The undersigned have an interest in the agreed settlement amount as specified in that certain Right of Way Contract dated _____________________________, by and between the State of Idaho, Idaho Transportation Board, by and through the Idaho Transportation Department and the undersigned. PAYMENTS MADE ON BEHALF OF TRANSFEROR WILL BE REPORTED UNDER TRANSFEROR’S TAX IDENTIFICATION NUMBER WHICH SHALL BE COLLECTED BY THE TITLE COMPANY LISTED.

That agreed settlement amount specified in the Right of Way Contract shall be paid as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name/Address</th>
<th>TIN</th>
<th>Payment Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Title &amp; Escrow Corp.</td>
<td>820481163</td>
<td>$5,204.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>380 East Parkcenter Blvd. Suite 105</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Boise, ID 83706</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

On behalf of:
THE CITY OF NAMPA
411 3rd Street S
Nampa, ID 83651

TRANSFEROR(S) SIGNATURE(S)
We hereby certify that the foregoing claim is just and correct, that the amount claimed is legally due after allowing all just credits, and that no part of same has been previously paid.

THE CITY OF NAMPA

By: ____________________________________  By: ____________________________________
Title: ____________________________________  Title: ____________________________________
Printed Name: ____________________________  Printed Name: ____________________________

ATTEST:

By: ____________________________________  By: ____________________________________
Title: ____________________________________  Title: ____________________________________
Printed Name: ____________________________  Printed Name: ____________________________

DEPARTMENT USE ONLY
I hereby certify that the above Transferor(s) are entitled to the amount claimed above by virtue of transferring ownership or interest in real property to the State of Idaho and have examined the supporting data and recommend payment of the amount claimed.

Recommended: ____________________________  Approved: ____________________________
Right of Way Agent  Authorized Supervisor
MEMORANDUM OF CONTRACT OF SALE

This MEMORANDUM OF CONTRACT OF SALE is made and entered into as of the ___ day of __________________, 2019, by and between THE CITY OF NAMPA ("Grantor"), and the STATE OF IDAHO, IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD, by and through the IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT ("Grantee"), whose address is 3311 West State Street, Boise, Idaho 83703.

Grantor owns that certain real property located in the County of CANYON, State of Idaho, which is more particularly described as follows ("Property"):

SEE EXHIBIT A ATTACHED HERETO
AND BY THIS REFERENCE MADE A PART HEREOF.
Together with all appurtenances.

Fee Acquisition containing approximately 0.076 acres.

NOW, THEREFORE, Grantor declares as follows:

Grantor agrees to sell the Property to Grantee and Grantee agrees to purchase the same from Grantor upon all the terms and conditions set forth in that certain Right of Way Contract by and between Grantor and Grantee dated as of the ___ day of __________________, 2019.
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Grantor has hereunto set its hand and seal the day and year first above written.

GRANTOR:
THE CITY OF NAMPA

By:______________________________________
Title:_____________________________________
Printed Name:_____________________________

By:______________________________________
Title:_____________________________________
Printed Name:_____________________________

By:______________________________________
Title:_____________________________________
Printed Name:_____________________________

ATTEST:

By:______________________________________
Title:_____________________________________
Printed Name:_____________________________

STATE OF IDAHO )
) ss.
County of CANYON )

On this _____ day of ___________, 2019, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared ____________________, ____________________, and ____________________, known or identified to me to be the ____________________, ____________________, and ____________________, respectively, of THE CITY OF NAMPA, who executed the instrument on behalf of THE CITY OF NAMPA and acknowledged to me that such municipality executed the same.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year in this certificate first above written.

___________________________________
Notary Public for IDAHO
Residing at __________________________
(SEAL)

My commission expires ________________
IN WITNESS WHEREOF, Grantee has hereunto set its hand and seal the day and year first above written.

GRANTEE:

STATE OF IDAHO, IDAHO TRANSPORTATION BOARD,
by and through the IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT

By: ________________________________

JUSTIN POND
Right of Way Program Manager

State of IDAHO )
) ss.
County of ADA )

On this _____ day of ______________, 2019, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared JUSTIN POND, known or identified to me to be Right of Way Program Manager for the State of Idaho, Idaho Transportation Board, the person whose name is subscribed to the foregoing instrument, and acknowledged to me that he executed the same on behalf of the STATE OF IDAHO, IDAHO TRANSPORTATION DEPARTMENT.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed my official seal the day and year in this certificate first above written.

___________________________________
Notary Public for IDAHO.
Residing at __________________________
(SEAL)
My commission expires ________________
Authorize Addition of AECOM to 2018-2019 First Choice Hiring Roster and Implementation of Professional Services Term Agreement and Task Order for Benefit/Cost Ratio Determination for SH-45 Realignment (As Approved in Fiscal Year 2019 Budget)

- Beginning in 2007, the Public Works Department looked at many options for how to improve traffic flow and business accessibility, especially in the Nampa downtown area. Nampa’s Urban Renewal Development Agency (NDA) funded these efforts during a time when location of the Nampa Public Library and its footprint were being determined.

- The Downtown Nampa Traffic Alternatives Analysis, completed by URS Engineering, (adopted by NDA in 2011) explored 26 alternative ways to direct traffic effectively throughout downtown. Its number one conclusion was that SH-45 needed to be removed from downtown. The preferred realignment utilized 7th Street South, Yale Avenue and Northside Boulevard to connect northbound traffic to I-84 (see Exhibit A).

- SH-45 (12th Avenue South) is under the jurisdiction of the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD).

- Subsequently, Council authorized URS to complete a 2012 concept plan (approved in 2014) for the preferred realignment (known as Alternative 1A). This plan resulted in, (1) assumptions regarding how the improved roadway on 7th Street South and Yale Avenue would be developed, (2) a cost estimate for the realignment under those assumptions, and (3) the number of additional lane miles that Nampa would control if the realignment were completed.

- ITD has expressed interest multiple times in this alternative since 2012, including a formal presentation to the ITD Board. However, with the passage of time, ITD would like to have an updated cost estimate using current information for the same set of assumptions that were in the 2014 concept plan.

- Nampa’s Public Works Director has been asked by ITD to prepare a benefit/cost analysis for Alternative 1A. ITD uses benefit/cost ratios as one very important prioritizing criteria as they prepare their five-year construction programs. To calculate this ratio requires an assessment of travel time savings as major components of benefit. Updated costs would provide the cost component.
• URS (now AECOM) prepared all above-referenced prior studies. The attached Scope of Work and budget (see Exhibit B), in the amount of $53,890.00 time and material not to exceed (T&M NTE), provide for updating costs and determining benefit for Alternative 1A. Funding will be provided by Street Division’s fiscal year 2019 budget

• AECOM did not submit a Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) to be considered for the 2018-2019 City hiring roster. As the selection process has passed, additional consultants can be considered for addition to the City’s first choice consultant hiring roster. AECOM has submitted its SOQ (see Exhibit C) for consideration. Public Works recommends adding AECOM to the first-choice roster

REQUESTS:

(1) Authorize addition of AECOM to 2018-2019 Request for Qualifications First Choice Hiring Roster, and
(2) Authorize Mayor and Public Works Director to sign Miscellaneous Professional Services Term Agreement, and
(3) Authorize Mayor and Public Works Director to sign Task Order for Scope of Work with AECOM for Benefit/Cost Ratio Determination for SH-45 Realignment in the amount of $53,890.00 time and material not to exceed (T&M NTE) for Street Division.
The Downtown Nampa Traffic Alternatives Analysis (adopted by NDA in 2011) explored 26 alternative ways to direct traffic effectively throughout downtown Nampa. Its number one conclusion was that SH-45 needed to be removed from downtown. One of realignment options utilized 7th Street South, Yale Avenue and Northside Boulevard to connect northbound traffic to I-84 (Alternative 1A Option).
Jeff Barnes, P.E.
Deputy Director of Public Works
City of Nampa – Engineering Division
411 3rd St. South
Nampa, ID 83651

Scope of Work for SH-45 Re-alignment Benefit/Cost Evaluation

Dear Jeff:

Enclosed is a scope of work for the SH-45 Re-alignment Benefit/Cost Evaluation formatted per the City of Nampa’s scope of work template. AECOM will be the Prime Consultant Firm for the project and Water, Civil,and Environmental Inc. (WCE Inc.) will be a subconsultant to AECOM, tasked with developing the benefit estimate. I will be AECOM’s project manager and your primary point of contact. My contact information is:
Address: 3320 E. Goldstone Way, Meridian, Idaho 83642
Office: 208-386-5183
Cell: 208-867-4040
Email: dave.butzier@aecom.com

Likewise, Jay Witt will be WCE Inc.’s contact for the project. His contact information is:
Address: 2119 North 9th Street, Boise, Idaho 83702
Office: 208-319-9744
Email: jwitt@wce-inc.com

If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 208-867-4040

Yours sincerely,

David R. Butzier, P.E.
Program Manager
AECOM
T: 208-386-5000
M: 208-867-4040
E: dave.butzier@aecom.com
Scope of Work

Date: May 21, 2019
Task Order Number: TBD
Project Number: TBD
Project Name: SH-45 Re-alignment Benefit/Cost Evaluation
Prime Consultant Company: AECOM
Sub-Consultant Companies (if any): Water, Civil, and Environmental Inc.
Prime Consultant Company Address: 3320 E. Goldstone Way, Meridian, Idaho 83642
Prime Consultant Project Manager/Contact Information: David R. Butzier, P.E., 208-386-5183, dave.butzier@aecom.com
Contract Amount: $53,890 (T/M NTE)
Duration: 4.5 Months

Project Description:

This scope of services provides a benefit/cost (B/C) evaluation of a proposed realignment of SH-45 for the City of Nampa. A realignment of SH-45 was first explored as part of the Downtown Traffic Alternatives Analysis (November 2010) and later refined in the SH-45 Realignment Concept Study (June 2014). Materials developed for both previous projects will be updated to estimate both the costs and “benefit” of the realignment based on travel time estimates and average wage rate ($/hr.) for the City of Nampa.

Key Assumptions

1. The evaluation will be based on previously completed work.
2. There will be no significant deviations from the realignment concept identified in the SH-45 Realignment Concept Study (June 2014).
3. COMPASS will provide the travel demand model runs needed to develop travel time estimates.
4. An existing Synchro network will be updated and revised to estimate intersection delay for estimating travel time.
5. The City of Nampa will provide traffic counts and AM/PM Peak hour intersection turning movement counts needed to develop the Synchro model networks.
6. Only roadway intersections will be included in the evaluation. Driveways will not be modeled.
7. The City of Nampa will provide the “build year” and “design year” for the analysis. Benefits will be assumed to occur for a specific period of time between when the realignment is constructed (build year) and the year for which it was designed (design year).
8. The benefits evaluation will be delay-based only. Fuel saving will not be included in the evaluation because of the many variables associated with future fleet fuel economy and fuel prices.
1. Project Management

1.1. Contract Management, Invoicing and Progress Reports – This task will include project contract and administrative set-up, budget and schedule management and coordination. Monthly invoices specific to this project will be developed for its duration. Progress reports will describe work completed during the previous month and issues requiring attention by City of Nampa staff.

Assumptions:
1. A task-based progress report will be submitted with each monthly invoice.
2. Invoices will be submitted electronically (PDF) to the City of Nampa.
3. The study will require just over four (4) months to complete and up to five (5) invoices will be prepared.

Deliverables:
1. Monthly invoice packet, including progress report and back up information, submitted electronically via email (PDF).

1.2. Project Meetings – A maximum of two (2) 1-hour coordination meetings will be held with the City of Nampa staff throughout the study.

Assumptions:
1. Meeting times and locations will be determined based on Task 2 and 3 Milestones.

Deliverables:
1. Meeting appointments and materials via email (PDF).

2. Update Cost Estimates

The team will update and/or verify the project cost estimates developed by the SH-45 Realignment Concept Study. A list of the assumptions used to develop the original cost estimate for the SH-45 Realignment Concept Study are attached. Specifically, this task will update:

- Material and construction unit cost assumptions.
- Demolition costs assumptions. $30,000 per residential site was used previously.
- The cost per sq. ft. of right-of-way (ROW) assumptions. The previous estimate used $4.25/sq. ft.
- Acquisition of access rights cost assumptions. $50,000 per site was used previously.
- Reconstruction of property access and driveways cost assumptions. $10,000/per access was used previously.
- Personal property damage cost assumptions. $26,000 per site was used previously.
- Residential relocation cost assumptions. $100,000 per residence was used previously.

Two “bookend” estimates were originally developed, based on a “High” and “Low” number of relocation costs. These bookends will be retained during the update. It is anticipated, based on the previous cost estimate, that the range between the two will be close to 6.1% difference.
The ITD-2839 and ITD-1150 forms developed for the *SH-45 Realignment Concept Study* will be revised given the updated cost assumptions and estimates.

**Assumptions:**
1. The estimates of the number of potential property relocations (high/low) will not be re-evaluated.
2. Excavation, cut-fill, and material quantities estimates will not be reevaluated. These quantities were developed for the *SH-45 Realignment Concept Study* using the conceptual cross section for the preferred alternative.
3. No survey or preliminary design will be conducted to develop the cost estimates.

**Deliverables:**
1. Updated project cost estimates based on the two scenarios for relocations (high/low).
2. Revised ITD forms (ITD-2839 and ITD-1150) based on updated assumptions.
3. Benefit Analysis

Travel time saving will define the benefits associated with the realignment of SH-45 and will be estimated by comparing a “build” condition to a “no-build” condition given when the realignment is completed (build year) and the year it is designed for (design year). Daily weekday and weekend day travel times will be estimated and used for the analysis. Estimates of weekday travel time savings will be developed by estimating and aggregating weekday PM peak, AM peak, and off-peak travel times for two (2) northbound and two (2) southbound routes between the intersections of 2nd St. South/Northside Blvd. and 12th Ave./7th St. South. Weekend day travel times will be estimated using readily available traffic counts and estimates of off-peak weekday travel times. Travel time for each route will be aggregated to an annual travel time using forecasted daily travel volumes and the days per year for both the build year and design year given build and no build conditions. An average annual travel time savings in hours per year will be calculated for the build and no-build conditions, multiplied by the evaluation time period and applied to the current average wage rate for the City of Nampa.

Weekday travel times will be developed using forecasted travel volumes, intersection delay, and route distances. Forecasted daily, PM peak, and AM peak travel volumes will be requested from COMPASS for four (4) conditions:

- Build condition, build year (2025)
- No build condition, build year (2025)
- Build condition, design year (2045)
- No build condition, design year (2045)

AM and PM peak hour model volume forecasts for existing conditions will be compared to AM and PM peak hour intersection counts collected by the City of Nampa and model volume adjustment factors developed if needed. Peak-hour volumes will then be used along with current AM and PM peak period turning volume counts to develop turning forecasts for each of the arterial intersections along the routes given each of the conditions above. Intersection delay and congested speeds will then be
estimated for PM peak and AM peak hours given each condition by updating and modifying the SYNCHRO model network developed for the Downtown Traffic Alternatives Analysis (November 2010). This network includes the arterials and arterial intersections in an area south of I-84, north of Amity Road/Lake Lowell Avenue, east of Canyon Street, and west of Chicago Street.

Aggregate travel time estimates for weekdays and weekend days will be developed for each of the four routes; northbound from 12th Ave. South at 7th St. South to Northside Blvd. and southbound from 2nd St. South and Northside Blvd. to 7th St. South at 12th Ave. South. The aggregate travel times will add up the delay each vehicle experiences driving these routes at different times on weekdays and on the weekends. AM and PM peak conditions are assumed to last for 2-hours each (4 hours total) on weekdays. Off-peak weekday delay is assumed to be a fraction of that experienced during peak periods, and weekend delay is assumed to be a fraction of that experienced during weekdays. Little delay is expected during the late evening/early morning hours, providing “ideal” travel time estimates (i.e. least amount of delay possible). Delay for the peak periods will come from the Synchro model analyses. The relationship between PM peak hour volume and weekday volume will be used to estimate hourly off-peak delay. Likewise, a comparison of weekday traffic volumes to weekend day traffic volumes will be used to estimate weekend day travel time. The number of weekdays and weekend days per year will be calculated and total annual travel time (in hours) will be estimated for each of the four routes given the four conditions described above. An average annual travel time (in hours) will be calculated by averaging the annual build travel time for both the build year and design year. The same will be done for the no-build travel time and the two travel time estimates will be multiplied by the number of years between when the realignment would be built and the year it was designed, assumed to be a 20-year period. The two travel time estimates will be compared, and the difference calculated. The difference, in hours, will be multiplied by the current hourly wage rate for the City of Nampa to convert hours to dollars. This will be used to develop a benefit/cost ratio using the updated cost estimate provided in Task 2.

The consultant team will discuss the results of the analysis with City of Nampa staff at one of the coordination meetings identified in Task 1.2.

Assumptions:
1. The Synchro network developed for the Downtown Traffic Alternatives Analysis will be updated for use in this analysis.
2. WINTURNS will be used to forecast turning movement volumes based on existing turning movement counts.
3. Intersection turning movement counts required for the analysis will be provided by City of Nampa.
4. The “build” year is assumed to be 2025 and design year is assumed to be 2045.
5. No more than 8 Synchro model networks will be developed:
   a. PM Peak
      i. Build condition, build year (2025)
      ii. No build condition, build year (2025)
      iii. Build condition, design year (2045)
      iv. No build condition, design year (2045)
b. AM Peak
   i. Build condition, build year (2025)
   ii. No build condition, build year (2025)
   iii. Build condition, design year (2045)
   iv. No build condition, design year (2045)

6. COMPASS will model the build condition (SH-45 realignment): 2 travel lanes in each direction on 7th Ave. and Yale between 2nd St. and 12th Ave.; 11th Ave. one-way south between 3rd St. South and 7th St. South, 12th Ave. one-way north starting at 7th St. South. This was last modeled by COMPASS for the Downtown Traffic Alternatives Analysis.

7. COMPASS will supply AM peak, PM peak, and daily model volume forecast shape files for: existing conditions, no build conditions (2025 and 2045), and build conditions (2025 and 2045).

8. The City of Nampa will coordinate all data collection efforts and will send the data to the consultant team.

Deliverables:
1. 8 Synchro model networks.
2. Hourly, daily, and annual traffic volume forecasts
3. Turning Movement volume forecasts for AM and PM peak hours:
   a. Build Conditions; build year and design year
   b. No-build Conditions; build year and design year

4. Technical Memo and Project Charter

A benefit/cost estimate tech memo for the SH-45 realignment concept will be developed to document this evaluation. Additionally, an ITD Project Charter form will be completed for the project. The City will review both the draft tech memo and ITD charter form and provide one set comments/corrections. Comments/corrections will be addressed, and a final memo and project charter form submitted to the city.

Assumptions:
1. ITD will provide the most current version of its project charter template/form (ITD 0332).
2. The project charter template/form will be completed to the extent possible given the information in the SH-45 Realignment Concept Study. It is likely some of the information needed to complete the form will be unavailable and/or unknown.
3. The technical memo will be approximately 3 pages long.
4. One (1) set of review comments will be provided by the city.
5. Deliverables will be distributed electronically.

Deliverables:
1. Draft Memo, PDF via email.
2. Final Memo, PDF via email.
3. ITD Project Charter Form (Rev. 10), Word document via email.
**Project Schedule**

Notice to Proceed – June 10, 2019  
Update Project Costs – June 11 through July 31, 2019  
Traffic Forecasting - June 11 through July 12, 2019  
Synchro Modeling – July 15 through August 9, 2019  
Preliminary Travel Time Estimate – August 8 through August 15, 2019  
Project Meeting #1 – Sometime between August 16 and August 23, 2019  
Draft Tech Memo and ITD Project Charter – August 26 through September 20, 2019  
Project Meeting #2 - Sometime between September 23 and October 4, 2019  
Final Tech Memo – October 7 through October 18, 2019

**Cost of Services**

Services will be on a time and materials not-to-exceed (NTE) basis.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Service</th>
<th>Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Management</td>
<td>$8,080</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer</td>
<td>$6,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>$8,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Transportation Engineer</td>
<td>$28,710</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Cost of Services**  
$53,890

Attached is the labor estimate and cost summary.
## Salary Cost

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>A. Summary Estimated Man-Hour Time &amp; Salary</th>
<th>Hours</th>
<th>Rate</th>
<th>Labor + OH+Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Manager</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>Man-Hours @ $250.00</td>
<td>$9,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Civil Engineer</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>Man-Hours @ $160.00</td>
<td>$8,960</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Designer</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>Man-Hours @ $140.00</td>
<td>$6,720</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sr. Transportation Engineer</td>
<td>261</td>
<td>Man-Hours @ $110.00</td>
<td>$28,710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Labor</strong></td>
<td>403</td>
<td>=</td>
<td><strong>$53,890</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Direct Costs

| Direct Costs | =       | $0   |

**Total Direct Costs**

| Subtotal | =       | $0   |

### Total Estimate

<p>| Total Estimate | =       | $53,890 |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Task #</th>
<th>DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>Labor Cost</th>
<th>Labor Hours</th>
<th>Project Manager</th>
<th>Civil Engineer</th>
<th>Designer</th>
<th>Sr. Transportation Engineer</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Task 1 - Project Management</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.1 Contract Management, Invoicing and Progress Reports</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.2 Project Meetings</td>
<td>$1,080</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 1 Subtotal</td>
<td>$8,080</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 - Update Cost Estimates</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update/Verify Cost Assumptions</td>
<td>$4,410</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update/Verify Unit Costs Assumptions</td>
<td>$4,410</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update ITD 2838 Forms</td>
<td>$2,650</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Update ITD 1150 Forms</td>
<td>$2,650</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 2 Subtotal</td>
<td>$14,120</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 - Benefit Analysis</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS Coordination</td>
<td>$470</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>COMPASS Model Adjustment Factor Development</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AM Turning Movement Forecasts</td>
<td>$5,720</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PM Turning Movement Forecasts</td>
<td>$5,720</td>
<td>52</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SYNCHRO Modeling</td>
<td>$8,800</td>
<td>80</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Travel Time Estimates</td>
<td>$1,320</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Estimate Benefit</td>
<td>$660</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 3 Subtotal</td>
<td>$24,890</td>
<td>225</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>224</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4 - Technical Memo and Project Charter</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Draft Memo</td>
<td>$4,490</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td></td>
<td>24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Develop Final Memo</td>
<td>$885</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ITD Project Charter Form</td>
<td>$1,425</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task 4 Subtotal</td>
<td>$6,800</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Totals</td>
<td>$53,890</td>
<td>403</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>261</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Task Order Review Checklist

Project: SH-45 Re-alignment Benefit/Cost Evaluation

Date: 5/21/19

SOW should contain the following information:

1) Name of Project
   Yes ☒ No ☐

2) Name of Firm
   Yes ☒ No ☐

3) Contact Name and Number
   Yes ☒ No ☐

4) Current Date
   Yes ☒ No ☐

5) Page Numbers
   Yes ☒ No ☐

6) Outline of task(s) to be provided
   Yes ☒ No ☐
   a) PM, Design, Bid, Construction

7) Project Schedule
   Yes ☒ No ☐
   a) Milestone Dates and Cost Estimates at PM (Preliminary Design Portion), Design, Bid, Construction

8) Cost of Service
   Yes ☒ No ☐
   a) (fee for services to be noted "Time and Material Not to Exceed")

9) Any Key Understandings to be noted
   Yes ☒ No ☐

10) Cover letter with the correct contact information
    Yes ☒ No ☐
Re: SOQ for Miscellaneous Professional Services Term Agreement FY 2018-19

Dear Mr. Points:

AECOM is pleased to present our Statement of Qualifications (SOQ) for the City’s Miscellaneous Professional Services Term Agreement. We have included our SOQ for the Civil Engineering -Roadway and Traffic as defined by the City of Nampa. Our project managers and key team members possess the experience needed to successfully complete these types of projects. They have worked on many successful projects in Nampa, the greater Treasure Valley, and throughout Idaho. Several of our applicable projects are highlighted in Section II of the attached SOQ. We will work hard to provide you with the quality work and responsive service you deserve.

As required, we agree to the terms of the sample Miscellaneous Professional Services Term Agreement and are willing to execute them. Pending selection, we anticipate a successful contract negotiation process as we have successfully contracted with the City of Nampa in the past. As a result, AECOM will be able to “hit the ground running” with any miscellaneous projects you ask us to complete.

We look forward to working with Public Works Department staff in developing practical, yet innovative solutions to the issues facing the City. On behalf of our team, I would like to thank you for the opportunity to provide the City of Nampa with our services. If you have any questions, please feel free to call me at (208) 386-5183.

Sincerely,

David R. Butzier, P.E.
Operations Manager
1. Firm Overview

AECOM has a more than 100-year history in the Treasure Valley based on the work of several prominent legacy companies, including Morrison-Knudsen (MK), Centennial Engineering, Inc., Washington Group International, URS Corporation, and now as AECOM. Our team for the City of Nampa on-call support will be led from the Meridian AECOM Office. Despite the name changes, the office has remained a constant fixture in the transportation engineering market here in the Treasure Valley for more than 30 years. The mission of the Meridian AECOM Office is to provide quality transportation planning and engineering design services to public agencies in Idaho for a variety of transportation modes. Over the decades, we have completed projects for the City of Nampa and a number of local agencies, including the Idaho Transportation Department (ITD), ACHD, COMPASS, and many of the cities. The types of projects completed by AECOM in the Treasure Valley include:

- Traffic engineering and intersection design, including intersection-related safety improvements
- Roadway design, including maintenance and safety improvements
- Public transportation, including planning and capital infrastructure design
- Highway and intermodal safety improvements, including railroad crossings
- Utility and stormwater projects related to transportation infrastructure

Our office’s list of current on-call clients, in addition to the City of Nampa, includes ITD, ACHD, the City of Boise, the Idaho Department of Environmental Quality, and Western Federal Lands. No project is too big or too small for AECOM. The size of projects undertaken by our project managers varies considerably, from $5,000 on-call support work for the City of Nampa to the multi-million dollar Connecting Idaho Program for ITD.

Regional Support

Dating back to our history as Centennial Engineering and MK Centennial, the Meridian AECOM Office has continuously concentrated on public works projects for public agencies, with a focus on projects in the state of Idaho. The mission of the Meridian Office is to provide quality planning and design services to state and local agencies within Idaho, specializing in planning, engineering, design, and construction management for a variety of transportation modes. While we are currently in a rebuilding phase in our Meridian office, we will have strong support from the AECOM offices in Salt Lake City, Portland, Seattle, and Denver, should the need arise.

AECOM is a premier, multidisciplinary engineering consulting firm providing planning, environmental, design, and construction services to clients across the United States (US). The combination of our more than 1,400 regional staff and national Department of Transportation (DOT) expertise, innovation, and best practices adds up to a team that understands how to navigate the challenges of transportation design projects and that can provide the City of Nampa with the right technical capabilities to meet your requirements. In 2019, AECOM was ranked #1 in Transportation, and General Building, and in the top 3 in most of the other major sectors by Engineering News-Record (ENR) magazine. We achieved this recognition by being a leader in the key markets we serve and by blending national experience, local knowledge, innovation, and technical excellence to deliver customized and creative solutions to meet the needs of our clients.

General Approach to QA/QC

Hundreds of transportation design projects have been successfully managed by AECOM’s Office using our proven Project Execution Procedures (PEPs) developed using industry standards, proven best practices, and
lessons learned. Over 750 governing procedures guide our reporting, invoicing, design control and reviews, contracts, and estimates. AECOM project managers will develop specific Project Execution Plans (PXP) for each project that will include the applicable PEPs, design guidelines/standards from the AASHTO Green Book, City of Nampa standards/specifications, and the ISPWC design standards/specifications. PXPs identify unique project aspects and the roles/responsibilities of each team member. Comprehensive and frequent communication is essential to a successful project. Project managers provide overall control and ensure effective communication by working closely with the client and critical stakeholders. They monitor and control project scope, deliverables, schedule, and budget as needed utilizing industry standard reporting tools (Microsoft Project) and task-level financial reports. AECOM project managers are also responsible for reporting the status of the project’s scope, schedule, and budget to the client and senior management at least monthly.

