Mayor Kling called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m.

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

❖ (1) Consent Agenda (Action Items) ❖

MOVED by Haverfield and SECONDED by Skaug to approve the Consent Agenda as presented; Item #1-1. - Regular Council Minutes of August 19, 2019; Special Council meeting of August 19 and August 26, 2019; Bicycle and Pedestrian Advisory Committee Minutes; Board of Appraisers Minutes of August 22, 2019; Airport Commission Minutes; Planning & Zoning Commission Minutes of August 13, 2019; Library Commission Minutes; Mayors Summer Town Hall Meeting Minutes of August 14, 2019; Item #1-2. - The Nampa City Council dispenses with the three (3) reading rule of Idaho Code § 50-902 for all ordinances; Item #1-3. - Final and Preliminary Plat Approvals: 1) Subdivision Final Plat Approval for Gemstone Subdivision at 3615 Southside Blvd. (16 single family detached lots on 5 acres for 3.2 dwelling units per gross acre – 5 acre or 217,800 sq. ft portion of the SE ¼ Section 20 T2N R2W BM), for Mason and Associates representing Lanco, Inc. (SPF-00096-2019); 2) Subdivision Final Plat Approval for Laguna Farms Subdivision No. 1 at 16852 N Idaho Center Blvd, north of the CWI Campus (45 multi-family residential lots and 2 commercial lots on a 15.42 acre portion of the NW ¼ of Section 7 T3N R1W BM), for Kent Brown representing Fig Laguna Farms, LLC (SPF-00097-2019); 3) Request for 1st Extension of Subdivision Final Plat Approval for Hartland Subdivision No. 1 at 0 Northside Blvd, on the east side of Northside Blvd, north of Ustick Rd, in an RS-7 (Single Family Residential – 7000 sq. ft) zoning district. (75 Single Family Residential dwellings on 225.2 acres for 2.97 dwelling units per gross acre – Located in the SW ¼ of Section 34 T4N R2W BM), for Ron Walsh/Lori Sanderson – Hartland Subdivision LLC (SPF-00062-2018). Request to extend 08/20/2018 approval which expires 08/20/2019 to 08/20/2020; 4) Subdivision Short Plat Approval for East Iowa Subdivision in an RD (Two-family Residential) zoning district at 1017, 1021, 1025, and 1029 E Iowa Ave. (3 Fourplexes and 1 Triplex on 1.25 acres for 12 dwelling units per gross acre – A part of the SE ¼ of Section 34 T3N R2W BM), for Wolf Building Co, LLC, Blake Wolf (SPS-00021-2019); Item #1-4. - Authorize Public Hearings: 1) Zoning Map Amendment from RA (Suburban Residential) to RS-6 (Single Family Residential – 6,000 sq. ft, at 409 S Midland Blvd, for a .71 acre or 30,747 sq. ft portion of the SE ¼ of Section 29 T3N R2W BM, for Christopher K Shultzze (ZMA-00111-2019); 2) Annexation and Zoning to the adjacent RS-7 (Single Family Residential – 7000 sq. ft), RS-8.5 (Single Family Residential – 8,500 sq. ft), or RS-22 (Single Family Residential – 22,000 sq. ft) zoning district for Lake Lowell Avenue located in the NW ¼ of Section 31 and the SW ¼ of Section 30 T3N R2W BM, Canyon County, being the northerly 25 ft of said NW ¼ of Section 31 ft and the southerly 25 ft of said SW ¼ of Section 30 (50 ft x 2,640 feet – 3.03 acres, or 132,000 sq. ft), for the City of Nampa (ANN-00129-2019) Item #1-5. - Authorize to Proceed with Bidding Process: 1) Request Council authorize Engineering Division to proceed with the formal bid process for the Water Electrical Improvements FY19 project; 2) Request Council authorize Engineering Division to proceed with the formal bid process for the Irrigation Electrical Improvements FY19 project; Item #1-6. - Authorization for execution of Contracts and Agreements: 1) Request Council approve public utility easement encroachment for property located at 3137 Avondale Ave Authorize Mayor to sign Encroachment
Agreement with property owners Jeffery and Kimberly Schwartz: **Item #1-7. - Monthly Cash Report**: 1) None; **Item #1-8. - Resolutions**: 1) None; **Item #1-9. - License for 2019**: a) **Renewal Alcohol**: 1) None; b) **New Alcohol**: 1) None; **Miscellaneous Items**: 1) Authorization to Amend Exhibit A (Rate Sheet) for Resolution No. 31-2019, Relating to Domestic Water Rates and Fees, Originally Approved by City Council on July 1, 2019. Mayor Kling asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting **YES.** Mayor Kling declared the **MOTION CARRIED.**

✉️ (2) Proclamation ✉️

**Item #2-1 – Prostrate Cancer Awareness Month**

**Whereas,** the American Cancer Society estimates there will be 220,800 new cases of prostate cancer diagnosed in the USA in 2015, and 27,540 men will die from prostate cancer; it is estimated that 1 in 7 men will develop prostate cancer in their lifetime and 1 in 38 will die from prostate cancer; and

**Whereas,** prostate cancer is the most frequently diagnosed cancer in men aside from skin cancer, and is the second leading cause of cancer death in men aside from lung cancer; and

**Whereas,** the survival rate approaches 100% when prostate cancer is diagnosed and treated early, but drops to 28% when it spreads to other parts of the body; and

**Whereas,** early prostate cancer usually has no symptoms and advanced prostate cancer commonly spreads to the bones, which can cause pain in the hips, spine, or other areas; and

**Whereas,** recent studies suggest that a diet high in processed meat or dairy foods may be a risk factor, and obesity appears to increase the risk of aggressive prostate cancer; and

**Whereas,** obesity and smoking are associated with an increased risk of dying from prostate cancer; and

**Whereas,** according to the Prostate Cancer Foundation, African American men are more likely to develop prostate cancer compared with Caucasian men, and are nearly 2.3 times as likely to die from the disease; although scientists do not yet understand why prostate cancer incidence and death rates are higher among African American men, it is widely believed that a combination of genetic differences, lifestyle, nutritional habits and medical care may all play a role in the statistics; and

**Whereas,** National Prostate Health Month is observed every September in the United States by health experts, health advocates, and individuals concerned with men’s prostate cancer; and
Whereas, designating a month for the issue serves the purpose of increasing public awareness of the importance of prostate health; educating about risk factors and symptoms of prostate related diseases; and advocating for further research on prostate cancer based on their personal values and preferences; and

Whereas, the City of Nampa joins states across our nation to increase the awareness about the importance for men to make an informed decision with their health care provider about early detection and testing for prostate cancer based on their personal values and preferences; and

Now Therefore, I, Debbie Kling, Mayor of the City of Nampa, Idaho, do hereby proclaim the month of September 2019 as

“PROSTATE CANCER AWARENESS MONTH”

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, I have hereunto set my hand and caused the Great Seal of the City of Nampa to be affixed this 3rd day of September in the year of our Lord two thousand nineteen.

Barb Nielson and Lonna Welch of Idaho Urologic Institute gave statistic on prostate cancer and thanked the City for the awareness.

❖ 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): ❖
  • Carolyn Kling Keech, 220 14th Avenue South – Appeal of the CUP for V-Cut Lounge
  • Michael Marion, 3100 South Montego Way - Thanked the Police for their quick response and put a sign up, wants more enforcement
  • Marcia Yropan, 1403 4th Street South – Block Party in front of the Train Depot, College Band – Splash Pad (wish list)
  • Butch Henry, 2219 Caldwell Boulevard – Moratorium on Storage Units

❖ Mayor Kling’s and Council Comments ❖
  • Mayor Kling – Patriot Day – September 11, 2019 at 8:00 a.m. at Fire Station one
  • Councilmember Levi – gave a shout out to mom in the audience
  • Councilmember Hogaboam – a shout out to the Idaho Horseman (indoor football)
(3) Agency/External Communications ❖

Item #3-1. – None

(4) Staff Communications ❖

Item #4-1. – Patrick Sullivan and Anne Westcott presented a staff report to update council on the following project:

**Fiscal Impact Analysis** - The City of Nampa is currently involved in the development of a long-term strategic plan, while also updating its Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Map to the year 2040. The purpose of these plans is to identify goals, objectives and strategies that will ensure the City will continue to be a place where families can live, work and play while maintaining its independent spirit and unique identity.

Preliminary policy areas being outlined in the Comprehensive Plan update reflect a desire to:

- Facilitate economic development while preserving natural resources and protecting the environment;
- Improve the physical appearance and image of the City;
- Provide for an adequate supply and mix of housing;
- Support neighborhood revitalization and sustainable new neighborhood design;
- Develop a balanced transportation system;
- Provide a high level of community services;
- Provide needed infrastructure for projected growth;
- Preserve and protect the public health, safety and welfare of City residents;
- Retain the existing high-quality environment for future generations;
- Provide an array of parks and recreation programs; and
- Encourage development that is compatible with or enhances natural resource values

A key part of any comprehensive planning process is an analysis of the degree to which the Comprehensive Plan is fiscally sustainable - will the various land uses, and densities produce enough revenue to offset the marginal costs of serving each new unit of growth? To provide this information, the City of Nampa retained Galena Consulting to develop an analytical model that would identify the fiscal sustainability of the City’s current and future Comprehensive Plans.

The fiscal impact model developed for the City of Nampa estimates current marginal costs and marginal revenues for all City General Fund Departments and applies them to a developed parcel of land on a per unit or per square foot bases to determine the net fiscal impact to the City.
The fiscal impact model is dynamic – assumptions can be adjusted to reflect a range of possible land use development scenarios. City staff will be trained to apply to model to various land use proposals such as annexations, urban renewal areas, and the updated Comprehensive Plan.

Questions About Growth

- How much does it cost to serve each new home or commercial development?
- Does growth pay its own way?
- Do any projects warrant development incentives such as fast-tracking or fee reductions?
- Are we planning for the right mix between residential and commercial development?
- How do different land use plans (i.e., more or less density) fiscally impact the City?

Paying for Growth – True or False?

Impact fees are designed to recover the cost of new growth

**FALSE:** Impact fees can only pay for the new *capital infrastructure* necessitated by new growth (fire stations, parks, roads). They cannot be used to pay for operating costs. Tax and other revenues are used to provide services to growth.

New growth generates enough revenue to pay for itself

**FALSE:** Not always. Only a percentage of newly generated revenues go straight to the city. Property tax increases are capped at 3% annually, but operating costs are increasing at a higher rate (health benefits, fuel, etc.). Some types of development cost more to serve than what they produce in revenue.

Fiscal Impact Analysis

- A fiscal impact analysis helps the determine whether growth will produce enough new revenues to offset the operating costs of providing services (additional police officers, firefighters, park maintenance, street maintenance etc.).
- A fiscal impact model evaluates the impact of a specific development, an urban renewal project, a Comprehensive Plan, etc. on a City’s operating budget.

Basic Fiscal Impact Methodology
Nampa Base Model Current Comp Plan Build Out to 2038

- All assumptions are variable and can be easily modified by staff
- Data assumptions can be as granular as desired/known
- Costs to serve based on City’s FY19 operating budget

Land Use Assumptions

- Exhibit II-2 Page 7 of report
- Types of land uses in Comprehensive Plan
- Number of units per land use type added over 20 years
- Average appraised value of each unit (before exemptions)
- Equal phasing assumed but can be more specific
- Each assumption can be easily modified

New Tax Revenues by Land Use Type

Property Tax Calculations

Low-Density Residential Unit $203,400

\[
\text{minus} \quad \text{Property Tax Exemption} \quad $100,000
\]

\[
\text{equals} \quad \text{Assessed Value per Unit} \quad $103,400
\]

\[
\text{times} \quad \text{General Fund Mill Levy} \quad 0.008512504
\]

\[
\text{equals} \quad \text{Property Tax Revenue Per Unit} \quad $880.19
\]

New property tax from a low-density residential unit

The model calculates new property tax revenue or every land use type
New Tax Revenues by Land Use Type

Sales Tax Calculations
Sales tax revenue is distributed based on a formula; only a portion of sales tax generated in Nampa goes back to Nampa.

The model calculates total new sales tax revenue or every land use type.

Base Model assumes $156 per residential unit and $0.0088 per non-residential sf in new sales tax revenue, based on pro-rata share (residential and non-residential) of current sales tax revenues for the City of Nampa, divided by current number of units of each land use type.

Other Revenues are calculated by variability “How much will growth affect this revenue type?”

