Feasibility Study
Nampa Fire Protection District
& Kuna Rural Fire District

February 6, 2026

TischlerBise
FISCAL | ECONOMIC | PLANNING

999 W Main Street
Boise, Idaho 83702
208.515.7480
www.tischlerbise.com

[page left intentional blank]

TABLE OF CONTENTS

[page left intentional blank]

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

TischlerBise was engaged to evaluate the fiscal feasibility of consolidating the Nampa Fire Protection District and Kuna Rural Fire District. In 2025, House Bill 208 removed language that previously treated fire district consolidation as an annexation. Under the prior framework, very few consolidations in Idaho were fiscally advantageous. Now, a consolidated fire district's first-year property tax revenue can equal the sum of the formerly independent districts, and the combined tax base becomes the new base for future growth calculations.

This analysis evaluates three potential paths for the Nampa and Kuna Fire Districts:

1. Maintaining the status quo as separate districts
2. Consolidating while maintaining current combined revenue levels
3. Consolidating with a recalculated tax base to fully fund service needs

The analysis focuses on the following key fiscal elements:

- Current and five-year operational staffing needs for both districts
- Operational savings achievable through consolidation (staffing redundancy, efficiency gains, capacity optimization)
- Property tax revenue capacity under each scenario, constrained by Idaho's statutory caps
- Estimated property tax impact to an average homeowner ($400,000 home)

Property tax revenue accounts for approximately 90 percent of both districts' operating revenue, making it the most consequential factor in determining fiscal feasibility. However, property tax revenue is limited under §63-802, a taxing district may not increase its property tax budget annually by more than 3 percent (to account for inflation) and 5 percent (to account for new construction in the year). Below summarizes the scenarios and results:

SCENARIO 1: STATUS QUO

This scenario models each district continuing to operate independently, subject to Idaho's property tax limitations. It serves as the baseline for comparison and answers the question: *Can each district independently meet its service needs under current revenue constraints?*

- **Nampa Fire District:** Projected to generate $5.4 million in new property tax revenue by Year 5 ($2.5 million from new construction, $2.9 million from inflation). This is sufficient to fund $2.4 million in staffing needs including Fire Station #7.
- **Kuna Fire District:** Faces a $1.9 million annual deficit. Projected revenue growth from new construction of $550,000 by Year 5 falls far short of the $2.6 million needed for Station #2 additional staff, Station #3, battalion chiefs, and other positions.
- **Supplemental Levy Required:** Kuna would need a voter-approved supplemental levy of approximately $1.9 million, adding $94 annually to the average homeowner's tax bill.

Scenario 2: Consolidated – Status Quo

Consolidation without recalculating the tax base. The consolidated district's Year 1 revenue equals the combined current revenues of both districts. It answers the question: *Can consolidation achieve fiscal sustainability through operational savings alone, without raising taxes?*

- **Direct Budget Savings:** $783,000 annually (e.g., fleet manager vs. contracts, eliminated duplicate subscriptions, reduced overtime, single board meetings)
- **Avoided Duplicate Hires:** $800,000 annually (battalion chiefs, deputy fire marshal, training captain, admin support positions that both districts would have hired separately)
- **Total Operational Savings:** $1.6 million annually
- **Wildfire Response:** $750,000 potential annual revenue from state/federal contracts
- **Result:** $4.8 million available to fund $4.2 million in combined staffing needs over five years. Service expansion occurs incrementally as revenue becomes available.

Scenario 3: Consolidated – Recalculated Base

Consolidation with an increased property tax base to address all staffing needs in Year 1. It answers the question: *What would full, immediate service capacity require, and what is the taxpayer impact?*

- **Year 1 Revenue:** $31.6 million (vs. $27.4 million combined under Status Quo)
- **Voter Approval:** Required under Idaho Code §63-802(1)(h), the consolidated district would have to get two-third voter approval to recalculate its base.
- **Result:** All three new stations (Nampa #7, Kuna #2 staff, Kuna #3) and administrative positions funded immediately. Same $1.6 million in operational savings applies.