Establishing clearly identified project goals, objectives, and milestones during the scoping process will minimize out of scope work. However, in some cases changes to a project are unavoidable. Therefore, during project scoping with the client, specific change management processes are documented. If a significant change in scope, schedule, or budget is identified during the course of the project, AECOM project managers immediately document the change and discuss it with the client. AECOM submits the reasons for the change (or changes) as well as the ramifications to schedule and budget with recommendations to the client for approval. Once the change is formally approved, AECOM develops revised scopes, schedules, and budgets.
FINANCIAL ACCOUNTABILITY

The company’s cost accounting system must be able to track direct project-related expenditures and indirect costs and expenditures, and to keep these separate from non-project related costs or other projects.

Does your company have a job cost accounting system to provide for recording and accumulation of costs incurred on each contract?  □ Yes  □ No

AECOM Technical Services, Inc.
COMPANY NAME

[Signature]
Signature of Responsible Party

05/17/19
Date
CERTIFICATION REGARDING DEBARMENT, SUSPENSION, 
AND OTHER RESPONSIBILITY MATTERS

By signing this document, the Consultant certifies to the best of his knowledge and belief that except as noted on an attached Exception, the company, material suppliers, vendors or other lower tier participants on this project:

a) Are not presently debarred, suspended, proposed for debarment, declared ineligible or voluntarily excluded from covered transactions by any Federal, State or Local department or agency.

b) Have not within a three-year period preceding this proposal been convicted of or had a civil judgment rendered against them for commission of fraud or a criminal offense in connection with obtaining, attempting to obtain or performing a public (Federal, State or Local) transaction or contract under a public transaction; violation of Federal or State antitrust statutes or commission of embezzlement, theft, forgery, bribery, falsification or destruction of records making false statements, or receiving stolen property.

c) Are not presently indicted for or otherwise criminally or civilly charged by a government entity (Federal, State or Local) with commission of any of the offenses enumerated in paragraph (b) of this certification.

d) Have not within a three-year period preceding this application/proposal had one or more public transactions (Federal, State or Local) terminated for cause or default.

Where the prospective primary participant is unable to certify to any of the statements in this certification, such prospective participant shall attach an explanation to this proposal.

NOTE: Exceptions will not necessarily result in denial of award, but will be considered in determining Consultant responsibility. For any exception noted, indicate to whom it applies, initiating agency and dates of action. Providing false information may result in criminal prosecution or administrative sanctions.

_________________________________________
AECOM Technical Services, Inc.

_________________________________________ _____________________________
COMPANY NAME 
Signature of Responsible Party Date 

05/17/19
AFFIRMATIVE ACTION

The City of Nampa is an Equal Employment Opportunity (EEO) employer and values diversity in its workforce. It also requires its recipients and consultants to have an operating policy as an EEO employer. Consultants shall implement affirmative action programs to ensure equal employment opportunity.

AECOM Technical Services, Inc. (Name of Firm) certifies to having a formal statement of nondiscrimination in employment policy and has an affirmative action program if over 50 employees. (Firms of 50 employees or less do not need a formal program, but must have a policy).

Does your Firm have 50 or more employees? ☑ Yes ☐ No

Provide the name of your company’s EEO Officer, and attach a copy of the company’s EEO Policy.

[Signature]
Signature of Authorized Representative certifying all statements as true

May 1, 2019
(Date)

NOTE: Those companies that do not comply with the above requirements will not be permitted to perform work for the City of Nampa until the information in on file.
Statement of Commitment from AECOM’s Chief Executive Officer

It is the policy of AECOM not to discriminate or allow the harassment of employees or applicants on the basis of sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, color, religious creed, national origin, physical or mental disability, protected veteran status, or any other characteristic protected by law with regard to any employment practices, including recruitment, advertising, job application procedures, hiring, training, promotion, transfer, compensation, job assignments, benefits, and/or other terms, conditions of employment, provided the individual is qualified, with or without reasonable accommodations, to perform the essential functions of the job. This policy applies to all jobs at the Company. The Company will continue to ensure that individuals are employed, and that employees are treated during employment, without regard to their sex, gender identity, sexual orientation, race, color, religious creed, national origin, physical or mental disability, protected veteran status, or any other characteristic protected by law in all employment practices as follows:

Employment decisions at the Company are based on legitimate job-related criteria. All personnel actions or programs that affect qualified individuals, such as employment, promotion, demotion, transfer, recruitment, advertising, termination, rate of pay or other forms of compensation, and selection for training, are made without discrimination because of any basis protected by law. Employees may choose to voluntarily disclose their sex, race, national origin, disability and protected veteran status at any time by contacting Human Resources. Such information will be maintained in a confidential manner and will not be used against an individual when making any employment decisions. Employees and applicants with disabilities and disabled veterans are encouraged to inform Human Resources if they need a reasonable accommodation to perform a job for which they are otherwise qualified. The Company makes, and will continue to make, reasonable accommodations to the known physical or mental limitations of an otherwise qualified applicant or employee to promote the employment of qualified individuals with disabilities and disabled veterans, unless such accommodations would impose an undue hardship on the operations of the Company’s business.

As AECOM’s Chairman and Chief Executive Officer, I am fully committed to the principles of equal employment opportunity and affirmative action. I have appointed EEO Officers responsible for supporting the successful implementation of the Company’s Affirmative Action Plans (APPs). Those EEO Officers work with Affirmative Action Coordinators at various locations of the Company, with joint responsibility for implementation of the Company’s affirmative action activities. The EEO Officers and Affirmative Action Coordinators have the full support of top management and the staff necessary to fully implement this Program. All managers and supervisors will take an active part in the Company’s AAPs to ensure qualified employees and prospective employees are considered and treated in a nondiscriminatory manner with respect to all employment decisions. Furthermore, AECOM will solicit the cooperation and support of all employees for the Company’s Equal Employment Opportunity and Affirmative Action Policy.
Our Affirmative Action Plans include an audit and reporting system, which, among other things, uses metrics and other information to measure the effectiveness of our Programs. The Affirmative Action Coordinator is responsible for periodically reviewing progress in the compliance and implementation of the policy of affirmative action. In accordance with public law, the Company’s program of affirmative action for qualified individuals with disabilities and the program of affirmative action for protected veterans are available for inspection in the Human Resources Department, Monday through Friday, from 9:00 a.m. to 5:00 p.m. upon request.

In addition, employees and applicants will not be subjected to harassment, intimidation, threats, coercion, or discrimination because they have engaged in, or may have engaged in, filing a complaint, assisting or participating in an investigation, compliance review or hearing, or other activity related to the administration of Section 503 of the Rehabilitation Act of 1973, the Vietnam Era Veterans’ Readjustment Assistance Act of 1974, Executive Order 11246, all as amended, and/or any other federal, state, or local law or regulation regarding Equal Employment Opportunity, opposing any act or practice made unlawful, or exercising any other right protected by such laws or regulations. AECOM will not discharge or in any other manner discriminate against employees or applicants because they have inquired about, discussed, or disclosed their own pay or the pay of another employee or applicant. However, employees who have access to the compensation information of other employees or applicants as part of their essential job functions cannot disclose the pay of other employees or applicants to individuals who do not otherwise have access to compensation information, unless the disclosure is (a) in response to a formal complaint or charge, (b) in furtherance of an investigation, proceeding, hearing, or action, including an investigation conducted by the employer, or (c) consistent with the contractor’s legal duty to furnish information.

Michael S. Burke
January 2019
SERVICE CATEGORY CHECKLIST

Following is the list of Service Categories. Mark the box beside each category for which you are submitting a proposal.

☐ ARCHITECTURE
☐ CIVIL ENGINEERING - ROADWAY AND TRAFFIC
☐ CIVIL ENGINEERING - STRUCTURAL
☐ CIVIL ENGINEERING – UTILITY
☐ CONSTRUCTION ENGINEERING AND INSPECTION
☐ ELECTRICAL ENGINEERING
☐ GEOTECHNICAL ENGINEERING
☐ LANDSCAPE ARCHITECTURE
☐ MECHANICAL ENGINEERING
☐ MISCELLANEOUS ENGINEERING SERVICES
☐ SURVEYING
## SERVICE CATEGORY COVER SHEET

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Company:</th>
<th>AECOM Technical Services, Inc.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Address:</td>
<td>3320 E Goldstone Way</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Meridian, ID 83642</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Contact Name: | Dave Butzier                  |
| Title:        | Program Manager               |
| Office Number:| 208-386-5183                  |
| Cell Number:  | 208-867-4040                  |
| Email:        | dave.butzier@aecom.com        |

Year Firm was established: 1993

Firm’s Annual Gross Receipts: $7.9 Billion

Service Category Estimated Annual Gross Receipts: $785 Million

Type of Firm:
- [x] Corporation
- [ ] LLC
- [ ] Partnership
- [ ] Sole Proprietorship
- [ ] Other
1. Qualifications of Project Managers

The Roadway and Traffic Category encompasses several civil disciplines including traffic engineering, transportation planning, and roadway/intersection design. Due to the broad nature of this category, AECOM offers three experienced project managers to choose from with expertise in these disciplines. AECOM will work with the City to determine which project manager is best suited for the project(s) at hand.

**Dave Butzier P.E.**

David Butzier earned B.S. and M.S. degrees from the University of Wyoming and has 40 years of experience in design, construction and planning for the transportation industry throughout the western United States. His design experience includes planning studies, environmental clearance, and preliminary and final roadway design. Mr. Butzier has completed design projects for various state and county transportation systems, including urban and rural freeways and city and county arterials and collectors. His experience as a resident engineer includes supervising land survey and project layout, performing quality control inspections, providing design support during construction, and developing cost estimates.

Currently, Mr. Butzier is the project manager for ITD’s State Highway 44 Corridor Study, from Eagle to I-84, to provide environmental clearance for the widening of this vital 16 mile corridor in Canyon and Ada counties. He is also serving as the project manager for the design of ACHD’s Cole Road and Franklin Road Intersection, and Cole Road widening from Franklin to I-84, which is currently under construction. He was involved in the recently completed City of Nampa Transportation Master Plan Update. He has been the Project Manager (PM) and also the Principal in Charge (PIC) of many other transportation projects throughout Idaho since moving to Boise in 1987, to open the office for Centennial Engineering.

**Robert Clegg, P.E.**

Robert Clegg is a project manager and project engineer with more than twenty years of experience in transportation, site civil, and construction engineering. His expertise is in providing roadway and transit design services. He has led transportation design projects and civil engineering efforts for many years and understands the importance of early and continual communication through the life of the project. Bob is currently helping with two ITD design projects in District 3. The first being our SH-16, I-84 to US 20/26 Preliminary Engineering project, where he is leading the design effort for the new interchange at SH-16 and Ustick Road. Bob is also helping with the design effort for the SH-44 Corridor Study, involving the new intersection layouts at Linder Road, Star Road and the Middleton Alternate Route.

**Travis Bailey, P.E.**

Travis Bailey brings a strong transportation study and traffic modeling (VISSIM, Synchro, Highway Capacity Software [HCS], TrafFix) background to City of Nampa, having worked on various traffic engineering projects over his 11-year career. He has a passion for solving complex operational challenges, especially those requiring integration of multiple modes of transportation, such as at-grade railroad crossings where trains, vehicles, bikes and pedestrians all compete for the right-of-way. His experience in both analysis and design allows him to work closely with other disciplines and to see a project through to completion.

Recently, Mr. Bailey helped with the City of Nampa Transportation Master Plan Update, working on the intersection analysis to identify the 30 most critical intersections to include in the long range plan for the City of Nampa. Travis also recently modified the traffic signal design for the Cole/Franklin Intersection project to accommodate the UP railroad requirements for queuing and right-turn protection. Travis has had extensive experience with multimodal operational evaluations, including developing timings plans for 50 traffic signals along a new light rail corridor and through complex downtown areas. Since 2014, Travis has
been working closely with Utah Department of Transportation’s (UDOT’s) Chief Railroad Engineer as the Railroad Safety Program Manager visiting at-grade railroad crossings throughout the state and identifying safety improvements.

**Lori Labrum, P.E., P.T.O.E**

Lori Labrum is a senior transportation engineer with 25 years of experience in transportation and transit planning, traffic engineering, roadway design, project management, and alternative project delivery. She has been involved in local, state, and regional transportation projects in Idaho, Utah, Arizona, Colorado, and Washington. Lori has extensive experience performing corridor studies in which she has evaluated safety issues, geometric deficiencies, and operational deficiencies. She has led travel demand modeling efforts, evaluating and making recommendations on the link between land use and transportation infrastructure. Ms. Labrum has been instrumental in the development of UDOT’s Performance-Based Maintenance of Traffic Specification to be used on both Design-Build and Design-Bid-Build projects. Lori was also involved with the City of Nampa’s Transportation Master Plan Update that was completed in 2018.

### 2. Qualifications of Firm and Staff

AECOM is consistently ranked by ENR Magazine as one of the top five transportation design firms in the country. One of the reasons for this consistently high ranking is that AECOM maintains specialized experience within small local engineering offices. The AECOM’s Meridian Office is one of these specialized offices that focus on providing transportation planning and design services to customers all over Idaho. In addition to the project managers above, some key staff includes:

**Casey Brown P.E.**

Casey is a project manager and project engineer with 19 years of experience in transportation engineering. His responsibilities include involvement in project development for various local government, state DOT, and federal projects. This includes concept studies; traffic studies; utility design and relocation; signal interconnect; timing plans; signal coordination studies; geometric design; and final design details, summaries, cost estimates, and specifications necessary to complete final construction bid documents.

**Jaime White, P.E.**

Jaime is a Transportation Planning Senior Project Manager with expertise in the planning, design, and construction of transportation, transit, public utilities, site development, and municipal projects. Jaime’s experience also includes ecological and environmental consulting, National Environmental Policy Act (NEPA) document preparation, and administrative requirements for Federal Transit Administration (FTA) and Federal Highway Administration (FHWA) funding programs. Jaime has also been involved in numerous long range planning efforts involving public and agency coordination and outreach. Jaime has worked on several ITD projects including the US-26 Gooding Feasibility Study for ITD D-4, and the US-95 Lewiston to Moscow widening project for ITD D-2.

### 3. Relevant Project Experience and References

AECOM’s Engineering Office has managed many roadway and traffic projects for agencies in the Treasure Valley. The sampling of projects provided varies widely in scope, schedule, and budget; from a 2-year $400,000 roadway redesign project to a 3-month $14,000 traffic signal design project. Each project title is followed by the schedule (duration) and budget for that project.
Roadway and Intersection Design

**Cole Rd & Franklin Rd, ACHD, (2 years, $916,000)**

This project will improve capacity and safety on Cole Road from north of the I-84 westbound ramp terminal to Bethel Street. This project involves adding capacity by widening Cole Road and Franklin Road as well as the Cole Road and Franklin Road intersection to seven-lane by seven-lane concrete intersection. The Cole Road and McMullen Street intersection will be widened to accommodate a new five-lane Cole Road with the west leg of McMullen realigned to align with the east leg. Signal upgrades and modifications will be constructed for the Cole/McMullen, Cole/Gratz, and Cole/Franklin intersections. This project also includes significant improvements to the existing drainage system, and irrigation system to include replacing the existing Farmer’s Lateral canal crossing with a new box culvert. The project also included coordination with and upgrades to a Union Pacific Railroad crossing just north of Franklin Road. Plans were prepared for right-of-way (ROW), roadway, utilities, traffic signals, signal interconnect, drainage and irrigation, box culvert, traffic control, signing and pavement markings, and stormwater pollution prevention (SWPPP). An Environmental Evaluation was completed for this project, was well as a US Army Corps of Engineers 404 Permit. Construction began in October of 2018, and will be completed in the fall of 2019.

**Broadway Bridge, ITD, (1.5 years, $912,000)**

This project replaced the Broadway Avenue Bridge across the Boise River next to Albertsons Stadium on the campus of Boise State University. AECOM assisted ITD District 3 with the preliminary design and put the final PS&E Package together for construction, not only replacing and widening the bridge, but also widening Broadway Avenue from University Drive to Front Street, and improving the connectivity with the Boise Greenbelt on both sides of the river. AECOM also assisted with the significant coordination effort with the many stakeholders involved, including Boise State University, City of Boise Parks Dept., City of Boise Fire Dept., City of Boise Public Works Dept., City of Boise Planning Dept., Idaho Smart Growth, Boise Metro Chamber of Commerce, Board of Directors for the Christ Chapel and the many adjacent business owners in the vicinity. AECOM was responsible for the roadway design, utility coordination and relocations, Boise Greenbelt connections, design of 19 retaining walls, emergency rescue boat ramp, landscaping, roadway lighting and three construction packages.

**Eagle Rd. & McMillan Rd. Intersection; ACHD (2 years, $495,000)**

This project involved improving safety and capacity at the intersection of Eagle Rd. at McMillan Rd. by widening it from a five-by-five lane section to a seven-by-seven lane section. Other significant design improvements were made to the drainage system, irrigation system, and the traffic signal. The AECOM’s Engineering Office completed the traffic analysis, conceptual design, preliminary design plans, final design plans, and the preparation/submittal of the PS&E plans for the bid documents. The intersection design included right-of-way plans, roadway plans, traffic signal plans, signal interconnect plans, drainage and irrigation plans, traffic control plans, and signing and pavement marking plans. AECOM also provided designs to improve the access to Lowell Scott Middle School located on McMillan Rd. and relocate and upgrade an existing HAWK pedestrian signal.

Roadway and Intersection Evaluation/Transportation Planning

**State Highway 45 Realignment Concept; City of Nampa (2 years, $259,400)**

This project included an analysis of one-way and two-way roadways in the city’s downtown core and a concept-level evaluation of a new State Highway (SH) 45 alignment. As part of the Downtown Nampa Traffic Alternatives Analysis, a new alignment of SH-45 was recommended to facilitate the movement of regional traffic through Nampa to the interstate. Traffic analyses were conducted using SYNCHRO to support operational changes that would reduce delay and support redevelopment activities in Downtown.
Nampa. It also compiled and documented the preliminary engineering data necessary to advance the realignment of SH-45 into the NEPA and preliminary design phases of development.

**Nampa Citywide Transportation Plan; City of Nampa (2 years 5 months, $246,500)**

We inventoried and evaluated the City’s existing transportation system. Planning-level capacity thresholds were applied to traffic forecasts to develop a list of short-term (2010–2019) and future (2020–2035) system needs based on a specific growth scenario. AECOM used traffic capacity models and software (HCS+ and SYNCHRO) to conduct analyses of the area’s intersections. AECOM identified transportation projects based the capacity needs analysis and input from stakeholders. Projects were then prioritized based on several criteria developed specifically for the city. Cost estimates were produced for each transportation project and a Capital Improvements Plan developed.

**Downtown Nampa Traffic Alternatives Analysis; NDC (1 year 9 months, $112,000)**

This project involved consideration of improvements to Downtown Nampa’s current traffic pattern to help increase redevelopment opportunities and reduce the amount of regional traffic (e.g. truck traffic) moving through the area. AECOM conducted an analysis of various traffic alternatives and roadway improvements necessary to meet future capacity needs with the purpose of identifying the best traffic routing options. Specific analyses of intersections in the study area were conducted using SYNCHRO traffic modeling software. Based on the results of an alternatives screening process, two alternatives were selected for additional traffic modeling. Simulations of these alternatives were completed using VISSIM software. Travel times provided by VISSIM were used to recommend the best performing alternative adopted by the NDC Board in November 2010.

### Traffic Engineering

**I-84 Garrity Interchange #38, Eastbound (EB) On-ramp; ITD (6 months, $149,500)**

AECOM supported ITD’s design of a two-lane EB on-ramp at the Garrity Blvd. interchange. This project was the result of a road safety audit ITD conducted in conjunction with the City of Nampa and FHWA. The proposed design for the ramp involved modifying the intersection of Garrity/Flamingo to accommodate two NB lanes. In addition, AECOM conducted a traffic analysis of several other improvements to the interchange including the addition of left turn lanes at the ramp terminal intersections. AECOM completed a benefit/cost analysis of the improvements, updated the interchange modification report (IMR) for the interchange, and provided traffic design support for the project.

**Troxel Way/Ustick Rd. Traffic Signal Design; ACHD (3 months, $14,000)**

AECOM managed this traffic signal design project for the intersection of Troxel Way and Ustick Rd. in 2010. AECOM worked with ACHD to develop preliminary and final design plans, specifications and a construction cost estimate. Site power service was coordinated with Idaho Power to ensure the installed traffic signal poles, mast arms, and luminaires would not encroach into the overhead power lines buffer zone. A pavement marking and signing plan was also developed as part of the project.

### Project References

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ryan Cutler, Project Manager</th>
<th>Clair Bowman, Sr. Transportation Planner</th>
<th>Dyan Bevins, Capital Projects Manager</th>
<th>Mark Campbell, Project Manager</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Ada County Highway District</td>
<td>City of Nampa</td>
<td>Ada County Highway District</td>
<td>ITD District 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>208-387-6202</td>
<td>208-468-5474</td>
<td>208-387-6260</td>
<td>208-334-8423</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><a href="mailto:rcutler@achdidaho.org">rcutler@achdidaho.org</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:bowmancm@cityofnampa.us">bowmancm@cityofnampa.us</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:dbevins@achdidaho.org">dbevins@achdidaho.org</a></td>
<td><a href="mailto:mark.campbell@itd.idaho.gov">mark.campbell@itd.idaho.gov</a></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Geographic Considerations

As highlighted by our project experience, the office is very familiar with Nampa and the Treasure Valley. AECOM’s Engineering Office staff has worked with every local governmental and regulatory agency in the Treasure Valley, including the City of Nampa and ITD.

5. Understanding of Service Category Requirements

Establishing agreed upon design criteria at the very beginning is paramount to having a successful and cost effective project. The City refers to applicable design criteria documented in AASHTO’s “Greenbook” guidelines, the MUTCD, and/or 2008 ISPWC standards. However, the City does have standard construction specifications documented in the Standard Construction Specifications Manual (September 2012) and design policies documented in the Engineering Development Process and Policy Manual (September 2012).

As with all of our civil engineering projects, it is critical to establish a well-defined scope, budget, and schedule that is realistic for the consultant and suitable to the client’s needs. AECOM has established checks and balances throughout the design process that will provide a cost effective product that, once completed, is done right the first time meeting all of the goals established for it. Typical design project work tasks include:

- **Concept Development and Approval** - A clear and concise project concept will be laid out involving all the appropriate stakeholders. At this stage many concept-level studies and evaluations are conducted. Design standards will be documented and specific subtasks developed based on the project’s complexity. In general, subtasks may include preliminary survey work, alternatives identification, construction cost estimation, preliminary geotechnical investigation, traffic analysis, and environmental scan/evaluation.

- **Preliminary Design** - Preliminary design identifies and refines the preferred alternative developed during concept development. This task is usually considered complete when it reaches a 30% of final design level. Subtasks include more refined traffic engineering evaluations, roadway/intersection design, geotechnical investigation, a hydraulic study, detailed mapping, utilities location, and right-of-way needs determination. NEPA clearance is often sought concurrently to this task.

- **Final Design** - Final design is a culmination of the 60% and 90% design reviews, utility conflict resolution, and final right-of-way needs assessments. The subtasks associated with final design include preparation of final roadway/traffic/drainage/right-of-way/utilities plan sets, preparation of PS&E, and preparation of a contractor bid package.

A contract to provide design services during construction is often sought once the project moves into the construction phase. These services typically include design revisions as needed, review of shop drawings, and responses to requests for information from the contractor.

Nampa does have specific requirements for traffic impact Studies (effective October 2010). However, required work tasks for planning projects in this service category often depend on the roadway, area, or issues being investigated. Therefore, city staff and AECOM will need to identify those critical planning tasks during the project scoping process. Generally, planning work tasks can be grouped into these types of work items:

- Develop Plan Goals and Objectives
- Identify Existing Conditions
- Identify Future Needs/Issues
- Develop Alternative Solutions and Identify a Preferred One
- Produce Recommendations and Outline Next Steps
BID AWARD
South Sugar Street Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk &
North Nampa Bike and Pedestrian Improvements
ITD Key No.: 19959
FTA Project ID No.: 1736-2018-6
(As approved in the FY19 budget)

- Through multiple funding applications the City was awarded Federal Funds to design and construct multimodal improvements around the City of Nampa.
- Funding is through the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Grant Program and administered by Valley Regional Transit (VRT).
- Total estimated project funding for KN 19959 is $590,000 with the federal allocation being $472,000 (80%) and the City’s match portion being $118,000 (20%). Two project sites are included as follows:
  - Key No. 19959: 14th Ave. Bike Boulevard & Pedestrian Improvements - construct pavement markings and signing for a Bike Boulevard through north Nampa from 1st Street N. to Garrity Blvd., through Lakeview Park and construct pedestrian ramp improvements (see Exhibit A, Vicinity Map).
  - Key No. 19959: N. Sugar St. Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk - construct a Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk (Rectangular Rapid Flashing Beacon – RRFB) across N. Sugar Street at the Indian Creek Pathway (see Exhibit B, Vicinity Map).
- The City’s match will be paid out of FY19 Streets Budget.
- Construction is anticipated to begin in June with completion in August, pending availability of the electrical equipment for the pedestrian activated crosswalk.
- The City received two bids for the South Sugar Street Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk & North Nampa Bike and Pedestrian Improvements project. The apparent low bidder is Paul Construction Inc. with a bid amount of $512,976.50. All necessary public bidding requirements appear to be satisfied (See Exhibit C, Bid Tabulation)
- Estimated project costs:
  - Design & Construction Inspection Services $ 88,340.00
  - Construction $512,976.50
  - Total Estimated Costs $601,316.50
- Engineering recommends award of the South Sugar Street Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk & North Nampa Bike and Pedestrian Improvements project to Paul Construction Inc., in the amount of $512,976.50.
- Overage of $11,316.50 will be accounted for through the efficient use of the $60,000 contingency item specified within the contract to maintain the project budget.

REQUEST: Award bid to Paul Construction Inc. and authorize the Mayor to sign contract for the South Sugar Street Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk & North Nampa Bike and Pedestrian Improvements project.