Marginal Cost to Serve Development

Similar 3-Step Process

☐ Estimating Fixed and Variable Expenditures by Dept.
Estimating Residential/Non-Residential Expenditures

Allocating Cost per unit/square foot

How much will growth affect this expenditure?  Who Creates the Demand?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Public Safety, FY 2019</th>
<th>Percent Variable*</th>
<th>Percent Fixed</th>
<th>Variable Costs</th>
<th>Fixed Costs</th>
<th>Percent Residential</th>
<th>Percent Non-Residential</th>
<th>Residential Costs</th>
<th>Non-Residential Costs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$37,198</td>
<td>$10,999</td>
<td>$37,198</td>
<td>$37,198</td>
<td>$9,300</td>
<td>$9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Investigative Services</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$37,198</td>
<td>$10,999</td>
<td>$37,198</td>
<td>$37,198</td>
<td>$9,300</td>
<td>$9,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Operations</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$23,817,800</td>
<td>$22,498,120</td>
<td>$18,999</td>
<td>$18,999</td>
<td>$7,882,882</td>
<td>$14,863,068</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PD Training</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,352</td>
<td>$2,352</td>
<td>$2,352</td>
<td>$2,352</td>
<td>$494</td>
<td>$494</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$13,154,198</td>
<td>$12,477,488</td>
<td>$85,719</td>
<td>$85,719</td>
<td>$7,480,490</td>
<td>$4,999,999</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Prevention Bureau</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>$6110</td>
<td>$25,550</td>
<td>$25,550</td>
<td>$25,550</td>
<td>$610</td>
<td>$29,440</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$36,840,096</td>
<td>$34,958,357</td>
<td>$1,881,739</td>
<td>$1,881,739</td>
<td>$19,694,009</td>
<td>$19,694,009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Variable Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$34,958,357</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$29,352,357</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Fixed Costs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$1,881,739</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

In Dollars

Residential Expense Allocation 44% $16,353,784 Percentage is an imputed weighted average $29,352,357

Commercial Expense Allocation 56% $19,654,503 Percentage is an imputed weighted average

Per Unit Expenses

Cost Allocation by unit/square foot

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>General Fund Expenditures</th>
<th>Total Department</th>
<th>Total Fixed</th>
<th>Total Variable</th>
<th>Variable Expenses by Residential</th>
<th>Variable Expenses by Commercial</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 9 - General Government</td>
<td>$5,829,116</td>
<td>$3,797,952</td>
<td>$2,031,164</td>
<td>$1,569,874</td>
<td>$441,290</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Allocation (percent)</td>
<td>78%</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>$441,290</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Per Unit or Square Foot</td>
<td></td>
<td>$441,290</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7 - Public Safety</td>
<td>$36,840,096</td>
<td>$1,881,739</td>
<td>$34,958,357</td>
<td>$15,353,754</td>
<td>$19,604,003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Allocation (percent)</td>
<td>44%</td>
<td>56%</td>
<td>$19,604,003</td>
<td>$0.09</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Per Unit or Square Foot</td>
<td>$427.62</td>
<td>$0.09</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10 - Planning and Economic Dev</td>
<td>$1,611,205</td>
<td>$771,049</td>
<td>$840,156</td>
<td>$386,944</td>
<td>$453,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Allocation (percent)</td>
<td>46%</td>
<td>54%</td>
<td>$453,211</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Per Unit or Square Foot</td>
<td>$10.79</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8 - Parks, Recreation, Library, etc</td>
<td>$5,820,232</td>
<td>$974,567</td>
<td>$4,845,645</td>
<td>$4,502,514</td>
<td>$343,132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Allocation (percent)</td>
<td>93%</td>
<td>7%</td>
<td>$343,132</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Per Unit or Square Foot</td>
<td>$125.40</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6 - Public Works</td>
<td>$16,828,546</td>
<td>$4,440,493</td>
<td>$12,388,053</td>
<td>$9,781,391</td>
<td>$2,606,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Allocation (percent)</td>
<td>70%</td>
<td>21%</td>
<td>$2,606,652</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expense Per Unit or Square Foot</td>
<td>$272.43</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total General Fund Expenditures</td>
<td>$66,929,195</td>
<td>$11,865,820</td>
<td>$55,063,376</td>
<td>$31,614,478</td>
<td>$23,448,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Per-Unit Expenditures</td>
<td>$880.51</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Types of Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Land Use</th>
<th>Other Revenue +</th>
<th>Property Tax +</th>
<th>Sales Tax -</th>
<th>Total Revenue/Unit -</th>
<th>Total Expense/Unit -</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>$91.96</td>
<td>$680.10</td>
<td>$155.79</td>
<td>$1,127.94</td>
<td>$880.51</td>
<td>$247.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mixed Use Residential</td>
<td>$91.96</td>
<td>$621.84</td>
<td>$155.79</td>
<td>$869.59</td>
<td>$880.51</td>
<td>($10.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>$91.96</td>
<td>$680.10</td>
<td>$155.79</td>
<td>$1,127.94</td>
<td>$880.51</td>
<td>$247.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>$91.96</td>
<td>$708.24</td>
<td>$155.79</td>
<td>$955.98</td>
<td>$880.51</td>
<td>$75.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>$91.96</td>
<td>$552.04</td>
<td>$155.79</td>
<td>$799.76</td>
<td>$800.51</td>
<td>($80.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>$91.96</td>
<td>$1,164.51</td>
<td>$155.79</td>
<td>$1,412.25</td>
<td>$950.51</td>
<td>$511.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>($0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>($0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.23</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>($0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>($0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.08</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>($0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>($0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mixed Use</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>($0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>($0.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Low-Density Residential:
Each home produces $1,127.94 in revenue, and costs the City $880.51 to serve = net revenue surplus of $247.43

### Types of Land Use

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Types of Land Use</th>
<th>Other Revenue +</th>
<th>Property Tax +</th>
<th>Sales Tax -</th>
<th>Total Revenue/Unit -</th>
<th>Total Expense/Unit -</th>
<th>Fiscal Impact/Unit</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>$91.96</td>
<td>$680.10</td>
<td>$155.79</td>
<td>$1,127.94</td>
<td>$880.51</td>
<td>$247.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mixed Use Residential</td>
<td>$91.96</td>
<td>$621.84</td>
<td>$155.79</td>
<td>$869.59</td>
<td>$880.51</td>
<td>($10.93)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>$91.96</td>
<td>$680.10</td>
<td>$155.79</td>
<td>$1,127.94</td>
<td>$880.51</td>
<td>$247.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>$91.96</td>
<td>$708.24</td>
<td>$155.79</td>
<td>$955.98</td>
<td>$880.51</td>
<td>$75.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>$91.96</td>
<td>$552.04</td>
<td>$155.79</td>
<td>$799.76</td>
<td>$800.51</td>
<td>($80.73)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>$91.96</td>
<td>$1,164.51</td>
<td>$155.79</td>
<td>$1,412.25</td>
<td>$950.51</td>
<td>$511.75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>($0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>($0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.23</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.24</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.13</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.14</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>($0.03)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.10</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>($0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.08</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>($0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.05</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>($0.07)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.12</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mixed Use</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>($0.08)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$0.02</td>
<td>$0.01</td>
<td>$0.03</td>
<td>$0.11</td>
<td>($0.08)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some types of residential and non-residential land uses (i.e., High-Density Residential and Heavy Industrial) have lower assessed valuations, resulting in a negative fiscal impact.

This does NOT mean they are “BAD” land uses - they may contribute to other strategic priorities like affordable housing and employment generation.
20 Year Cumulative Net Impact of Residential Units

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Tax Revenue</th>
<th>20 Year Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>$3,745,785</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mixed Use Residential</td>
<td>$42,670,231</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>$51,870,370</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>$109,354,469</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>$13,988,081</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>$13,947,428</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Agricultural</td>
<td>$662,972</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mixed Use Residential</td>
<td>$10,740,101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Density Residential</td>
<td>$9,178,641</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium Density Residential</td>
<td>$24,053,927</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>High Density Residential</td>
<td>$3,947,489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Mixed Use</td>
<td>$1,605,866</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential</td>
<td>$29,770,987</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Residential Revenues</td>
<td>$319,994,548</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**20 Year Cumulative Net Impact of Commercial Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Tax Revenue</th>
<th>20 Year Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>$132,419</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>$1,162,384</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>$164,170</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td>$476,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>$2,773,861</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>$966,002</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>$1,019,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>$518,272</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>$14,664</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mixed Use</td>
<td>$7,265,041</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual Mixed Use - Commercial Portion</td>
<td>$24,824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport</td>
<td>$71,592</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Business Park</td>
<td>$614,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Downtown</td>
<td>$4,007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employment Center</td>
<td>$32,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Commercial</td>
<td>$243,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Heavy Industrial</td>
<td>$311,338</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highway Commercial</td>
<td>$45,244</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Light Industrial</td>
<td>$720,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Neighborhood Commercial</td>
<td>$3,926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Mixed Use</td>
<td>$574,141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residential Mixed Use - Commercial Portion</td>
<td>$13,354</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Revenue</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commercial</td>
<td>$1,166,331</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Commercial Revenues</td>
<td>$23,516,844</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**20 Year Cumulative Net Impact of Commercial Units**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Commercial Expenditures</th>
<th>20 Year Cumulative</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Table 9 - General Government</td>
<td>$223,344</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 7 - Public Safety</td>
<td>$27,761,367</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 10 - Planning and Economic Development</td>
<td>$540,389</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 8 - Parks, Recreation, Library, etc.</td>
<td>$884,246</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Table 6 - Public Works</td>
<td>$3,053,222</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Commercial Expenditures</td>
<td>$33,133,289</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Net Surplus (Deficit):**

- Residential: $30,655,006
- Commercial: $(10,557,025)

---

If the City develops according to its Comprehensive Plan, by 2038 new residential development will have produced almost $31M in new net revenues.

Even though a few residential land uses produced a deficit, it is offset by more units of higher valuation residential.

As a whole, residential development generates more revenue than it costs to serve.

If the City develops according to its Comprehensive Plan, by 2038 new non-residential development will have produced a deficit of almost $11M.

The low valuation on most non-residential land uses does not produce enough new property tax to offset the costs to serve these developments.
Sensitivity Analysis

20 Year Cumulative Residential $30.8M + Commercial ($10.5M) = $20.3 M
At Net Present Value = $8.5M positive net fiscal impact for City

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Performance</th>
<th>Baseline Performance</th>
<th>High Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Variability</td>
<td>($19,041,340)</td>
<td>($4,836,989)</td>
<td>$9,367,362</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Cost Variability</td>
<td>($5,688,567)</td>
<td>$8,515,783</td>
<td>$22,720,134</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Cost Variability</td>
<td>$7,664,205</td>
<td>$21,868,566</td>
<td>$38,072,906</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Sensitivity Analysis allows us to account for variability in the assumptions of the model (number of units, unit value, absorption rate, marginal expenses, etc.)**

What Does This Tell Us?

- The City’s current Comprehensive Plan is fiscally sustainable, as long as property values meet or exceed assumptions, and costs meet or are less than assumptions.
- However, if costs exceed 10% of the model’s assumptions, or values are 10% less than the model’s assumptions – the City could face a deficit of almost $20M.
- Fiscally sustainable development has a balance of land uses: those uses producing a revenue surplus can offset those uses which produce a deficit but contribute to other strategic objectives.
- Fiscal Impact is only one variable in the policy discussion about land use and growth – land use decisions must also consider objectives for affordable housing, increased employment, reduced congestion, environmental protection, high-quality service delivery, community appearance and the preservation of natural resources.

Alternative Scenarios

The City’s model is dynamic – assumptions can be altered to run alternate scenarios to assess the fiscal impact of different land use patterns.

We analyzed 2 alternate scenarios –

- Low Density and
- Transit Oriented Development (TOD)
Regular Council  
September 3, 2019

- **Low-Density Alternative** - Reduce the number of deficit-producing high-density residential units and mixed-use developments in order to reduce financial risk
- The City still has a surplus of $8M but reduces its financial “risk” to a worst-case cumulative deficit of $8M versus $20M.
- Reduces City’s financial “risk” to a worst-case cumulative deficit of ($8M) versus ($20M).
- This alternative will not produce more affordable housing, reduce congestion, create efficiencies in service delivery, or allow for as much employment generation

- **Transit-Oriented Alternative** – Move more robustly toward policy objectives and planning goals without the financial risk of the Base Model
- If we increase the number of high-density residential and mixed-use zones around transit and employment centers, the City increases its surplus to $60M, and the worst-case scenario is still a surplus of $12M.
- **Why?** Density allows for operating efficiencies. It costs less to provide police, fire, parks and streets services to dense, localized development.
- Increases in the number of square feet of industrial and commercial development in core areas allow for the creation of more livable wage jobs and generate additional non-residential development.

Ozzie Gripenthorp explained the following analysis on a parcel that is already planned for storage units.

