

NAMPA BOARD OF APPRAISERS REGULAR MEETING MINUTES

May 1, 2024

Call to Order/Roll Call

Present: Member Nathan Cleaver, Member Jacob Allen, Member Anthony Oxsen, Member Dave Peterson, Member Sharon Harris, Member William Vroman

Absent: Tom Points, Sr. Director of Public Works

Staff Present: Daniel Badger, City Engineer; Jeff Barnes, Director of Water Resources; Ashlee Teeter, Executive Assistant; Heather Tafoya, Business Manager; Mireya Pena, Utility Billing Customer Service Supervisor; Alpha Rodriguez, Utility Billing Supervisor, Leslie Howard, Budget Manager, Debbie Kling, Mayor; John Spencer, Water Superintendent, Doug Racine, Chief Finance Officer, Todd Lakey, Legal Counsel

Guests: Kenneth King, Citizen

(1) Proposed Amendments to Agenda

(2) Staff Communications

2-1. Underlying Irrigation Districts Summary 05.01.24 – Daniel Badger, P.E., City Engineer

- Nothing requested since prior meeting

2-2. AWWA Water Week Fly In Report-Tom Points, P.E., Senior Director of Public Works

- Staff member Daniel Badger presented in Tom's absence
- Tom went to DC as a delegate for American Water Works Association a few weeks ago
- They discussed the State Revolving Fund which is how we've funded several projects. Earmarks that those congressional delegations that have been putting money in through bills have been taking money away from that fund. Municipalities from the state haven't had enough to support the projects due to the earmarks coming out of that fund. A request from AWWA was to discuss where the earmarks come from and maybe allocate to a different area
- They discussed PFAS and possibility putting the responsibility on the creators of PFAS materials. Here in Idaho we don't necessarily have the creators of them
- This visit to DC was regarding water issues
- Information presented is included in the packet

(3) New Business

3-1. Water Rate Adjustment Request – 116 P.F.E. Dr. – Mireya Pena, Utility Billing Customer Service Supervisor

MOVED and SECONDED, MOVED and SECONDED, MOTION MADE to approve the request,
Seconded, 6 YES votes, 0 NO votes. MOTION PASSED

RESULT: [6 TO 0]

AYES: 6

NOES: None

ABSTAIN: None

- Staff presented background information on the property. Owner is getting billed nonresidential rates and wishes to be billed under residential rates
- Staff gave background on property location – Between Caldwell Blvd & the railroad tracks
- On the property is a house and mechanic shop that is now rented out to another mechanic shop
- The buildings are on separate meters
- This property is not being addressed in the rate study
- Question was asked about previous charged amounts

3-2. Nampa Municipal Landowner Requests for Irrigation Tax Exclusion 05.01.24-Daniel
Badger, P.E., City Engineer

- Staff presented background on requests for a no benefit rate
- The first group is recommending no change to the current rate being received
- 1st property
 - They are using the irrigation
 - **MOVED and SECONDED, MOVED and SECONDED, MOTION MADE Agree with the staff recommendation and not provide a no benefit rate,** Seconded, 6 YES votes, 0 NO votes. MOTION PASSED
- 2nd Property – Juniper Street
 - Staff provided background on the property and the request
 - The ownership is just the footprint of the building and there is a common area surrounding the property
 - The current bill on the property is \$28.00 and doesn't meet the standards for a no benefit rate. Staff understands the request and that the property owner is not utilizing the irrigation on the property he owns – completely taken up by the building
 - Staff would oppose an exclusion, but a no benefit rate would be acceptable
 - Discussion was held on if the no benefit rate would provide any difference – the difference would be minimal
 - Staff provided background on the status of the property and is being looked at for the impervious use
 - Staff provided background info on irrigation billing and that it is not based on usage but is billed on water rights
 - Question was asked why the city is billing each property owner even though they don't have access to or need to water
 - Question was asked if the billing is based on pass through and discussion was held on portion of a pass through and billed to the city
 - Question and discussion were held on the water rights
 - Property owner provided background and provided discussion on apartments across the street that aren't being billed the same as the town homes. He is not concerned about the cost but the principal. Staff followed up with explanation-based on state statutes that we are required to bill the property owner
 - Question and discussion was held on the HOA paying for the green areas vs the property

- owners
 - Question and discussion were held on if the HOA could discount for the property owner
 - Question and discussion were held on options with the water rights
 - Question was asked if meters could be added – Follow up was added that it would need to be added city wide
 - Board member provided personal example of being a home member and being a member of being an HOA and what he is billed
 - Establishing a no benefit rate would not reduce a water right
 - Discussion was held on the staff recommendation
 - Property owner provided that the HOA is owned by a property management property and that it is a principal issue that hundreds of people are experiencing the same thing
 - Board member provided engineering example that many of the lots are just buildings with nothing to be watered and that the water
 - **MOVED and SECONDED, MOVED and SECONDED, MOTION MADE to approve a no benefit rate for this property**, Seconded, 5 YES votes, 1 NO votes. MOTION PASSED
 - More discussion was held on water rights within a property
- 3rd Property – Back behind the freeway by car dealerships
 - Owned by ITD
 - Annexed into the irrigation district
 - Already receiving a no benefit rate and staff would not recommend a change
 - Option available to them: If they transferred it into public right of way then they would not receive a bill
- 4th Property
 - Already receiving a no benefit rate