Attached: Exhibit A, Vicinity Map
Exhibit B, Vicinity Map
Exhibit C, Bid Tabulation
CITY OF NAMPA
14TH AVE. BIKE BOULEVARD & PEDESTRIAN IMPROVEMENTS
KEY NO. 19959

CANYON COUNTY

Bike Boulevard Through North Nampa

Pedestrian Ramp Improvements

Scale: N.T.S.
Date: 5/31/2018
Project Number: 005-15-002
Drawing: P:\Projects\Nampa 005-15-002\CEs\CADD\Vicinity Map.dwg

CITY OF NAMPA
411 3rd St S
Nampa, Idaho 83651
PH: (208) 468-5458
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201.4.1.D.1.A-N</td>
<td>Removal of Bituminous Surface (Up To 6&quot; Thick)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>1280</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>$12,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.4.1.D.1.B-N</td>
<td>Removal of Concrete (Sidewalk/Ped Ramp/Driveway Ramp)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>$6,900.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.4.1.E.1.A-N</td>
<td>Removal of Curb and Gutter</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>450</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.4.1.E.1.B-N</td>
<td>Removal of Pipe</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>$1,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.4.1.F.1-N</td>
<td>Removal of Catch Basin</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>$4,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.4.1.A.1-N</td>
<td>Excavation (Plan Quantity)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>810</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$16,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307.4.1.G.1-N</td>
<td>Type &quot;P&quot; Surface Restoration</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>410</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>$21,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706.4.1.A.5-N</td>
<td>Standard 6&quot; Vertical Curb &amp; Gutter</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$14,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706.4.1.B.3-N</td>
<td>Concrete Valley Gutter</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>710</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>$53,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706.4.1.E.1.A-N</td>
<td>Concrete Sidewalk, Thickness 5&quot;</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>190</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>$14,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706.4.1.A.1-A-N</td>
<td>Pedestrian Ramp w/Delectable Warning Domes Type &quot;F1&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>$37,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706.4.1.B.1-N</td>
<td>Pedestrian Ramp w/Delectable Warning Domes Type &quot;E1&quot;</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>$37,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>801.4.1.B.1-N</td>
<td>Crushed Aggregate for Base Type I</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>300</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>$15,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>810.4.1.A.1.1-N</td>
<td>SP-3 Plant Mix Pavement Including Asphalt &amp; Additives</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>90.00</td>
<td>$13,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103.4.1.A.1-N</td>
<td>Construction Traffic Control</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5,000.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103.4.1.A.1-N</td>
<td>Traffic Control Maintenance</td>
<td>DAY</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>$9,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104.4.1.B.1-N</td>
<td>Thermoplastic Pavement Markings</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>320</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>$4,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105.4.1.A.1-N</td>
<td>Permanent Signing</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>40.00</td>
<td>$2,960.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105.4.1.C.1-N</td>
<td>Steel Sign Post (E-1)</td>
<td>LB</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>$4,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-1-N</td>
<td>Remove &amp; Reset Sign</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>200.00</td>
<td>$400.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-2-N</td>
<td>Landscape/Sod/Sprinkler Repair</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>330</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>$8,250.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-3-N</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Site Work</td>
<td>CA</td>
<td>40,000</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>$40,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-4-N</td>
<td>Erosion Sediment Control</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,000.00</td>
<td>$2,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-5-N</td>
<td>Construction Survey</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3,000.00</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-6-N</td>
<td>Remove &amp; Replace Fence</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>$450.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-7-N</td>
<td>Obliteration of Pavement Markings</td>
<td>SF</td>
<td>260</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>$1,040.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010.4.1.A.1-N</td>
<td>Mobilization (Maximum Allowed = 5% of Total Bid)</td>
<td>LS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14,700.00</td>
<td>$14,700.00</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**SUBTOTAL - NORTH NAMPA**

| Amount | 309,550.00 |
| Amount | 315,720.00 |
| Amount | 364,725.00 |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Item No.</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Quantity</th>
<th>Unit</th>
<th>Unit Price</th>
<th>Amount</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>201.4.1.D.1.A-S</td>
<td>Removal of Bituminous Surface (Up To 6&quot; Thick)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>280</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$5,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.4.1.D.1.B-S</td>
<td>Removal Of Concrete (Sidewalk/Ped Ramp/Driveway Ramp)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>30.00</td>
<td>$3,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.4.1.E.1.A-S</td>
<td>Removal Of Curb And Gutter</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$4,200.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.4.1.E.1.B-S</td>
<td>Removal Of Pipe</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$220.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>201.4.1.F.1-S</td>
<td>Removal Of Catch Basin</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>500.00</td>
<td>$500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>202.4.1.A.1-S</td>
<td>Excavation (Plan Quantity)</td>
<td>CY</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20.00</td>
<td>$740.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>307.4.1.G.1.S</td>
<td>Type &quot;P&quot; Surface Restoration (Asphalt Roadway)</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>$21,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>601.4.1.A.5-S</td>
<td>12&quot; Storm Drain Pipe, C-900 PVC</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>$300.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>602.4.1.F.1-S</td>
<td>Catch Basin - TY IV</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>$2,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706.4.1.A.1.S</td>
<td>Standard 3&quot; Rolled Curb &amp; Gutter</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>$630.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706.4.1.A.5.S</td>
<td>Standard 6&quot; Vertical Curb &amp; Gutter</td>
<td>LF</td>
<td>180</td>
<td>45.00</td>
<td>$8,100.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706.4.1.E.1.A-S</td>
<td>Concrete Sidewalk, Thickness 5&quot;</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>130</td>
<td>75.00</td>
<td>$9,750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706.4.1.E.1.B-S</td>
<td>Concrete Sidewalk On Bridge Deck</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>225.00</td>
<td>$4,050.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706.4.1.F.1-S</td>
<td>Concrete Driveway Approach, SD-710A</td>
<td>SY</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>100.00</td>
<td>$4,500.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>706.4.1.H.1-S</td>
<td>Pedestrian Ramp w/Delectable Warning Domes, SD-712G</td>
<td>EA</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2,500.00</td>
<td>$5,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>802.4.1.B.1-S</td>
<td>Crushed Aggregate for Base Type I</td>
<td>TON</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>50.00</td>
<td>$2,800.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Item Code</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>Units</td>
<td>Engineers Estimate</td>
<td>Paul Construction, Inc.</td>
<td>Hawkeye Builders, Inc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------</td>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1101.4.1.A.1-S</td>
<td>Traffic Signal (RRFB)</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$55,000.00 $55,000.00</td>
<td>$54,800.00 $54,800.00</td>
<td>$54,771.00 $54,771.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103.4.1.A.1-S</td>
<td>Construction Traffic Control</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$5,000.00 $5,000.00</td>
<td>$13,800.00 $13,800.00</td>
<td>$9,451.00 $9,451.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103.4.1.G.1-S</td>
<td>Traffic Control Maintenance</td>
<td>80 DAY</td>
<td>$100.00 $6,000.00</td>
<td>$100.00 $6,000.00</td>
<td>$116.50 $9,320.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1103.4.1.1.1-S</td>
<td>Traffic Control Flaggers</td>
<td>40 MH</td>
<td>$25.00 $1,000.00</td>
<td>$53.00 $2,120.00</td>
<td>$40.00 $1,600.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104.4.1.A.1-S</td>
<td>Painted Pavement Markings</td>
<td>770 SF</td>
<td>$2.00 $1,540.00</td>
<td>$1.25 $962.50</td>
<td>$1.15 $685.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1104.4.1.B.1-S</td>
<td>Thermoplastic Pavement Markings</td>
<td>150 SF</td>
<td>$15.00 $2,250.00</td>
<td>$9.00 $1,350.00</td>
<td>$8.70 $1,305.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105.4.1.A.1-S</td>
<td>Permanent Signing</td>
<td>64 SF</td>
<td>$40.00 $2,560.00</td>
<td>$22.00 $1,408.00</td>
<td>$23.25 $1,488.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1105.4.1.C.1-S</td>
<td>Steel Sign Posts (E-1)</td>
<td>290 LB</td>
<td>$10.00 $2,900.00</td>
<td>$6.00 $1,740.00</td>
<td>$6.10 $1,769.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2030.4.1.C.1-S</td>
<td>Valve Box Adjust To Grade</td>
<td>3 EA</td>
<td>$250.00 $750.00</td>
<td>$450.00 $1,350.00</td>
<td>$948.00 $2,844.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-2-S</td>
<td>Landscape/Sod/Sprinkler Repair</td>
<td>66 SY</td>
<td>$25.00 $1,650.00</td>
<td>$59.00 $3,894.00</td>
<td>$63.00 $4,158.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-3-S</td>
<td>Miscellaneous Site Work</td>
<td>1 CA</td>
<td>$20,000.00 $20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00 $20,000.00</td>
<td>$20,000.00 $20,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-4-S</td>
<td>Erosion Sediment Control</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$3,000.00 $3,000.00</td>
<td>$1,100.00 $1,100.00</td>
<td>$8,964.00 $8,964.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SP-5-S</td>
<td>Construction Survey</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$3,000.00 $3,000.00</td>
<td>$8,000.00 $8,000.00</td>
<td>$4,070.00 $4,070.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2010.4.1.A.1-S</td>
<td>Mobilization (Maximum Allowed = 5% of Total Bid)</td>
<td>1 LS</td>
<td>$9,000.00 $9,000.00</td>
<td>$9,410.00 $9,410.00</td>
<td>$9,029.50 $9,029.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SUBTOTAL - SUGAR STREET</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$189,140.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$197,256.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$207,706.00</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL FOR BID SCHEDULE</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$498,690.00</strong></td>
<td><strong>$512,976.50</strong></td>
<td><strong>$572,431.00</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Highlighted values indicate an apparent math error on the Bidder's Bid Form. Highlighted values reported are corrected in favor of the unit prices and the correct sum, in accordance with Article 14.01.C of the Instructions to Bidders.
RESOLUTION NO. ________________

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO, DIRECTING STAFF TO PROCEED WITH CONTRACTING FOR PHASE II OF THE NAMPA WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT IMPROVEMENTS AND APPROVING PROJECT PACKAGING AND PROJECT DELIVERY CONTRACTING METHODS.

WHEREAS, the City of Nampa is a duly formed municipal corporation of the State of Idaho and operates a wastewater treatment facility providing wastewater services to system users ("WWTP"); and

WHEREAS, the City of Nampa has been in the process of implementing significant WWTP improvements to replace and modernize older equipment and processes, provide wastewater treatment that complies with the Clean Water Act requirements embodied in Nampa’s NPDES Permit, expand capacity, and provide for the beneficial reuse of treated wastewater; and

WHEREAS, Phase I of the improvements referred to above is nearing completion and Phase II will be underway this year; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that, as with Phase I, it is feasible, efficient and more manageable to break down Phase II into various project packages to be contracted, designed and constructed separately; and

WHEREAS, to clarify for staff and instruct the contracting process, the City Council finds that the following project packaging and delivery methods for the construction of Phase II of the WWTP improvements is in the best interests of the City of Nampa.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO:

Section 1. Staff is instructed to proceed with bidding, advertising, contracting and other administrative procedures for the purposes of securing construction of Phase II of the WWTP improvements all according to law.

Section 2. Project Group D of Phase II of the WWTP improvements shall consist substantially of construction of primary digester no. 5 and the waste gas burner (flare) to be acquired through a design-bid-build project delivery method.

Section 3. Project Group E of Phase II of the WWTP improvements shall consist substantially of renovations to the laboratory and administration building to be acquired through a design-bid-build project delivery method.

Section 4. Project Group F of Phase II of the WWTP improvements shall consist substantially of construction of a new aeration basin no. 4, new blower building and blowers, new tertiary filtration pump station, new tertiary filtration, new final clarifier no. 4, replacement of the WAS and RAS pumps, new class A UV disinfection, new irrigation reuse pump station and force main, new industrial reuse pump station and force main, new internal mixed liquor recycle pumps, replace final clarifier mechanisms, replace post aeration basin structure and blower, new digested sludge storage tank, solids facility
expansion, MCC replacements, and demolition of trickling filters and secondary clarifier all to be acquired through a progressive design-build delivery method.

**Section 5.** Project Group G of Phase II of the WWTP improvements shall consist substantially of construction of primary clarifier 1 structure, mechanism and sludge pump repair and repairs for the headworks facility to be acquired through a design-bid-build project delivery method.

**Section 6.** Project Group H of Phase II of the WWTP improvements shall consist substantially of construction of a new side stream treatment facility to be acquired through a design-bid-build project delivery method.


Approved:

______________________________
Mayor

Attest:

______________________________
City Clerk
The Preliminary Design Technical Team and Wastewater Design Review Committee (DRC) evaluated packaging and delivery options for the WWTP Phase II Upgrades Project. A briefing paper has been prepared for City Council (Exhibit A).

The Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) Phase II Upgrades Project has approximately 11 discrete portions of work that could be designed and constructed separately from a technical perspective. This creates unnecessary risks for the City, such as organizational management, construction coordination and scheduling, cash flow, and limits value engineering opportunities.

All project packaging and delivery options can be successful. For large complex wastewater projects, market trends show that construction management/general contractor and design-build delivery methods are becoming more common practice (Exhibit B).

Choosing the delivery method is about alignment of City priorities. The project packaging and delivery options were evaluated on the following priorities:

- **Value Engineering/Opportunity for Innovation**
- **Owner Control**
- **Risk Allocation/Transfer**
- **City Input to Design & Delivery**
- **Lowest Capital Cost**

Four project packaging and four delivery methods were evaluated and will be presented (Exhibit C) at the public hearing.

Staff and the DRC recommend moving forward with five project packages. A copy of the DRC Meeting Summary is attached (Exhibit D).

Project Group D, E, G, and H are recommended to follow the City’s traditional delivery method of design-bid-build. For Project Group F, the complexity and six-year duration creates an opportunity for using an alternative delivery method to better manage project risks and capture innovation and value engineering. The DRC agreed that the progressive design-build contracting method would achieve the best value for the City.
The WWTP Phase II Upgrades Project has received interest from multiple consultants and contractors. Two letters of support for alternative delivery methods were also received (Exhibit E).

A resolution has been prepared to authorize the Mayor’s signature to declare the City’s intent to deliver the Wastewater Phase II Upgrades Project Group D, E, G, H as Design-Bid-Build and Group F as Progressive Design-Build to complete the Wastewater Phase II Project (Exhibit F).

The City’s legal counsel has reviewed and recommend approval of the resolution.

Public Works staff has reviewed and recommend approval of the resolution, which is included as a New Business agenda item the same day of this public hearing.
The Issue

Selecting the correct delivery approach(es) for the Phase II/III Upgrades to the Nampa Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP) is a key decision in the overall success of the Wastewater Program. Procurement methods and their resulting delivery models take numerous forms, ranging from standard design-bid-build (DBB) techniques, through construction manager/general contractor (CM/GC), to several variations of design-build (DB). Each of the traditional and collaborative project delivery methods has its own attributes that generally differ in terms of allocation of risks and responsibilities, scheduling and schedule certainty, ownership, performance guarantees, and procurement complexity. The City may opt for a combination of delivery methods across various project packages within the Phase II/III Upgrades.

The intent of this City Council briefing is to provide background information ahead of the May 20th public hearing. This briefing summarizes the recommendation for project packaging, delivery model options, survey results from the Design Review Committee (DRC), and proposed delivery approach for the Phase II Upgrades. This briefing presents additional information from previous briefings based on questions from the May 6th City Council workshop.

Background and Analysis

The Phase II Upgrades at the Nampa WWTP represent a significant capital investment for the City. Determining the preferred project packaging approach and selecting an appropriate delivery model for each project is a key step in the successful delivery of the Phase II Upgrades. The following sections summarize the background and analysis for each stage of the delivery model and project packaging development process.

Project Packaging Background

The City’s approach to project packaging is critical to implementing Phase II Upgrades at the Nampa WWTP given the scope, complexity, and regulatory schedule requirements. Project packages divide the overall Phase II Upgrades into discrete projects of varying scope and contract size. The structure of the contract packages directly impacts the organizational commitments, project schedule, and the market acceptance for the Phase II Upgrades.

Nampa’s Wastewater Preliminary Design Team prepared options for contract packaging that sought to balance schedule, site conflicts, state revolving fund loan payback terms, organizational commitments and market acceptance. This analysis paired with feedback from the DRC resulted in the recommendation of five projects as part of the Phase II Upgrades. Figure 1, attached, shows the proposed project packages. The DRC-approved project packaging approach to Phase II Upgrades comes with the following considerations:

- **Schedule:** The size and complexity of the contract packages dictates the time needed for design and construction. Larger contract packages, such as Project Group F, will require multiple years to design and construct. In contrast, smaller contract packages, such as Project Group E will have a much shorter schedule with design and construction complete in approximately two years. The recommended approach allows for expedited completion of Project Groups D and E concurrent with the design of the more complex facilities in Project Group F.
- **Site Conflicts:** Multiple contractors working simultaneously on the site increases the risk of site conflicts and associated increased costs. The recommended approach limits the number of contractors onsite...
during the periods of most intense construction activity (i.e. Project Group F). This reduces the potential for site conflict risks.

- **Organizational Commitments:** The amount of management and coordination required by the owner increases with every additional project being done. To the extent possible, the recommended packaging and delivery approach establishes manageable organizational commitments to execute the Phase II Upgrades by limiting the number of simultaneously executed project groups.

**Project Packaging Analysis**

There are approximately 11 discrete portions of that work that could feasibly be designed and constructed separately from a technical perspective. However, this many projects would create both organizational and site conflict challenges. The Preliminary Design Technical Team has developed the following options for the Phase II Upgrades contract packages.

- **Option #1** – This option consists of four contract packages – Project Groups D, E, F, and G. Project Group D consists of the fifth primary digester, the waste gas burner relocation, and the sidestream phosphorus treatment. Project Group E encompasses the new laboratory. Project Group F comprises the majority of the rehabilitation and replacement projects along with the new Aeration Basin #4 and the new blower facility. Project Group G is comprised of primarily new construction including Final Clarifier #4, the new tertiary filtration facility, and disinfection facility. It is proposed that Project Groups D and E be designed and constructed ahead of the major construction activities for Project Groups F and G.

- **Option #2** – This option also consists of four contract packages – Project Groups D, E, F, and G. The primary difference between this option and Option #1 is the inclusion of the new Aeration Basin #4 and the blower building in Project Group G. This increases the size of the larger project package (Project Group G) and reduces the size of Project Group F. Consistent with Option #1, Project Groups D and E are proposed to be designed and constructed ahead of the major construction on Project Group G.

- **Option #3** – This option reduces the number of contract packages to three – Project Groups D, E, and F. Project Groups D and E remain unchanged from the previous options and would still be proposed for early execution. For this option, all remaining work would be included in one larger design and construction package.

- **Option #4** – This option consists of five contract packages – Project Groups D, E, F, G, and H. Project Groups D and E again are consistent in both scope and proposed timing with the other options. As compared with Option #1, this option would separate the work on the eastern side of the WWTP into two separate contract packages, Project Group F and H. Project Group F constitutes the rehabilitation and replacement projects along with the primary sludge thickening building. Project Group H would then consist of the new Aeration Basin #4 and the new blower building.

An analysis of each of the options is presented in Table 1. Note that the costs presented in Table 1 are presented in 2017 dollars and reflect estimates from the Facility Plan as updated cost information was not available when the initial packages were developed.
## Table 1. Project Packaging Options Overview

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Packaging Options</th>
<th>Site Conflicts</th>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Approximate Contract Package Value¹, ²</th>
<th>Organizational Commitments</th>
<th>Financial Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option #1</strong></td>
<td>- Projects are split by either proximity or time to limit risk of site conflicts&lt;br&gt;- Two contractors working simultaneously during heavy construction period</td>
<td>- Ability to accelerate design and construction for PGD and PGE&lt;br&gt;- Design and construction of PGF and PGG would occur in parallel</td>
<td>- PGD: $17.2M&lt;br&gt;- PGE: $2.4M&lt;br&gt;- PGF: $26.5M - $35.4M&lt;br&gt;- PGG: $54.4M - $63.3M</td>
<td>- Moderate number of engineers and contractors involved&lt;br&gt;- Baseline option for organizational commitments</td>
<td>- Reduces inflation costs associated with PGD and PGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option #2</strong></td>
<td>- Potential for site conflicts between PGF and PGG due to proximity&lt;br&gt;- Reduces the size of PGF, which includes the replacement and rehabilitation projects</td>
<td>- Ability to accelerate design and construction for PGD and PGE&lt;br&gt;- Design and construction of PGF and PGG would occur in parallel</td>
<td>- PGD: $17.2M&lt;br&gt;- PGE: $2.4M&lt;br&gt;- PGF: $6.0 - $14.8M&lt;br&gt;- PGG: $75.0 M - $83.8M</td>
<td>- Moderate number of engineers and contractors involved&lt;br&gt;- Baseline option for organizational commitments</td>
<td>- Reduces inflation costs associated with PGD and PGE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option #3</strong></td>
<td>- Lowest risk of coordination issues&lt;br&gt;- One contractor working during heavy construction periods limits risk associated with site conflicts</td>
<td>- Ability to accelerate design and construction for PGD and PGE&lt;br&gt;- Design and construction for PGF occur independently</td>
<td>- PGD: $17.2M&lt;br&gt;- PGE: $2.4M&lt;br&gt;- PGF: $89.8M</td>
<td>- Least number of engineers and contractors involved&lt;br&gt;- Fewer project groups limits the organizational commitments during design and construction</td>
<td>- Reduces inflation costs associated with PGD and PGE&lt;br&gt;- Larger contract package would allow GC to maintain trade involvement and reduce the risk of increased costs&lt;br&gt;- Less ability to control cash flow through contract packaging</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Option #4</strong></td>
<td>- Highest risk of coordination issues&lt;br&gt;- Potential for up to three contractors working on site simultaneously during heavy construction periods</td>
<td>- Ability to accelerate design and construction for PGD and PGE&lt;br&gt;- Design and construction of PGF, PGG, and PGH would occur in parallel</td>
<td>- PGD: $17.2M&lt;br&gt;- PGE: $2.4M&lt;br&gt;- PGF: $6.0 - $14.8M&lt;br&gt;- PGG: $54.4M - $63.3M&lt;br&gt;- PGH: $18.1M</td>
<td>- Most contractors and engineers involved&lt;br&gt;- More project groups increases the organizational commitments during design and construction</td>
<td>- Reduces inflation costs associated with PGD and PGE&lt;br&gt;- Increased number of project groups may result in higher bids for later packages due to availability of trades</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

¹ All costs are presented in unescalated 2017 dollars.

² Contract values are based on Facility Plan cost estimates. These estimates have a range of -30% to +50%, which is not reflected in this table.
Project Delivery Approaches Overview

Project delivery and procurement methods have generally evolved from the traditional DBB approach as the “baseline” most commonly used by public entities. In recent decades, the various collaborative delivery methodologies have emerged as viable alternatives to traditional delivery. These alternatives to DBB seek to better allocate risk and responsibility, save time, and support a selection methodology beyond low-bid capital price. Four delivery methods for municipal wastewater projects were considered for the Phase II Upgrades: traditional DBB, CM/GC, Progressive Design-Build (PDB), and Fixed Price Design-Build (FPDB). These delivery models are discussed in more detail below and the contractual relationships are shown in the figure attached to this briefing.

- **Design-Bid-Build:** DBB has historically been the most common approach to developing public infrastructure projects. A typical DBB project involves the owner engaging one or more engineering firms to develop a detailed design and specifications. The owner then uses the detailed design and specifications package as part of a contract package to obtain bids from contractors. The contractor selected through the competitive bidding process is subsequently engaged to construct the facility in accordance with the bid price and schedule.

  Roles in a DBB project are normally very clearly defined. Design and project performance risks lie with the design team. Construction and scheduling risks lie with the contractor. Operations risk rests with the owner. However, contractors and operators may not have significant input into the design, which can contribute to change orders. Claims during construction are common, and the requirement for some redesign during construction exists, typically at the owner’s cost. In addition, design performance or lifecycle responsibility and risk is not typically transferable using DBB delivery.

- **Construction Manager/General Contractor:** CM/GC is also considered a traditional delivery model, albeit an improved approach where an intentional overlap is created between the engineer and the contractor, allowing the contractor to bring construction insight to bear as early as practical in the design process. This methodology maintains two separate contracts between the owner and the design and CM/GC firms, similar to DBB, but encourages collaboration during design to reduce risk once the contractor proceeds to construction in the field.

  While in conformance to most traditional procurement processes (where the engineer is selected using traditional professional services criteria), this method introduces the concept of contractor selection without a hard bid of the construction cost. Instead, contractors are generally selected based on their qualifications in combination with their proposed scope of services and fee for service prior to construction as well as their fee and overhead costs for construction services. The ultimate construction cost is developed during the design period, typically in an open-book fashion, and ultimately agreed upon as a “guaranteed maximum price” (GMP) or lump sum prior to authorizing the start of construction.

  While promoting collaboration early in the design process, the formal contract vehicles with separate agreements between the Owner and Engineer, and the Owner and Contractors are essentially unchanged compared to traditional DBB delivery. During construction delivery, traditional practices for managing contractor change orders, requests for information from the designer, and verification of construction performance remain unchanged.

- **Progressive Design-Build:** Progressive design build is a version of design-build, which is authorized by Idaho Code Ann. § 67-2309. In a progressive design-build procurement, a design-builder is selected based primarily on qualifications and, where local practice dictates, limited pricing information generally similar to the CM/GC model with an added component of cost for design and preconstruction services (either in a lump-sum or on a not-to-exceed basis for this early work). As the design-builder develops the design, a construction cost estimate is progressively developed, often in conjunction with the 30- and 60-percent levels of design detail. Once the design is well advanced (beyond 60 percent and often up to 90 percent), a GMP is defined for approval by the owner. If the design-builder and the owner cannot
reach agreement on an acceptable GMP or lump sum, the owner can use the completed design as the basis for a hard construction bid procurement. In this case, an “off-ramp” occurs and the project becomes more like a contract DBB, which may impact design ownership.

Progressive procurements are often preferred when a project lacks definition or final permitting or when an owner prefers to remain involved in the design process while leveraging the schedule, collaboration, and contractual advantages provided by a DB approach. This model is also valuable when regulatory permitting requires well-developed design solutions, or when an owner believes that it can lower cost by participating in design decisions and in managing risk progressively through the project definition phase. It is the owner’s responsibility (or its designee’s responsibility) to provide clear and consistent direction to the design-builder (or designer and contractor).

- **Fixed Price Design-Build:** Fixed price design-build is another version of design-build. In a fixed price design-build procurement, the procurement documents generally includes a conceptual design as a minimum and a 30 percent design (sometimes referred to as a “bridging” design) as a maximum. Requirements for a performance-based approach are stated as measurable performance objectives of the completed project rather than the specific approaches or processes the design-builder should follow to achieve those objectives. Requirements for a prescriptive approach rely on the pre-design documents as required templates for the design-builder.

A performance-based procurement gives a design-builder the flexibility to propose how they will meet the owner’s objectives, while requiring proposers to provide a lump sum, fixed price for completion of the project. Alternatively, owners may ask for a “target price” for construction that establishes a not-to-exceed construction price basis, while allowing the owner to collaborate on and adjust scope during detailed design definition. In this case, the “target” lump sum can be adjusted after award but only as directed via owner-approved scope changes. Except for these explicitly approved owner changes, the design-builder must conform to their originally proposed price. Thus, this option provides some confirmation of a set price for the project. This model is used to prompt industry’s most innovative and cost-effective solutions through what is essentially a design competition, typically in combination with a need to accelerate schedule.

**Design Review Committee Survey Results**

The DRC participated in a survey during DRC Meeting #4 designed to solicit feedback on specific aspects of project delivery to inform a delivery method determination. The same survey was administered to the City staff participating in the preliminary design process in December 2018.

The survey administered to the DRC and City staff is an objective method for evaluating delivery methods. Brown and Caldwell (BC) used an anonymous, interactive polling methodology to force-rank priorities relative to each other. This prioritization process is based on the premise that all identified issues are fundamentally important but that there is a degree of relative importance among them. Internal to each primary issue, the questions within each group were also all considered to be critical, important issues. Similarly, each of these issues is assumed to have a relative importance. Responses were also used to create a relative weighting for the primary issue groups as well as for the questions/issues contained within each group. Based on the responses to the survey, the following list indicates the priorities for the Phase II Upgrades delivery options. The numbers in the parentheses following the category indicate the relative weighting of the group on a scale from 0 to 100.

1. Getting the “best” value (71.1)
2. Clearly defining scope and configuration (67.0)
3. Establishing accountability for performance (59.9)
4. Retaining Nampa control and decision-making (57.9)
5. Getting the “best” price (56.9)
Within these priorities the following aspects of the delivery method carried the most weight within the overall evaluation and recommendation.

1. Considering the entire lifecycle versus just the capital cost
2. Seeing real cost versus just the price
3. Achieving quality and performance
4. Accommodating project complexity during design/construction
5. Focusing on operations to increase lifecycle efficiency
6. Requiring proven solutions to reduce risk
7. Coordinating among other projects and systems
8. Controlling and making design decisions
9. Integrating O&M expertise into the design process*

*Applicable to new construction projects.

Based on the identified priorities BC developed an assessment of the effectiveness of each delivery model in addressing each identified concern or objective. This assessment accounted for the relative importance of each issue in respect to the favorability (or unfavorability) of each potential delivery model. The output of the assessment ranked each delivery model relative to the others.

The results of the delivery method analysis indicate a preference towards the PDB delivery model for both new construction and rehabilitation projects. This preference is a result of several factors. First, there is an interest in cost transparency and the consideration of life-cycle costs within design and construction decisions. This lends itself towards the CM/GC and PDB delivery models. Second, there is an interest in maintaining input in the design process. This makes the FPDB approach less favorable. Finally, there is also an interest in assigning performance requirements to the designer, which lends itself to a PDB approach. This preference in delivery model applies primarily to larger, more complex project groups within the Phase II Upgrades. More traditional methods, such as DBB, are still considered viable approaches to delivering smaller, less technically complex projects.