Taxpayer Impact ($400,000 Home)

Comparing property tax impacts for an average homeowner provides a tangible metric for community communication. For a typical $400,000 home (applying the homeowner's exemption), the following illustrates the relative tax bill impact under each scenario. In both consolidation scenarios, the tax burden decreases for current Nampa Fire residents while the tax burden increases for current Kuna Fire residents.

Importantly, the Kuna Fire District will need a supplemental levy to account for its funding deficit. The levy is estimated to add $94 annually. Thus, when compared to the tax burden with the supplemental levy, consolidation is projected to decrease the overall burden.

Figure 1. Impact on Taxpayer

Scenario	Nampa Resident	Kuna Resident
Status Quo	No change	No change (or +$94/yr with levy)
Consolidated (Status Quo)	Decrease, $22	Increase, $81
Consolidated (Recalculated)	Decrease, $7	Increase, $96

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Each scenario presents distinct trade-offs between service capacity, taxpayer impact, and political feasibility. The Status Quo is unsustainable for Kuna without a supplemental levy. Consolidation offers a path forward, with Scenario 2 providing a lower-risk, incremental approach and Scenario 3 offering immediate, comprehensive solutions at a higher taxpayer cost.

The analysis supports consolidation as fiscally advantageous, generating approximately $1.5 million in annual operational savings and enabling access to additional revenue opportunities (wildfire response team). The choice between Scenarios 2 and 3 depends on the urgency of service needs and the community's willingness to approve a higher levy rate.

Furthermore, although the tax burden to a Kuna resident is similar when the District is able to pass a supplemental levy compared to consolidation, a consolidated district provides a greater level of service. For example, the consolidated district:

- Will have more a flexible and resilient staffing model and fleet, allowing for enhanced and more efficient unit response.
- Will be able to generate additional revenue and cost savings, resulting in better staff retention and expanded services.
- Will have a higher new construction property tax limit give it a greater ability to reduce future tax burdens on existing residents.

Figure 2. Summary of Scenario Feasibility

Scenario	Nampa Fire - Status Quo	Kuna Fire - Status Quo
5-Year Staffing Needs	($2,355,000)	($2,635,000)
5-Year Property Tax New Const. Rev.	$2,489,000	$730,000
5-Year Staffing Needs Funded	Yes (phased)	No

Scenario	Consolidated - Status Quo	Consolidated - Recalculated Based
5-Year Staffing Needs	($4,245,000)	($4,245,000)
5-Year Property Tax New Const. Rev.	$3,250,000	$4,245,000
Total Operational Savings	$1,508,000	$1,508,000
Direct Budget Savings	$708,000	$708,000
Wildfire Revenue	$750,000	$750,000
5-Year Staffing Needs Funded	Yes (phased)	Yes (immediate)

Importantly, the results of the analysis represent if the consolidated district were to form in 2026. However, it will be about 18 months for the formation to be completed if the Fire Boards approve of the consolidation. The analysis takes this approach to keep the financial and growth assumptions consistent between the Status Quo and Consolidation Scenarios. As long as the Districts continue their business as usual (i.e. increase property tax revenue by the maximum allowable) and there are no major changes in the Districts' budgets or growth, a future consolidation will have consistent results to this analysis.

Overview of Fire District Consolidation

Fire protection districts in Idaho are governmental subdivisions established under Idaho Code Title 31, Chapter 14. These districts are authorized to provide fire protection services within their boundaries and are funded primarily through property taxes. When two or more fire protection districts serve adjacent areas with overlapping service needs or operational inefficiencies, consolidation may offer a pathway to improved service delivery and fiscal sustainability.