![Table 13 - Sensitivity Analysis of 5-year Project Present Value](image)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Performance</th>
<th>Baseline Performance</th>
<th>High Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>High Cost Variability</strong></td>
<td>$65,494</td>
<td>$81,285</td>
<td>$97,077</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Baseline Cost Variability</strong></td>
<td>$72,460</td>
<td>$88,251</td>
<td>$104,043</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Low Cost Variability</strong></td>
<td>$79,426</td>
<td>$95,218</td>
<td>$111,009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

266,800 commercial square feet at the current Citywide average of $28.10 per area footprint with construction equally spread over 5 years
320,160 commercial square feet at the current Citywide average of $64.80 per area footprint with construction equally spread over 5 years

Table 13 - Sensitivity Analysis of 5-year Project Present Value
Nampa Fiscal Impact Model - BUSINESS PARK

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Performance</th>
<th>Baseline Performance</th>
<th>High Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Variability</td>
<td>$290,080</td>
<td>$332,528</td>
<td>$374,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Cost Variability</td>
<td>$298,440</td>
<td><strong>$340,888</strong></td>
<td>$383,336</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Cost Variability</td>
<td>$306,799</td>
<td>$349,248</td>
<td>$391,696</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

68 new units at the current Citywide average of $300,000 with construction equally spread over 5 years

Table 13 - Sensitivity Analysis of 5-year Project Present Value
Nampa Fiscal Impact Model - MEDIUM DENSITY RESIDENTIAL

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Low Performance</th>
<th>Baseline Performance</th>
<th>High Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>High Cost Variability</td>
<td>$125,334</td>
<td>$156,507</td>
<td>$187,679</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Baseline Cost Variability</td>
<td>$139,445</td>
<td><strong>$170,617</strong></td>
<td>$201,789</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low Cost Variability</td>
<td>$153,555</td>
<td>$184,728</td>
<td>$215,900</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
160 new units at the current Citywide average of $150,000 with construction equally spread over 5 years

Mayor and Councilmembers asked questions and made comments.

◈ (6) Public Hearings ◈

**Item #6-1. -** Mayor Kling explained it was time for the continued public hearing for annexation and zoning to RS6 (Single Family Residential – 6,000 sq. ft.) zoning district for **Calvary Springs Subdivision at 1713 E. Iowa Ave.** (64 single family detached lots on 16.79 acres for 3.81 dwelling units per gross acre - a 16.79-acre or 731,372 sq. ft. portion of the NW ¼ SW ¼ Section 35, T3N, R2W, BM) for **Kent Brown representing Trilogy Idaho.** The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval (ANN 123-19).

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

Senior Planner Kristi Watkins presented the following staff report explaining that the request is for annexation and zoning assigned land to RS-6 for A 16.79-acre portion of land at 1713 E. Iowa Ave. (62 single family detached lots on 16.79 acres for 3.69 dwelling units per gross acre - a 16.79-acre or 731,372 sq. ft. portion of the NW ¼ SW ¼ Section 35, T3N, R2W, BM) (hereinafter the “Property”).…, Calvary Springs Subdivision for Trilogy Idaho/Kent Brown.

**Annexation and 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.

**Findings of Fact & Conclusions of Law Regarding Annexation and Zoning**
Zoning: Regarding Applicant’s Annexation and Zoning Request (to RS-6) Staff finds:

1. **Current Jurisdiction/Status:**
   That the Property is currently within Nampa City’s Impact Area, and, is either owned or optioned by the Applicant or that the Applicant has the Property owner’s permission to apply for the entitlement and plat applications made the subject of this report; and,

2. **Current and Surrounding Zoning:**
   That the Property is presently under Canyon County jurisdiction. See the attached Vicinity Map; and,

   Existing zoning:
   - **North:** Canyon County zoning, Enclaved, Residential
   - **South:** RA (Suburban Residential, one single family parcel)
   - **East:** Canyon County, Enclaved, Residential Subdivision
   - **West:** RS6 (Single-Family Residential Subdivision)

3. **Immediately Surrounding Land Uses:**
   Single-family residential land uses surround or lie near the Property; and,

4. **Proposed Zoning:**
   That the proposed RS 6 district, “…is intended for medium density, urban single-family residential and compatible uses. A stable and healthful environment, together with the full range of urban services, makes this an important land use district within the community”; and,

5. **Reasonable:**
   That it may be variously argued that consideration for annexing the Property is reasonable given that: a) the City of Nampa has received an application to annex 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) annexation and zoning assignment is a legally recognized legislative act long sanctioned under American administrative law; and, c) that the Applicant intends to develop all or a portion of the Property; and, d) Nampa City utility services are, or may be made, available to the Property; and, e) emergency services are available to the Property; and, f) that the Property abuts and/or is enclosed by City of Nampa land zoned for residential (RS) subdivision development; and, g) land uses in the nearby area, and, more particularly site development both suggest that RS zoning would be an acceptable fit for the area (other properties) given that RS zoning was already approved for the properties to the west; and,

6. **Public Interest:**
That Nampa has determined that it is in the public interest to provide varying residential-housing opportunities for its citizens and the current real estate market is pressing a need for additional housing inventory/product; 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 zoning regulations, therefore, are standards governing residential development which pertain to allowable land uses, building setbacks, building aesthetics, provision of parking and service drives, property landscaping, etc. Staff notes that any site development will be regulated by, and through, the building permit review process and in accordance with the RS Zone’s already adopted regulations (e.g., standards that govern land use, building setbacks, landscaping, subdivision design, etc.); and,

8. **Comprehensive Plan:**
   The Property is positioned in an “Employment Center “setting” per the Future Land Use Map associated with the City of Nampa’s adopted Comprehensive Plan.

5.7.2.2 - **Principles of an Employment Center:**
- Concentration of employment, commercial and residential;
- Street connectivity for easy ingress & egress;
- Development project should have sidewalk and pathways to promote walking, bicycling, transit use and ride sharing, while also accommodating auto…; and,

5.12.1 **Infill Development and Redevelopment**

Infill and redevelopment refer to development on vacant, underutilized, or partially used land. Infill occurs on land that may have been skipped over in the urbanization process.

Infill areas have been identified as enclaves and undeveloped lands where existing Nampa City Services are available. Infill and redevelopment are encouraged in order to revitalize developed residential and commercial areas and take advantage of existing infrastructure.

9. **Safe Routes to School:**
   - **Skyview High School** = .65 miles (within walking distance, but many sidewalk gaps on county properties along the way)
   - **South Middle School** = 1.64 miles (not within walking distance)
   - **Greenhurst Elementary School** = .5 miles via undeveloped ROW on Iowa Ave, perfect for walking to school with no traffic. (an improved short pathway would be ideal, not adjacent to subject property)
10. Services:
   That utility and emergency services are available to the Property...

11. COMPASS Analysis:
   Bicycle and Pedestrian Level of Stress: N/A
   Jobs/Housing Ratio: .2 (indicates the need for more housing)
   Emergency Services: Police = 2.4 miles and Fire = 1.1 miles
   Developments within 1.5 miles provide for more efficient service and reduce costs for these important public services.
   Farmland is consumed by this project.
   Bus stop: 1.2 miles
   Park: 1.0 miles
   Grocery Store: 1.5 miles

Note(s):
The preceding general statements are offered as possible [preliminary] findings and are not intended to be all inclusive or inarguable. They are/were simply provided to the Commission in case the requested entitlement is considered for recommendation of approval. In the event of an opposite course, then negative findings may be adopted by the Nampa City Council.

In summary, this Property fits the definition for infill development because, 1) it is surrounded by developed single-family properties and 2) all city utilities are immediately available to the site. Therefore, given the findings noted above, staff recommends that this property be annexed and zoned RS 6.

Staff has provided the Council with all of the relevant report/packet documentation or visual information available to us at the time this report was generated. We anticipate that the Applicant’s representative(s) may have visual displays of their concept plan for the build-out of the Property at the Commission’s public hearing wherein the application package associated with this report will be vetted.

Notification of the Council hearing was done in accordance with legal requirements. An environmental impact study (EIS) was not called for in conjunction with the Application package submittal as such is not normal required saved when called for by City of Nampa Engineering under special circumstances. Any extant street frontage improvements along E Iowa Ave, should the Application be approved, will be required to be emplaced at the time of Project build-out per adopted Nampa City policy and practice. No taking of other parties’ property(ices) will be effectuated should the Project develop. In Nampa’s case, street improvements and school construction accompany and follow, respectively, land development.
Agency/City Department Comments for Annexation and Zoning

Agency/City department comments have been received regarding both the entitlement request and platting approval request associated with this matter [and report]. Such correspondence, by way of information, as received from agencies or the citizenry regarding the application package [received by noon August 14, 2019] is hereafter attached to this report, to include:

1. A June 19, 2019 email printout from the Nampa Parks Department authored by Cody Swander indicating that they have no requests; and,

2. On June 9, 2019, Neil Jones with the Nampa Building Department made a note in the EnerGov permitting program indicating that the Building Department will require a top of foundation wall or a finish floor elevation on each lot, shown on the final plat construction drawings; and,

3. A June 19, 2019 email printout from the Nampa Highway District #1 authored by Eddy Thiel, indicating that they have no comment; and,

4. A June 26, 2019 letter from the Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District authored by David Duvall indicating that they have no comment on the Project; and,

5. A June 26, 2019 email printout from the City of Nampa Forestry Department authored by Carolynn Murray indicating that they No Class III trees are allowed in the planting strip, should be Class II only; this email is supported by review and correction notice, dated July 2, 2019 and sent by Doug Critchfield, Nampa Planning Department, that states that the Street Tree – Liquidambar Styraciflua tends to heave the sidewalk and a different species should be specified on a revised landscape plan; and,

6. A memo dated July 3, 2019, authored by Dan Wagner, Nampa GIS Division, stating required changes to street names as follows:
   a. Propose new, unique name for W Louisiana Ave and Ashbourne Way; and,
   b. Ashbourne Way/Garrustown Street should have one name, we suggest Garrustown Way; and,
   c. Suncroft St should be S Suncroft Ave; and,
   d. Celbridge St should be E Celbridge St; and,
   e. Garrustown St should be E Garrustown Way and continue to E Iowa Ave; and,

7. A memo, dated July 9, 2019, authored by Caleb LaClair, stating the following:
Engineering Annexation & Zoning Comments

a. The project is located at 1713 E Iowa Ave and will take access from the following roads:
   - E Iowa Ave – classified as “Local Road”
   - E Kentucky Ave – classified as “Local Road”

b. While E Iowa Avenue is classified as a “Local Road” it is possible the classification of the road may change to a “Collector” in the future given its location on the half-mile section line. As such, the Engineering Division will request 40’ of right-of-way dedication from the Quarter Section Line.

c. The City of Nampa’s water, sewer, and pressure irrigation systems have adequate capacity to serve this property. The City of Nampa maintains the following utilities in the vicinity of the project:
   - 18” and 15” sewer main in E Iowa Ave;
   - 10” water main on north side of E Iowa Ave;
   - 8” pressure irrigation main on south side of E Iowa Ave;
   - 8” sewer main in E Kentucky Ave;
   - 8” water main in E Kentucky Ave; and,
   - 6” pressure irrigation main along the east boundary of the Canyon Meadows Subdivision.

d. The project will be required to construct utilities to and through the property at the time of development, as well as, provide looping/redundant connections for water and pressure irrigation.

Engineering Preliminary Plat Comments

e. The project consists of fewer than 100 lots; therefore, a Traffic Impact Study is not required per the criteria of the City of Nampa’s 2015 Transportation Impact Study Policy.

f. To support future annexation and development of adjacent enclaved parcels, and to avoid future street cuts, it is preferable to stub utility services to the following parcels:
   - 1625 E Iowa Ave (Parcel # R3234600000) – Sewer only
   - 0 E Iowa Ave (Parcel # R3234700000) – Sewer, water, and irrigation
   - 1715 E Iowa Ave (Parcel # R3234601000) – Sewer only

g. It should be confirmed during final design whether it is necessary to extend gravity irrigation piping along the southerly and easterly property boundaries. Confirm what properties are still assigned to this lateral and if there is opportunity to convert them to city pressure irrigation to reduce or eliminate this extensive piping. Any properties that desire to hook up to Nampa City services that are adjacent to city limits will be required to annex per Nampa City Code.

h. Parcel # R3234700000 is land locked. Access to this parcel shall be provided from E Kentucky Street through Lot 10, Block 1 via an ingress/egress easement.

i. There appears to be an existing pond/wet area located just south of the project on the 1906 S Powerline Road. It should be confirmed during final design that the project is not
restricting a historical drainage or irrigation path, and that lots are elevated sufficiently to not be impacted by any historical drainage that may exist in this location.

j. The submitted Geotechnical Report groundwater may be as high as 2 to 4 feet below existing ground surface. On-going groundwater monitoring should be performed at the site through the irrigation season and data submitted with final design documents to confirm groundwater impact on proposed drainage facilities and home crawl spaces.