Construction Manager / General Contractor Delivery Model

The City has not used the CM/GC delivery model for any of the projects at the Nampa WWTP. Therefore, this section describes this delivery model in detail.

Overview

The CM/GC model is a two-phase collaborative delivery method. This model involves contracting with two separate entities, one for design engineer and one for a CM/GC firm (i.e. contractor), which is similar with DBB delivery from a contractual standpoint. There are two phases to the CM/GC contract. Phase I involves preconstruction services at approximately the 30 percent design stage, followed by agreement on the project schedule and GMP or fixed price at the 60 to 90 design completion point. Phase II is when the CM/GC firm acts as the general contractor, including further design review, subcontractor/vendor procurement, self-performance of certain owner-specified elements, project construction, and commissioning.

CM/GC is a favorable model when the owner wishes to use traditional DBB delivery but maintain control over project definition and design. Unlike DBB delivery, the CM/GC firm is typically procured at the 30 percent design milestone; this intentional overlap is how the CM/GC model facilitates collaboration during design to reduce risk once the contractor proceeds to construction in the field. The CM/GC firm includes preconstruction services, which involve providing input to the design phase for aspects such as site layout, constructability, general arrangements, and early price and schedule factors. The CM/GC’s early involvement increases budget certainty and decreases constructability risks.
After the CM/GC proposes and agrees to a GMP or fixed price with the City, they can begin construction. The CM/GC firm functions as the familiar general contractor role through construction, commissioning and startup. At the end of the project construction the City is responsible for the completed project (i.e. CM/GC firm does not provide performance guarantees).

City’s Role in Project Delivery Process
The CM/GC model increases the role of the owner in the delivery process. The CM/GC model requires the owner to be proactive in collaborating between the designer and CM/GC firm, as these entities have an informal, “embedded relationship.” The City will be required to assess and provide direction on proposals from both the design engineer and CM/GC firm. Following these decisions, active scope management will be necessary from the City, design engineer, and CM/GC firm to maintain clarity on expectations for the scope, schedule, and budget. This is similar to the traditional DBB methodology, but will require greater City involvement as compared to the PDB approach. The City’s role as a liaison between the designer and CM/GC firm is critical to avoiding an “off-ramp” scenario, where an agreement on the GMP or fixed price is not achieved, and the City terminates the CM/GC firm’s contract.

Risk Transfer
Project design risk is retained by the City. Because CM/GC delivery has two separate contract relationships with the designer and CM/GC firm, it has similar risk allocation as traditional DBB delivery. The designer’s responsibility is limited to the standard of care and the CM/GC firm is held to the as-bid construction documents, not the mechanical completion of the project. It is ultimately the City’s responsibility to evaluate the merits of a change order, entitling the CM/GC to compensation related to the design changes and interpretation. The CM/GC firm is not liable for project performance or the finished product (i.e. the quantity and quality of effluent).

Table A, provided as an attachment, provides a summary of risk allocation for CM/GC compared to DBB and PDB delivery models.

Determining Project Price and Project Value
During CM/GC firm procurement, there is little project price information. The CM/GC firm’s contract provides preconstruction services, including value engineering and cost estimating to develop the proposed schedule and GMP or fixed price. The CM/GC proposals will include a cost for these services as well as established markup for overhead and profit for construction costs. The CM/GC firm uses an open-book price development process, which gives more transparency to the City as to cost of work, self-performance, and other factors, similar to a PDB approach. The City and CM/GC firm would strive to reach agreement on project schedule and either GMP or fixed price, at the 60 to 90 percent design completion stage. Construction begins once there is agreement on project price. If the City and CM/GC firm cannot reach an agreement on price, an “off-ramp” exists where the City can terminate the CM/GC firm’s contract and pursue negotiations with another CM/GC firm, or have the design finished and execute a DBB procurement.

Performance Guarantees
Performance risk for the project is held by the City in the CM/GC delivery method. The design engineer’s liability is established by the standard of care. Similarly, the CM/GC firm is expected to deliver the as-bid project. The City retains the risk of performance of the complete project, assuming these two conditions have been met. This is shown in more detail in Table A, which is attached to this briefing.

Progressive Design-Build Delivery Model
The City has not used the PDB delivery model for any of the projects at the Nampa WWTP. Therefore, this section describes this delivery model in detail.
Overview

PDB delivery is a two-phase, collaborative delivery method where the project’s design, cost-estimating, construction schedule and final guaranteed maximum price (GMP) or fixed price are developed in phase one. Phase two encompasses the final design, construction and commissioning of the project. Phase two begins only if the City and the design-builder reach agreement on the schedule and GMP or fixed price.

The PDB model uses a collaborative relationship between the City and the design-builder. The PDB procurement stage uses the familiar two-step RFQ and RFP process to select a design-builder based primarily on qualifications. There is little project price definition and additional pre-construction services. The PDB delivery facilitates greater City input into the design process than other design-build approaches. This model uses concurrent design development and construction cost estimation, with iterative cost estimates prepared that help “design to budget.” Once the City and design-builder agree upon a GMP or fixed price the project would advance to construction. If the design-builder and the owner cannot reach agreement on an acceptable GMP or fixed price, the owner can use the completed design as the basis for a hard construction bid procurement (i.e. the traditional DBB approach). In this case, an “off-ramp” occurs, and the project becomes more like a contract DBB, which may impact design ownership.

At the conclusion of construction, the design-builder is responsible for demonstrating the facility’s performance through an acceptance-testing procedure that is agreed upon with the City and included in the contract. Performance risk is borne by the design-builder until the City accepts the project, which represents the transfer of operation, maintenance, and performance risk to the City.

The PDB delivery model has some defining characteristics as compared to other, more traditional delivery models such as DBB and CM/GC as well as the FPDB model. The following sections describe these characteristics in more detail.

City’s Role in Project Delivery Process

The PDB model allows for greater owner involvement in project delivery compared to traditional design-build delivery methods. The City would follow an RFQ process to generate a short list of candidate design-build firms. The City next conducts interviews and selects the design-build firm based on qualifications, past performance, and limited pricing information. The design-builder and City would develop the project scope and detailed design together. This allows for continued input from the Nampa WWTP staff throughout the design process, similar to the traditional DBB delivery model. The design-builder also prepares the construction cost estimate progressively and in parallel to the detailed design development. The City would negotiate the price with the design-builder, manage the design-build contact, verify that performance guarantees have been met, and transition operations after the constructed project is accepted.

Risk Transfer

Project design risk is shared by the design-builder and the City because they work together during the design phase, with the City providing input to the design at specific milestones. This collaboration reduces risk of design decisions impacting constructability. Because of the single-point responsibility for the design-builder, design coordination risks are shifted to the design-builder, which distinguished PDB from DBB and CM/GC delivery methods. These risks often result in project changes in the DBB and CM/GC delivery methods because the designer’s liability is limited to the “standard of care” and the contractor’s liability is restricted to the as-bid construction documents.

The design-builder retains construction schedule risks, assuming the design reviews and other City responsibilities are met. The cost of the constructed project up to the GMP is the responsibility of the City, such as price escalation not explicitly addressed by the contract, owner-requested changes in scope, and changed conditions. Beyond the GMP limit, the design-builder is responsible for budget overages. The design-builder is responsible for project performance/acceptance. The quantity and quality of the facility effluent, which can be specified in the contract standards, is the responsibility of the design-builder to achieve.
The design-builder is responsible for demonstrating the facility’s performance through an acceptance-testing procedure that is agreed upon with the City during the contract negotiation or GMP/fixed price negotiation stages. The contract explicitly states these performance standards required for project acceptance. Performance risk is borne by the design-builder until the City accepts the project, which represents the transfer of operation, maintenance, and performance risk to the City.

The attached table (Table A) shows the risk transfer profile for the PDB delivery model as it relates to the Phase II Upgrades. The risk transfer profile for the DBB delivery and CM/GC approaches are also shown for comparison. The risks with differing risk profiles between the delivery models are highlighted for convenience.

**Determining Project Price and Project Value**

At the point when the City procures a design-builder firm there is little price definition. The selected design-builder prepares a fixed price or GMP for the project. The City can help select key subcontractors and equipment suppliers proposed by the design-builder and used in their cost estimation. The City and design-builder would collaborate to determine the team that will provide the most value.

During the design development, the construction cost is progressively developed by the design-builder often in conjunction with the 30- and 60-percent levels of design detail. The iterative, “design to budget” approach to cost estimates from the design-builder help ensure the project budget is not exceeded. As compared to the often single, value engineering step within a DBB or CM/GC model, this continuous price feedback allows the City to constantly evaluate decisions and adjust as needed to deliver the best overall project value.

After sufficient design definition is achieved, often around the 60- to 90-percent range, a proposed GMP or fixed price is prepared by the design-builder for City approval. There is an “off-ramp” in the event the City and design-builder cannot reach an agreement on the GMP or fixed price. The City could either renegotiate with a different design-build firm or opt to take the partially-completed design and proceed with a DBB procurement.

**Performance Guarantees**

Compared to traditional DBB and CM/GC delivery, the PDB model shifts performance risk responsibility from the City to the design-builder through performance guarantees. The PDB model involves an “acceptance test” where the design-builder must demonstrate the project meets performance standards established in the contract. The performance standards may be set in the initial contract or can be negotiated as part of the GMP or fixed price negotiations process. Performance standards can include hydraulics, effluent quality, quantity (volume) of treatment, and/or regulatory requirements. The acceptance test is typically performed over a 30-day period to confirm the performance standards can be achieved. The achievement of these standards can be a pass/fail test. If the project doesn’t pass, the design builder has the opportunity to make adjustments and re-test. If the performance standards are still not met after multiple acceptance tests, the design-builder is liable for liquidated damages or may have to invest in capital fixes to remedy the issues.

**Recommendation**

The Nampa WWTP Phase II Upgrades are proposed to be delivered as five distinct project groups using a combination of DBB and PDB delivery methods. Survey results from the DRC and City staff presented a preference in delivery model characteristics that align with the PDB delivery approach. Therefore, this is recommended as the delivery method for Project Group F, the largest and most technically complex portion of the Phase II Upgrades. The other project groups are proposed to be delivered using the traditional DBB approach. Table 2, below, summarizes the recommended project packaging and project delivery methods for the Phase II Upgrades.
## Table 2. Overview of Recommended Project Packaging and Delivery Approach to Phase II Upgrades

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Group Name</th>
<th>Project Group Components</th>
<th>Approximate Package Value(^1,2,3)</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Group D    | • Primary Digester No.5  
                  • Waste Gas Burner (Flare) | $9.9M                              | Design-Bid-Build |
| Project Group E    | • Renovation of the Laboratory and Administration Building | $2.9M                              | Design-Bid-Build |
| Project Group F    | • New Aeration Basin No.4  
                  • New Blower Building and Blowers  
                  • Demo Trickling Filters, Secondary Clarifier  
                  • New Tertiary Filtration Pump Station  
                  • New Tertiary Filtration  
                  • New Final Clarifier No.4  
                  • Replace WAS and RAS Pumps  
                  • New Class A UV Disinfection  
                  • New Irrigation Reuse Pump Station and Forcemain\(^4\)  
                  • New Industrial Reuse Pump Station and Forcemain\(^4\)  
                  • New Internal Mixed Liquor Recycle Pumps \(^4\)  
                  • Replace Final Clarifier Mechanisms  
                  • Replace Post Aeration Basin Structure and Blower  
                  • New Digested Sludge Storage Tank  
                  • Solids Facility Expansion  
                  • MCC Replacements | $126.4M                              | Progressive Design-Build |
| Project Group G    | • Primary Clarifier 1 Structure, Mechanism, and Sludge Pump Repair  
                  • Repairs for Headworks Facility | $4.5M                              | Design-Bid-Build\(^5\) |
| Project Group H    | • New Sidestream Treatment Facility | $12.4M                              | Design-Bid-Build\(^6\) |

---

1. All costs are presented in escalated dollars based on current program schedules.
2. Contract values are based on programmatic cost estimates and include design and construction related costs. These estimates have a range of -30% to +50%, which is not reflected.
3. Approximate Contract Values do not include Programmatic Contingency.
4. Inclusion of scope items depends on decision to accelerate Recycled Water Program.
5. Project delivery approach may be changed in the future as project is further defined.
**Table A. Risk Transfer Profiles for DBB, CM/GC, and PDB Delivery Models**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Risk</th>
<th>Design-Bid-Build</th>
<th>Construction Manager/General Contractor</th>
<th>Progressive Design-Build</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Contractor</td>
<td>Owner</td>
<td>CM/GC</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Land and Easement Acquisition</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical Requirements</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Design</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Building and Administrative Permits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coordination with Existing Facilities</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environmental Approvals and Permits</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fines and Penalties</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity and Quality of Influent</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quantity and Quality of Effluent (finished water)</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Performance 2</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Proprietary Processes or Equipment</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Shared</td>
<td>Shared</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schedule 3</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cost of Constructed Project beyond GMP/Bid</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing Site Conditions</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction Warranty</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>X</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defined Uncontrollable Circumstances</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Materials Cost Escalation 5</td>
<td>X</td>
<td></td>
<td>TBD</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

1. Adapted from the Water Design Build Council’s Water and Wastewater Design-Build Handbook (Fifth Edition)
2. In PDB model, the design-builder provides performance guarantee. CM/GC does not provide performance guarantees. CM/GC’s responsibility is for mechanical completion of project and system/performance testing.
3. This is the agreed-upon schedule between owner and CM/GC/design-build firm.
4. CMAR firm generally won’t provide professional liability insurance, since on a CM/GC project this lies with the design engineer under its contract directly with the owner.
5. PDB can include provisions in contracts to address price escalation.
### Design-Bid-Build (DBB)

**Features/Process:**
- **Owner selects Engineer**
- Engineer designs project, develops plans/specs, and evaluates bids
- Construction awarded to lowest responsive, responsible bidder
- Construction monitored by Engineer or CM

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Owner retains control of design</td>
<td>• Owner maintains majority of risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More bidders for construction contracts</td>
<td>• Finger-pointing between designer and contractor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Independent oversight of construction contractor</td>
<td>• Longer schedule</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Traditional/well understood</td>
<td>• Potential for claims and change orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More Owner staff resources required</td>
<td>• Later certainty of construction $5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| WORKS BEST WHEN...                                                   |                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|                                                             |
| • Project requires high degree of public oversight                   |                                                             |
| • Owner desires extensive involvement in design                      |                                                             |
| • Schedule is not a priority                                         |                                                             |

### Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC)

**Features/Process:**
- **Owner selects Engineer and CM/GC based on qualifications**
- Engineer designs project
- CM/GC involved during design (constructability, value engineering, cost estimates)
- Owner and CM/GC negotiate GMP at some point in design
- Subcontractors can be competitively bid

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Avoids low bid</td>
<td>• Does not eliminate designer-contractor conflicts</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Contractor involved during design</td>
<td>• No significant schedule benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Owner retains some involvement in design</td>
<td>• Later certainty of construction price than DB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Earlier certainty of construction price than DB</td>
<td>• Owner retains most of performance risk</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• More Owner staff resources required</td>
<td>• More Owner staff resources required</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| WORKS BEST WHEN...                                                   |                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|                                                             |
| • Project requires high degree of public oversight                   |                                                             |
| • Owner desires extensive involvement in design                      |                                                             |
| • Schedule is not a priority                                         |                                                             |

### Design-Build (DB)

**Features/Process:**
- **Select D/B primarily on qualifications**
- D/B prepares 30% design then negotiate GMP
- GMP negotiations are “open book”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Relatively easy procurement process</td>
<td>• Complex construction project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DB selection is primarily qualifications-based</td>
<td>• Construction at an existing facility that must continue to operate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Owner retains some involvement in design</td>
<td>• Contractor input to design is critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Price is open book and transparent</td>
<td>• Low-bid contractor selection is risky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| WORKS BEST WHEN...                                                   |                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|                                                             |
| • Project requires high degree of public oversight                   |                                                             |
| • Owner desires extensive involvement in design                      |                                                             |
| • Schedule is not a priority                                         |                                                             |

### Progressive

**Features/Process:**
- **Select D/B primarily on qualifications**
- D/B prepares 30% design then negotiate GMP
- GMP negotiations are “open book”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• Relatively easy procurement process</td>
<td>• Complex construction project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• DB selection is primarily qualifications-based</td>
<td>• Construction at an existing facility that must continue to operate</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Owner retains some involvement in design</td>
<td>• Contractor input to design is critical</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Price is open book and transparent</td>
<td>• Low-bid contractor selection is risky</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| WORKS BEST WHEN...                                                   |                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|                                                             |
| • Project requires high degree of public oversight                   |                                                             |
| • Owner desires extensive involvement in design                      |                                                             |
| • Schedule is not a priority                                         |                                                             |

### Fixed Price

**Features/Process:**
- **Select Designer to prepare preliminary (10-30%) design**
- Competitive procurement of D/B with GMP
- D/B performs final design and constructs project
- T-Rex Model

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PROS</th>
<th>CONS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>• One contract</td>
<td>• Does not foster design innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Competitive pricing</td>
<td>• Less choice in selection of final designer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Owner retains some involvement in design</td>
<td>• Price is only partially competitive</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| WORKS BEST WHEN...                                                   |                                                             |
|----------------------------------------------------------------------|                                                             |
| • Project requires high degree of public oversight                   |                                                             |
| • Predominantly a construction project                               |                                                             |
| • Schedule and early price certainty are high priorities to Owner    |                                                             |
EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

2018 ANNUAL RESEARCH REPORT ON COLLABORATIVE-DELIVERY USE AND GROWTH IN THE WATER AND WASTEWATER SECTOR
Between 2013 and 2017, WD3C's members participated in 650 collaborative-delivery projects worth an estimated $29.82 billion. During that period, the use of collaborative-delivery methods—progressive design-build, fixed-price design-build, and construction management at-risk—for water and wastewater projects grew steadily from $3.4 billion, approximately 8% of the total market, to about $5.29 billion, or nearly 12% of the total market. This represents a compound annual growth rate of 10.3%, even while the overall market was flat.

This growth is expected to continue to increase at an even faster pace at least through 2021, with a forecasted total market size of $6.1 billion in that year.

Six states lead in the design-build market, accounting for >75% of project volume.
What Drives Owners to Use Collaborative-Delivery Methods

Extensive interviews of leading owners identified the core drivers influencing their use of collaborative-delivery methods.

- More control of project design and implementation
- Better management of project risk
- Faster project delivery times
- Regulatory requirements
- Integration of design, construction, and operations
- Interest of design-build teams
- Clearer lines of responsibility
- Increasingly complex technical solutions
- Similar successful projects
- Anticipated cost savings

Future Trends in Collaborative-Delivery Methods

Percentage of Owners Reporting Increased Use of Collaborative Delivery

Research Question:
What percentage of the total capital expenditure will be spent on collaborative-delivery methods, such as fixed-price design-build, progressive design-build, or construction management at-risk?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2018</th>
<th>2019–2023</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12.1%</td>
<td>3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.1%</td>
<td>15.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>27.3%</td>
<td>24.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.3%</td>
<td>30.3%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Design-Build/CMAR percent of planned capital expenditures
- None
- <10%
- 10-25%
- 25-50%
- >50%

© 2019 Water Design-Build Council, Inc.
Trends in Types of Collaborative-Delivery Methods

Number of projects delivered by owners (2013–2017)

- Construction Management at-Risk
- Fixed-Price Design-Build
- Progressive Design-Build

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Wastewater</th>
<th>Water</th>
<th>Combination</th>
<th>Other</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Projects</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Value of projects delivered by owners (2013–2017)

- Progressive Design-Build: $14.2B
- Fixed-Price Design-Build: $10.2B
- Construction Management at-Risk: $5.5B

Owners Report a Rapidly Growing Preference for Progressive Design-Build

- 2013: 39%
- 2014: 39%
- 2015: 40%
- 2016: 62%
- 2017: 62%

Primary reasons owners report their preference for progressive design-build delivery:

1. More influence over equipment selection, which in turn helps ensure that the utility can continue known O&M practices and meet forecasted O&M budgets
2. Increased participation in early-stage design innovation, logistics and construction decisions, and interface with other utility initiatives
3. Overall more participation, which leads to a higher likelihood of delivering a competitively procured, higher-quality project

© 2019 Water Design-Build Council, Inc.
Answering the Research Questions

The results of the annual research studies conducted for the WDBC highlight the significant increased use of collaborative-delivery methods by owners in the water/wastewater industry and growing trend to continue to do so. The answers to the 2018 research questions give compelling insights into this trend.

What are the number of projects, total project value, and market share for the collaborative-delivery methods?

The compiled project data through 2018 show that progressive design-build delivery emerged as the leading collaborative method during 2015 and continues as the preferred approach in the U.S. water and wastewater sector to date.

While owners seemed to prefer progressive design-build delivery over fixed-price for wastewater projects, they used both fixed-price and progressive design-build about evenly when developing new water supply and treatment projects. The value of the projects was not a determining factor in selecting the preferred delivery method, but rather which one could most effectively achieve the owner's project objectives.

Is it reasonable to forecast these same trends for the future?

In 2013, 8% of the total market for water and wastewater projects (worth over $3.4 billion) used some form of collaborative-delivery method. In 2017, this same market segment showed a 12% increase in growth of the use of collaborative-delivery methods (worth nearly $5.29 billion). So the short answer is, yes, if this trend continues to increase at this rate, then it may be reasonable to expect an annual conservative rate of growth in the use of collaborative-delivery methods, which means collaborative-delivery projects could play a dominant role in the marketplace by 2025.

What are the decision-making drivers for collaborative-delivery methods?

The drivers behind the use of collaborative-delivery methods are clear. Owners state that the decision to use collaborative-delivery methods is influenced by the ability to have a more efficient integration of technical input among key stakeholders during the design process, which then results in a more transparent project cost. They further cited that they like being able to engage during the design process, which enables them to make better decisions on how to allocate and manage risk more appropriately. Budget limitations, regulatory complexities, new technology, and the ability to achieve integrated project solutions are key considerations by owners that influence decisions to use collaborative-delivery methods.

Lastly, as new financing mechanisms become available that allow for hybrid delivery approaches, the use of collaborative-delivery methods continues to increase. As evidenced in the research findings in 2017 and 2018, the use of collaborative-delivery methods for water and wastewater infrastructure will not only continue to increase, but will likely become a dominant preference of owners.

---

**RESEARCH METHODOLOGY** — WDBC's 2018 research examined specific trends in the use of three types of collaborative-delivery methods (fixed-price design-build, progressive design-build, and construction management at-risk) through three tasks. The first updated the 2017 project database with current data by surveying 18 WDBC members, whom we estimate participate in about 75% to 80% of the dollar value of the total market. The second task involved in-depth interviews of owners that either considered or pursued collaborative-delivery methods for water and/or wastewater projects in 2017 and 2018 to better understand how and why they made such decisions and whether the process of collaborative delivery was successful. The third task consisted of an online survey of owners, practitioners, water/wastewater technology suppliers, and others (mostly educators and regulators), asking many of the same questions from the in-depth interviews of owners, such as procurement trends within their organizations and the market as a whole; trends in the three forms of collaborative-delivery methods used; drivers underlying decisions for procurement; types of projects for which each collaborative method is best suited; and the future use for each.

**RESEARCH FINDINGS** — The results of the Council's market research confirm that collaborative delivery is widely accepted and used by the nation's public utilities for a variety of water/wastewater treatment and related infrastructure projects. Moreover, the findings confirm that a clear increase in popularity exists for design-build in this market space. In keeping with its education and research mission, the Council intends to regularly update this market research.

**ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS** — The Water Design-Build Council expresses its sincere appreciation to Dr. Kenneth Rubin and Amit Dalal (Rubin Mallows Worldwide) for their thorough and insightful research. This work continues to guide the development of new research, industry best practices, and most importantly, the educational needs of all industry members. Special thanks to Dr. Edward Wetzel, PE, at-large board member (retired), and chair of the Research Committee that guided this work.

© 2019 Water Design-Build Council, Inc.
The Water Design-Build Council’s mission is advancing design-build delivery methods to transform the water industry—through collaborative thought leadership and education, supported by research.

**WDBC MEMBERS**

WDBC is currently comprised of 17 regular member firms. Regular membership in the Council consists of any private sector legal entity of whatever form, including affiliates and subsidiaries, who: (1) are frequently and regularly engaged in providing design-build and other forms of collaborative delivery in the water industry as a prime contractor (including joint venture partner or member of a special purpose corporation) accepting performance guarantee risks; and (2) have in-depth, in-house comprehensive professional engineering capabilities or self-perform construction capabilities. Regular members must have appropriate licenses or authority to perform its work as recognized by the appropriate governmental body in which the organization conducts its business to design and build public or private (including investor-owned, rate-regulated utilities) water or wastewater systems or facilities in North America. Regular members directly engage in contracting for design-build and other forms of collaborative delivery, as opposed to providing ancillary activities, such as serving as a consultant to owners on technical, institutional, legal, procurement, commercial, or other collaborative-delivery related issues.