Consolidation involves merging two or more independent fire protection districts into a single unified district. The consolidated district assumes all assets, liabilities, personnel, and service obligations of the predecessor districts. Idaho law provides specific statutory mechanisms for consolidation, with particular attention to governance structures, property tax implications, and voter approval requirements.

Legal Framework and Consolidation Procedure

Fire district consolidation in Idaho is governed primarily by Idaho Code §31-1413 (Consolidation of Districts) and §31-1414 (Election for Consolidation of Districts). The process involves multiple steps and can proceed through either a board-initiated process or an elector-initiated petition.

Consolidation Agreement Requirements

Under Idaho Code §31-1413, a consolidation agreement must address the following elements:

- Name of the proposed consolidated fire protection district
- All property of the districts to be consolidated shall become the property of the consolidated district
- All debts of the districts to be consolidated shall become the debts of the consolidated district
- Governance structure for the new district, including whether the board will consist of three or five commissioners
- Employee retention provisions, including seniority rights under existing employment contracts

Board-Initiated Consolidation Process

When fire district commissioners believe consolidation would benefit their district, they may initiate the process by preparing a consolidation agreement. After each board approves the agreement, a public hearing must be held within 10 to 30 days. Notice of the hearing must be published in a newspaper of general circulation at least 5 days prior. At the hearing, any person may speak in support or opposition. If each board approves the agreement, consolidation becomes effective 30 days after approval—unless 25 percent of qualified electors in any one district petition for an election.

Elector-Initiated Consolidation Process

Under Idaho Code §31-1414, electors can initiate consolidation by gathering petition signatures from at least 10 percent of voters in the last general election residing in each district proposed for consolidation. This triggers a mandatory election. At least one public hearing must be held prior to the election. The ballot question asks whether the districts should be consolidated and may include reference to a recommended levy rate if applicable. If a majority of votes cast in each district favor consolidation, the districts are deemed consolidated.

Post-Consolidation Requirements

Upon the consolidation agreement becoming effective, the board must file a certified copy with the county recorder of each county in which the district is located and comply with Idaho Code §63-215. The consolidated district then has all rights and obligations of any fire protection district under Idaho law. Existing commissioners from the predecessor districts serve until the next election, at which point three or five commissioners are elected depending on the agreement's terms.

Property Tax Revenue in Consolidation

Property tax treatment in fire district consolidation is governed by two key statutes: Idaho Code §63-802 (the statewide cap on property tax budget growth) and Idaho Code §31-1423 (levy authority for fire districts). Understanding these provisions is essential for projecting the fiscal outcomes of consolidation.

Idaho's Property Tax Cap

After revisions in 2021 with House Bill 389 Idaho law further limited the annual growth in property tax revenue for taxing districts. Under §63-802, a taxing district may not increase its property tax budget annually by more than 3 percent (to account for inflation) and 5 percent (to account for new construction in the year). The base for this calculation is the highest dollar amount of property taxes certified in any of the three preceding tax years. This limitation applies to total property tax revenue, not the levy rate itself. Therefore, even if property values increase significantly or residential and commercial development exceed 5 percent, a district's property tax revenue growth is capped. This is especially limiting to rural districts that are experiencing suburban growth while already large suburban districts had a much larger "base" prior to the 2021 revisions.

Consolidation and Property Tax Budgets

A critical revision was made in 2025 to the Idaho Code §31-1423. House Bill 208 removed language that treated a consolidation as an annexation of fire districts. Under this limitation, there were very few fire district consolidations in Idaho which were fiscally advantageous. Now, a consolidated fire district's first year property tax revenue can be the sum of the formerly independent districts. In addition, the tax base of the consolidated district is the sum of the formerly independent districts. Thus, a consolidated district has the potential of continuing the current operations (with the potential of operational cost savings) while benefiting from a larger tax base in which the 5 percent cap would be greater.