**Engineering Conditions of Approval**

k. Dedicate the following public right-of-way at the time of annexation:
   - E Iowa Ave – 40’ from the Quarter Section Line.

l. Any onsite wells or septic systems shall be abandoned and/or removed in accordance with Local and State regulations at the time of property development/redevelopment and prior to connection to Nampa City services.

m. Any and all domestic and irrigation surface and/or groundwater rights shall be transferred to the City of Nampa at the time of property development/redevelopment, and prior to connection to Nampa City services. Applicant/Owner shall provide documentation to the Nampa Engineering Division verifying water rights for the full parcel.

n. Utilities shall be constructed to and through the site at the time of property development/redevelopment, and at the sole expense of the Developer.

o. Applicant/Owner shall comply with all Nampa City Codes, Policies, and Standards in place at the time of property development/redevelopment.

p. Applicant shall address all street name comments identified in the letter from Nampa Engineering Division prior to Final Plat submittal.

q. Applicant shall coordinate with the following properties and install utility service stubs to said properties with the development:
   - 1625 E Iowa Ave (Parcel # R3234600000) – Sewer only
   - 0 E Iowa Ave (Parcel # R3234700000) – Sewer, water, and irrigation
   - 1715 E Iowa Ave (Parcel # R3234601000) – Sewer only

8. A review document from COMPASS iterating their findings respecting the Development.

**Recommended Conditions of Approval**

Should Nampa City Council vote to approve the annexation and zoning request Staff would suggest the following as (a) Condition(s) of Approval for adoption with any such vote/action (note: the Commission may obviously add, subtract and/or modify conditions as it deems appropriate):

1. The Developer/Development shall comply with all requirements imposed by City of Nampa agencies involved in the review of this matter including, specifically the following:
2. Indicate a top of foundation wall or a finish floor elevation on each lot on the final plat construction drawings; and,

3. Submit revised landscape plans; and,

4. Make necessary street name corrections as listed:
   a. Propose new, unique name for W Louisiana Ave and Ashbourne Way; and,
   b. Ashbourne Way/Garrustown St should have one name, we suggest Garrustown Way; and,
   c. Suncroft St should be S Suncroft Ave; and,
   d. Celbridge St should be E Celbridge St; and,
   e. Garrustown St should be E Garrustown Way and continue to E Iowa Ave;

5. Confirm, during final design, whether it is necessary to extend gravity irrigation piping along the southerly and easterly property boundaries. Confirm what properties are still assigned to this lateral and if there is opportunity to convert them to city pressure irrigation to reduce or eliminate this extensive piping. Any properties that desire to hook up to Nampa City services that are adjacent to City of Nampa limits will be required to annex per Nampa City Code.

6. Parcel # R3234700000 is land locked. Provide access to this parcel from E Kentucky Street through Lot 10, Block 1 via an ingress/egress easement.

7. There appears to be an existing pond/wet area located just south of the project on the 1906 S Powerline Road. It should be confirmed during final design that the project is not restricting a historical drainage or irrigation path, and that lots are elevated sufficiently to not be impacted by any historical drainage that may exist in this location.

8. On-going groundwater monitoring should be performed at the site through the irrigation season and data submitted with final design documents to confirm groundwater impact on proposed drainage facilities and home crawl spaces.

9. Dedicate the following public right-of-way at the time of annexation:
   a. E Iowa Ave – 40’ from the Quarter Section Line.

10. Any onsite wells or septic systems shall be abandoned and/or removed in accordance with Local and State regulations at the time of property development/redevelopment and prior to connection to Nampa City services.

11. Any and all domestic and irrigation surface and/or groundwater rights shall be transferred to the City of Nampa at the time of property development/redevelopment, and prior to connection to Nampa City services. Applicant/Owner shall provide documentation to the Nampa Engineering Division verifying water rights for the full parcel.

12. Utilities shall be constructed to and through the site at the time of property development/redevelopment, and at the sole expense of the Developer.

13. Applicant/Owner shall comply with all Nampa City Codes, Policies, and Standards in place at the time of property development/redevelopment.
14. Applicant shall coordinate with the following properties and install utility service stubs to said properties with the development:
   a. 1625 E Iowa Ave (Parcel # R3234600000) – Sewer only
   b. 0 E Iowa Ave (Parcel # R3234700000) – Sewer, water, and irrigation
   c. 1715 E Iowa Ave (Parcel # R3234601000) – Sewer only

15. The water system for the Development shall be completely installed and able to deliver water prior to any Building Permits being issued within the development. The water shall be sufficient in volume and pressure to provide sufficient adequate fire suppression for the Development in accordance with Fire Department policy or International Fire Code requirements as applicable; and,

16. Prior to filing for a final plat approval for any portion of the Project, the Developer’s engineer shall correct any spelling, grammar, punctuation and/or numbering errors that may be evident on the plat face and/or in the proposed plat development notes and include said corrections in a revised preliminary plat plan set that shall be remitted to the City of Nampa; and,

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

Those appearing with questions were: Bill Fisher, 1623 Ventura Drive; Jim Kalusik, 1717 Ventura Drive.

The applicant presented a rebuttal to questions brought forth in the public hearing.

Councilmembers asked questions.

MOVED by Hogaboam and SECONDED by Skaug 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 annexation and zoning to RS6 (Single Family Residential – 6,000 sq. ft.) zoning district for Calvary Springs Subdivision at 1713 E. Iowa Ave. (64 single family detached lots on 16.79 acres for 3.81 dwelling units per gross acre - a 16.79-acre or 731,372 sq. ft. portion of the NW ¼ SW ¼ Section 35, T3N, R2W, BM) for Kent Brown representing Trilogy Idaho 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
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Item #6-2 - Mayor Kling opened a public hearing for Appeal of Planning and Zoning Commission denial of Subdivision Plat Short Approval for Atkinson Acres Subdivision (SPS 020-19) in a RA (Suburban Residential) zoning district at 5025 Feather Creek Lane (3 Single family lots on 5 acres for 1.67 lots per acre - A part of the SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 6, T3N, R1W, BM) for Larry Atkinson (APL 009-19).

Craig Atkinson, 5025 Feather Creek Lane presented the request.

Principal Planner Rodney Ashby presented the following staff report explaining that the request is for an appeal of Planning and Zoning Commission denial of Subdivision Short Plat Approval for Atkinson Acres Subdivision (SPS 020-19) in a RA (Suburban Residential) zoning district at 5025 Feather Creek Lane (3 Single family lots on 5 acres for 1.67 lots per acre – A Part of the SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 6, T3N, R1W, BM) for Larry Atkinson (APL 009-19).

General Information

Planning & Zoning History:
2006 - Annexation and zoning to RS8.5 zoning and Development Agreement for Sonoma single-family homes approved  
2007 - Final plat for the Sonoma Creek single-family subdivision approved  
2008 - No building permits requested, and final plat expired  
November 2016 - Low Angle Subdivision (immediately to the west of the four five-acre parcels created through a lot split, and that the Atkinson property is one of) was approved for a subdivision by Nampa City Council, creating four parcels smaller in size to what is being requested by this application.  
2016 - Rezone to RA; no Development Agreement Modification was requested  
May 22nd, 2019 - Application for Short Plat Subdivision for Atkinson Acres Subdivision  
July 34, 2019 - The Nampa Planning & Zoning Commission voted to recommend denial of the Atkinson Acres Subdivision due to confusion over the history of the properties in the area and statements made by neighboring property owners claiming the City of Nampa staff denied them the ability to split their properties in the past.

Proposed Land Uses: Three single family homes and a common driveway (E Feather Creek Ln)

Surrounding Land Use and Zoning: 
North- Single Family home on an RA (suburban residential) lot  
South- Single Family Homes (RS6 zoning)  
East- Single Family Homes (RS6 zoning)  
West- Single Family Homes (RS6 zoning)

Comprehensive Plan Designation: Community Mixed Use
Public Utilities/Services:
No water, irrigation, or sewer services are available to the property at this time. The closest services are located over 3,000 feet to the south in Star Road. Engineering indicated that since the proposed lots are greater than 1-acre in size, “the use of individual on-lot septic systems is acceptable. City water is planned to be extended in Star Road and Cherry Lane as part of the Silver Star and Spring Hollow Ranch Subdivisions. New pressure irrigation pump stations and delivery pipes will also be constructed with these subdivisions.”

Transportation: Access to the properties is from Feather Creek Lane, an existing private street.

Applicable Regulations:
Subdivision Short Plat
Section 10-27-4F Short Plats, allows an abbreviated platting process for subdivisions of three to seven lots created from a single original property. “Drawings shall portray all features required to be shown on standard preliminary and final plat drawings; and Short plats will be processed as combination preliminary and final plats requiring a public hearing before the Nampa City’s Planning and Zoning Commission and approval by the Nampa City Council.”

As stated in the subdivision chapter of the Title 10, the Planning & Zoning Commission shall evaluate a proposed plat’s design based on city codes in making its determination. The plat must also meet the standards identified in the approved Subdivision Process and Policy Manual; and Standard Construction Specification Manual.

Correspondence:
The applicant has indicated his interest in seeking a deferral for sidewalk construction. The Engineering Division clarified at the Planning & Zoning Commission Public Hearing that by Nampa City Code, deferrals are not an option along principal arterials. Because Star Road is a principal arterial, this is not an option for the applicant.

The applicant has also indicated an interest in seeking a variance for the 25’ landscaping requirement fronting Star Rd. Staff has communicated that the applicant would need to show a “hardship” to justify a variance of the landscaping requirement, and that it is unclear what that hardship would be in this case.

The following is a summary of agency correspondence that can be found in full detail in the exhibits:

- **Nampa & Meridian Irrigation District:** No impact as long as all storm drainage is retained on-site.
- **Nampa Engineering Division:**
Access to the property is from Feather Creek Lane, an existing private street
City utilities are not currently available to the site
City water and pressurized irrigation is planned to be extended in Star Rd as a part of the Silver Star and Spring Hollow Ranch Subdivisions
On-lot septic systems are acceptable but will require permitting through Southwest District Health Department.
Frontage improvements along Star Road are required, though ROW has already been dedicated.

Conditions:
- Increase the easement width along the northerly and westerly subdivision boundaries from 10’ to 12’
- Add Block # to the plat
- Five foot (5’) wide sidewalk shall be constructed along the Star Road frontage, according to Engineering conditions and staff approval
- Obtain a septic permit from SW District Health Department & submit to Nampa Building Department prior to a permit approval
- Surveyor shall address all Final Plat comments prior to city Engineering’s signature of the plat

**Nampa Planning and Zoning Department:**
- A 25’ landscape buffer is not shown on the plans
- A Landscape Plan, including a 25’ landscape buffer along Star Road shall be submitted
- Trees may be selected from the Treasure Valley Tree Selection Guide
- Class II trees are required in the landscape buffer

**Nampa Parks Division:** No requests
**Nampa Forestry Division:** Since no landscape plans were submitted, Forester is unable to provide a review
**Nampa Highway District #1:** no comment

**Staff Findings & Discussion**

As has been stated, a variance to the twenty-five-foot (25’) landscaping requirement seems to have no valid basis or hardship. However, the landscape requirement along Star Rd can be delayed until development (or building permit is pulled) for the property abutting Star Rd. This will allow the owner to sell the property as a separate lot prior to installing landscaping.

Several concerns were stated by neighbors at the Planning & Zoning public hearing:
1. Neighbors expressed concerns that the subdivision was developed with five acre lots to preserve a rural, farm-like, atmosphere. They argued that subdividing the lot would change the feel or atmosphere of the subdivision and that would be counter to their purpose for moving into the area.
2. Subdividing the property will reduce land utilized for farming or raising farm animals.
3. Finally, the property owners of 5020 E. Feather Creek, directly across the street from the development, argued that Nampa Planning & Zoning staff denied them the ability to subdivide their property in the past. They felt that if they were not allowed to subdivide, the Atkinsons should be treated equally.

Staff Findings Regarding Previous Three (3) items:
1. One of those speaking out against the Atkinson Acres subdivision at the Planning & Zoning Public Hearing, was the owner, at that time, of the property that was subdivided into the Low Angle Subdivision in 2016. This subdivision is directly west of the subject properties, is accessed by way of the shared private roadway “E Feather Creek Ln,” and has smaller parcel averages than what is being requested by Mr. Atkinson. Nampa City boundaries are expanding in this area. Planning expects this area to continue to develop with higher density residential than the existing conditions. If the Council considers the area in general, and not just the four roughly five-acre parcels, the proposed subdivision appears to exceed the lot sizes of developed residential properties.