**WDBC ADVISORS**

WDBC advisor members are an affiliated category of firms working with, and providing services to, engineering and construction firms in the water design-build industry. Candidates for this group include legal, insurance and finance firms, equipment suppliers, consultants, contractors, vendors, trade associations, and academic institutions. WDBC created this membership category to provide opportunities for service providers engaged in the water industry to collaborate with other member firms and gain further recognition of their services in design-build and other forms of collaborative delivery.
Nampa WWTP Phase II/III Preliminary Design: Project Packaging and Delivery Approach Public Hearing

June 3, 2019
1. Introduction
2. Defining Nampa’s Priorities
3. Project Packaging Options
4. Design Review Committee Preferred Packaging
5. Overview of 3 Delivery Methods
6. Design Review Committee Delivery Recommendation
Identifying Nampa’s Priorities

DRC and Staff Survey Results – How do these align with delivery?
DRC survey sought to understand 5 key priorities:

1. Clearly defining scope and configuration
2. Establishing accountability for performance
3. Retaining Nampa control and decision-making
4. Getting the “best” price
5. Getting the “best” value

Key priorities for the Wastewater Program then aligned to delivery methods
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Scale 1:100</th>
<th>Priority</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>71.1</td>
<td>Getting the “best” value</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>67.0</td>
<td>Clearly defining scope and configuration</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>59.9</td>
<td>Establishing accountability for performance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>57.9</td>
<td>Retaining Nampa control and decision-making</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>56.9</td>
<td>Getting the “best” price</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
How City’s ranked priorities align with delivery

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Key Wastewater Program Priority</th>
<th>Design-Build Feature</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>#1 – Getting the “best” value</td>
<td>Value Engineering/Opportunity for Innovation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#2 – Clearly defining scope and configuration</td>
<td>Owner Control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#3 – Establishing accountability for performance</td>
<td>Risk Allocation / Transfer</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#4 – Retaining Nampa control and decision-making power</td>
<td>City Input to Design &amp; Delivery</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>#5 – Getting the “best” price</td>
<td>Lowest Capital Cost</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Phase II Upgrades: Project Packaging

Options Overview & DRC Recommendation
Key Project Packaging Considerations

- Multiple options for how to deliver the Phase II Upgrades
- Project packaging needs to balance multiple criteria

✔ Site Conflicts
✔ Schedule
✔ Contract Package Value
✔ Organizational Commitments
✔ Financial Capacity
**Recommended Phase II Packaging**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Group Name</th>
<th>Project Group Components</th>
<th>Approximate Package Value</th>
<th>1, 2, 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| Project Group D    | • Primary Digester No.5  
                    • Waste Gas Burner (Flare)                                                    |                           | $9.9M   |
| Project Group E    | • Renovated Laboratory and Administration Building                                        |                           | $2.9M   |
| Project Group F    | • New Aeration Basin No.4  
                    • New Blower Building and Blowers  
                    • Demo Trickling Filters, Secondary Clarifier  
                    • New Tertiary Filtration Pump Station  
                    • New Tertiary Filtration  
                    • New Final Clarifier No.4  
                    • Replace WAS and RAS Pumps  
                    • New Class A UV Disinfection  
                    • New Irrigation Reuse Pump Station and Forcemain  
                    • New Industrial Reuse Pump Station and Forcemain  
                    • New Internal Mixed Liquor Recycle Pumps  
                    • Replace Final Clarifier Mechanisms  
                    • Replace Post Aeration Basin Structure and Blower  
                    • New Digested Sludge Storage Tank  
                    • Solids Facility Expansion  
                    • MCC Replacements                                                     |                           | $126.4M |
| Project Group G    | • Primary Clarifier 1 Structure, Mechanism, and Sludge Pump Repair  
                    • Repairs for Headworks Facility                                              |                           | $4.5M   |
| Project Group H    | • New Sidestream Treatment Facility                                                      |                           | $12.4M  |
Overview of Project Delivery Models

Summary of Design-Build-Bid, Construction Manager / General Contractor, and Progressive Design-Build
**Design-Bid-Build (DBB)**

- **Pros**:
  - Owner retains control of design
  - More bidders for construction contracts
  - Independent oversight of construction contractor
  - Traditional, well-understood

- **Cons**:
  - Owner maintains majority of risk
  - Finger-pointing between designer and contractor
  - Longer schedule
  - Potential for claims and change orders
  - Lower certainty of construction $5
  - More Owner staff resources required

- **Works best when**:
  - Project requires high degree of public oversight
  - Owner desires extensive involvement in design
  - Schedule is not a priority

---

**Construction Manager/General Contractor (CM/GC)**

- **Pros**:
  - Avoids low bid
  - Contractor involved during design
  - Owner retains some involvement in design
  - Earlier certainty of construction price than DBB

- **Cons**:
  - Does not eliminate designer-contractor conflicts
  - No significant schedule benefits
  - Lower certainty of construction price than DB
  - Owner retains most of performance risk
  - More Owner staff resources required

- **Works best when**:
  - Complex construction project
  - Construction at an existing facility that must continue to operate
  - Contractor input to design is critical
  - Low-bid contractor selection is risky

---

**Design-Build (DB)**

- **Pros**:
  - Relatively easy procurement process
  - DB selection is primarily qualifications-based
  - Owner retains some involvement in design
  - Price is open book and transparent
  - “Off ramp” if GMP can’t be negotiated

- **Cons**:
  - Price is not known or guaranteed at initial contract signing
  - Price is only partially competitive

- **Works best when**:
  - DB qualifications are more important than best price
  - Complicated design elements
  - Design details are a priority for the Owner

---

**Features/Process**:

- Owner procures a design-build team (one contract)
- D/B contractor designs and constructs project
- Price is either negotiated or competitively bid
- Variations of DB:
  - Progressive
  - Fixed Price

---

**Fixed Price**:
- Select Designer to prepare preliminary (10-30%) design
- Competitive procurement of D/B with GMP
- D/B performs final design and constructs project
- T-Rex Model

---

**One contract**
- Competitive pricing
- Owner retains some involvement in design
- Early price certainty

---

**Does not foster design innovation**
- Less choice in selection of final designer

---

**Project elements can be well defined at prelim, design**
- Preominantly a construction project
- Schedule and early price certainty are high priorities to Owner
Design-Bid-Build

Advantages

• Traditional/well understood method
• Owner retains control of design
• Lowest bid approach for construction price

Disadvantages

• Owner maintains the majority of the risk
• Conflicts between engineer and contractor
• Later certainty in the construction costs
• More owner staff required

BEST FOR: Less complex projects with lots of City involvement
Construction Manager/General Contractor

Advantages

• Value engineering through early contractor involvement
• Owner retains some control of design
• “Open book” pricing

Disadvantages

• Owner maintains project performance risks
• Conflicts between engineer and contractor
• Price is not known when CM/GC is selected
• More owner staff required

BEST FOR: Complex projects where early contractor involvement is beneficial
Progressive Design-Build

**Advantages**

- Continuous opportunities for value engineering and innovation
- Owner retains some control of design
- “Open book” pricing
- Single point of responsibility for project performance

**Disadvantages**

- Price is not known when PDB team is selected
- Price is only partially competitive

**BEST FOR:** Complex projects where risk transfer is advantageous
CM/GC AND PDB USE SAME OPEN-BOOK PRICING METHOD FOR DEVELOPING PROJECT COSTS

- **Cost of Work**
  - Labor rates, materials, equipment, subcontractor bids
  - Established from hard costs and bids

- **Price**
  - General conditions, overhead & profit
  - Typical established as a percentage through proposal process

- **Guaranteed Maximum Price**
Open-Book Pricing in Practice

**New Tertiary Filtration Process**

**Cost of Work**
- Filtration equipment
- Concrete work (self-performed by Prime contractor)
- Electrical subcontractor bid

**Price**
- General Conditions (construction trailers, project manager, etc.)
- Overhead & Profit (negotiated in procurement process)

**Guaranteed Maximum Price**
Open-Book Pricing

- Key principles:
  - Transparency and validation
  - Accuracy and completeness → all cost elements visible to owner
  - Realism and fairness
  - Risk and opportunity assessment → defines project contingency

- Actual price is monitored throughout construction process

- Allows for sharing of project savings
Procurement Criteria

Non-Price Factors
- Qualifications and Experience
- Capability and Capacity
- Project Approach

Cost/Price Factors
- Preconstruction Services Fee
- General Conditions
- Overhead & Profit
- Initial GMP (PDB only)

BEST VALUE – Blended price and non-price factors
National Trends in Project Delivery

2018 Annual Research Report on Collaborative-Delivery Use and Growth in the Water and Wastewater Sector, Water Design-Build Council

Owners Report a Rapidly Growing Preference for Progressive Design-Build

- Progressive Design-Build
- Fixed-Price Design-Build
- Construction Management at-Risk

2013: 39%
2014: 39%
2015: 39%
2016: 51%
2017: 62%
Recent Market Interest

7 Contractors

6 Engineers
Interviewed owners on alternative delivery

- Owner’s forum at 2019 Design Build for Water/Wastewater Conference
- Idaho Transportation Department
- City of Boise
- City of Sandpoint
Phase II Project Packaging and Delivery Method Recommendation
# Nampa Wastewater Program

**DRC-Recommended Phase II Packaging**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project Group Name</th>
<th>Project Group Components</th>
<th>Delivery Model</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Group D</td>
<td>• Primary Digester No.5&lt;br&gt;• Waste Gas Burner (Flare)</td>
<td>Design-Bid-Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Group E</td>
<td>• Renovated Laboratory and Administration Building</td>
<td>Design-Bid-Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Group F</td>
<td>• New Aeration Basin No.4&lt;br&gt;• New Blower Building and Blowers&lt;br&gt;• Demo Trickling Filters, Secondary Clarifier&lt;br&gt;• New Tertiary Filtration Pump Station&lt;br&gt;• New Tertiary Filtration&lt;br&gt;• New Final Clarifier No.4&lt;br&gt;• Replace WAS and RAS Pumps&lt;br&gt;• New Class A UV Disinfection&lt;br&gt;• New Irrigation Reuse Pump Station and Forcemain 4&lt;br&gt;• New Industrial Reuse Pump Station and Forcemain 4&lt;br&gt;• New Internal Mixed Liquor Recycle Pumps 4&lt;br&gt;• Replace Final Clarifier Mechanisms&lt;br&gt;• Replace Post Aeration Basin Structure and Blower&lt;br&gt;• New Digested Sludge Storage Tank&lt;br&gt;• Solids Facility Expansion&lt;br&gt;• MCC Replacements</td>
<td>Progressive Design-Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Group G</td>
<td>• Primary Clarifier 1 Structure, Mechanism, and Sludge Pump Repair&lt;br&gt;• Repairs for Headworks Facility</td>
<td>Design-Bid-Build</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Group H</td>
<td>• New Sidestream Treatment Facility</td>
<td>Design-Bid-Build</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Nampa WWTP Phase II/III Upgrades
Design Review Committee
Thursday, May 23, 2019
Nampa Public Library | 215 12th Avenue South, Nampa, ID
7:00 AM – 8:30 AM
MEETING SUMMARY

Meeting Overview
On Thursday, May 23, 2019, the Nampa Wastewater Treatment Plant Design Review Committee (DRC) convened its eighth meeting. The objective of this meeting was to review the project packaging and delivery recommendation in detail and confirm DRC support for the recommended approach. The following is a summary of the discussion.

Meeting Summary
Elizabeth Spaulding, facilitator, welcomed DRC members and reviewed the agenda. Nate Runyan, City of Nampa, provided an update on the May 6 Nampa City Council meeting where the WWTP project packaging and delivery approach recommendation was presented. Based on outstanding questions at the meeting, it was determined that the DRC should review the recommendation in more detail to ensure that all questions and concerns are fully considered before providing the Council a show of support.

Project Deliver Approach Presentation and Discussion
Matt Gregg, Brown and Caldwell, provided an overview of the project delivery options that were reviewed by the DRC. Of highest concern is how Project Group F, which is the largest package of projects, is delivered. Matt reviewed the priorities identified by the DRC at previous meetings and explained how these priorities would be met through delivery features. Matt then reviewed the three potential delivery models being considered, including 1) Design-Bid-Build; 2) Construction Manager/General Contractor; and 3) Progressive Design-Build. Matt reviewed aspects of open-book pricing, procurement criteria and processes, and data on how Progressive Design-Build is becoming a preferred delivery approach nationally for wastewater treatment projects. The proposed delivery approach for Project Group F is Progressive Design-Build.

DRC members asked clarifying questions regarding critical aspects of the delivery approaches, including issues around risk, liability, cost control, and local capacity. Through discussion, it was determined that the Progressive Design-Build model is appropriate for Project Group F in that it will meet the interests of the City without placing undue risk on the City or strain on existing staff capacity. Nampa City Attorney Mike Hilty was also present at the meeting, and stated that he did not believe there were any contractual limitations or concerns with Progressive Design-Build.

Once all DRC questions were fully addressed, Elizabeth Spaulding took a vote of DRC members in support of a Progressive Design-Build approach for Project Group F. Six DRC members voted in support of the recommendation. No members voted against the recommendation.

James Hall, Admiral Beverage, and Carol Kenfield, citizen, both offered to attend the upcoming Public Hearing on June 3rd to provide DRC representation and show of support for the recommended delivery approach.
May 7, 2019

City of Nampa
Mayor Kling and City Council
411 3rd Street South
Nampa, ID 83651

Re: City of Nampa Wastewater Project Group F Support

Dear Mayor and City Council,

JC Constructors, Inc. is writing to support the recommendation to deliver the Group F Wastewater Treatment Plant expansion utilizing the Progressive Design-Build process. JCC has completed numerous wastewater projects with the City of Nampa and has completed several dozen collaborative design-build projects. Our company will be pursuing the Group F project.

The Progressive Design-Build (PDB) delivery offers owners the greatest project value. This year’s Design-Build Institute of America (DBIA) conference demonstrated that PDB is the preferred delivery option by owners. Alternative collaborative delivery methods of Fixed-Price Design-Build and CMAR have inherent drawbacks of cost changes and administrative expense. The historic delivery method of Design-Bid-Build includes risk for cost and schedule changes while missing the opportunity for collaboration. Meanwhile, owners selected PDB 62% of the time in 2017 (Fixed-Price Design-Build was 25% and CMAR 13%) for water/wastewater projects around the country. In a study of 650 water/wastewater projects totaling $30B and constructed between 2013 and 2017, the DBIA documented that a PDB approach regularly brought owners the best value through three specific characteristics:

1) Collaboration between the owner, engineer, and contractor to resolve technical design, construction and schedule challenges
2) Appropriate assessment and allocation of risk
3) Open book review of contractor pricing of construction costs

In JCC’s twenty years of business, the collaborative efforts of the owner, the engineer and the contractor working together from conception through the end of the project has, without exception, produced a superior climate of success; PDB is certainly JCC’s preference. We are sure the PDB approach will produce a similar Group F story.
The solicitation for PDB proposals should produce many qualified teams with skilled resources capable of delivering the Group F project. Four or more proposals should be expected from local qualified self-perform contractors and engineer teams that are qualified in the PDB delivery process. Many local engineers and contractors have long standing relationships with the City and each other. The advantages of local relationships, local skilled self-perform workforces, and local businesses that contribute to the local tax base while supporting the City’s employees are all strengths that add favor toward this PDB delivery process.

JC Constructors, Inc. supports the PDB delivery process. JCC is convinced the PDB delivery is in the City’s best interest for this Group F Expansion Project, best in value to the City and best in broad local participation.

If we can be of any further assistance, or if you would like to discuss our comments in greater detail, please contact us, (208) 850-1375, cell.

Yours Truly,

[Signature]

Jim Cox, P.E., President
JC Constructors, Inc.
May 9, 2019

Nate Runyan, Deputy Public Works Director
City of Nampa, ID
411 3rd Street South
Nampa, ID 83651

RE: Progressive Design Build (PDB) – Nampa Phase 2 WWTP Improvements

Dear Mr. Runyan:

ACEC Idaho represents the consulting engineering industry in our state and consists of over 50 engineering firms. Our primary mission is to protect the health, safety and welfare of the public and to advocate for the interests of our engineering profession and business climate.

We are responding to your request for an opinion about using the Progressive Design Build (PDB) delivery method in the City’s planned Phase 2 expansion of your wastewater treatment plant. We understand this project is quite complex and that early and continuous collaboration between the designer and builder would be beneficial to its success. It’s our understanding that your approach to PDB consists of three primary steps:

1. The City would solicit qualification statements and select a progressive design-build team based on qualifications per Idaho Code 67-2320.
2. That team would work with the City to advance the design to a point at which a fixed price for construction would be established.
3. The City would then decide to proceed with construction using the progressive design-build team at that fixed price or may elect to bid the project out to a separate construction firm.

It is also our understanding that you have already retained, and will continue to retain, an independent engineering firm as Program Manager to assist the City through this process.

Based on the nature of the project and these understandings, it is the opinion of ACEC Idaho that using Progressive Design Build (PDB) on this project is acceptable to our membership.

(Note that this is not a legal opinion as to the efficacy of PDB as it relates to statutory authority to use this delivery method.)

We would like to provide broader context about ACEC Idaho’s interests and concerns regarding alternative delivery processes in Idaho public works, including PDB. Our interest and concerns, from the perspective of ACEC Idaho membership (design engineering firms) can be summarized as follows:

1. We believe that alternative delivery methods, including Construction Manager / General Contractor (CMGC), Progressive Design Build (PDB) and Design Build (DB) are viable options to the typical Design-Bid-Build (DBB or DBB + contractor pre-qualifications) methods, based on the individual project circumstances. Those circumstances could
include project complexity, need for designer / contractor collaboration, ability to allow innovation or alternative concepts in the design, and accelerated project schedule requirements. Use of alternative delivery should be clearly justified, otherwise, traditional DBB or DBB + contractor pre-qualifications should be used.

2. We believe that it is preferable to the engineering profession to maintain the primary contract relationship with the public works owner, not a contractor.

   a. This aligns our primary obligation of the health, safety, and welfare of the public with that of the public works owner. Although we endeavor to work as a team, when we are involved in PDB or DB, the engineer may find themselves in situations where the interests of the public do not align with the interests of their client (the builder). Being under a contract with the builder increases the potential of a conflict of interest. Being under a separate contract with the owner eliminates this potential conflict.

   b. In addition, this arrangement of a separate contract with the owner clearly establishes lines of responsibility – the designer is responsible for the design and the builder is responsible for the finished construction. These lines of responsibility can become blurred in PDB or DB, particularly for engineering work related to construction means and methods and for construction site safety.

   c. It is true that the “one contract” approach of PDB or DB may appear to lessen the owner’s risk, however, we believe that it may not to a significant degree. Issues of scope changes, changed conditions, incomplete preparatory documents, or non-negligent design omissions will still occur – and will still fall to the owner.

   d. Separate owner contracts with the builder and the designer may actually lower the owner’s risk. Since most risk is associated with construction, having the designer contract with the owner will allow the designer to help the owner with contractor change orders or claims. Otherwise, the designer is beholden under contract to the contractor, their client. Having separate contracts puts the designer on equal footing with the owner and contractor, from both risk and reward standpoints.

   e. Some ongoing issues specifically with DB (from the designer’s perspective) are low fees, lack of sufficient stipends, and slow payment. These issues are particularly troublesome for small to medium sized firms being used as project subconsultants.

3. We believe that for PDB and DB methods, the design professional’s risk must be manageable, commensurate with their ability to control the risk, and limited to the potential impact of the design itself. For example, contract language must be insurable so as to not put the design firm at risk of a catastrophic loss. Also, contract language must state that the designer has sole authority over design decisions impacting the health, safety, and welfare of the public. Another example is that the professional standard of care should be the measure of the designer’s performance, not the warrantee on the constructed project. Finally, the designer should not be “on the hook” for construction related issues beyond their control that may likely exceed insurance coverage. These
stipulations, and others, can be difficult for the designer to negotiate with the builder which may put the designer at significant risk.

4. For CMGC, DB, or PDB, we believe that it is important that the owner have a professional engineer on board throughout the design and construction process to act as the owner’s advocate and to perform technical work. This “Owner’s Design Professional” can be either employed by the owner or hired as a consultant through the QBS process.

5. We believe, and it has been proven, that selecting the designer (or design-build team including the designer) based on qualifications and then negotiating a fair price is in the best interest of the public – resulting in lower overall cost and greater schedule compliance. Therefore, for alternative delivery methods, we favor CMGC and PDB over DB. If DB is chosen, we advocate for a two-stage process where DB firms are short listed based on qualifications prior to the proposal stage. The proposal stage should also rank qualifications and quality of the proposal as significant criteria for award – beyond just low pricing.

6. In terms of statutory authority and detail, the traditional DBB method (with or without contractor pre-qualifications) is well established. CMGC has recently been added by statute, but contains less specific direction. DB is allowed by statute, but detail on policy and procedure is lacking (except for ITD’s program). PDB is not specifically mentioned in statute, but might be allowable under DB. Therefore, for alternative delivery, CMGC is preferred by ACEC Idaho from a statutory perspective.

To summarize the suite of delivery options in Idaho and consideration for selection, we offer the graphic on the following page. It shows that the typical DBB or DBB (with contractor pre-qualifications) are preferred for all projects unless complexity, innovation, or need for designer/contractor collaboration necessitates an alternative delivery approach. From our perspective, the best alternative delivery method is CMGC. For design build options, PDB is highly preferable to DB.

One consideration with respect to all of the potential delivery methods is assessing the size and complexity of the project with respect to the field of engineers and contractors. Very large and complex project packages can narrow the field of engineers and contractors, therefore reducing competition. Therefore, assessing the ability of contractors and engineers to respond to a particular request can be beneficial to both the City, engineering firms, and contractors.

ACEC-Idaho thanks the City for asking for our input on this subject. We look forward to helping your City advance the public’s interest as we build a better Idaho.

Sincerely,

John F. Ringert, P.E., President
ACEC Idaho

Cc: QBS Facilitator’s Council
Project Delivery Methods in Idaho

(Summary by ACEC Idaho)

- Project Complexity
- Need for Collaboration between Designer & Builder
- Opportunity for Innovation & Alternatives

KEY
- Traditional Delivery
- Alternative Delivery
- DBB = Design-Bid-Build
- CMGC = Construction Manager/General Contractor
- PDB = Progressive Design-Build
- DB = Design-Build

* = May allow project acceleration relative to other options
+ = Specifically cited in Idaho Code

- Ability to Maintain Relationship with Public Works Owner/Alignment of Interests
- Ability to Manage Risk
- Emphasis on Qualifications Based Selection
- ACEC Idaho Preference
RESOLUTION NO. _________________

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO, DIRECTING STAFF TO PROCEED WITH CONTRACTING FOR PHASE II OF THE NAMPA WASTEWATER TREATMENT PLANT IMPROVEMENTS AND APPROVING PROJECT PACKAGING AND PROJECT DELIVERY CONTRACTING METHODS.

WHEREAS, the City of Nampa is a duly formed municipal corporation of the State of Idaho and operates a wastewater treatment facility providing wastewater services to system users (“WWTP”); and

WHEREAS, the City of Nampa has been in the process of implementing significant WWTP improvements to replace and modernize older equipment and processes, provide wastewater treatment that complies with the Clean Water Act requirements embodied in Nampa’s NPDES Permit, expand capacity, and provide for the beneficial reuse of treated wastewater; and

WHEREAS, Phase I of the improvements referred to above is nearing completion and Phase II will be underway this year; and

WHEREAS, the City Council finds that, as with Phase I, it is feasible, efficient and more manageable to break down Phase II into various project packages to be contracted, designed and constructed separately; and

WHEREAS, to clarify for staff and instruct the contracting process, the City Council finds that the following project packaging and delivery methods for the construction of Phase II of the WWTP improvements is in the best interests of the City of Nampa.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO:

Section 1. Staff is instructed to proceed with bidding, advertising, contracting and other administrative procedures for the purposes of securing construction of Phase II of the WWTP improvements all according to law.

Section 2. Project Group D of Phase II of the WWTP improvements shall consist of construction of primary digester no. 5 and the waste gas burner (flare) to be acquired through a design-bid-build project delivery method.

Section 3. Project Group E of Phase II of the WWTP improvements shall consist of renovations to the laboratory and administration building to be acquired through a design-bid-build project delivery method.

Section 4. Project Group F of Phase II of the WWTP improvements shall consist of construction of a new aeration basin no. 4, new blower building and blowers, new tertiary filtration pump station, new tertiary filtration, new final clarifier no. 4, replacement of the WAS and RAS pumps, new class A UV disinfection, new irrigation reuse pump station and force main, new industrial reuse pump station and force main, new internal mixed liquor recycle pumps, replace final clarifier mechanisms, replace post aeration basin structure and blower, new digested sludge storage tank, solids facility expansion, MCC

RESOLUTION NO. _________________, Page 1
replacements, and demolition of trickling filters and secondary clarifier all to be acquired through a progressive design-build delivery method.

**Section 5.** Project Group G of Phase II of the WWTP improvements shall consist of construction of primary clarifier 1 structure, mechanism and sludge pump repair and repairs for the headworks facility to be acquired through a design-bid-build project delivery method.

**Section 6.** Project Group H of Phase II of the WWTP improvements shall consist of construction of a new side stream treatment facility to be acquired through a design-bid-build project delivery method.


Approved:

[Signature]

Mayor

Attest:

[Signature]

City Clerk
Applicant/Representative(s):
Jose Sanchez, Owner
File No(s): VAR-065-2019
Analyst: Rodney Ashby

Requested Action(s): Variances to Nampa City Zoning Code as follows:

From N.C.C. §10-8-6.A requiring a 6,000 sf lot size in the RS6 (Single Family Residential – 6,000 s.f. minimum lot size) zoning district for 1217 11th Ave S (the NE ½ of Lot 9 Block 59 Waterhouse Addition) and 1223 11th Ave S (the SE 100 ft of the SW ½ of Lot 9 and SE 100 ft of Lot 11 Block 59 of Waterhouse Addition). See Exhibit 2 (Page 7), Zoning & Vicinity Map.

Property History

April 7, 2014 – Variance VAR 1641-2014 for Jose Sanchez for setbacks and placement of a single wide mobile home. APPROVED.

General Site Information

Existing Zoning: RS 6 (Single-Family Residential District – 6,000 s.f. minimum lot size)

Surrounding Zoning & Land Uses:
North – RS 6 residential
South – RS 6 residential
East – BC commercial
West – RS 6 residential

Public/Agency Comment or Correspondence:
Agency/City department comments have been received regarding this matter. Such correspondence as received from agencies or the citizenry regarding this application package [received by noon May 29, 2019] is hereafter attached.

1. An April 29, 2019 email from the Nampa Highway District# 1 authored by Eddy Thiel, stating the Highway District has no comment; and,
2. An April 30, 2019, email from the Nampa Building Department, authored by Neil Jones stating that he has no comments on the application, but that building permits will be required for any and all work before it starts; and,

3. A May 6, 2019 letter from the Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District authored by David Duvall indicating that they have no comment on the Project; and,

4. A May 13, 2019 letter from the Idaho Transportation Department, authored by Sarah Arjona, stating that ITD does not object to this request; and,

5. An May 24, 2019, memorandum from the Nampa City Engineering Division, authored by Jim Brooks indicates they do not oppose granting this variance with the following conditions:
   a. Drive access to 1217 shall be via the alley. No drive approach access is permitted from 11th Ave S; and,

6. Staff has not received commentary from any surrounding property owners or neighbors either supporting or opposing this request.

**CODE REGULATIONS**

Variance Purpose Statement (10-24-1):
"The Council is empowered to grant variances in order to prevent or to lessen such practical difficulties and unnecessary physical hardships inconsistent with the objectives of zoning as would result from a literal interpretation and enforcement of certain of the regulations prescribed by this Title.

A variance shall not be considered a right or special privilege, but may be granted to an applicant only upon showing of undue hardship because of 1) special characteristics applicable to the site which deprive it of privileges commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity, and 2) the characteristics relating to the size, shape or dimensions of a site or the location of existing structures thereon, from geographic, topographic or other physical conditions, or from population densities, street location or traffic conditions.

Variances are not intended to allow something that others do not have a permitted right to do. The purpose of a variance is to provide fair treatment and to see that individuals are not penalized because of site characteristics beyond their control."

10-24-2: ACTION:

A) The Council may grant a Variance with respect to fences and walls, site, area, width, frontage, depth, coverage, front yard, rear yard, side yards, outdoor living area, height of structures, distances between structures or landscaped areas as the Variance was applied for or in modified form if, on the basis of application, investigation and evidence submitted, the Council makes the following findings (read, "Conclusions of Law"):

1. Literal interpretation and enforcement of the regulation would [would not] result in a practical hardship or unnecessary physical hardship inconsistent with the objectives of the zoning ordinance for the property.

2. There are extraordinary site characteristics applicable to the property involved or to the intended use of the property which [do] do not apply generally to other properties classified in the same zoning district.
3. Literal interpretation and enforcement of the regulation would [would not] deprive the applicant of privileges enjoyed by the owners of other properties classified in the same zoning district.

4. Granting of the variance [will] will not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations on other properties and improvements in the vicinity.

5. Granting of the variance [will] will not be detrimental to public health, safety or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the area.

**ANALYSIS**

City Council has previously granted a variance for this property, finding that the size, shape, and location of the lot constituted a legal basis for the variance findings listed above. The following are staff analysis of the current application and potential findings of fact that may be used by Council to justify approval or denial of the variance request.

1. The applicant proposes adjusting the lot line between 1217 and 1223 11th Ave S by approximately 16 feet to the southwest, thereby increasing the lot size for 1217 to approximately 5,098 square feet (still a substandard lot size) and decreasing the lot size of 1223 to approximately 5,879 square feet (thereby creating a substandard lot size); and,

2. Though the variance approved in 2014 has already allowed for construction of a dwelling (placement of single-wide mobile home), the applicant would like to construct a site built dwelling that more closely meets city standards or emplace a double-wide manufactured home on a foundation, which is also more closely complies with city standards. As such, being unable to construct a more compliant dwelling on the parcel could be seen as a hardship to the property owner. To construct a home on the subject property, a reasonable approach is to seek a variance to the Nampa City Code §10-8-6, requiring a 6,000 sf lot size in the RS 6 zoning district.

3. Though smaller sized properties have existing homes in the immediate area, they have typically been constructed on corner lots where City Code provides allowances for smaller lots. The site characteristics, being a relatively small lot not on a corner property, may be considered extraordinary site characteristics which do not apply generally to other properties within the zoning district.

4. Enforcement of the code in this case, could be assumed to deprive the applicant of privileges enjoyed by other owners in the district, namely, construction of a city code compliant single-family home.

5. The proposed use is consistent with land uses in the area. More so than the existing (previously approved) single-wide mobile home. Approval of this variance is unlikely to be considered granting a special privilege inconsistent with the area.

6. Construction of a new single-family structure shall comply with current building & fire codes. New structures must comply with required setbacks as well. The proximity to other buildings is consistent with other lots in the immediate area. Police and Fire Departments already service this area. Staff finds no conditions that would create a determinant to public health, safety or be injurious to others in the area.