Forgone Increases

Forgone increases represent the difference between the maximum allowable property tax increase and what a district actually certified in prior years. Districts that did not take the full max increase each year accumulate forgone amounts that can be recovered in future years by resolution (with public notice and hearing). A consolidated district receives the benefit of forgone increases accumulated by both predecessor districts, providing additional revenue flexibility.

Feasibility Analysis

The Nampa and Kuna Fire District Feasibility Study employed a three-scenario approach to evaluate the fiscal implications of consolidation. This methodology allows the Fire Boards to compare current trajectories against consolidated alternatives and understand the trade-offs in terms of revenue capacity, service delivery, and taxpayer impact. Below are the three scenarios:

1. **Status Quo Scenario** reveals whether each district can independently meet service needs while operating under the State property tax caps.
2. **Consolidated Status Quo Scenario** shows how combining current resources can improve capacity through operational savings without a significant impact to property tax bills.
3. **Consolidated Recalculated Base Scenario** demonstrates the resulting impacts if the consolidated district addresses current and near-term funding needs by recalculating its property tax base. **Importantly, the consolidated district would have to receive a two-third approval by its voters to recalculate its base.**

The feasibility analysis examines the key fiscal features of consolidation:

- The current and 5-year operational needs of Nampa and Kuna Fire Districts
- Operational savings under a consolidation scenario
    - Through staffing redundancy and efficiency
- Property tax revenue capacity for the independent districts and a consolidated district
- Estimated property tax impact to an average resident

Annual estimates for the districts' tax bases, property tax revenue, and other assumptions can be found in the Appendix A: Fiscal Assumptions.

Importantly, the results of the analysis represent if the consolidated district were to form in 2026. However, it will be about 18 months for the formation to be completed if the Fire Boards approve of the consolidation. The analysis takes this approach to keep the financial and growth assumptions consistent between the Status Quo and Consolidation Scenarios. As long as the Districts continue their business as usual (i.e. increase property tax revenue by the maximum allowable) and there are no major changes in the Districts' budgets or growth, a future consolidation will have consistent results to this analysis.

Lastly, property tax revenue accounts for approximately 90 percent of Nampa and Kuna Fire Districts' operating revenue and making it the most consequential when determining the fiscal feasibility of a consolidation. However, TischlerBise examined other key sources of revenue including sales tax distribution from the State, plan inspection fees, grants, investments, and impact fees. Below is a summary of the sources:

- **Sales tax** – The State of Idaho distributes a portion of its collected sales tax to special districts based on the district's proportion of property tax revenue being collected by all special districts statewide. In the Scenarios 1 and 2, property tax revenues do not differentiate from the status quo, thus, sales tax distribution would be constant. In Scenario 3, the consolidate district would have a higher property tax revenue, however, the increase in sales tax distribution would be marginal because of the likelihood of other special districts increasing its property tax revenue.

- **Plan inspection fees** – Construction trends are assumed to not be affected if Nampa and Kuna Fire District consolidate. Thus, it is assumed that inspection fees (and other development related fees) will be constant in all scenarios.
- **Grants** – The eligibility for the consolidated fire district does not differ from Nampa and Kuna Fire Districts' eligibility. Thus, it is assumed that grant revenue will be constant in all scenarios.
- **Investments** – Operating reserves for the districts will be consolidated and represents the needed reserves for the larger consolidated budget. Additionally, the reserves will still be held in the State managed saving accounts. As a result of the larger sum, the annual interest in those accounts will be greater in a consolidated scenario, but this will be offset by the need to continue increasing the reserve as the operating budget increases. Thus, it is assumed that investment revenues will be constant in all scenarios.
- **Impact fees** – Both fire districts collect impact fees to fund its growth-related capital improvement plan (CIP). If the districts do consolidate, a new CIP will need to be prepared, but that will be very similar to the sum of the two independent districts. However, at that time the consolidated district should update its impact fees to reflect the new CIP.

In summary, the current amounts for these minor revenues are not anticipated to increase greater than the sum of the two districts. They also fund existing expenditures and levels of service. Thus, they are excluded from the analysis since expanded future costs are examined.