2. A large amount of research has been produced by the American Planning Association regarding the impacts of large residential lots on farming. The conclusion has been for many years that higher density residential is the best planning tool to minimize impact to productive farmland. Larger lot residential reduces the efficiency of crop production. Though a homeowner may produce food for their household on a five-acre-lot, that same five acres is able to have a much higher production rate as part of a larger farm. In this specific case, the property is not being utilized for crop or animal production. Therefore, subdividing the land for additional residential uses, is a means to preserve farmland elsewhere instead of converting it to a rural residential property.

3. The property owners at 5020 E. Feather Creek, stated that they were denied the ability to subdivide their property. This was one of the primary reasons that Planning & Zoning Commission denied the Short Plat. The Commission stated in the public hearing that staff should research the history behind why the neighbor was denied the ability to subdivide their property. They also believed that the short plat would still automatically go to Nampa City Council for final approval and that the research by staff would help Nampa City Council to make an informed decision. Staff was unable to find any documentation of application for subdivision of the 5020 E Feather Creek property. I am unable to confirm what was communicated to that property. However, the Low Angle Subdivision to the west was approved only three years ago. This subdivision is and was the same zoning district as 5020 E Feather Creek. It is Planning & Zoning policy to work with property owners to comply with the Zoning ordinance. It would be very unusual to tell an applicant they cannot subdivide if the zoning ordinance allows it. Some conditions that may affect whether a subdivision can take place include the placement of buildings, wells, septic tanks, etc. This property includes an older original farm home that has since been converted to an accessory dwelling unit (in-law’s quarters). Perhaps the placement of these two homes, the septic...
tank, and other conditions, prevented the property from being divided with a minimum lot size of 30,000 square feet (as required by the RA zoning conditions). Another possible scenario is that the property owners were informed of requirements such as landscaping, sidewalk, etc. and concluded that they would not be able to subdivide the property.

Staff finds that with the changes requested in the Correspondence Section of this report, the proposed subdivision short plat for the Atkinson Acres Subdivision conforms, or substantially conforms within acceptable limits, with relevant RA zoning codes and City of Nampa subdivision standards pertaining to land division. This determination is conditioned on the applicant submitting a landscape plan which complies with the conditions stated in the attached correspondence authored by Doug Critchfield and being revised in limited form and fashion to meet requirements set forth by various responding agencies and city departments.

Accordingly, Staff recommends that the Development be approved, contingent on Applicant/Developer/Development compliance with various Conditions of Approval as iterated hereafter.

**Suggested Conditions of Approval**

Should the Nampa City Council vote to appeal the Planning and Zoning Commission denial of the “Atkinson Acres Subdivision” Short Plat, then Staff would suggest the following as (a) Condition(s) of Approval(s):

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. A development agreement, in place for the Sonoma Creek Subdivision, shall be rescinded before approval of the final plat
   b. Retain storm drainage on site
   c. Increase the easement width along the northerly and westerly subdivision boundaries from 10’ to 12’
   d. Add Block # to the plat
   e. Five foot (5’) wide sidewalk shall be constructed along the Star Road frontage, according to Engineering conditions and staff approval
   f. Obtain a septic permit from SW District Health Department & submit to Nampa Building Department prior to a permit approval
   g. Surveyor shall address all Final Plat comments prior to city Engineering’s signature of the plat
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h. A Landscape Plan, including a 25’ landscape buffer along Star Road shall be submitted before Nampa City Council considers the plat for approval
i. The Landscape Plan shall show trees selected from the Treasure Valley Tree Selection Guide
j. The Landscape Plan shall show Class II trees only in the required landscape buffer

Councilmembers asked made comments and made comments.

Nampa City Engineer Daniel Badger presented information on the streets and the 4 lots.

No one appeared in favor of the request.

Those appearing in opposition to the request were: Michael Dudley, 5020 East Feather Creek; Sharon Dudley, 5020 East Feather Creek; Jacquelin Dudley, 5020 East Feather Creek gave time to Michael Dudley; Michael Landon in opposition but did not speak; John Low, 5280 East Feather Creek; Kim Hatch, 17232 Star Road; David Brenneman, 5120 East Feather Creek.

The applicant presented a rebuttal to questions brought forward in the public hearing.

Daniel Badger presented information on the street width, curbs, gutters and sidewalks and gave some information on what happened between 2016 and present.

MOVED by Skaug 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 Hogaboam to grant the appeal of the petitioner for the Planning and Zoning Commission denial of Subdivision Plat Short Approval for Atkinson Acres Subdivision (SPS 020-19) in a RA (Suburban Residential) zoning district at 5025 Feather Creek Lane (3 Single family lots on 5 acres for 1.67 lots per acre - A part of the SE ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 6, T3N, R1W, BM) for Larry Atkinson with staff conditions. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with Councilmembers Bruner, Hogaboam, Skaug voting YES. Councilmembers Levi, Haverfield voting NO. Councilmember Rodriguez ABSENT. The Mayor declared the

MOTION CARRIED

Item #6-3 - Mayor Kling opened a public hearing for a vacation of the road right-of-way in the Amended Plat of Elmwood Place Addition lying between Lot B - 523 18th Ave. No., and Lot C – 611 18th Ave. No. for Ludmila and Viktor Dudlya (VAC 041-19).

Michael Dudlya, 523 17th Avenue North presented the request.
Planning and Zoning Director Norm Holm presented the following staff report explaining that the request is for the Vacation of the Alley Right-Of-Way in the Amended Plat of Elmwood Place Addition lying between Lot B - 523 18th Ave. No., and Lot C – 611 18th Ave. No. for Ludmila and Viktor Dudlya (VAC 041-19). The applicant has constructed a foundation for a garage they intend to build on a portion of the proposed vacation area. They seek vacation of the undeveloped alley in order to complete the construction of the garage.

**General Information**

**Status of Applicant:** Property Owner.  **Existing Zoning:** RD (Two-Family Residential).  **Location:** That portion of the road right of way in the Amended Plat of Elmwood Place Addition to Nampa as recorded in Book 4 of Plats at Page 49, records of Canyon County, Idaho, lying between Lots B and C of said plat and being bounded on the Northwest by the Southeasterly right of way of 17th Avenue North and on the Southeast by the Northwesterly right of way of 18th Avenue North, each of these rights of way being named Elmwood Place of the said Plat.  **Size of Vacation Area:** Approximately 25’ x 90’ or 2,250 square feet.  **Surrounding Land Use and Zoning:** North- Single Family Residential; RD (Two-Family Residential); South- Single Family Residential; RD (Two-Family Residential); East- Single Family Residential; RD (Two-Family Residential); West- Single Family Residential; RD (Two-Family Residential).  **Comprehensive Plan Designation:** Medium Density Residential.  **Applicable Regulations:** State law requires the consent of adjoining property owners for the vacation of street right-of-way. The neighbor and adjoining property owner to the vacation area at 611 18th Ave. No. has not yet provided a written statement of consent. The applicant has been notified regarding the need for their soliciting the opposite property owners’ consent. If consent is not provided the vacation should not be granted.  **Description of Existing Uses:** Vacant and undeveloped alley right-of-way, presently utilized as part of the adjoining properties.

**Special Information**

**Planning & Zoning History:** The alley was originally platted in the Elmwood Place Subdivision recorded January 2, 1906.

**Public Utilities:** No existing city street facilities or utilities are situated in the vacation area, nor does it appear that Idaho Power, ITD, or other public utilities have facilities or easements within the proposed alley right-of-way vacation area.

**Environmental:** Approval of the vacation will have no negative effect on properties adjacent either side of the proposed alley right-of-way vacation area. The positive effect that the adjoining property owners call split the area between them and utilize their portion as extended lot area.
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**Correspondence:** As of the date of this staff report no objections have been raised by any utility companies or surrounding property owners. Fire, Building, and Engineering Departments do not oppose the vacation of the alley right-of-way area.

While I was visiting the site neighboring property owners Jerry and Virginia McCardle - 615 18th Ave. No. approached staff expressing their opposition to the alley vacation and also expressed concern over the lack of property maintenance and the fact that the house addition shown in street view photo has been underway and uncompleted for over three years.

**Staff Findings and Discussion**

Planning staff sees no reason why the requested alley right-of-way vacation should not be approved, unless the required adjacent property owner consent is not provided.

**Recommended Approval Conditions**

If the applicant has not provided written consent to the vacation from the adjacent property owner prior to the hearing. A possible condition of approval would be that the Vacation ordinance is not passed by the Nampa City Council until said consent has been provided. And that if it is not provided the ordinance would not be finalized and the vacation effectively denied. In other regards the Planning and Zoning Department has no concerns with the granting of the alley right-of-way vacation request with no other conditions attached.

Daniel Badger addressed the width of the road and referred to the letter on the fire departments approval of the vacation.

Building and Safety Director Patrick Sullivan addressed the building permit and the stop work order for the property in question.

Councilmembers asked questions.

Those appearing in favor of the request were: Chris Colligan, 611 18th Avenue North; Greg Calsone, 1190 Savage Drive; Irene Obsesco, 3906 South Raintree; Irma Lato, 1604 18th Avenue North; Elvia Dudlya, 523 17th Avenue North.

Owner Chris Colligan was in favor of the vacation with conditions that was stated (survey of property and the powerline moved)

Daniel Badger explained that generally there is not a meats and bounds, the description would be more general in the nature of the alley located between lot and block. Then we would get some
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general dimensions, it is this long by approximately this wide and that is what typically would be in the ordinance.

Nampa City Attorney Doug Waterman explained that there are a number of issues of human interaction going on. I just want to remind you that what is going on today is a vacation and the facts that are relevant to this hearing are those that relevant to whether the vacation of this right of way is in the public interest.

Those in opposition to the request were: Virginia McCardell, 615 18th Avenue North; Jerry McCardell, 615 18th Avenue North; Karen Dahl, 615 18th Avenue North.

Applicant presented a rebuttal to questions that were brought forward in the public hearing.

Councilmembers asked questions.

Doug Waterman asked the applicant to get the Council copies of the exhibits that has been presented for the city files.

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

Patrick Sullivan addressed the questions on the Idaho Power easement.

Mayor made comments on the issue that is on the table.

Doug Waterman explained that the Idaho code is not saying who the obligation for a survey would be on. I do want to clarify; this is a little bit different than some vacations in so far that the alley way has not been used or opened for a long period of time. So, in this case the consent requirement for a joining property owner does not come into play if the area has not been open for a period of 5 years and if they have access to their property from another public right of way which both are present in this case.

Patrick Sullivan said that given the age of the plat of this property and there may not be pins available we would need to have an accurate survey to place a property line because this structure is going to be close enough to the property line. The determination of exactly how close it is going to determine whether or not you need a fire ?? walls, if there needs to be a fire separation and also we need to be able to . . . we would need written verification from Idaho Power that there is no easement. We are not going to rely on hearsay. Either way, whether Council requires it, ultimately the building department will require it going forward.
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MOVED by Haverfield and SECONDED by Bruner to approve the vacation of the road right-of-way in the Amended Plat of Elmwood Place Addition lying between Lot B - 523 18th Ave. No., and Lot C – 611 18th Ave. No. for Ludmila and Viktor Dudlya with the understanding that it does not approve the foundation that is currently there 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

❖ (5) New Business ❖

Item #5-1. - Mayor Kling presented the request for discussion of the Valley Regional Transit budget.

Tom Points explained that we listened to your questions about VRT funding and asked VRT to put together this information and we will review on it and Public Works has not been engaged at this point in looking at allocations and we would like to moving forward and if there is a new way of doing that we would like to be involved in that.

Mayor made comments.

Steven Hunt, Principal Planner who presented the following report:

Inter-County Cost Allocations – Nampa Review - The Valley Regional Transit Board of Directors established the allocation for transit services contributions for Canyon County’s Local and Inter-county services in 2003. It was based on a combination of population and the number of stops in each jurisdiction and how often they are served. The location of stops is an important driving factor in cost allocations because stops are where people access service and the number of times a stop is served has a direct relationship to how that service is distributed.

Since the original contributions were established in 2003, VRT has adjusted those amounts to reflect changes in operating costs but has not re-evaluated the distribution of contributions. In addition, the existing methodology doesn’t account for the distribution of administrative overhead or capital expenses required to support the operations.

VRT initiated an evaluation of the distribution of contributions in September 2018, following the adoption of ValleyConnect 2.0 by the VRT Board of Directors. VRT is implementing the new methodology in the FY2021 budget process.

Existing Contribution Distribution Analysis
Table 1 below is a comparison of the current contributions for Inter-county services 40, 42, 43 and 45. Route 45 is solely funded by Boise State University and the College of Western Idaho. The total contribution does not reflect the 50% match provided to Valley Regional Transit by FTA.