**CONCLUSIONS OF LAW & FINDINGS OF FACT**

Whether the Council votes to deny or approve the Variance request, the statements cited in this report as being from 10-24-2 above, in bold type, are the Conclusions of Law that must be used and supported by further Findings of Fact to either justify approval or denial of the request (See ANALYSIS section above).
The proposed variance is requested to facilitate construction of a site built single-family home on a parcel in an area of town that is largely zoned for single-family use. The area is completely developed out and is serviced by utilities, public safety, parks, and other city services. The granting of this variance will bring 1217 closer to compliance with current city ordinances and while it does create a substandard lot, it will have little effect on the existing property located at 1223.

**Applicable Regulations:** Chapter 24 sets forth criteria to use when reviewing (a) Variance request(s).

---

**CONDITION(S) OF APPROVAL**

Should the Council vote to approve the Variance Permit, the following draft Approval Condition(s) is/are proposed for consideration:

1. Comply with any other applicable agency (e.g., City Building Safety, City Engineer, Southwest District Health, Fire Department, etc.) requirements as they may pertain to the Variance request.
   a. Obtain all necessary building permits required for construction before starting any and all work on the property.

2. No access shall be created from/to 11th Ave S.

---

**Exhibits**

1) Application (pages 5-9)
2) Vicinity map with zoning (page 10)
3) Aerial photo (page 11)
4) Street view of property (page 12)
5) Previous Variance Permit (Recorded) (page 13-18)
6) Agency and other correspondence (pages 19+).
APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE
PLANNING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT
411 3RD STREET S., NAMPA, IDAHO 83651 P: (208) 468-4487 F: (208) 465-2261
Nonrefundable Fee: $255.00

Applicant Name

Home Number

Street Address

Mobile Number

City

State

Zip code

Email

Property Owner Name

Home Number

Street Address

Mobile Number

City

State

Zip code

Applicant’s interest in property: ( ) Own ( ) Rent ( ) Other

ADDRESS OF SUBJECT PROPERTY:

Please provide the following required documentation

☐ Completed Application

☐ A copy of one of the following: ✓ Warranty Deed ☐ Proof Of Option ☐ Earnest Money Agreement

☐ Signed & Notarized Affidavit of Legal Interest (attached). Form must be completed by the legal owner (If owner is a corporation, submit a copy of the Articles of Incorporation or other evidence to show that the person signing is an authorized agent)

☐ Original Legal description of property AND a legible WORD formatted document. (Must have for final recording) Old or illegible title documents will need to be retyped in a WORD formatted document.

Project Description

➢ State the nature of the variance request and the practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship, which would result from a literal interpretation and enforcement of the specific regulation for which the variance is being sought, (attach additional pages if necessary):

Variance for 1217 & 1223 11th Ave.

Substandard lot size to allow for new residence @ 1217 property

Dated this 4/19/19 day of ____________, 20__

Jose Sanchez

Applicant Signature

PLEASE NOTE

This application will be referred to the Nampa City Council for its consideration. The City Council shall hold a public hearing on the application and it shall be granted or denied. Notice of the public hearing shall be sent to adjacent property owners no less than 10 or more than 30 days prior to the hearing. You will be given notice of the public hearing and should be present to answer any questions.

A variance shall not be considered a right or a privilege, but will only be granted upon showing the following undue hardship:

1. Special characteristics of the site, which deprive it of privileges commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity, and

2. The variance is not in conflict with the public interest.

Variances are not intended to allow something that others do not have a permitted right to do.

The use or construction permitted by a variance must be commenced within a 6-month period. If such use or construction has not commenced within such time period, the variance shall no longer be valid. Prior to the expiration of the 6-month period the applicant may request from the city Council an extension for up to an additional 6 months from the original date of approval.

OFFICE USE ONLY

FILE NUMBER: VAR - 072 - 2019

PROJECT NAME: Substandard lots

12/11/13 Revised

RS-6 Zone
AFFIDAVIT OF LEGAL INTEREST

STATE OF IDAHO

COUNTY OF CANYON

A. I, Jose M. Sanchez, whose address is 1223 11th Ave. S. Nampa, ID 83686, being first duly sworn upon oath, depose and say that I am the owner of record of the property described on the attached application.

B. I grant my permission to Agustin Sanchez, whose address is ______________________, to submit the accompanying application pertaining to the property described on the attached application.

C. I agree to indemnify, defend and hold the City of Nampa and its employees harmless from any claim or liability resulting from any dispute as to the statements contained herein or as to the ownership of the property which is the subject of the application.

Dated this 19 day of April, 2019.

[Signature]

SUBSCRIBED AND SWORN to before me the 19 day of April, 2019.

Notary Public for Idaho

Residing at: Nampa, Canyon County

Commission Expires: 12/09/2023
Approximately 1673 sq. ft. to be surveyed and transferred from 1223 11th Ave S. to 1217 11th Ave S., making two
substandard lot sizes.

1223 currently approx. 7,492.82 sq. ft.,
less approx. 1,413.23 sq. ft.,
leaving lot size approx. 5,979.09 sq. ft. Reduced by 121 sq. ft.

1217 currently approx. 3,484.28 sq. ft.,
plus approx. 1,413.23 sq. ft.
5,098.03 sq. ft. Reduced by 115 sq. ft.
Canyon County Parcel Information

Property ID: R1591700000
Alt Parcel ID: N9245059009A
Property Address: 1217 11th Ave S
Nampa, ID 83651-4517
Parcel City Code: Nampa

Owner Information
Name: Sanchez Jose M
Sanchez Margarita Sanchez
Address: 1223 11th Ave S
Nampa, ID 83651

Assessor Information
Legal Description: 27-3N-2W NW WATERHOUSE ADD NE1/2 OF LT 9
BLK 59 T74795
Twn/Range/Section: 03N02W27 Quarter:NW
Acres: .08 (3,485 SqFt)
Irrigation Dist: NAMPA & MERIDIAN IRRIGATION DISTRICT
School District: 762 Nampa School Dist
Instrument #: 2008030531
Subdivision: Waterhouse Add
Plat Instr. #: 0
Lot: 9
Block: 59
Recreation: -

Assessed Values
Land Value: $32,000
Improvement Value: $600
Total Value: $32,600

Residential Characteristics

Transfer Information
Rec. Date: 06/05/08
Owner: SONCHEY-SANCHEY, JON M
Orig. Loan Amt: 
Finance Type: 

Treasurer Information
Year: 2018 
Tax: $575
Year: 2017 
Tax: $508
Year: 2016 
Tax: $449

Levy Year: 2018
Levy Code: 002-00
Levy Rate: 0.017638348

Assessor Land Categories
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Use</th>
<th>Code</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20H</td>
<td>20H</td>
<td>City Res Lot</td>
<td>$32,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41H</td>
<td>41H</td>
<td>Imp on 20</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
QUITCLAIM DEED

THIS QUITCLAIM DEED, Executed this 5th day of June, 2008, by first party, Grantor(s), Lynn M. Beckman, whose address is 1117 11th Ave So, Nampa, ID 83686-4517, to second party, Grantee(s), James Lacy, James G. Lacy, and Margie Lacy, whose address is 1233 11th Ave So, Nampa, ID 83686-4517.

WITNESSETH, That the said first party, for and in the consideration of the sum of Seventeen Thousand dollars ($17,000.00), does hereby and forever remise, release, assign and quitclaim unto the said second party, all right, title, interest and claim which the said first party has in and to the following described parcel of land, and improvements and appurtenances thereto in the County of Canyon, State of Idaho, and more fully described as:

Northeastly one half lot 9 in Block 5-9 of Waterdown Addition to Range, Canyon County, Idaho, according to that plat filed in book 71 at page 154, records of said County, or, as in the attached EXHIBIT "A", and said property being known by the street address of

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, The said first party has signed and sealed these presents the day and year first above written.

Signature of First Party

State of Idaho

County of Canyon

On this 5th day of June, 2008, before me, Janice C. Hanson, a Notary Public in and for the State of Idaho, personally appeared, Lynn M. Beckman known to me to be the person(s) whose name(s) are subscribed to the within instrument and acknowledged to me that she/they executed the same.

WITNESS my hand and official seal.

Janice C. Hanson
Notary Public for State of Idaho
My commission Expires: Sept 30, 2010
Exhibit 912

Variance for two substandard-size residential lots in an RS6 (Single Family Residential) Zone

Visit Planning & Zoning at cityofnampa.us for more info.
A Variance Permit is hereby granted by the City of Nampa for the following described real property located within the City limits of Nampa, Canyon County, Idaho, more particularly described as follows, to wit:

1217 11TH AVENUE SOUTH, NAMPA
NE ½ LOT 9, BLOCK 59, WATERHOUSE ADDITION
Canyon County Account # R1591700000

The City of Nampa issues this Variance Permit on the basis of the following findings:

A. The above described property is situated within zoning district: RS-6 (Single Family Residential – 6000 sq ft minimum lot size).

B. Nampa City Council approves the following Variances within the above zoning district:
   1. Variance from City of Nampa Zoning Ordinance Section 10-8-6 which requires 6,000 sq ft of land for a property in the RS-6 zoning district.
   2. Variance from City of Nampa Zoning Ordinance Section 10-8-6-D which requires a five (5) ft side yard setback for both sides of a structure in an RS-6 zoning district if a property has an alley for rear yard access.

C. The permitted use will be compatible with the existing zoning district and/or enhance or serve the community if, and only if, the following regulations are continuously met by the owner, his heirs and assigns, in the use of the above described property:
   1. Applicant(s) shall comply with all applicable requirements [including obtaining a Building Permit] as may be imposed by City agencies appropriately involved in the review of the request (e.g. Nampa Fire, Building, Planning and Zoning and Engineering Departments, etc) as the Variance(s) approval does not and shall not have the affect of abrogating requirements from those agencies.
   2. The Variance approval shall “run with the land” and only facilitates, by intent, construction of a single-family detached stick built house on a foundation on the property and thereby disallows emplacement of a single wide mobile home on said Property.
This permit is hereby issued in perpetuity for 1217 11th Avenue South, from the date of issuance. In the event (1) actual construction or alteration does not begin, (2) authorized activity does not commence when no construction is involved or, (3) extensions are not granted pursuant to Nampa Municipal Code Section 10-25-11 within six months of the date of issuance, this permit shall be terminated.

Issued this 7th day of April, 2014.

PROJECT VAR 1641-14

CITY OF NAMPA:

Norman L. Holm
Planning Director

City Clerk Dori J. Hayward-Blando
State of Idaho  

Canyon County  

On this 7th day of April, 2014, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public in and for said State, personally appeared Norm Holm and Doris Hayward-Roland known to be the Planning Director and Deputy City Clerk, of the City of Nampa, Idaho, a municipal corporation, who executed the foregoing instrument.

In Witness Thereof, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed by official seal, the day and year in this certificate first above written.

[Signature]

Soyla M. Reyna
Residing at: Nampa, Canyon County, Idaho
My Commission Expires: 10/22/2018
JOSE M. SANCHEZ HAS REQUESTED A VARIANCE TO CITY OF NAMPA ZONING ORDINANCE SECTION 10-8-6 REQUIRING A 6,000 SQ FT MINIMUM LOT SIZE IN THE RS-6 (SINGLE FAMILY RESIDENTIAL 6000 SQ FT MINIMUM LOT SIZE) ZONING DISTRICT AND VARIANCE TO SECTION 10-8-6-D REQUIRING A FIVE (5) FT SETBACK FOR 1217 11TH AVENUE SOUTH PARCEL R1591700000, THE NE ¼ LOT 9 BLOCK 59 WATERHOUSE ADDITION, NAMPA TO CONSTRUCT A SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING ON PROPERTY

PROJECT # VAR 1641-14
My name is Agustin Sanchez and my dad is
Jose Sanchez owner of address 1217 11th
Ave. S 853651. We requested a variance
for that property so I could build a home
for me. Unfortunately my dad had to
get two spine surgeries and since he
can't work right now he lost his job.
I don't have enough money right now
and im sure the bank won't give
me any loans since all my cards are
maxed out. I'm hoping that we can
extend that variance until the summer
of 2013. I'm hoping on having enough
money by then to be able to start
on the project. When you have an
answer for me could you please contact
me, and hopefully there is no need to
re-apply for it but I understand
procedures change with time.

Agustin Sanchez
(City 9453611)
February 18, 2015

Jose M. Sanchez
1217 11th Avenue South
Nampa, ID 83687

Subject: Extension of Variance of 6,000 minimum lot area and 5 foot side yard setback in an RS 6 zone for construction of a new dwelling at 1217 11th Avenue South (VAR 1641-14)

Dear Mr. Sanchez:

The following is the decision of the City Council on the above variance extension request considered by them on February 17, 2015. The City Council voted to approve your extension request extending the validity of your variance until August 7, 2015. Should you have any questions on this decision, feel free to contact me at 465-2224.

Sincerely,

Norman L. Holm, Planning Director
CITY OF NAMPA
Date: May 24, 2019
Rev:
To: Mayor and City Council
Cc: Caleb LaClair, P. E., Assistant City Engineer
Cc: Daniel Badger, P.E., City Engineer
Cc: Tom Points, P. E., Nampa City Public Works Director
From: Jim Brooks – Engineering Division
Subject: Variance – Substandard lot area to approximately 5,879 SF.
Applicant: Jose Sanchez
Applicant Address: 1223-11th Avenue South, Nampa, Idaho 83651
Owner: Jose Sanchez
Owner Address: 1223-11th Avenue South, Nampa, Idaho 83651
Parcel Address: 1217-11th Avenue South, Nampa, Idaho 83651

VAR-00072-2019 for the June 3, 2019 City Council Meeting

The Engineering Division does not oppose granting of this variance with the following conditions:
- Drive access to lot shall be via the alley. No drive approach access permitted from 11th Avenue South.
May 13, 2019

Sylvia Mackrill  
City of Nampa  
411 3rd Street South  
Nampa, Idaho 83651

**VIA EMAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application</th>
<th>VAR-00072-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>SUBSTANDARD LOTS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>1217 11th Avenue South and 1223 11th Avenue South, north of SH-45 milepost 26.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Request a variance to City of Nampa Zoning Ordinance Section 10-8-6 requiring a 6,000 square feet lot in the RD-6 zoning district for both lots. Applicant proposes a lot line adjustment between 1217 and 1223 11th Avenue South by approximately 16 feet to the southwest, thereby increasing the lot size for 1217 to approximately 5098 square feet which would allow sufficient lot size for construction of a dwelling, or placement of a double wide manufactured home on a foundation. This would cause 1223 11th Avenue South to become a substandard lot.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Jose Sanchez</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) reviewed the referenced variance application and has the following comments:

1. This project does not abut the State highway system.

2. Idaho Code 40-1910 does not allow advertising within the right-of-way of any State highway.

3. The Idaho Administrative Procedures Act (IDAPA) 39.03.60 governs advertising along the State highway system. The applicant may contact Justin Pond, Right-of-Way Section Program Manager, at (208) 334-8832 for more information.

4. ITD does not object to the variance request and lot line adjustment as presented in the application.
If you have any questions, you may contact Ken Couch at (208) 332-7190 or me at (208) 334-8338.

Sincerely,

Sarah Arjona
Development Services Coordinator
Sarah.Arjona@itd.idaho.gov
May 6, 2019

Norman L. Holm, Planning Director
City of Nampa
411 3rd Street South
Nampa, ID 83651

RE: VAR-00072-2019/ 1217 & 1223 11th Avenue South

Dear Norm:

Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District (NMID) has no comment on the above-referenced application as no facilities are impacted and plans show storm water is retained on site.

All private laterals and waste ways must be protected. All municipal surface drainage must be retained on-site. If any surface drainage leaves the site, NMID will need to review drainage plans. The developer must comply with Idaho Code 31-3805.

Please feel free to contact me with any further questions

Sincerely,

David T. Duvall
Asst. Water Superintendent
Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District
DTD/ gnf

Cc: Office/ file
Building Department has no conditions on this variance, but will require permits for any and all work before it starts.

From: Sylvia Mackrill <mackrill@cityofnampa.us>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2019 4:17 PM
To: Addressing <Addressing@cityofnampa.us>; Beth Ineck <ineeckb@cityofnampa.us>; bob.parsons@phd3.idaho.gov; Bobby Sanchez <sanchezb@cityofnampa.us>; bocc@canyonco.org; Brent Hoskins <hoskinsb@cityofnampa.us>; Caleb LaClair <laclairc@cityofnampa.us>; Canyon Highway District No. 4 (chopper@canyonhd4.org) <chopper@canyonhd4.org>; Carl Miller - Compass of Idaho <cmiller@compassidaho.org> <cmiller@compassidaho.org>; Chanee Grant <cgrant@nmid.org>; Cody Swander <swanderc@cityofnampa.us>; Daniel Badger <BadgerD@cityofnampa.us>; deerflat@fws.gov; Don Barr <barrd@cityofnampa.us>; Doug Critchfield <critchfieldd@cityofnampa.us>; Eddy Thiel <eddy@nampahighway1.com>; Elijah Effinger <effingere@cityofnampa.us>; Eric R Shannon <eric@nampahighway1.com>; gwiles@nampachristianschools.com; Jared Bryan <bryanj@cityofnampa.us>; Jason Kimball <kimballj@cityofnampa.us>; Jay Young <youngj@cityofnampa.us>; Jeff Barnes <barnesj@cityofnampa.us>; jenny.titus@vallivue.org; jessica.mansell@intgas.com; Jim Brooks <brooks@cityofnampa.us>; Ken Couch - Idaho Transportation Dept, District 3 (D3Development.Services@itd.idaho.gov) <D3Development.Services@itd.idaho.gov>; Ken Keene <keenek@cityofnampa.us>; Kent Lovelace <lovelacek@cityofnampa.us>; kfunke@idahopower.com; mark@pioneerirrigation.com; Melissa Close <closem@cityofnampa.us>; monica.taylor@intgas.com; Neil Jones <jonesn@cityofnampa.us>; nick@nampahighway1.com; nmid@nmid.org; nre.easement@centurylink.com; Patrick Sullivan <sullivanw@cityofnampa.us>; Phillip Roberts <robertsp@cityofnampa.us>; pnilsson@canyonco.org; Ray Rice <ricer@cityofnampa.us>; rdewey@nsd131.org; Reggie Edwards <edwardsr@cityofnampa.us>; Richard Davies <daviesr@cityofnampa.us>; Shellie Lopez <lopezs@cityofnampa.us>; Soyla Reyna <reynas@cityofnampa.us>; Tammy Wallen <twallen@nsd131.org>; Tom Points <pointst@cityofnampa.us>; UCC ben melody <ben.melody@intgas.com>; vcharles@idahopower.com
Subject: VAR-00072-2019 for 1217 and 1223 11th Ave S, Nampa - Variance for substandard lot size for both lots
Sylvia Mackrill

From: Eddy Thiel <eddy@nampahighway1.com>
Sent: Monday, April 29, 2019 6:47 AM
To: Sylvia Mackrill
Subject: [External] RE: VAR-00072-2019 for 1217 and 1223 11th Ave S, Nampa - Variance for substandard lot size for both lots

Good Morning Sylvia,

Nampa Highway District #1 has no comment.

Thank you,

Eddy

---

Eddy Thiel
ROW
eddy@nampahighway1.com
4507 Highway 45. • Nampa, id 83686
TEL 208.467.6576 • FAX 208.467.9916

From: Sylvia Mackrill <mackill@cityofnampa.us>
Sent: Thursday, April 25, 2019 4:17 PM
To: Addressing <Addressing@cityofnampa.us>; Beth Ineck <ineckb@cityofnampa.us>; bob.parsons@phd3.idaho.gov; Bobby Sanchez <sanchezb@cityofnampa.us>; bocc@canyonco.org; Brent Hoskins <hoskinsb@cityofnampa.us>; Caleb LaClair <laclaire@cityofnampa.us>; Canyon Highway District No. 4 (chopper@canyonhd4.org) <chopper@canyonhd4.org>; Carl Miller - Compass of Idaho (cmiller@compassidaho.org) <cmiller@compassidaho.org>; Chanee Grant <cgrant@nmid.org>; Cody Swander <swanderc@cityofnampa.us>; Daniel Badger <BadgerD@cityofnampa.us>; deerflat@fws.gov; Don Barr <barrd@cityofnampa.us>; Doug Critchfield <critchfieldd@cityofnampa.us>; Eddy Thiel <eddy@nampahighway1.com>; Elijah Effinger <effinger@cityofnampa.us>; Eric Shannon <eric@nampahighway1.com>; gwiles@nampachristianschools.com; Jared Bryan <bryanj@cityofnampa.us>; Jason Kimball <kimballj@cityofnampa.us>; Jay Young <youngj@cityofnampa.us>; Jeff Barnes <barnesj@cityofnampa.us>; jenny.titus@vallivue.org; jessica.mansell@intgas.com; Jim Brooks <brooksj@cityofnampa.us>; Ken Couch - Idaho Transportation Dept, District 3 (D3Development.Services@itd.idaho.gov) <D3Development.Services@itd.idaho.gov>; Ken Keene <keeneck@cityofnampa.us>; Kent Lovelace <lovelacek@cityofnampa.us>; kfunke@idahopower.com; mark@pioneerirrigation.com; Melissa Close <closem@cityofnampa.us>; monica.taylor@intgas.com; Neil Jones <jonesn@cityofnampa.us>; Nick Lehman <Nick@nampahighway1.com>; nmid@nmid.org; nre.easement@centurylink.com; Patrick Sullivan <sullivanw@cityofnampa.us>; Phillip Roberts <robertsp@cityofnampa.us>; pnilsen@canyonco.org; Ray Rice <ricer@cityofnampa.us>; rdewey@nsd131.org; Reggie Edwards <edwardsr@cityofnampa.us>; Richard Davies <daviors@cityofnampa.us>; Shellie Lopez <lopezs@cityofnampa.us>; Soyla Reyna <reynas@cityofnampa.us>; Tammy Wallen <twallen@nsd131.org>; Tom Points <pointst@cityofnampa.us>; UCC ben melody <ben.melody@intgas.com>; vcharles@idahopower.com
Subject: VAR-00072-2019 for 1217 and 1223 11th Ave S, Nampa - Variance for substandard lot size for both lots

Jose Sanchez owns both 1217 11th Ave S (the NE ½ of Lot 9, Block 59 Waterhouse Addition) and 1223 11th Avenue South (the SE 100 ft of the SW ½ of Lot 9, and the SE 100 ft of Lot 11, Block 59 of Waterhouse Addition), located within an RS-6 (Single Family Residential – 6000 sq ft minimum lot size) zoning district.

The applicant has requested a Variance to City of Nampa Zoning Ordinance Section 10-8-6 requiring a 6,000 sq ft lot in the RS-6 zoning district for both lots.
Vacation of the southerly 10’ of the westerly 70’ of the right-of-way of Lone Star Rd. adjacent 561 Lone Star Rd. (A .74 acre or 32,234 sq. ft. portion of the NE ¼, Section 28, T3N, R2W, BM and Tax 07709 and 13199 in Lot 2, Tuite’s Subdivision) for Mitchell Page (VAC 035-19).

To: Mayor & City Council

Applicant: Mitchell Page

File No: VAC 035-19

Prepared By: Norman L. Holm

Date: May 29, 2019

Requested Action: Vacation of 10’ x 70’ portion of the Lone Star Rd. right-of-way.

Purpose: The applicant is requesting vacation of a 10’ wide section of the Lone Star Rd. right-of-way adjacent the westerly portion of their property to align their front property line after their dedication of a 15’ wide portion adjacent the easterly portion of their property.

GENERAL INFORMATION

Status of Applicant(s): Owners

Existing Zoning: RS6 (Single Family Residential – 6,000 sq. ft.)

Location: The southerly 10’ of the westerly 70’ of the right-of-way of Lone Star Rd. adjacent 561 Lone Star Rd.
Size of Vacation Area: The area is 700 sq. ft.

Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:

North- Residential, RS6 (Single Family Residential – 6,000 sq. ft.)
South- Residential, RS6 PUD (Single Family Residential – 6,000 sq. ft. PUD)
East- Residential, RS6 PUD (Single Family Residential – 6,000 sq. ft. PUD)
West- RS6 (Single Family Residential – 6,000 sq. ft.)

Comprehensive Plan Designation: Medium Density Residential

Applicable Regulations: State law requires the consent of adjoining property owners. The only property owner adjoining the right-of-way to be vacated is the applicant.

Description of Existing Uses: The area currently occupied as a portion of the applicant’s front yard area. No change of use is intended, only an alignment of the front property line through the vacation and dedication.

SPECIAL INFORMATION

Planning & Zoning History: The proposed right-of-way vacation and dedication will bring the front property and right-of-way line to the same location as previously dedicated in the Cobblestone Square subdivision adjacent to the east.

Public Utilities:
8" sewer main located in Lone Star Rd.
8" water main located in Lone Star Rd.
8" irrigation main located in Lone Star Rd.

Environmental: Approval of the vacation will have no effect on area properties, only alignment of the right-of-way in front of the property.

Correspondence: As of the date of this staff report no objections have been raised by any utility companies or surrounding property owners concerning the proposed vacation. Fire, Building, and Engineering Departments have not expressed any opposition to the right-of-way vacation.

STAFF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

Planning staff sees no reason why the vacation of this 10’ section of Lone Star Rd. right-of-way should not be approved, especially with the 15’ dedication to the east for alignment.

RECOMMENDED APPROVAL CONDITIONS

If the City Council following the public hearing determines to approve the requested street vacation no conditions of approval are required.
ATTACHMENTS

1) Application (Page 4)
2) Vicinity map with zoning (Page 5)
3) Aerial photo of subject property (Page 6)
4) Site plan showing vacation and dedication areas (Page 7)
5) Deed and dedication information (Pages 8-12)
6) City and other agency correspondence (Pages 13+)
APPLICATION FOR VACATION OF EASEMENT, PUBLIC RIGHT-OF-WAY OR PLAT
PLANNING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT
411 3RD STREET S., NAMPA, IDAHO 83651  P: (208) 468-4487 F: (208) 465-2261
Nonrefundable Fee: $505.00

Applicant Name
MITCHELL PAGE

Home Number

Street Address
2005 W DEW MIST DR.

Mobile Number
(208) 697-8024

City
Nampa

Email

State
ID.

Zip code
83651

Applicant’s interest in property: (X) Own ( ) Rent ( ) Other

Property Owner Name
MITCHELL PAGE

Address of Subject Property:
561 LONE STAR RD. Nampa ID.

Subject Property Information
Please provide the following REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION to complete the Vacation

☐ A copy of one of the following: □ Warranty Deed □ Proof Of Option □ Earnest Money Agreement

☑ List of names, addresses AND written consent of the owners and contract purchasers of all property adjoining the vacated portion

☐ Signed & Notarized Affidavit of Legal Interest (attached). Form must be completed by the legal owner
(If owner is a corporation, submit a copy of the Articles of Incorporation or other evidence to show that the person signing is an authorized agent)

☑ Original Legal description of property AND a legible WORD formatted document. (Must have for final recording)
Old or illegible title documents will need to be retyped in a WORD formatted document.

☑ Sketch drawing of the portion proposed to be vacated

Project Description

☐ State (or attach a letter stating) the reason you desire the easement, public right-of-way, plat or part thereof to be vacated: To align property lines

Dated this day of May, 2019

Applicant Signature

PLEASE NOTE
This application will be referred to the Nampa City Council. If the Council desires, it may refer the application to the Planning Commission for its recommendation. If the application is recommended for approval the City Council shall hold a public hearing.

Written notice of the public hearing shall be sent to all property owners within 300 feet of the boundaries of the proposed vacation by certified mail with return receipt, at least 10 days prior to the date of the public hearing. Notice shall also be published once a week for 2 successive weeks in the Idaho Press-Tribune, with the last publication at least 7 days prior to the hearing. You will be given notice of the public hearings and should be present to answer any questions.
Exhibit:

561 Lone Star Rd

Vacation of portion of Right-Of-Way to align property lines

VAC-00035-2019

Visit Planning & Zoning at cityofnampa.us for more info.