Scenario 1: Status Quo (No Consolidation)

Under the Status Quo scenario, Nampa Fire Protection District and Kuna Rural Fire District continue to operate as independent entities. Each district maintains its own governance structure, personnel, equipment, and revenue base. This scenario serves as the baseline for comparison with consolidation alternatives.

Nampa Fire Protection District

At the moment, the Nampa Fire District is in a stable fiscal position with sufficient revenue growth to fund its current operation service needs. However, the district will continue to grow and will need to expand operations to continue its levels of service. Below are hiring needs the district is anticipating over the next five years along with estimated salary required:

- Staffing for Fire Station #7 - $1,500,000
- Three battalion chiefs - $480,000
- Deputy fire marshal - $110,000
- Training captain - $100,000

- HR admin support - $55,000
- IT admin support - $55,000
- Other admin support - $55,000

By 2030, the additional staffing costs total $2,355,000 annually.

Five-Year Property Tax Revenue Projection

Estimated property tax revenue for Nampa Fire District over the next five years is detailed in Figure 3. By Year 5, the district's property tax revenue is projected to grow from $23 million to $28.4 million, a 23 percent increase. Of the revenue increase between Year 1 and Year 5 ($5.4 million), $2.9 million is related to the 3 percent increase for inflation and $2.5 million is related to new construction.

Furthermore, the figure details the change in the Nampa Fire District property tax rate and the property tax bill for a $400,000 home as the budget grows. Based on the growth and budget assumptions, the levy rate is going to grow by 8 percent over the next five years, while the tax bill increases by $45.

Figure 3. Nampa Fire District Status Quo 5-Year Property Tax Projection

Nampa Fire - Status Quo	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Property Tax Revenue	$22,986,000	$24,245,000	$25,559,000	$26,930,000	$28,360,000
Property Tax Levy Rate (per $100)	0.114	0.116	0.118	0.121	0.123
Property Tax on $400k Home*	$313	$324	$335	$346	$358

*Includes $125,000 reduction for homestead exemption and 1 percent annual increase

Fiscal Results

Shown above in Year 5, there is an estimated increase of $5.4 million in property tax revenue, approximately half is attributed to the projected new construction in the district. Based on the growth projections, revenue growth trajectory allows for incremental hiring as demand increases. This includes a significant cost of staffing a new station along with all other administrative staffing needs. Additionally, the district is able to fund an annual 3 percent inflation for all its existing expenditures. Thus, Nampa Fire can independently fund its projected service needs over the five-year horizon.

Kuna Rural Fire District

Currently, Kuna Fire District faces existing unfunded staffing needs and additional expenditures that will come in the future as the district grows. Despite growth in the Kuna area, revenue increases have not been able to keep pace with service demand expansion because of the property tax caps. Below is a summary of the needed hires for Kuna Fire to serve both existing and future demand:

- Additional staff for Fire Station #2 - $390,000
- Staff for Fire Station #3 - $1,500,000
- Three battalion chiefs - $480,000
- Deputy fire marshal - $110,000
- Training captain - $100,000

- IT admin support - $55,000

By 2030, the additional staffing costs total $2,635,000 annually.

Five-Year Property Tax Revenue Projection

Estimated property tax revenue for Kuna Fire District over the next five years is detailed in Figure 4. By Year 5, the district's property tax revenue is projected to grow from $4.4 million to $5.6 million, a 29 percent increase. Of the revenue increase between Year 1 and Year 5 ($1.3 million), $ 547,000 is related to the 3 percent increase for inflation and $730,000 is related to new construction.

Furthermore, the figure details the change in Kuna Fire District property tax rate and the property tax bill for a $400,000 home as the budget grows. Based on the growth and budget assumptions, the levy rate is going to grow by 11 percent over the next five years, while the tax bill increases by $39.