Table 1: 2020 Requested Contributions for Inter-county routes 40, 42, 43 and 45

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Agency</th>
<th>Local Contributions</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Boise</td>
<td>$14,212</td>
<td>4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Meridian</td>
<td>$99,349</td>
<td>30%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Caldwell</td>
<td>$25,025</td>
<td>7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nampa</td>
<td>$122,221</td>
<td>37%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other Contributing Agencies*</td>
<td>$73,698</td>
<td>22%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Local Contributions</td>
<td>$334,505</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Includes Boise State University, College of Western Idaho, Ada County and Canyon County

There are 27 bus stops in Nampa served by inter-county routes. These stops are primarily along Nampa Caldwell Blvd, Birch Dr, or near the Idaho Center Blvd or the College of Western Idaho. Table 2 shows both how many times any of the intercountry routes 40, 42 or 43 serve a bus stop and the percent of total stops served by jurisdiction.

The location of bus stops and the number of times they are served, however, gives an incomplete picture of who is benefiting and how. Ridership data can be used to approximate where riders live. It was originally agreed that the majority of costs for inter-county services would be borne by the jurisdictions where the trips originated, or the residential end. As shown in Table 3 eighty percent (80%) of AM boardings (trip origins) occur outside the City of Boise. Because of this, Table 2 also shows the percent of stops in each jurisdiction each weekday excluding Boise.

Table 2: Number of Times Routes 40, 42 or 43 Stop in Each Jurisdiction Each Weekday

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Member Agency</th>
<th>Total Stops</th>
<th>% of Total Stops</th>
<th>Stops Outside Boise</th>
<th>% of Stops Outside Boise</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Boise</td>
<td>230</td>
<td>40%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Meridian</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>22%</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>36%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Nampa</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>55%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Caldwell</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>5%</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>582</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>352</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

By comparing Tables 1 and 2, you can see the percent of local contributions is typically within the range between the Percent of Total Stops and the Total Stops by Origin.

Inter-County Ridership
Comparing ridership by jurisdiction provides a way to evaluate the distribution of benefits. Table 3 below estimates an annual number of boardings based on the average daily boardings since July 2019 (because these samples were taken in the summer the annual estimates may be low, but they illustrate the point and do represent the appropriate order of magnitude). These numbers are based on the newly installed Automatic Passenger Counters (APCs) which are able to show report on ridership by stop. The APC’s are also able to report on ridership by time of day. By dividing ridership by AM and PM Table 3 shows where riders likely begin and end their trips. Before noon, eighty percent of the boarding occur outside the City of Boise, while afternoon, seventy-seven percent of the trips occur in the City of Boise suggesting that riders are traveling from Caldwell, Nampa and Meridian to Boise.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Jurisdiction</th>
<th>AM*</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>PM**</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>%</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Boise</td>
<td>5,100</td>
<td>20%</td>
<td>19,800</td>
<td>77%</td>
<td>24,900</td>
<td>49%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Caldwell</td>
<td>4,800</td>
<td>18%</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>6,300</td>
<td>12%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian</td>
<td>8,400</td>
<td>33%</td>
<td>1,500</td>
<td>6%</td>
<td>9,900</td>
<td>19%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nampa</td>
<td>7,400</td>
<td>29%</td>
<td>2,800</td>
<td>11%</td>
<td>10,200</td>
<td>20%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>25,700</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>25,600</td>
<td>100%</td>
<td>51,300</td>
<td>100%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*AM is from 5:30 am – 11:59 am  
**PM is from 12:00 pm – 8:05 pm

The major destinations for riders on these routes include downtown Boise, Boise State University, St. Luke’s main campus, Ada County Courthouse, Idaho Power, etc. These trips are all in excess of 16 miles from the last transit stop in Nampa at the College of Western Idaho. Table 4 below shows the comparable per/cost trips for various modes.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Trip Type</th>
<th>Inter-County (~16 mi)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Private Auto¹</td>
<td>$8.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyft²</td>
<td>$25.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Taxi³</td>
<td>$40.50</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| Transit (Average Current Inter-County Costs for trips originating and returning to Nampa – 14,800)⁴ | $16.52 (full costs)  
$8.25 (Nampa share) |

¹ Based on 2017 AAA Costs per Mile for Medium Sedan averaging 15,000 miles/year. Federal reimbursement rates of $0.58/mile would value this trip at $9.28  
² Based on sample Lyft trips  
³ Based on Taxi Finder [https://www.taxifarefinder.com](https://www.taxifarefinder.com)  
⁴ As transit productivity increases costs decrease.
Ridership and number of people
By evaluating pass usage Valley Regional Transit has been able to create an estimate for the number of people “actively” (at least once every 3 months) accessing transit services at certain stops. Using this methodology, we are able to estimate the number of people actively accessing the intercountry services from stops in Nampa to be between 100 and 200 individuals.

Draft Allocation Methodology
The draft allocation methodology presented to the VRT board in 2019 would distribute contributions among funding partners according to three categories;

1. General Assessment: Which would cover all overhead that cannot be directly associated with transit service levels or special projects. These costs would be shared based on the percent of the regional population represented by the funding partner.

2. Special Allocations: Would cover specific capital, service or planning activities requested by specific funding partners. These costs would be distributed according to the funding partners requesting or benefiting from the projects.

3. Service and Capital Allocations: Would cover the on-going operating and capital costs that are directly associated with service levels. These allocations would be distributed based on the share of services provided within each jurisdiction.

This cost allocation approach will facilitate greater coordination between jurisdictions and Valley Regional Transit. Figure 1 below illustrates how VRT is recommending future budget requests be coordinated with jurisdiction priorities.

Figure 1: Draft Local Allocation Diagram
Mayor Kling recommended that we stay with where we are committed. Because I understand what the impact would be to staff if all of a sudden, we pulled funding this year. I think that we need that commitment that this next year we are going to look at the allocation and we are going to do some work on our side to actually see what the needs of our citizens are and to ensure that we are meeting those needs.

Councilmembers made comments and asked questions.

MOVED by Bruner to only approve up to $100,000 on the intercounty routes.

MOTION DIED FOR LACK OF SECOND

(4) Staff Communications

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

Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan Open House – The Fiscal Year 2020 City of Nampa Bicycle and Pedestrian Master Plan (Plan) update is currently underway. The first Bicycle and Pedestrian Steering Committee (Committee) meeting was held on April 24, 2019, with the city’s consultant, Alta Planning & Design, local school districts, irrigation districts, Safe Routes to School representatives, Nampa City staff, COMPASS, Idaho Transportation Department, and local businesses participation

During the design period, a link to an online mapping tool was distributed citywide to gather public input. Over five hundred (500) comments were received using the online tool. The data was used to create a story map, showing the existing and proposed bike and pedestrian facilities. A snapshot of the online mapping tool is shown below:
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A public open house was held on August 8, 2019, at the Nampa Public Library to review the online public comments and gather additional public input.

Over 70 people attended the open house. Committee members, the open house, and online mapping tool gathered a tremendous amount of stakeholder and public input.

A high quality, non-motorized transportation network is the hallmark of a desirable community; making it a pleasant place to live, work and play. The Plan is a critical tool in realizing Nampa’s walking and biking potential.

Nampa City staff would like to personally thank Committee members for being very instrumental in the entire process of updating the Plan.

The Plan will be presented for Council review and adoption in the fall of 2019.

**Flamingo Watermain Break** – On Flamingo over by Cassia we have an Elijah Drain crossing there. On Friday night about 7:00 p.m. we got word that a 12-inch water main had been broken underneath the roadway.

It flowed down hill and all went into the Elijah Drain. There was no property damage but there was road damage.

The crews had it repaired the next day and had a patch over the top. The road is still closed because it was somewhat similar to Garrity that the water got underneath the pavement and floated it up and then when the water dissipated it all went back down and was wavy and was not safe to drive on it.

Nampa City Engineer Daniel Badger has a past contractor that we hired to come and patch the pavement, so the contractor will be out tomorrow, and we hope to have it open by the end of the week.

We don’t have final cost yet. The pavement will be a little under $50,000.

We are looking at this segment of road for some maintenance work in the next cycle that is coming around. This will be our next asset management zone.

We have had more than one problem in this stretch of road. The cause of this break according to the Water Department was that a PVC pipe was sitting on a rock. It wasn’t bedded right when installed. It basically split the bottom of the pipe completely the whole 20-foot section.

We have some concerns about the workmanship. This was installed in the 70’s or early 80’s.
Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Improvement Projects - In fiscal year 2018, Engineering Division staff presented a workforce plan for the engineering/capital projects that identified organizational strategies that would save the Nampa City professional services costs over the next five-years. A combination of in-house and outsourced services was 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/Capital Improvement Projects plan (see Exhibit A) provides an update on the workforce plan efforts and a list of capital projects scheduled for this fiscal year.

- 25 major projects
- $19M in value
I am a firm believer in setting a goal and measuring our progress. My motto is: “What gets measured gets done”. Our goal is to design and construct all projects this FY. We expect to be very near our construction goal by the end of the year.

We are behind in comparison to last year due to less engineering staff as open positions have yet to be filled and the reduction in consultant assistance. Also note that we are tracking federally funded projects that this year we believe will be a hinderance to delivery as they will likely extend beyond the fiscal year.
Project Savings to Date

Engineering staff has relied less on consultants this fiscal year reducing overall expenses. Thus far we have exceeded our project savings goal of $400,000 for the fiscal year by $185,792. The last quarter we have hired consultants to attempt to deliver the remaining projects within the fiscal year and fall.

Key elements of the Fiscal Year 2019 Capital Improvement Projects plan are summarized as follows:

**Hire additional staff to reduce outsourced consulting cost:** Engineering Division will hire one engineer in training (EIT), one contract administrator, and one part-time public involvement professional. According to the 5-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:** The Engineering Division is currently understaffed due to recent in-house promotions. The division has hired Caleb LaClair, Assistant City Engineer, to oversee development, and Tiffany McCree, Public Involvement Coordinator, part-time. Staff have attempted to hire two staff engineers; unfortunately, due to difficulty finding qualified engineering candidates, no hires have been made. An offer has been made for the contract administrator position.

**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 Street, Wastewater, and Water (domestic and pressurized irrigation) Divisions Fiscal Year 2019 Projects and Schedule:** Engineering will strive to deliver 100% of the 61 design and construction projects within the fiscal year 2019 funding year. Total capital funding is $19,744,111.00

Engineering Division staff strived to meet its goal of 100% delivery of capital projects in the designated funding year; however, this year staff was unable to
Finding qualified staff has proven to be difficult, thus reducing project delivery for this fiscal year

Staff remain focused on delivering the capital improvement projects in a timely manner and will continue working to deliver the unfinished projects as quickly as possible with several being completed this fall

In-house staff resources for design and inspection, as well documenting staff savings this fiscal year (due to not being able to find qualified applicants), has provided an estimated $585,792.00 in project savings, exceeding the fiscal year goal of $400,000.00

✦ (5) New Business ✦

**Item #5-2. -** Mayor Kling presented the request to approval by the Council to apply for the Idaho Local 2019 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant (JAG) Program.

Police Captain Brad Daniels presented a staff report explaining that the describe the proposed program activities including the type of programs to be funded and a brief analysis of the need for the programs The Nampa Police Department (NPD) and Canyon County Sheriff’s Office (CCSO) are requesting funding to purchase equipment for law enforcement programs. This request is consistent with the approved program areas and purpose of the Byrne JAG Program. Both law enforcement departments put officer safety, traffic enforcement, and effective evidence collection at a high importance. The agencies have identified specific areas within their jurisdiction that will effectively address permissible uses of JAG funds and provide our agencies with a means to improve and expand on our current effort to work in a cooperative effort with community leaders, citizens and employees to reduce crime. With funds received from the 2019 BJAG, we will be able to provide officer safety to individuals and teams, enforce traffic laws and serve our victims of crime by providing more effective investigation measures in the prosecution of crimes.
The Nampa Police Department (NPD) is requesting to use $40,626 in funding to purchase several different items/tools that will assist in patrol duties and evidence collection. Currently we have two WRAP safe restraint systems that are being utilized in patrol. The WRAP is a four-piece temporary restraining device that is placed on combative subjects to keep them from hurting themselves or others. It consists of a helmet, a harness for the upper body, and a mesh material piece for the bottom of the legs. It keeps the subject restrained in a sitting position with their legs straight out in front of them. The WRAP result in calming a situation quickly and making it much safer for both officers and suspects. We are requesting funding to purchase three WRAP systems at approximately $1,425 each for a total of $4,275. This will allow for each patrol team to have one available for use. This increases officer safety by not having to wait for another officer to retrieve one from the station.