5/13/2019

Page 5
Vacate to the City of Nampa

Return To Mitchell & Tabitha Page
PLANNING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT

MEMORANDUM

To: Tom Points – Public Works Director

From: Sylvia Mackrill, City of Nampa Planning Department
       mackrill@cityofnampa.us

Date: May 15, 2019

Subject: Public Works Director Signature – Deed and Dedication of Right-Of-Way for Lone Star Road, adjacent 561 Lone Star Rd, Parcel R15216010A1 for Mitchell Page

Mitchell Page has signed the attached Deed for Dedication of Right-Of-Way for Lone Star Rd, adjacent 561 Lone Star Rd.

Mr Page has also submitted for Vacation of Right of Way for the 70 ft of Lone Star Rd in order to align the property line adjacent Lone Star Rd - VAC-00035-2019 and that will go before City Council on their June 3, 2019 Agenda.

The legal description for the Dedication of Right-Of-Way has been checked.

Please sign the Dedication of Right-Of-Way document as soon as possible and return to my attention.
DEED

On this _____ day of ____________, 2019, Grantor(s), MITCHELL PAGE, for good and valuable consideration, the receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, do hereby grant, bargain, sell and convey to the CITY OF NAMPA, an Idaho municipal corporation, grantee, 411 – 3rd Street South, Nampa, ID 83651, the following described real property for right of way and such other uses as the City deems in the best interests of the public, to wit:

See Attached Exhibit “A” Legal Description

For Dedication of Right-Of-Way for Lone Star Road,
Adjacent 561 Lone Star Road, Canyon County Parcel R15216010A1 in the NE ¼ Section 28 T3N R2W

Together with all improvements, easements, hereditaments and appurtenances thereto.

And the Grantor(s) hereby fully warrant the title to said land and will defend the same against all lawful claims of all persons whomsoever.

In witness whereof, the parties hereto have executed this agreement the day and year first above written.

Grantor:
MITCHELL PAGE

Grantee:
Tom Points, P.E.
Public Works Director

For Gift deeds, Nampa City Council approval and the signature of the Mayor are required.

Deborah A Kling
Mayor

Deed and Dedication Page 1
STATE OF IDAHO
COUNTY OF CANYON

On this 15th day of May, 2019, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public, in and for said State, personally appeared MITCHELL PAGE, known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed by official seal, the day and year in this certificate first above written.

Notary Public for Idaho
Commission expires: 1/19/2023

SEAL

STATE OF IDAHO
COUNTY OF CANYON

On this 20th day of May, 2019, before me, the undersigned, a Notary Public, in and for said State, personally appeared Tom Points, P.E., known to me to be the person whose name is subscribed.

IN WITNESS THEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and affixed by official seal, the day and year in this certificate first above written.

Notary Public for Idaho
Commission expires: 10-26-24

SEAL
EXHIBIT "A"

BOUNDARY DESCRIPTION
FOR
MITCHELL PAGE

15 foot Right-of-way Dedication

Part of the Northwest ¼ of the Northeast ¼ of Section 28, Township 3 North, Range 2 West of the Boise Meridian, City of Nampa, Idaho described as follows:

Commencing at the Northwest corner of the Northeast ¼ of the Northwest ¼ of Section 28, Township 3 North, Range 2 West of the Boise Meridian, City of Nampa, Idaho and running thence S89°34'55"E 1326.50 feet along the North line of said Section 28 to the North Quarter corner of said Section 28; thence S00°29'45"W 25.00 feet; thence S89°34'40"E 70.00 feet parallel to the North line of said Section to the Point of Beginning; thence S89°34'40"E 123.17 feet parallel to the North line of said Section to a point on a curve; thence Southerly 15.68 feet along said curve to the right (Curve data: Radius= 550.00', Delta= 01°37'59", Chord Bearing and Distance= S17°17'33"W 15.67 feet); thence N89°34'40"W 118.64 feet parallel to the North line of said Section; thence N00°29'45"E 15.00 feet to the Point of Beginning.

Parcel contains 1,814 square feet or 0.04 acres more or less.

106 W Main St. Unit D, Middleton, ID 83644 * pls12220@yahoo.com * (208) 861-7513 (O) * (866) 337-4925 (F)
Date: May 29, 2019

Rev:

To: Mayor and City Council
Cc: Planning and Zoning
Cc: Caleb LeClair, P. E., Assistant City Engineer
Cc: Daniel Badger, P. E., City Engineer
Cc: Tom Points S, P. E., Nampa City Public Works Director

From: Jim Brooks – Engineering Division
Re: Portion of existing 50-foot right-of-way of Lone Star Road

Applicant: Mitchell Page

Applicant Address: 2005 W. Dew Mist Drive, Nampa, Idaho 83651

Property Owner: Mitchell and Tabitha Page

Owners Address: 2005 W. Dew Mist Drive, Nampa, Idaho 83651

Property Address: 561 Lone Star Road

VAC-00035-2019 for the June 3, 2019 City Council Meeting

Applicant is desirous to vacate a ten-foot (10’) portion of an existing 50-foot (50’) right-of-way of Lone Star Road. Action will conform this section of right-of-way with existing rights-of-way along Lone Star Road. In addition, the owners have dedicated forty-feet (40’) of right-of-way across frontage of the adjacent parcel they own.

The Engineering Division has no concerns with recommending granting this vacation request.
Sylvia Mackrill

From: Neil Jones
Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2019 8:09 AM
To: Sylvia Mackrill
Cc: Patrick Sullivan
Subject: RE: VAC-00035 Vacation of Right-Of-Way 561 Lone Star Rd for Mitchell Page

Building Department has no conditions.

Neil Jones
Assistant Building Official
P: 208.468-5492 F: 208.468.4494
jonesn@cityofnampa.us
Department of Building Safety, Like us on Facebook

----Original Message-----
From: Sylvia Mackrill <mackrill@cityofnampa.us>
Sent: Tuesday, May 14, 2019 11:12 AM
To: Addressing <Addressing@cityofnampa.us>; Beth Ineck <ineckb@cityofnampa.us>; bob.parsons@phd3.idaho.gov; Bobby Sanchez <sanchezb@cityofnampa.us>; bocc@canyonco.org; Brent Hoskins <hoskinsb@cityofnampa.us>; Caleb LaClair <laclaire@cityofnampa.us>; Canyon Highway District No. 4 <chopper@canyonhd4.org>
overof Idaho <cmiller@compassidaho.org> <cmiller@compassidaho.org>; Chanee Grant <cgrant@nmid.org>; Cody Swander <swanderc@cityofnampa.us>; Daniel Badger <BadgerD@cityofnampa.us>; deerflat@fws.gov; Don Barr <barrd@cityofnampa.us>; Doug Critchfield <critchfieldd@cityofnampa.us>; Eddy Thiel <eddy@canyonhighway1.com>; Elijah Effinger <effingere@cityofnampa.us>; Eric R Shannon <eric@canyonhighway1.com>; gwiles@nampachristianschools.com; Jared Bryan <bryanj@cityofnampa.us>; Jason Kimball <kimballj@cityofnampa.us>; Jay Young <youngj@cityofnampa.us>; Jeff Barnes <barnesj@cityofnampa.us>; jenny.titus@vallivue.org; jessica.mansell@intgas.com; Jim Brooks <brooksj@cityofnampa.us>; Ken Couch - Idaho Transportation Dept, District 3 <D3Development.Services@itd.idaho.gov>; Ken Keene <keenek@cityofnampa.us>; Kent Lovelace <lovelacek@cityofnampa.us>; kfunke@idahopower.com; mark@pioneerirrigation.com; Melissa Close <closem@cityofnampa.us>; monica.taylor@intgas.com; Neil Jones <jonesn@cityofnampa.us>; nick@canyonhighway1.com; nmid@nmid.org; nre.easement@centurylink.com; Patrick Sullivan <sullivanp@cityofnampa.us>; Phillip Roberts <robertsp@cityofnampa.us>; pnilsson@canyonco.org; Ray Rice <ricer@cityofnampa.us>; rdewey@nsdl131.org; Reggie Edwards <edwardsr@cityofnampa.us>; Richard Davies <daviesr@cityofnampa.us>; Shellie Lopez <lopezs@cityofnampa.us>; Soyla Reyna <reynas@cityofnampa.us>; Tammy Wallen <twallen@nsdl131.org>; Tom Points <pointst@cityofnampa.us>; UCC ben melody <ben.melody@intgas.com>; vcharles@idahopower.com
Subject: VAC-00035 Vacation of Right-Of-Way 561 Lone Star Rd for Mitchell Page

Mitchell Page, the applicant, has requested Vacation of a 10 ft deep x 70 ft long portion of the Lone Star Rd Right-Of-Way, located on the west side of the property addressed as 561 Lone Star Rd (Canyon County Parcel R15216010A1). A .741 acre parcel located within an RS-6 (Single Family Residential - 6000 sq ft minimum lot size), on the south side of Lone Star Rd.

The applicant states they are requesting the Vacation of Right-Of-Way in order to align the property lines after dedicating 15 ft of Lone Star Rd Right-Of-Way to the City of Nampa on the east side of the subject property.
Hi Sylvia, regarding the applicant's request, the engineer responsible for this area has no objections, as there are no buried facilities in that ROW to be vacated. He did mention though that after the vacate, CenturyLink would have no way to pull facilities into the building, should the applicant want CenturyLink service at a future time.

Let me know if you need anything else regarding this request. Thanks.

Thank

Brad Baker
Faulk & Foster | CenturyLink
Network Infrastructure Services
11108 Chennault Beach Rd
Mukilteo WA 98275
cell: 425.286.4017

This communication is the property of CenturyLink and may contain confidential or privileged information. Unauthorized use of this communication is strictly prohibited and may be unlawful. If you have received this communication in error, please immediately notify the sender by reply e-mail and destroy all copies of the communication and any attachments.
May 14, 2019

Sylvia Mackrill  
City of Nampa  
411 3rd Street South  
Nampa, Idaho 83651

**VIA EMAIL**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application</th>
<th>VAC-0035-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>VACATION OF PUBLIC RIGHT OF WAY</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>561 Lone Star Road, west of SH-45 milepost 27.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Vacate a 10 foot deep by 70 foot long portion of the Lone Star Road right-of-way, located on the west side of the property addressed as 561 Lone Star Road</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Mitchell Page</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) reviewed the vacation application and has the following comments:

1. This project does not abut the State highway system.
2. Idaho Code 40-1910 does not allow advertising within the right-of-way of any State highway.
3. The Idaho Administrative Procedures Act (IDAPA) 39.03.60 governs advertising along the State highway system. The applicant may contact Justin Pond, Program Manager for ITD's Headquarters Right-of-Way Section at (208) 334-8832 for more information.
4. ITD does not object to the vacation of property as presented in the application.

If you have any questions, you may contact Ken Couch at (208) 332-7190 or me at (208) 334-8338.

Sincerely,

Sarah Arjona  
Development Services Coordinator  
Sarah.Arjona@itd.idaho.gov
Lafky Properties has requested a Variance to City of Nampa Zoning Ordinance 10-16-15 (C) and 10-33-04 (A) (1) requiring a twenty (20) ft setback from the front property line. The applicant has requested a reduction to ten (10) ft for the setback from the front property line for property located at 520 Caldwell Blvd (R3130700000), within a BC (Community Business) zoning district in order to allow for construction of a new mini storage and office buildings at 504 Caldwell Blvd, and expansion of the mini-storage facility onto the 520 property.

To: Mayor & City Council

Owner/Applicant: Aaron Lafky, of Lafky Properties
File No: VAR-00073-2019

Prepared By: Rodney Ashby, AICP – Principal Planner
Date: May 24, 2019

Requested Action(s): Variance to reduce the required minimum front setback from 20 to 10 feet.

Purpose/Applicant Explanation: “The purpose of the variance is to provide for expansion of the mini storage facility located at 504 and 498 Caldwell Boulevard in a manner consistent with the existing development. Granting the variance will: 1. Allow for a unified appearance and landscaping buffer to help integrate the expansion into the existing facility as a single unified project. 2. Alleviate the development difficulties presented by the unique variation in the property lines fronting the north side of Caldwell Boulevard, which would include installing 90 degree bends in utilities and irrigation lines, maintaining front landscaping of varying widths, and aligning buildings, driveways and circulation through the integrated mini storage facility. 3. Avoid an interpretation of the setback regulation that would result in properties on either side of the
applicant's property having the right to construct buildings closer to the improved Caldwell Boulevard right of way and encourage consistency with existing development on this property and other properties in the same zoning district along Caldwell Boulevard."

GENERAL INFORMATION

Status of Applicant: Owner

Existing Zoning: BC (Community Business)

Location: 504 & 520 Caldwell Blvd, Nampa; also known as Parcels R313100000 & R3130700000 respectively, located at the SE Quarter of Section 10, Township 3N, Range 2W, Boise-Meridian, Canyon County, Idaho.

Size of Property: 2.38 acres at 520 Caldwell Blvd or a 103,673 sq. ft.

Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:
North- Industrial, IL (Light Industrial)
South- Caldwell Blvd, BC (Community Business)
East- Storage Units, BC (Community Business)
West- Used Car Sales, BC (Community Business)

Comprehensive Plan Designation: General Commercial

History: On November 16, 2015, the Nampa City Council voted to approve a variance to reduce the required front yard setback from twenty (20') feet to ten (10') feet at 498 and 504 Caldwell Blvd. The variance was requested primarily because of a jog along the front property lines from 498 to 504 Caldwell Blvd - 498 being approximately thirty-seven feet (37') from Caldwell Blvd centerline and 504 being approximately 47' from centerline. Because city code requires property owners to landscape and maintain the property between the property line and the sidewalk or edge of pavement, this meant that the twenty feet (20') of landscaping was installed in alignment with the neighboring properties required twenty-foot (20') setback landscaping. The request currently being considered would allow the applicant to continue the landscaping alignment as previously constructed on the properties to the southeast.

Applicable Regulations:

10-24-1: [Variance] Purpose:

The City Council is empowered to grant variances to prevent or to lessen practical development difficulties, unique site circumstances and unnecessary physical, geographical hardships inconsistent with the objectives of zoning as would result from a literal interpretation and enforcement of certain bulk or quantifiable regulations prescribed by zoning ordinance.

A variance shall not be considered a right or special privilege but may be granted to an applicant only upon a showing of undue hardship because of: a) special characteristics applicable to the site which deprive it of privileges commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity, and b) the variance is not in conflict with the public interest. Hardships must result from special site characteristics relating to the size, shape or dimensions of a site or the location of existing structures thereon, from geographic, topographic or other physical conditions, or from population densities, street locations or traffic conditions or other unique circumstances.
Variance are not intended to allow something that others do not have a permitted right to do. The purpose of a variance is to provide fair treatment and to see that individuals are not penalized because of site characteristics beyond their control. (Ord. 2140; amd. Ord. 2978)

10-24-2: Actions:

A. Granting of Variance Permit: The council may grant a variance permit with respect to requirements for fences and walls, site, area, width, frontage, depth, coverage, front yard, rear yard, side yards, outdoor living area, height of structures, distances between structures or landscaped areas as the variance was applied for or in modified form if, based on application, investigation and evidence submitted, the council concludes the following:

1. Literal interpretation and enforcement of the regulation would result in practical difficulty or unnecessary physical hardship inconsistent with the objectives of the zoning ordinance.
2. There are extraordinary site characteristics applicable to the property involved or to the intended use of the property which do not apply generally to other properties classified in the same zoning district.
3. Literal interpretation and enforcement of the regulation would deprive the applicant of privileges enjoyed by the owners of other properties classified in the same zoning district.
4. The granting of the variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations on other properties classified in the same zoning district.
5. The granting of the variance will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

10-16-5 Property Area, Coverage and Yard Requirements: (for the BC Zone)

C. Front Yard/Street Side (Setback): Twenty feet (20') is/shall be required on/for all properties that abut front streets classified or identified as collectors or arterials on the most currently utilized Nampa urban boundary and functional classification system map. (Ord. 3960, 4-4-2011).

10-33-2: Actions:

B3. Any land between the property line and the developed roadway within the right of way, shall also be landscaped but only with grass, and/or crushed rock/gravel, with shrubs and/or flowers as desired. Commercial, industrial and multiple residential uses/interior yards (setbacks) in the various districts (when required) shall also be landscaped with some combination of grass, shrubs, trees, colored decorative rock or round gravel or nonartificial plant materials. Exception: Trees are and shall be restricted from being planted in roadway "clear zones" (a.k.a., the 'clear way') unless otherwise approved by the city. (Ord. 3960, 4-4-2011).

SPECIAL INFORMATION

Transportation/Access: The subject property is accessed from Caldwell Boulevard, a state highway and principal arterial.

Environmental, Aesthetics/Landscaping: The applicant states they are requesting the Variance in order to allow a reduced front yard setback of 10 feet for construction of a proposed...
new mini storage unit development and building. The closest building fronting Caldwell Blvd, according to plans (see exhibit) submitted for design review of the project, is a building where storage will be accessed from interior hallways. According to the submitted landscape plans (see exhibit), landscaping will front Caldwell Blvd, and in most cases, will exceed the landscaping required for a 20' setback.

Citizen/Agency Input: At the time of the preparation of this staff report, no comments were received by property owners or nearby businesses and residents. We received comments from Nampa Building Department, Code Enforcement and Engineering Division expressing no opposition. A letter from Sarah Arjona dated May 23, 2019 (attached) from Idaho Transportation Department states that opposition to the application will be removed when two curb cuts identified in an ITD permit for the property are removed. Staff has included this as a recommended condition of approval if the Council chooses to approve the application.

Staff Findings

A variance has already been granted for a reduced front yard setback at 504 Caldwell Blvd. The applicant is requesting to apply a similar variance to 520 Caldwell Boulevard. This will allow them to construct additional buildings on 504 and extend the storage units onto 520 Caldwell Blvd.

Caldwell Blvd is recognized in the Nampa 2035 Comprehensive Plan as one of six gateways into our community. The plan calls for added landscape measures beyond those required for other areas or roadways. However, the plan calls for the Building and Site Design Standards Committee to take an active role in determining what specific requirements should be placed on properties along gateways into our community.

This project is scheduled before the Building and Site Design Standards Committee for consideration on June 10, 2019. Specific appearance conditions of this project will be considered at that time and are not under consideration for this variance request to City Council.

Variances are not intended to allow something that others do not have a permitted right to do. The purpose of a variance is to provide fair treatment and to see that individuals are not penalized because of site characteristics or a site situation beyond their control (Ord. 4340, 9-18-2017).

A variance shall not be considered a right of special privilege, but may be granted to an applicant only upon a showing of undue hardship because of a) special characteristics applicable to the site which deprive it of privileges commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity, and b) the variance is not in conflict with the public interest. Council may wish to consider the larger right-of-way width on the property, compared to others in the area, as constituting an undue hardship for the property. Council may find that without a variance, the property owner would be penalized because of site characteristics beyond their control. Finally, City Council may find that the variance is not in conflict with the public interest because it will allow development that is consistent with the area.
RECOMMENDED CONDITIONS OF APPROVAL

Should the City Council vote to approve the requested Variance, staff recommends that approval be justified by the required findings found under “Applicable Regulations” of this report and listed in 10-24-2 of the Nampa City Code. Staff recommends the following condition(s) be applied:

Generally
1) The applicant shall comply with all applicable requirements as may be imposed by City divisions/departments appropriately involved in the review of this request as the Variance approval shall not have the effect of abrogating requirements from those City divisions/departments.

Specifically
1) Compliance with the Idaho Transportation Department Permit No. 3-19-203, including the removal of two of the existing curb cuts as identified in the permit.

ATTACHMENTS

1) Variance application (Page 6);
2) Applicant project description (Page 7);
3) Variance vicinity and zoning map (Page 8);
4) Aerial View of Property (Page 9)
5) Site plans (Pages 10-12);
6) Action Letter & Staff Report for 498 and 504 Caldwell Blvd Variance (Pages 13-26)
7) Comment letter from Idaho Transportation Department (Pages 27-28);
8) Comment letter from Nampa - Engineering Division (Page 29);
9) Comment letter from Nampa - Building Department (Page 30);
10) Comment letter from Nampa – Code Enforcement (Page 31);
APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE
PLANNING AND ZONING DEPARTMENT
411 3RD STREET S, NAMPA, IDAHO 83651 P: (208) 468-4487 F: (208) 465-2261
Nonrefundable Fee: $255.00

Applicant Name: LAFKY PROPERTIES - AARON LAFKY
Home Number:
Street Address: 60524 LONGVIEW ST
City: BEND State: OR Zip code: 97702

Property Owner Name: LAFKY PROPERTIES LLC
Home Number:
Street Address: 60524 LONGVIEW ST
City: BEND State: OR Zip code: 97702

Applicant’s interest in property: ( ) Own ( ) Rent ( ) Other

ADDRESS OF SUBJECT PROPERTY:
504 S 520 CALDWELL BLVD

Please provide the following required documentation
☐ Completed Application
☐ A copy of one of the following: ☑ Warranty Deed ☐ Proof Of Option ☐ Earnest Money Agreement
☐ Signed & Notarized Affidavit of Legal Interest (attached). Form must be completed by the legal owner
(If owner is a corporation, submit a copy of the Articles of Incorporation or other evidence to show that
the person signing is an authorized agent)
☐ Original Legal description of property AND a legible WORD formatted document. (Must have for final
recording) Old or illegible title documents will need to be retyped in a WORD formatted document.

Project Description
☐ State the nature of the variance request and the practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship, which
would result from a literal interpretation and enforcement of the specific regulation for which the variance
is being sought, (attach additional pages if necessary): PLEASE SEE ATTACHED

Dated this 20TH day of MAY, 2015
Applicant Signature

PLEASE NOTE
This application will be referred to the Nampa City Council for its consideration. The City Council shall hold a public hearing on
the application and it shall be granted or denied. Notice of the public hearing shall be sent to adjacent property owners no less
than 10 or more than 30 days prior to the hearing. You will be given notice of the public hearing and should be present to answer
any questions.

A variance shall not be considered a right or a privilege, but will only be granted upon showing the following undue hardship:
1. Special characteristics of the site, which deprive it of privileges commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zone or
vicinity, and
2. The variance is not in conflict with the public interest.
Variances are not intended to allow something that others do not have a permitted right to do.
The use or construction permitted by a variance must be commenced within a 6-month period. If such use or construction has not
commenced within such time period, the variance shall no longer be valid. Prior to the expiration of the 6-month period the
applicant may request from the city Council an extension for up to an additional 6 months from the original date of approval.
Application for Variance – Narrative

Lafky Properties, LLC requests a variance from N.C.C. Sections 10-16-15(C) and 10-33-04(A)(1) in the BC Zone to reduce the minimum front yard setback from twenty feet (20') to ten feet (10'). The variance is requested for approximately 50’ of frontage on Caldwell Boulevard at the west end of 504 Caldwell Boulevard (R31310) and approximately 107’ of frontage on Caldwell Boulevard at 520 Caldwell Boulevard, the adjacent property to the west (R31307). The purpose of the variance is to provide for expansion of the mini storage facility located at 504 and 498 Caldwell Boulevard in a manner consistent with the existing development.

In 2015 the applicant’s predecessor was granted a similar variance for 504 and 498 Caldwell Boulevard in Project VAR-2046-2015. With that variance the existing mini storage facility was constructed with a ten foot (10’) front yard setback from Caldwell Boulevard for approximately 150’ on the west end where the property line jogs approximately ten feet (10’) to the north. As a result of the variance the mini storage facility was constructed with a consistent depth of landscaping and separation from the sidewalk even though the building is set back twenty feet (20’) from the front property line on the eastern portion of the development and ten feet (10’) from the front property line on the western portion of the development. The aerial photograph submitted by the applicant shows the jog in the property line along Caldwell Boulevard and the location of the existing mini storage buildings.

The applicant desires to construct a new mini storage office building at 504 Caldwell Boulevard and expand the mini storage facility onto 520 Caldwell Boulevard. As shown in the aerial photograph the property line fronting Caldwell Boulevard continues in a straight line from the ten foot (10’) jog in front of 504 Caldwell Boulevard along to entire frontage of 520 Caldwell Boulevard until it meets the parcel to the west (R31316) where the property line jogs out to the middle of Caldwell Boulevard. Granting the variance will allow the applicant to develop the remainder of its property with a consistent set back and landscaping buffer along Caldwell Boulevard in a manner consistent with its existing development.

Granting the variance will:

1. Allow for a unified appearance and landscaping buffer to help integrate the expansion into the existing facility as a single unified project.

2. Alleviate the development difficulties presented by the unique variation in the property lines fronting the north side of Caldwell Boulevard, which would include installing 90 degree bends in utilities and irrigation lines, maintaining front landscaping of varying widths, and aligning buildings, driveways and circulation through the integrated mini storage facility.

3. Avoid an interpretation of the setback regulation that would result in properties on either side of the applicant’s property having the right to construct buildings closer to the improved Caldwell Boulevard right of way and encourage consistency with existing development on this property and other properties in the same zoning district along Caldwell Boulevard.
520 Caldwell Blvd.

Variance for a 10' setback in lieu of 20' required setback from Cladwell Blvd. ROW in order to allow for construction of a mini-storage building.

VAR-00073-2019

5/17/2019
November 18, 2015

Dustin Cox
694 W. Davenport Street
Meridian, Idaho 83642

Re: Request for approval of a Variance Permit to N.C.C. § 10-16-05(C) [and 10-33-04(A)(1)] in order to allow a reduction in the required front yard setback of twenty feet (20') to ten feet (10') on a parcel in a BC Zone, appertaining to a parcel of land addressed as 504 and 498 Caldwell Boulevard, and, an adjacent parcel to the east (R31380) comprising in total some 3.8 acres (hereinafter the "Property") all situated in a BC (Community Business) Zone in Nampa; for and in behalf of Dustin Cox as Applicant; City case file no. VAR 2046-15

Dear Mr. Cox:

The Nampa City Council, during their regularly scheduled public hearing of November 16, 2015, voted to approve the above referenced request Variance request. Respecting the approval of the Variance application, the Council ultimately concluded that:

1. Literal interpretation and enforcement of the regulation would result in practical difficulty or unnecessary physical hardship inconsistent with the objectives of the zoning ordinance.

2. There are extraordinary site characteristics applicable to the property involved or to the intended use of the property which do not apply generally to other properties classified in the same zoning district.

3. Literal interpretation and enforcement of the regulation would deprive the applicant of privileges enjoyed by the owners of other properties classified in the same zoning district.

4. The granting of the variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations on other properties classified in the same zoning district.

5. The granting of the variance will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.

The Council made their approval contingent on your compliance with the
following [generic] condition(s) [as relevant]:

Generally:
1. Applicant(s) shall comply with all applicable requirements [including obtaining Design Review and Building Permits] as may be imposed by City agencies appropriately involved in the review of this request (e.g., Nampa Fire [inspection], Building, Planning and Zoning and Engineering Departments, etc.) as the Variance(s) approval does not, and shall not, have the effect of abrogating requirements from those agencies or City divisions/departments...

If you should have any questions concerning this letter, please call during normal business hours Monday through Friday at 468-5457.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Robert Hobbs
Assistant Director
On behalf of the Council

GRH/rh

cc: Jim Brooks, Engineering
    Neil Jones, Building
    file VAR 2046-15
ZONE-A

VARIANCE REQUEST TO REDUCE WIDTH DUE TO JOG IN RIGHT OF WAY, WATER LINE AND OVERHEAD POWER/ELECTRIC CONFLICTS.
PLANNING & ZONING DEPARTMENT

Before the Mayor & City Council
Meeting of 16 NOVEMBER 2015

PUBLIC HEARING ITEM NO. 3
STAFF REPORT

Applicant/Representative(s):
Dustin Cox
File No(s).: VAR 2046-15
Analyst: Robert Hobbs

Requested Action(s): Variances to Nampa City Zoning Code as follows:

1. From N.C.C. § 10-16-05(C) [and 10-33-04(A)(1)] in order to allow a reduction in the required front yard setback of twenty feet (20') to ten feet (10') on a parcel in a BC Zone...