MOVED and SECONDED, MOVED and SECONDED, MOTION MADE to approve the staff recommendations and leave the parcels at their current no benefit rate, Seconded, 6 YES votes, 0 NO votes. MOTION PASSED

3-3. FY25 Wastewater Rate and Hookup Fees Increase Recommendation-Heather Tafoya, Business Manager & Jeff Barnes, P.E., Director of Water Resources

- Staff provided background on the wastewater rates and hookup fees and provided an update on the Project Group F project update
- Staff provided an overview of the Wastewater Division
- Staff provided an overview of the mission of the Wastewater Division
 - Minimize impact to customers
 - Strategic Planning – About 5-10 years out in planning
 - Fair, Industry Rate making
 - Equipment that the wastewater team oversees and covers in operations
 - Accomplishments – Rate increases have helped achieve these
 - Employee Progression Plan
 - Leadership Development
 - 2 New Leads & Assistant Superintendent over Collections
 - Group F – 80% complete
 - Group G Headworks Launch
 - Master Plan & 5-Year CIP completed
 - Re-visioning
 - Cleaning Pipes
 - TV inspected pipes
 - Replaced 2.57 miles of sewer line

- FY25 Major Initiatives
- WWTP Upgrades Update
 - 85% complete
 - Ahead of schedule
 - Within original budget
 - Recycled Line Progress
 - Outfall facility in the Fred Meyer/Office Depot Parking
 - Will recycle 11 million gallons per day for irrigation use
 - It will be treated to be Class A Water
 - Governor Visit
- Question and Discussion was held on Wastewater Pipe and what the replacement and failure rate looks on them
- A thank you was provided by the Board Members for the forward thinking initiative of the Wastewater Upgrades Project
- Wastewater Rate Proposal
 - 8.28% for Wastewater Rate Increase – According to WWTP Upgrades commitment per the GO Bond
 - Staff provided background that we are on the 8th and last increase as apart of the Bond Vote that was approved
 - Secured \$165 DEW State Revolving Fund
 - Additional Funding
 - WaterSMART Grant – \$6M
 - Utility Impact Fees – Revenue Project is \$1M per year
 - Wastewater Impact Fees Collection – Goes to Capital Expansion
 - Question and Discussion was held on late comers agreements with Developers
 - If developers develop in impact area (Fill in explanation)
 - Looking at the funding from Can Ada to Ustick and if its not in the Impact Fees that it needs to be
 - Rate comparison between cities presented and discussion was held on the difference between the Regional Water & Wastewater Rate Comparison and the Average Rate Increase slide
 - Next year will require analysis now that the bond increases will be over to see if a rate increase will be needed
 - Question and Discussion was held on how exact the rate increase would be based on rounding and dollars
 - Question and Discussion was held on if communication will be sent to the customer about that the 8.28% and rounding it up to 8.3%
- Staff presented Fund Project with Headworks project added in

FY25 Wastewater Rates and Fees Increase Recommendation

MOVED and SECONDED, MOVED and SECONDED, MOTION MADE we take the staff recommendation and recommend to council the proposed rate schedule increase, Seconded, 6 YES votes, 0 NO votes. MOTION PASSED

FY25 Wastewater Hookup Fees Increase Recommendation

- Staff provided background on the different options for the Hookup Fee Increase
 - ENR – 2.57% increase
 - PPI West – No increase
 - PPI West - -2.44%

- CPI – 2.81%
- Board recommended putting link to the PPI West in council presentation
- Question and Discussion was held on the decrease amount and then leaving it at 0
- Question and Discussion was held on the PPI West Proposal and the source in which it was coming from
- On the rates that are construction related Council supported the PPI West rate increase
- Question and Discussion was held on if we've ever seen a decrease in the rate increase
- Question and Discussion was held on growth paying for growth

MOVED and **SECONDED** by **MOTION MADE** Make no increase or decrease to the hook up rates, 5 YES votes, 1 NO Vote. MOTION PASSED

RESULT: [5 TO 1]

AYES: 5

NOES: 1

ABSTAIN: None

3-4. June 13, 2024 2nd Quarterly Board of Appraisers Meeting Discussion

- Question and Discussion was held on if the board would like to move forward with the previously scheduled June Board Meeting
- Board elected to move forward

Adjournment