Nampa Police is requesting funding to purchase two Halligan tools and three Ram dynamic entry tools to assist with making entry into a car or a building that is secured. Halligan tools were initially designed for fire departments to make entry into locked homes. They have since been used by law enforcement to make entry into homes, buildings, vehicles, etc., that are locked and secured. The Halligan allows law enforcement to enter those secured areas without doing harm to themselves by pulling, prying, or kicking various doors to make entry. Besides being efficient, they also make entry very quick. This provides officers safety, so they are not stuck at a door trying to get in while a potential suspect is inside preparing to do them harm. Currently we have none of these tools deployed in patrol. The Halligan tool cost is approximately $215 each for a total of $430. The Ram dynamic entry tool offers the same basic use as the Halligan tool. Swift entry can be made with one swing of this tool. The Ram cost approximately $310 each for a total of $930.

Nampa Police currently maintains 9 K-9 units for patrol functions, school functions and drug operations. The dogs are assigned to specific officers who are required to maintain a secure location at their personal residences for the K9. This requires a large enough outdoor kennel for the dog to have plenty of room to move about and have a place to sleep and be housed when not on duty. Some of these kennels have been passed around as dogs and officer retire from the program. Two of these kennels are approximately 10 years old and need replacements as the frames are rusting and the panels are worn out. Nampa Police is requesting funding for two kennels with a cost of approximately $500 each for a total of $1,000.

We would like to purchase the equipment and software license needed to set up a portable barcoding system to be used at all major crime scene incidents. The system would be an addition to the current BEAST barcoding system used by the Evidence Department but would allow them to take the system out to crime scenes and assist investigators with the collection, packaging, sealing and labeling of evidence on scene. It would also allow them to print complete property invoices to be left at the scene with search warrants and present to the courts when returning search warrants. The current process requires handwriting on all packages and invoices which is very repetitive and labor intensive. Nampa Police requests funding for the systems: Barcode label
printer $700; laptop $1,000; additional license $1,000; annual software support $200; roll of 500 labels $43; plus, shipping and handling approx. $77; for a total cost of $3,020.

Nampa Police would like to request funding to purchase two Camera Kits for the Crime Scene Investigator (CSI) program. We currently only have two working cameras and they are shared between 6 officers. They are several years old and need cleaning and repair, but we are unable to take them out of circulation because we do not have any back-ups. These types of cameras are necessary for documenting crime scenes and evidence in a high enough quality that they can go on for forensic examination and analysis. This cannot be accomplished with point-and-shoot cameras. The cost breakdown for this kit is as follows: 2 Camera w/ 18-55mm lens $450 each; 2 Tripods w/horizontal mount $100 each; 2 flash attachments $85 each; 2 shutter release $5 each; 2 cases $150 each; 2 class 10 SD cards $20 each; and 2 card readers $15 each, (Total of $825 per camera kit), plus, shipping and handling approx. $50. Total cost of $1700.

We are also requesting funding for one portable Alternate Light Source (ALS). ALS are typically used in crime scene investigation to identify many forms of evidence. Physiological fluids (semen, urine, and saliva) can be identified through their natural fluorescent properties utilizing UV light. We currently have one that is shared between the evidence lab and the CSI program. The majority of the time it is used in the lab which makes it unavailable for the CSI’s when they process crime scenes. The addition of this portable ALS will enable the CSI’s to have one on hand to aid them in locating evidence in sexual assaults and other persons crimes. The approximate cost for one light and shipping is $450.

Nampa Police is requesting funding for a portable Trace Evidence vacuum. This item could be used to locate trace evidence to include, hairs, fibers, glass, paint, plant material, soil and numerous other types of microscopic evidence. The vacuum could be used in vehicles, on persons, and in crime scenes. It would be applicable to homicides, sex crimes, drug crimes, kidnappings, domestic violence cases and numerous other types of cases. We do not currently have any type of equipment capable of collecting this type of evidence. The cost is: vacuum $265; crevice tool $20; carpet tool $15; 100 replacement filters $75, approximate shipping $25. Total $400.

Nampa Police Department provides Narcan/naloxone to our officers to aid people who are experiencing an opiate related overdose. Multiple lives have already been saved from applications since we started issuing these kits in December 2016. They are issued to our patrol officers, narcotics officers, school resource officers, and evidence personnel. They are issued to new officers and when one is used another kit is provided to replace used stock. Our current kits will expire in November 2019. In March 2019, we were provided 50 kits through the Idaho Office of Drug Control Policy. That was the maximum they were able to provide. The Nampa Police Department needs an additional 50 kits to completely replace the expiring lot. Kits are currently assigned to 100 personnel including: 72 patrol officers, 11 School Resource Officers, 8 Traffic enforcement officers, 7 narcotics officers, and 2 in the evidence/drug processing area. The cost per kit is $75. Total cost for 50 kits is $3,750.00.
The Nampa Police Department is seeking to equip first responders (patrol officers and school resource officers) with ballistic helmets. This equipment will increase the safety of officers responding to active shooters in schools, workplace or other public places, as well as protecting officers in riot or crowd control situations. The helmet provides skull and head protection with a ballistic rating of NIJ II, NIJ III, and NIJ IIIA, as well as low velocity impact shock absorption. The integrated face shield provides protection against impact, splash and fragments. Officers who are better protected can remain engaged in combat and more effectively assist victims in active shooter situations. The helmets range in size (small, medium, large and extra-large). General cost is $375 per helmet including face shield with XL sizes costing $395. The Nampa Police Department estimates being able to provide 65 officers with this equipment for a price of $24,671.00, which includes shipping.

The Canyon County Sheriff’s Office (CCSO) is requesting their allotted funding in the amount of $16,167, along with the $10,000 that Nampa PD has relinquished, to purchase new X-2 electro-muscular- disruption-devices (EMD). These devices will meet the purpose of the grant program by increasing effectiveness and efficiency of the Sheriff’s Office. Deputies are regularly called into harm’s way and make split second decisions that could prove fatal for either the deputy or the offender. Modern policing has been afforded devices such as EMDs that give deputies an option to deadly force. Currently the Sheriff’s Office has approximately thirty model X-26 EMD’s issued. This model is obsolete and no longer supported by the manufacturer. The X-2 is available at an approximate cost of one thousand seven hundred forty-four dollars and forty-five cents (1744.45) per device. The cost per device is based on the handle (1220.00), a battery (66.45), a holster (80.00) and a four-year warranty (378.00). The Sheriff’s Office would like to purchase fifteen X-2’s for total cost of twenty-six thousand one hundred sixty-seven dollars (26167.00). It is the Sheriff’s office intent to budget for the remainder of the EMDs in their FY21 budget.

MOVED by Haverfield and SECONDED by Skaug to authorize the staff to apply for the Idaho Local 2019 Edward Byrne Memorial Justice Assistance Grant. 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 award the bid and authorize the Mayor to sign the contract with HCD, Inc. for the HNPSB Large Evidence Storage Project.

Facilities Supervisor Brian Foster presented a staff report explaining that the Nampa Police Department has identified the need to remodel the Large Evidence Storage area the Hugh Nichols Public Safety Building. The project is to be funded by the Police Department. The expenditure was approved as part of the 2019 budget for an amount of $120,000. The project will be funded using 25% from General Government Funds and 75% through Impact Fees. The project bids received were over the budgeted amount, and the Nampa Police Department determined they are able to
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fund the project with 75% or $119,654 through Impact Fees and 25% or $39,884 from the Police General Fund ($30,000 rollover from FY19 and $9,884 from FY20 Police General Government).

Documents have been reviewed and approved by Legal.

The cost of the project will be $159,538.

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.

Facilities Development procured bids for the project using an Informal Bid Process. A pre-bid walk through was conducted at the project site on June 4, 2019 at 10:00 a.m. The bid opening was held on June 18, 2019 at 2:00 p.m.

A total of three (3) bids were received on June 18, 2019.

The apparent low bid was received from HCD, 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.

MOVED by Hogaboam and SECONDED by Skaug to award the bid and authorize Mayor Kling to sign the contract with HCD, Inc. for the HNPSB Evidence Storage Remodel Project not to exceed the contract amount of $159,538. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the MOTION CARRIED

Item #5-4. – The following Resolution was presented:

Daniel Badger presented a staff report explaining that the Equivalent Dwelling Unit (EDU) and Strength Class Guide for Wastewater and Water User Classifications is used by staff in determining utility connection fees for new and expanding business within the City of Nampa.

At the August 22, 2019, Board of Appraisers (BOA) meeting*, Engineering and Wastewater staff recommended changes to the EDU guide for the following business types:
  o Brewery (non-industrial customer)
    ▪ This is a new addition to the guide with a strength class of SE6.
    ▪ With the number of new breweries coming to Nampa, staff identified the need to add this customer category to the guide to provide clarity for both staff and businesses wanting to locate in Nampa (see Exhibit 1).
Restaurants
 This is a modification to the restaurant class, removing the distinction between drive-in and sit down, and changing the gallons per day per seat from 30 to 20.
 Staff performed an analysis of the existing restaurants in the city after several new restaurants questioned the Nampa City’s guide for this customer category (see Exhibit 2).
 A 50-seat restaurant under the current rate structure would pay $26,943.24 in connection fees for water and sewer. Under the proposed rate structure, they would pay $18,026.22.

A motion was made, and seconded, by the BOA to adopt proposed changes (see Exhibit 3). The motion passed.

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO, IMPLEMENTING CHANGES IN THE SERVICE RATES AND FEES CHARGED BY THE CITY OF NAMPA OUTLINED IN THE CITY OF NAMPA EDU (EQUIVALENT DWELLING UNIT) AND STRENGTH CLASS GUIDE USED TO DETERMINE USER CLASSIFICATION FOR WASTEWATER AND WATER SERVICES.

MOVED by Bruner and SECONDED by Haverfield 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 42-2019 and directed the clerk to record it as required.

MOTION CARRIED

Item #5-5. - Mayor Kling presented the request to authorize the Fleet Services Division to Proceed with Letter of Intent for Piggyback Purchase 1 (One) 2020 Etnyre Oil Distributor Truck on October 1, 2019.

Tom Points presented a staff report explaining that the Street, and Fleet Services Divisions request authorization to offer a Letter of Intent (LOI) to purchase one (1) 2020 Etnyre oil distributor truck.
 A purchase order will be generated October 1, 2019, the effective date of the fiscal year 2020 budget.

The oil distributor truck will be purchased using street capital funds.
 The total unit cost is $222,500.00.

The purchase of this oil distributor was included in the fiscal year 2020 budget, adopted by Nampa City Council by Resolution #35-2019.
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The Etnyre truck will be purchased via “piggyback” off of the Ada County Highway District (ACHD) contract MD-541-01, executed May 5, 2019.

As per Idaho Code 67-2803(1), the piggyback process allows any governmental agency to use the bid of another governmental agency to establish the price for procurement, provided the initial process satisfied the public bidding rules and the supplier is willing to honor the price.

The intent of this request is to avoid a 3% cost increase that will be effective Sept. 1, 2019. The vendor has agreed to extend the order deadline to September 4, 2019.

The City of Nampa will not take delivery of the new truck until after October 1, 2019.

MOVED by Haverfield and SECONDED by Skaug to authorize Fleet Services Division to proceed with a Letter of Intent for piggyback purchase 1 (one) 2020 Etnyre oil distributor truck, not to exceed total estimated purchase price of $222,500.00, on October 1, 2019. 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 to authorize the Mayor and Public Works Director to sign the Local Professional Services Agreement with HDR Engineering, Inc. for Smith Ave and Middleton Rd Signal project.

Tom Points presented a staff report explaining that the City of Nampa secured grant funding through the Local Highway Safety Improvement Program (LHSIP) funds, administered by the Local Highway Technical Assistance Council (LHTAC), to improve roadway safety at the intersection of Smith Avenue & Middleton Road.

The Smith Avenue & Middleton Road Signal project will replace the existing two-way stop intersection configuration with a traffic signal. Intersection lighting will be improved as well as lane assignment improvements by adding left turn lanes along Middleton Road and Smith Avenue. (See Exhibit A)

The project was advanced in COMPASS’ Transportation Improvement Program for design and construction in FY2019.

The state local agreement for construction of the Smith Avenue & Middleton Road Signal project was executed February 15, 2019.
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The project is funded 92.66% with Local Highway Safety Improvement Program funds secured through COMPASS with the City of Nampa providing 7.34% match using streets funds. Total project cost is currently estimated at $621,561.54.

The Idaho Transportation Department (ITD) has provided a Local Professional Services Agreement for the City of Nampa to execute (see Exhibit B).

HDR Engineering, Inc., LHTAC and the City of Nampa have agreed upon a scope of work and cost estimate to provide construction engineering and inspection services for the Smith Avenue & Middleton Road Signal which the Local Professional Services Agreement is based upon.