Appertaining to:
Parcel of land addressed as 504 and 498 Caldwell Boulevard, and, an adjacent parcel to the east (R31380) comprising in total some 3.8 acres (hereinafter the “Property”) all situated in a BC (Community Business) Zone in Nampa...

Contents:
Conclusions of Law: Page 2
Staff Narrative Findings/Discussion: Pages 3-6
Recommended Condition(s) of Approval: Page 6
Attachments Description(s): Page 6

APPLICABLE REGULATIONS

10-24-1: [VARIANCE] PURPOSE:

The council is empowered to grant variances in order to prevent or to lessen practical development difficulties, unique site circumstances and unnecessary physical, geographical hardships inconsistent with the objectives of zoning as would result from a literal interpretation and enforcement of certain of the bulk or quantifiable regulations prescribed by this title.
A variance shall not be considered a right or special privilege, but may be granted to an applicant only upon a showing of undue hardship because of: a) special characteristics applicable to the site which deprive it of privileges commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity, and b) the variance is not in conflict with the public interest. Hardships must result from special site characteristics relating to the size, shape or dimensions of a site or the location of existing structures thereon, from geographic, topographic or other physical conditions, or from population densities, street locations or traffic conditions or other unique circumstances.

Variances are not intended to allow something that others do not have a permitted right to do. The purpose of a variance is to provide fair treatment and to see that individuals are not penalized because of site characteristics beyond their control. (Ord. 2140; amd. Ord. 2978)

10-24-2: ACTIONS:

A. Granting Of Variance Permit: The council may grant a variance permit with respect to requirements for fences and walls, site, area, width, frontage, depth, coverage, front yard, rear yard, side yards, outdoor living area, height of structures, distances between structures or landscaped areas as the variance was applied for or in modified form if, on the basis of application, investigation and evidence submitted, the council concludes the following:

1. Literal interpretation and enforcement of the regulation would result in practical difficulty or unnecessary physical hardship inconsistent with the objectives of the zoning ordinance.

2. There are extraordinary site characteristics applicable to the property involved or to the intended use of the property which do not apply generally to other properties classified in the same zoning district.

3. Literal interpretation and enforcement of the regulation would deprive the applicant of privileges enjoyed by the owners of other properties classified in the same zoning district.

4. The granting of the variance will not constitute a grant of special privilege inconsistent with the limitations on other properties classified in the same zoning district.

5. The granting of the variance will not be detrimental to the public health, safety or welfare or materially injurious to properties or improvements in the vicinity.
STAFF FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

I. Variance Introduction:

Variances are traditionally offered zoning tools used as remedies to seek jurisdictional waivers or reductions of quantifiable, measurable development code requirements (e.g., setbacks, property dimensions, height standards, min. or maximum quantities or sizes, etc.) with which compliance in a given situation could not be attained due to site constraints (such as unusual topography) inherent to a property, rather than being the result of an applicant's own action(s)/development desires. Normally, economic considerations or “self-imposed hardships” or predicaments are not qualifying grounds to support a Variance application or its approval. As noted in the planning text The Practice of Local Government Planning (ICMA, 1988, 2nd ed.),

"Many requests for variances are for minor bulk variances in existing neighborhoods: for example, expansions of patios or carports one or two feet into designated side-yard setbacks. On such matters the zoning board becomes a sort of neighborhood arbitration board, dealing with physical hardships. Although these hardships are rarely great, this should be weighed against the extent of the public sector's stake in the somewhat arbitrary determination that a 10-foot- side yard is superior to a 9-foot one."

In Nampa, in order to justify a Variance Permit request, an applicant is tasked with arguing successfully to the City's Council that there is some aspect of the Property that physically, topographically or based on code requirements puts them at a disadvantage in trying to accomplish what they wish in comparison to like properties, especially in the surrounding area.

If the Council believes that there is no real topographical hardship associated with a Variance application (e.g., a river, a highway or a mountain in the way, etc.), then left to the applicant is the opportunity to argue that there is a "unique site circumstance" sufficient to justify their request. In times past, Variance Permits have been issued on a case by case basis where a unique situation could be determined to exist that pertained to a Variance application. Thus, historical matters, errors by the City or County, demonstrated lack of knowledge concerning a code by an applicant or their contractor, common sense "solutioning", development precedent and a variety of other mitigating factors have been evaluated in conjunction with these kinds of applications for relief from quantifiable, measurable standards adopted as law via Nampa's zoning ordinance.

Council is at liberty to approve or deny a Variance. And, their vote should not necessarily be construed as setting precedent -- for nothing binds them to vote the same way twice other than their own perceptions and those of others that they may be concerned with. Still, consistency is a desirable goal when dealing with case by case Variance requests. As a Variance decision is a "quasi-judicial" matter, any vote to approve or deny should be accompanied by a reasoned statement listing the rationale for the decision made.

II. This Application:

As Variance Permits have been used to provide opportunity for an applicant to seek relief from a dimensional or quantifiable, metric standard, this request was received to ask the Council to consider allowing a reduced front yard setback for a proposed carport on the newly cleared Property. Were the Variance granted, the southern most proposed storage
building made a part of a complex being proposed by the Applicant would have about 145' of its 370' length placed within ten feet of the front property line along the Caldwell Boulevard. As this is a Variance request, it is the obligation of the Applicant to present such facts and persuasive arguments as to convince the Council that there exists some form of hardship or other unique site circumstance to justify issuance of the requested permit. The review criteria the Council is to use in assessing the application are those in bold font listed at the beginning of this report under the heading of “Applicable Regulations”, “Actions” 1-5. A "justification narrative" has not been received from the Applicant, though we expect they will be present at the hearing to explain their request and its merits.

III. General Findings and Opinion:

1. The Property made the subject of this Variance request is located within the incorporated limits of the City of Nampa; and,

2. The Applicant has a controlling interest in the Property and is authorized to represent the same or allow another party to represent the same in this matter; and,

3. The Applicant proposes to convert use of the Property, presently vacant, to a self-service mini-storage facility with attendant office (and related site improvements) on the Property; and,

4. As authorized and mandated according to Idaho statute, the City has adopted a comprehensive zoning ordinance that applies to all properties within the City's incorporated limits and, by limited form and fashion, to areas within its negotiated impact area; and,

5. The City's zoning ordinance requires that re-developed properties in the BC Zone comply with all relevant zoning code requirements appertaining thereto (including emplacement of any requisite, extant site improvements); and,

6. That among BC zoning regulations, a front yard setback standard exists which requires that any property abutting a right-of-way classified by the City as an “arterial” or a "collector" provide twenty feet (20') of setback buffer adjacent said roadway; and,

7. The Property is located within a Community Business (BC) Zone and lies abutting a right-of-way classified as an “arterial” (Caldwell Boulevard) and another right-of-way classified as a “local” street (Horton); and,

8. That a front yard setback of twenty feet (20') is applicable to development of the Property for/as a self-service mini-storage facility; and,

9. That the front yard setback is required to be landscaped in accordance with Chapter 33 of the City's adopted zoning ordinance; and,

10. The Applicant seeks a Variance Permit from the City of Nampa in order to allow a reduced front yard setback – proposed to be reduced from twenty feet (20') to ten feet (10') for a portion of the Property frontage (i.e. about 200' of 450'); and,

11. The Applicant has submitted to the City a complete Variance Permit Application together with the requisite fee, and the City has received the application; and,
12. The Variance Application is being processed in conjunction with procedures compliant with the Local Land Use Planning Act, and Nampa Zoning Ordinance standards appertaining to such an application type; and,

13. Variances, as a rule, are not to be issued simply for economic reasons or convenience; they "shall not be considered a right or special privilege, but may be granted to an applicant only upon a showing of undue hardship because of: a) special characteristics applicable to the site which deprive it of privileges commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity"; and,

14. No statement is provided that attempts to justify the Variance request as some form of topographical or other physical site hardship that restricts Property development or "buildout"; and,

15. Staff understands that the proposed front yard setback intrusion is desired to because the front property line jogs in its alignment/vectoring; accordingly, the front setback, keyed to that line, must jog with it. The asymmetry created by that condition may be reacted to by the Applicant by cutting short their southern most storage building at the place of angle change, or, by jogging the building at the same place, or foregoing emplacement of that building. The building spans 370', of which 145' is directly affected by the property line jog. Note that the proposed distance from the back of sidewalk abutting the Property that lines the Caldwell Boulevard is the same all along the proposed south building's footprint notwithstanding the property line jog. As that space is intended to be landscaped, the only difference between the area where twenty feet (20') of setback is provided versus where ten feet (10') is proposed will be on paper; and,

16. The City's design review committee has rendered a decision approving the aesthetics of the complex's street view which includes maintaining a consistent building wall plane on the south side of the southernmost proposed storage building – the subject of this report; and,

17. City Engineering has not forecast a need to widen the Caldwell Boulevard along the Property's frontage and seeks no right-of-way dedication on the City or State's behalf. Rather they have expresses that they do not oppose the Variance proposal; and,

18. No direct physical impact on the public by this request is foreseen by virtue of this request were it approved; expected impact would be center, rather, on the question any approval raises as to its propriety -- given compliance to setbacks demonstrated by other persons/parties; and,

19. Attached to this report is all of the information Staff had by the time this report was ready to go to print. No complaints or expressions of opposition, or, conversely of support have been received from the public in regards to this matter; and,

20. The application has received City design review approval from the Building and Site Design Committee, which approval addressed architectural aesthetics of the proposed southern storage building [made the subject of this report] as well as the business office for the facility.
Opinion: Based on the findings associated with this matter, Staff recommends approval of the Variance request.

**RECOMMENDED CONDITION(S) OF APPROVAL**

Should the Council vote to approve this Variance request, then Staff recommends that they consider imposing the following Condition(s) of Approval against the same:

Generally:
1. Applicant(s) shall comply with all applicable requirements [including obtaining Design Review and Building Permits] as may be imposed by City agencies appropriately involved in the review of this request (e.g., Nampa Fire [inspection], Building, Planning and Zoning and Engineering Departments, etc.) as the Variance(s) approval does not, and shall not, have the affect of abrogating requirements from those agencies or City divisions/departments...

**ATTACHMENTS**

- Copy of Vicinity Map (page/Exhibit 7)
- Copy of application form (page/Exhibit 8)
- Copies of digital/aerial image (page/Exhibit 9)
- Copies of any citizen/agency correspondence (page(s)/Exhibit(s) 10+)
DUSTIN COX HAS REQUESTED A VARIANCE TO CITY OF NAMPA ZONING ORDINANCE, SECTION 10-16.5.C, REQUIRING A TWENTY (20) FT FRONT YARD SETBACK FROM THE PROPERTY LINE FOR PROPERTY LOCATED AT 504, 498 CALDWELL BLVD AND ADJACENT PARCEL TO THE EAST R 313080, COMPRISING 3.8 ACRES. THE APPLICANT IS REQUESTING THE VARIANCE FOR THE PROPOSED SLEEPY HOLLOW STORAGE FACILITY IN ORDER TO REDUCE THE SETBACK AND RELATED LANDSCAPING TO TEN (10) FT DUE TO THE TEN (10) FT JOG IN THE STREET RIGHT OF WAY, EXISTING WATER LINE AND OVERHEAD POWER/ELECTRIC CONFLICTS ON THE WEST PORTION OF THE PROPERTY.

PROJECT: VAR 2046-15
APPLICATION FOR VARIANCE
City of Nampa, Idaho

This application must be filled out in detail and submitted to the office of the Planning Director for the City of Nampa, Idaho, accompanied by a nonrefundable fee of $255.00

Name of Applicant/Representative: Dustin Cox Phone: 208 541 6555
Address: 694 W. Davenport St. City: Meridian State: ID Zip Code: 83642
Applicant's Interest in property: (circle one) Own Rent Other
Owner Name: Dustin Cox Phone: 208 541 6555
Address: 694 W. Davenport St. City: Meridian State: ID Zip Code: 83642
Address of subject property: 504 Caldwell Blvd. Nampa, ID. 83651
Is a copy of one of the following attached? (circle one) Warranty Deed Proof Of Option Earnest Money Agreement.

Subject Property Information
(Please provide one form of the following REQUIRED DOCUMENTATION to complete the legal annexation):
☐ Original Legal description of property AND a legible WORD formatted document. (Must have for final recording)
☑ Old or illegible title documents will need to be retyped in a WORD formatted document
☐ Subdivision________________________ Lot_________ Block_________ Book_________ Page_________
☐ An accurate scale drawing of the site and any adjacent property affected, showing all existing and proposed locations of streets, easements, property lines, uses, structures, driveways, pedestrian walks, off-street parking and off-street loading facilities and landscaped areas.
☐ Miscellaneous information, considered pertinent to the determination of this matter,

Project Description
State the nature of the variance request and the practical difficulty or unnecessary hardship, which would result from a literal interpretation and enforcement of the specific regulation for which the variance is being sought, (attach additional pages if necessary):

See Attached - SETBACK

Dated this 7th day of OCT, 2015

Applicant Signature

NOTICE TO APPLICANT
This application will be referred to the Nampa City Council for its consideration. The City Council shall hold a public hearing on the application and it shall be granted or denied. Notice of the public hearing shall be sent to adjacent property owners no less than 10 or more than 30 days prior to the hearing. You will be given notice of the public hearing and should be present to answer any questions.

A variance shall not be considered a right or a privilege, but will only be granted upon showing the following undue hardship:
1. Special characteristics of the site, which deprive it of privileges commonly enjoyed by other properties in the same zone or vicinity, and
2. The variance is not in conflict with the public interest.
Variances are not intended to allow something that others do not have a permitted right to do.

The use or construction permitted by a variance must be commenced within a 6 month period. If such use or construction has not commenced within such time period the variance shall no longer be valid. Prior to the expiration of the 6-month period the applicant may request from the city Council an extension for up to an additional 6 months from the original date of approval.

For Office Use Only:
File Number: VAR2016 - 2015 Project Name: Sleepy Hollow Variance

12/11/13 Revised
ZONE A
VARIANCE REQUEST TO REDUCE WIDTH
DUE TO JOG IN RIGHT OF WAY, WATER
LINE AND OVERHEAD POWER/ELECTRIC
CONFLICTS.
May 23, 2019

Sylvia Mackrill  
City of Nampa   
411 3rd Street South  
Nampa, Idaho 83651

VIA EMAIL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Development Application</th>
<th>VAR-00073-2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Project Name</td>
<td>MINI STORAGE SETBACK VARIANCES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Location</td>
<td>504 Caldwell Boulevard, north of I-84B milepost 56.94</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Project Description</td>
<td>Variance to the City of Nampa Zoning Ordinance 10-16-15 (C) and 10-33-04 (A) requiring a 20 foot setback from the property line. Applicant has requested a reduction of the setback to 10 feet from the property line for property located at 520 Caldwell Boulevard and the western portion of 504 Caldwell Boulevard within a BC (Community Business) zoning district, in order to allow for construction of a new mini storage office building at 504 Caldwell Boulevard and the expansion of the mini storage facility already located at 504 and 498 Caldwell Boulevard. Applicant is requesting the variance in order to allow for a unified appearance and landscaping buffer with the existing facility at 504 and 498 Caldwell Boulevard as well as alleviating the development difficulties presented by the variation in the property lines fronting the north side of Caldwell Boulevard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Applicant</td>
<td>Aaron Lafky of Lafky Properties</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) reviewed the variance application and has the following comments:

1. This project abuts the State highway system.

2. The access to this parcel is permitted under ITD Permit No. 3-19-203. Applicant must adhere to all previously approved permits and conditions including the removal of two of the existing curb cuts as identified in the attached permit. All work under the permit shall be completed within one
year from the date that the Department issues the permit to begin work. Applicant may request, in writing, one, 6 month extension prior to expiration of the permit.

3. Idaho Code 40-1910 does not allow advertising within the right-of-way of any State highway.

4. The Idaho Administrative Procedures Act (IDAPA) 39.03.60 governs advertising along the State highway system. The applicant may contact Justin Pond, Program Manager for ITD’s Headquarters Right-of-Way Section at (208) 334-8832 for more information.

5. Once the identified curb cuts have been removed, ITD will withdraw any objection to the proposed application.

If you have any questions, you may contact Ken Couch at (208) 332-7190 or me at (208) 334-8338.

Sincerely,

Sarah Arjona
Development Services Coordinator
Sarah.Arjona@itd.idaho.gov
Date: May 24, 2019
Rev:
To: City Council
Cc: Caleb LaClair, P. E., Assistant City Engineer-Development
Cc: Daniel Badger, P. E., City Engineer
Cc: Tom Points, P. E., Nampa City Public Works Director
From: Jim Brooks – Engineering Division
Subject: Variance – Front Setbacks
Applicant: Lafky Properties – Aaron Lafky
Applicant Address: 61524 Longview Street, Bend, Oregon 97702
Owner: Lafky Properties – Aaron Lafky
Owner Address: 61524 Longview Street, Bend, Oregon 97702
Parcel Address: 498 & 504 Caldwell Boulevard

VAR-00073-2019 for the June 3, 2019 City Council Meeting

The Engineering Division does not oppose the granting of this variance request with condition that owner contacts State of Idaho Department of Transportation to verify that the request also meets with their approval as Caldwell Boulevard is under the jurisdiction of Idaho Department of Transportation.
Building Department will require permits for any and all work before it starts.

Sylvia Mackrill

From: Sylvia Mackrill <mackill@cityofnampa.us>
Sent: Thursday, May 16, 2019 10:48 AM
To: Addressing <Addressing@cityofnampa.us>; Beth Ineck <ineckb@cityofnampa.us>; bob.parsons@phd3.idaho.gov; Bobby Sanchez <sanchezb@cityofnampa.us>; bocc@canyonco.org; Brent Hoskins <hoskinsb@cityofnampa.us>; Caleb LaClair <laclaire@cityofnampa.us>; Canyon Highway District No. 4 (chopper@canyonhd4.org) <chopper@canyonhd4.org>; Carl Miller - Compass of Idaho (cmiller@compassidaho.org) <cmiller@compassidaho.org>; Chanece Grant <cgrant@nmid.org>; Cody Swander <swanderc@cityofnampa.us>; Daniel Badger <BadgerD@cityofnampa.us>; deerflat@fws.gov; Don Barr <barrd@cityofnampa.us>; Doug Critchfield <critchfieldd@cityofnampa.us>; Eddy Thiel <eddy@nampahighway1.com>; Elijah Effinger <effingere@cityofnampa.us>; Eric R Shannon <eric@nampahighway1.com>; gwiles@nampachristianschools.com; Jared Bryan <bryanj@cityofnampa.us>; Jason Kimball <kimballj@cityofnampa.us>; Jay Young <youngj@cityofnampa.us>; Jeff Barnes <barnesj@cityofnampa.us>; jenny.titus@vallivue.org; jessica.mansell@intgas.com; Jim Brooks <brooksj@cityofnampa.us>; ken.couch@itd.idaho.gov; Kent Keene <keene@cityofnampa.us>; kent.lovelace@lovelacek@cityofnampa.us; kfunke@idahopower.com; mark@pioneerirrigation.com; Melissa Close <closem@cityofnampa.us>; monica.taylor@intgas.com; Neil Jones <joncsn@cityofnampa.us>; nick@nampahighway1.com; nmid@nmid.org; nre.easement@centurylink.com; nre.easement@cityofnampa.us; Nicholas@nmid.org; Patrick Sullivan <sullivanw@cityofnampa.us>; Phillip Roberts <robertsp@cityofnampa.us>; pnilsson@canyonco.org; Ray Rice <ricer@cityofnampa.us>; rdewey@nsd131.org; Reggie Edwards <edwardsr@cityofnampa.us>; Richard Davies <daviesn@cityofnampa.us>; Shellie Lopez <lopezs@cityofnampa.us>; Soyla Reyna <reynas@cityofnampa.us>; Tammy Wallen <twaller@nsd131.org>; Tom Points <pointst@cityofnampa.us>; UCC ben melody <ben.melody@intgas.com>; vargas@cityofnampa.us; vcharles@idahopower.com

Subject: VAR-00073-2019 Reduced Setbacks for 520 and a portion of 504 Caldwell Blvd

Aaron Lafky of Lafky Properties has submitted a Variance to City of Nampa Zoning Ordinance 10-16-15(C) and 10-33-04(A)(1) requiring a 20 ft setback from the property line.

The applicant has requested a reduction of the setback to 10 ft from the property line for property located at 520 Caldwell Blvd (R3130700000), and the western portion of 504 Caldwell Blvd (R3131000000), within a BC (Community Business) zoning district, in order to allow for construction of a new mini storage office building at 504 Caldwell Blvd and expansion of the mini-storage facility already located at 504 and 498 Caldwell Blvd.
No code violations at this time.

Notice: All communication transmitted within the City of Nampa Email system may be a public record and may be subject to disclosure under the Idaho Public Records Act (Idaho Code 74-101 et seq.) and as such may be copied and reproduced by members of the public. In addition, archives of all City emails are generally kept for a period of two years and are also subject to monitoring and review.
ORDINANCE NO. _________

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO, TO CREATE LOCAL IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT NO. 163 FOR NAMPA, IDAHO, FOR CITY UTILITY EXTENSIONS AND CONNECTIONS; PROVIDING FOR THE LEVYING OF ASSESSMENTS UPON THE PROPERTY BENEFITTED BY SUCH IMPROVEMENTS AND FOR THE BASIS OF MAKING SAID ASSESSMENTS; SETTING FORTH THE PROPERTIES TO BE INCLUDED IN SAID DISTRICT; AND PROVIDING FOR MAKING THE ASSESSMENT ROLL.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT ORDAINED BY THE MAYOR AND COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO:

Section 1: There is hereby created a local improvement district in the City of Nampa, Idaho, to be called Local Improvement District No. 163 for City Utility Extensions and Connections; the boundaries of the real property included herein are in accordance with the resolution of intention, which was heretofore and hereby is adopted, ratified and approved; and the boundaries of said district and the real property included herein all within the City of Nampa at various locations throughout the corporate limits of the City.

Section 2: The property shall be assessed for construction costs not paid by the City, said amount is estimated to be thirty eight thousand nine hundred and sixty seven dollars and sixty seven cents, ($38,994.67); provided said costs shall not exceed the actual cost of the extension and connection fees together with expenses as set forth in Section 3.

Section 3: Each lot and parcel of land shall be separately assessed for said debt or cost and expense of said extensions and the connection fees in proportion to the benefits derived to such property by said improvements. The costs and expenses to be assessed as herein provided shall include the cost of connection fees.

Section 4: The City Engineer is hereby directed to make an assessment roll according to the provisions of Idaho Code § 50-1712.

Section 5: In the case of a sewer connection, the connection fee allows the property residence to be connected to the City sewer system. The property owner will need to hire a City of Nampa licensed plumber to connect their private line onto the City main line. In the case of a water connection, the City of Nampa Waterworks Division will install a service line, a meter box and a water meter for the residence. The property owner will need to hire a City of Nampa licensed plumber to connect their private line into the water meter. In the case of an irrigation connection, the City of Nampa Waterworks Division will install the service line, shut-off valve and service riser for pressure irrigation onto the property.
Section 6: Should the court having jurisdiction declare any part of this Ordinance invalid, unauthorized or unconstitutional or in conflict with any other part of this Ordinance, then such decision shall affect only the part declared to be unconstitutional, unauthorized or invalid, and shall not affect any part whatsoever of this Ordinance. The Mayor and City Council of the City of Nampa, Idaho, declare that it would have passed this Ordinance, and each part hereof, irrespective of parts declared invalid, unauthorized or unconstitutional.


Approved:

By ________________________________
Mayor

Attest:

By ________________________________
City Clerk
ORDINANCE NO. __________

AN ORDINANCE DETERMINING THAT CERTAIN LANDS, COMMONLY KNOWN AS 2008 W. ORCHARD AVENUE, COMPRISING APPROXIMATELY 3.50 ACRES, MORE OR LESS, LAY CONTIGUOUS TO THE CITY LIMITS OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, COUNTY OF CANYON, STATE OF IDAHO, AND THAT SAID LANDS SHOULD BE ANNEXED INTO THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO, AS PART OF THE RD (TWO-FAMILY (DUPLEX) RESIDENTIAL) ZONE; DECLARING SAID LANDS BY PROPER LEGAL DESCRIPTION AS DESCRIBED BELOW TO BE A PART OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO; DIRECTING THE CITY ENGINEER AND PLANNING AND ZONING DIRECTOR TO ADD SAID PROPERTY TO THE OFFICIAL MAPS OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO; REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES, RESOLUTIONS, ORDERS OR PARTS THEREOF IN CONFLICT HEREWITH; PROVIDING AN EFFECTIVE DATE; AND, DIRECTING THE CLERK OF THE CITY OF NAMPA TO FILE A CERTIFIED COPY OF THE ORDINANCE AND MAP OF THE AREA TO BE ANNEXED WITH CANYON COUNTY, STATE OF IDAHO AND THE IDAHO STATE TAX COMMISSION, PURSUANT TO IDAHO CODE, SECTION 63-215.

BE IT ORDAINED, BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, COUNTY OF CANYON, STATE OF IDAHO:

Section 1. That the Nampa City Council, upon recommendation of the Planning & Zoning Commission, and following the public notice and hearing procedures set forth in the Local Land Use Planning Act and Nampa City Code § 10-03-08 and Chapter 2, Title 10, approved Case No. ANN 105-19 (Pontifex Capital, LLC Annexation) at a public hearing held on January 22, 2019.

Section 2. The following described property, commonly known as 2008 W. Orchard Avenue, comprising approximately 3.50 acres, more or less, is contiguous to the City of Nampa, Idaho, and the applicant has requested that said following described property should be annexed into the City of Nampa as RD (Two-Family (Duplex) Residential):

See Exhibit “A,” attached hereto and made a part hereof by this reference.

Section 3. That the above-described property is hereby annexed into the corporate limits of the City of Nampa and zoned RD (Two-Family (Duplex) Residential).

Section 4. That the City Engineer and the Planning & Zoning Director of the City of Nampa, Idaho, are hereby instructed to so designate the same above described property on the official zoning map and other area maps of the City of Nampa, Idaho as lying within the city limits and zoned RD (Two-Family (Duplex) Residential).

Section 5. All ordinances, resolutions, orders or parts thereof in conflict herewith are hereby repealed, rescinded and annulled.
Section 6. This ordinance shall be in full force and in effect from and after its passage, approval and publication, according to law.

Section 7. The Clerk of the City of Nampa, Idaho shall, within 10 days following the effective date of this ordinance, duly file a certified copy of this ordinance and a map prepared in a draftsman-like manner plainly and clearly designating the boundaries of the City of Nampa, including the land herein annexed, with the following officials of the County of Canyon, State of Idaho, to-wit: the Recorder, Auditor, Treasurer and Assessor and shall file simultaneously a certified copy of this ordinance with the State Tax Commission of the State of Idaho, all in compliance with Idaho Code 63-215.


APPROVED BY THE MAYOR OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO, THIS 3RD DAY OF JUNE, 2019.

Approved:

By __________________________

Mayor

Attest:

______________________________

City Clerk
EXHIBIT “A”

DESCRIPTION FOR
ANNEXATION AND RD ZONING
2008 W. ORCHARD AVE.

A parcel of land located in the SE 1/4 of the SW 1/4 of Section 17, T.3N., R.2W., B.M., Canyon County, Idaho being more particularly described as follows:

Commencing at the SW corner of said Section 17 from which the S1/4 corner of said Section 17 bears South 89°25'25" East, 2649.80 feet;

thence along the South boundary line of said Section 17 South 89°25'25" East, 1,720.25 feet to the REAL POINT OF BEGINNING;

thence along the exterior boundary line of the Silvercrest Estates PUD No. 3 Record of Survey, recorded March 17, 1992 as Instrument No. 9205701, records of Canyon County, Idaho the following 2 courses and distances:

thence North 00°32'24" East, 570.84 feet;

thence South 89°25'32" East, 266.97 feet;

thence leaving said exterior boundary line South 00°31'43" West, 570.85 feet to a point on the South boundary line of said Section 17;

thence along said South boundary line North 89°25'25" West, 267.09 feet to the REAL POINT OF BEGINNING. Containing 3.50 acres, more or less.