The City of Nampa needs to execute the professional services agreement as quickly as possible to allow for the contractor to begin construction this fall to avoid potential conflicts in the spring with other construction anticipated along the Middleton Road corridor. Therefore, we are requesting pre-authorization for the Mayor to sign the agreement.

ITD’s Local Professional Services Agreement is a standard agreement that the City of Nampa has entered on many other projects and is currently being reviewed by legal.

Engineering Division estimates total project costs will be the following:

- **Design** $77,000.00
- **LHTAC Construction Administration** $17,000.00
- **ITD Construction Administration** $2,285.00
- **Construction Engineering and Inspection Services** $76,142.00
- **Construction** $448,655.50
- **Total Project Costs** $621,082.50

The existing construction funding of $570,374.00 with the City of Nampa paying 7.34% match. Consultant fees will be funded through the FY19 Streets Budget; as budgeted. Upon payment of consultant fees, reimbursement of 92.66% will be requested from ITD.

Contracts are being finalized between ITD and the low bidder Hawkeye Builders, construction is anticipated to begin in Mid-September.

Engineering Division has reviewed the Local Professional Services Agreement and recommends approval.

**MOVED** by Bruner and **SECONDED** by Hogaboam to **authorize** the **Mayor** and **Public Works Director** to **sign** the **Local Professional Services Agreement** between the City of Nampa and HDR Engineering, Inc. for the Smith Avenue and Middleton Road Signal Project (Key Number
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20167) in the amount of **$76,142.00** Time and Materials Not to Exceed. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting **YES**. The Mayor declared the **MOTION CARRIED**

**Item #5-7.** - Mayor Kling presented the request to **authorize** the Mayor to **sign a Subrecipient Agreement Amendment** with Valley Regional Transit and **authorize** Engineering to proceed with **formal bid process** for **Iowa Ave Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk** and Midland Blvd & Blaine Ave Hawk Pedestrian Signal project.

Tom Points presented a staff report explaining that through multiple funding applications the City of Nampa was awarded Federal Funds to design and construct multimodal transit improvements for two projects. The North Nampa Neighborhood Multimodal project is currently under construction while the Iowa Avenue Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk and the Midland & Blaine Ave. HAWK Pedestrian Signal project is currently under design.

Funding is through the Federal Transit Authority (FTA) Grant Program and administered by Valley Regional Transit (VRT). A subrecipient agreement was executed for the North Nampa Neighborhood Multimodal project Key Number 19959 which the proposed amendment will modify.

As previously discussed, VRT has supplied the amendment to the existing subrecipient agreement as funding has been appropriated to include funds for project Key No. 19855 (Iowa Avenue Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk and the Midland & Blaine Ave. HAWK Pedestrian Signal), (See Exhibit A, Vicinity Map).

Total estimated design and construction cost for Project 19855 is $579,000 with the federal allocation being $463,200 (80%) and the City of Nampa’s match portion being $115,800 (20%). Two project sites are included as follows:

- **Key No. 19855: Iowa Ave. Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk & Bike Lane** - construct a Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk across W. Iowa Avenue, near Owyhee Elementary and construct pavement markings and signage for bike facilities along Iowa Avenue.
- **Key No. 19855: Midland Blvd Pedestrian Hybrid Beacon & Blaine Avenue Bike Boulevard** - construct a High-intensity Activated crosswalk (HAWK) for the Midland Blvd crosswalk at Blaine Avenue and construct pavement markings and signage for bike facilities along Blaine Avenue.

The City of Nampa’s match will be paid out of FY19 Streets Budget; as budgeted.
Regular Council  
September 3, 2019

The Federal Program Funding Subrecipient Agreement Amendment (see Exhibit B, Amendment) must be executed between the City of Nampa and VRT. Key additions of the Amendment are summarized below:

- Total funding is increased. Maximum federal funds available under the amendment is increased to $935,000, the City of Nampa is responsible for an estimated local match of $233,750 and is responsible for all overages.
- The term of the agreement will be extended to 9/30/2020.

Council authorized a Task Order with Paragon Consulting, Inc. for design and construction engineering services for the project on November 5, 2018.

Construction is anticipated to begin in June 2020 with completion in August 2020, pending availability of the electrical equipment for the pedestrian activated crosswalk and the pedestrian hybrid beacon. This construction window was selected to reduce impacts with adjacent schools as well as potentially receiving lower bids with an extended window for bidders to plan their work for next year.

Estimated construction costs are $584,367.

Engineering recommends proceeding with the formal bid process.

MOVED by Bruner and SECONDED by Hogaboam to authorize the Mayor to sign the Subrecipient Agreement Amendment (Exhibit B) and authorize Engineering to proceed with the formal bid process for the Iowa Avenue Pedestrian Activated Crosswalk & Midland & Blaine Avenue Hawk Pedestrian Signal project, Key Number 19855. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with Councilmembers Levi, Haverfield, Hogaboam, Bruner voting YES. Councilmember Skaug voting NO and Councilmember Rodriguez ABSENT. The Mayor declared the

MOTION CARRIED

Item #5-8. - Mayor Kling presented the request to authorize the Mayor to sign MOU with the National Main Street Center for the administration of the Kevin and Mary Daniel Fund.

Economic Development Assistant Director Robyn Sellers presented a staff report explaining that the National Main Street Center announced the launch of the Kevin and Mary Daniels Fund to help stimulate Nampa’s Main Street Program and revitalization efforts in Downtown Nampa. This fund has been established in appreciation for all Kevin and Mary have done for America’s cultural heritage.

Kevin Daniels, owner of Daniels Real Estate based in Seattle, grew up in Nampa and has a passion to help communities thrive. Daniels recently moved to trustee emeritus status on the Main Street board.
The Kevin and Mary Daniels Fund received $100,000 in donations from Main Street board members, colleagues and friends to honor their dedication to historic preservation and help improve facades of Downtown Nampa’s historic buildings.

The fund will be administered by the National Main Street Center for the first round of funding and they help with working recipients on rehabilitation projects and historic façade improvements.

Attached is the Memorandum of Understanding between the City of Nampa and the National Main Street Center. It defines the roles and responsibilities of National Main Street and the City of Nampa’s Economic Development office to administer the Kevin and Mary Daniels Fund.

Staff Recommendation is to approve the Mayor to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with National Main Street Center for the administration of the Kevin and Mary Daniels fund.

MOVED by Haverfield and SECONDED by Hogaboam to authorize the Mayor to sign the Memorandum of Understanding with National Main Street Center for the administration of the Kevin and Mary Daniels fund. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all Councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the

MOTION CARRIED

Item #5-4. – The following Resolution was presented:

Fire Chief Kirk Carpenter presented the following staff report explaining that with the Federal AFG Grant that Nampa Fire received to purchase new SCBA Air Packs we no longer need our old and outdated Drager SCBA’s. Nampa Fire has found another fire department in Henderson NV that can use and is interested in the old equipment. We have made an agreement that in return for some of our old SCBA packs Henderson Fire will purchase Nampa Fire some needed station furniture.

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. (Fire Department)

MOVED by Hogaboam and SECONDED by Haverfield 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 43-2019 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 OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO, TO PROVIDE IL (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL) ZONE DESIGNATION FOR CERTAIN LANDS, COMMONLY KNOWN AS 1504 GARRITY BOULEVARD, NAMPA, CANYON COUNTY, IDAHO, COMPRISING APPROXIMATELY 2.38 ACRES, MORE OR LESS; DETERMINING THAT SAID ZONING IS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE CITIZENS AND CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO; REZONING SAID PROPERTY FROM RML (LIMITED MULTIPLE-FAMILY RESIDENTIAL) TO IL (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL); PROVIDING FOR RECORDATION; INSTRUCTING THE CITY ENGINEER TO DESIGNATE SAID PROPERTY AS IL (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL) ON THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP AND OTHER AREA MAPS OF THE CITY; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE; AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES, RULES AND REGULATIONS, AND PARTS THEREOF, IN CONFLICT HEREWITH.  (Applicant Dean Loni R Monson)

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 Hogaboam and SECONDED by Haverfield 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 4461 and directed the Clerk to record it as required.

MOTION CARRIED

Item #7-2. – The following Ordinance was read by title:

AN ORDINANCE OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO TO PROVIDE IL (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL) ZONE DESIGNATION FOR CERTAIN LANDS, COMMONLY KNOWN AS 2806 LANDON LANE, NAMPA, IDAHO, COMPRISING APPROXIMATELY 2.95 ACRES, MORE OR LESS; DETERMINING THAT SAID ZONING IS IN THE BEST INTEREST OF THE CITIZENS AND CONSISTENT WITH THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN OF THE CITY OF NAMPA, IDAHO; REZONING SAID PROPERTY FROM BC (COMMUNITY BUSINESS) TO IL (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL); PROVIDING FOR RECORDATION; INSTRUCTING THE CITY ENGINEER TO DESIGNATE SAID PROPERTY AS IL (LIGHT INDUSTRIAL) ON THE OFFICIAL ZONING MAP AND OTHER AREA MAPS OF THE CITY; PROVIDING FOR SEVERABILITY; PROVIDING FOR AN EFFECTIVE DATE; AND REPEALING ALL ORDINANCES, RULES AND REGULATIONS, AND PARTS THEREOF, IN CONFLICT HEREWITH.  (Applicant Thiel & Thiel, LLC)

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 Levi 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 **4462** 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 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)

8-2. 1st reading of ordinance for Annexation and Zoning to BC at 0 Star Rd (Parcel R036301200) on the south side of Ustick Road, east of Star Road, for access to City of Nampa 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)

8-3. 1st reading of Ordinance for Zoning Map Amendment from BC (Community Business) to IL (Light Industrial) and Conditional Use Permit 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), for Byron Healy. (ZMA-00106-2019, CUP-00138-2019) (PH was 6-17-2019)

8-4. 1st reading of Ordinances for Annexation and Zoning to RML (Limited Multiple-Family Residential) at 1111 E. Iowa Ave. (A .34 acre or 14,938 sq. ft. portion of NE ½, SE ¼ Section 34, T3N, R2W, BM) for Anthony Sparks for construction of a Fourplex. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval (ANN 121-19) (PH was 7-15-2019)

8-5. Annexation and Zoning to BC (Community Business) for .525 acres or 22,866 sq. ft. located in the SE ¼ Section 10, T3N, R2W, BM, Franklin Tracts Plot C at 0 N. Franklin Blvd.; Zoning Map Amendment from AG (Agricultural) to BC (Community Business) for 2.24 acres or 97,574 sq. ft. located in the SE ¼ Section 10, T3N, R2W, BM, Franklin Tracts Plot B at 1414 E. Karcher Rd. for Dean Anderson. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval (ANN 122-19, ZMA 107-19) (PH was 8-5-2019)

8-6. Zoning Map Amendment from RML (Limited Multiple-Family Residential) to IL (Light Industrial) for a 2.38 acre or 103,673 sq. ft. portion of the NE ¼ NW ¼ of Section 23, T3N, R2W, BM located at 1504 Garrity Blvd. for Dean Loni R. Monson. The
Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval (ZMA 108-19) (PH was 8-5-2019)

8-7. Annexation and Zoning to RA (Suburban Residential) for 2.30 acres or 100,188 sq. ft. located at 1460 Lake Lowell Ave in a portion of the SW ¼ of the SE ¼ of Section 30, T3N, R2W, BM for Jared and Melissa Lindsay for a 2-parcel split. The Planning and Zoning Commission recommended approval (ANN 125-19) (PH was 8-19-2019)

◆ (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) (j) to consider labor contract matters authorized under section 67-2345A [74-206A](1)(a) and (b), Idaho Code.

MOVED by Bruner and SECONDED by Haverfield to adjourn into executive session at 10:45 p.m. pursuant to Idaho Code 74-206 (1) Idaho Code 74-206 (1) (j) to consider labor contract matters authorized under section 67-2345A [74-206A](1)(a) and (b), Idaho Code. The Mayor asked for a roll call vote with all councilmembers present voting YES. The Mayor declared the MOTION CARRIED.

MOVED by Haverfield and SECONDED by Skaug to conclude the executive session at 11:12 p.m. during which discussion was held regarding Idaho Code 74-206 (1) and Idaho Code 74-206 (1) (j) to consider labor contract matters authorized under section 67-2345A [74-206A](1)(a) and (b), Idaho Code. The Mayor asked all in favor say aye with all councilmembers present voting AYE. The Mayor declared the MOTION CARRIED.

MOVED by Haverfield and SECONDED by Skaug to adjourn the meeting at 11:13 p.m. The Mayor declared the MOTION CARRIED.

Passed this 16th day of September 2019.

______________________________
MAYOR

______________________________
NAMPA CITY CLERK