Figure 4. Kuna Fire District Status Quo 5-Year Property Tax Projection

Kuna Fire - Status Quo	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Property Tax Revenue	$4,359,000	$4,657,000	$4,968,000	$5,294,000	$5,636,000
Property Tax Levy Rate (per $100)	0.079	0.081	0.083	0.085	0.088
Property Tax on $400k Home*	$216	$226	$235	$245	$255

*Includes $125,000 reduction for homestead exemption and 1 percent annual increase

Fiscal Results

Based on the growth assumptions for Kuna there is a deficit between the additional property tax revenue over the next five years and the need for additional staffing. Specifically, only $1.3 million of the needed $2.6 million is estimated to be available. Furthermore, only $730,000 in revenue from new construction while $547,000 is related to inflation for the district's current costs. Thus, there is projected to be an annual unfunded deficit of $1.9 million.

Supplemental Levy Option

To address the funding gap independently, Kuna would need to pursue a voter-approved supplemental levy. Such a levy would require two-thirds of the district voters to approve a referendum. Figure 5 details a hypothetical levy to cover the $1.9 million in unfunded staffing needs. Based on estimates for the tax base in Year 1, the levy rate would need to be at least 0.034 per $100. This would result in a $400,000 home paying an extra $94.

Figure 5. Hypothetical Kuna Fire Operational Supplemental Levy

Kuna Fire District Hypothetical Supplemental Levy	
Anticipated Kuna Fire Unfunded Operations	$1,900,000
Year 1 Kuna Fire Tax Base	$5,540,900,000
Supplemental Levy Rate (per $100)	**0.034**

Supplemental Levy Rate (per $100)	0.034
Supplemental Levy on $400k Home	**$94**

STATUS QUO SCENARIO SUMMARY

The Status Quo Scenario models each district continuing independently. Key findings include:

- **Nampa Fire District:** The district is projected to be able to fund service needs based on growth assumptions, with approximately $2.5 million available in Year 5 for added new operations. The district generates an additional $2.9 million in Year 5 to fund inflationary increases in its current expenditures.
- **Kuna Fire District:** Revenue does not allow for needed hires under the current structure. In Year 5, the district is estimated to generate an additional $1.3 million in property tax revenue. However, $547,000 is attributed to inflationary increases in its existing expenditures, leaving $730,000 for service expansion. This results in a shortfall when compared to hiring needs including Station #2 or #3 ($1,500,000 each), battalion chiefs ($480,000), and training captain ($100,000).
- **Kuna Supplemental Levy Option:** For Kuna to fund its service needs independently, a hypothetical referendum for a supplemental levy of approximately $1.9 million would be required, resulting in roughly $94 annually for the average homeowner.

Scenario 2: Consolidated Status Quo

This scenario models consolidation while maintaining a combined property tax revenue similar to the current districts' combined totals. In this scenario, the consolidated district relies on operational efficiencies and combined revenue growth to fund service needs over time. Through review of adopted budgets and interviews with fire district staff, the analysis examined the potential in savings from:

- **Staffing redundancy** – determining if existing staffing would be reduced through consolidation.
- **Operational efficiencies –** examining operational costs that exists for both districts which would be reduced when consolidated to one district.
- **Existing capacities –** identifying fire station and fire apparatus capacities at one district that may resolve existing and future purchases.
- **Overlap of future operational and capital needs** – identifying duplicate future staffing needs and capital improvement projects between the two independent districts.

Staff Redundancy

At the moment, administrative staff at both districts are experiencing exceeding workloads. This is especially the case for Kuna Fire District. Under a consolidated scenario, all current admin staff would remain while duties and responsibilities may shift to be more efficient. In addition, more staff would be needed in the future for the consolidated district.

Operational Efficiency

Below are four areas of operational savings:

1. There is approximately $150,000 annual administrative contracts at Kuna Fire related to not having enough full time staff. As a result of the consolidation, there would be a more balanced workload management that would eliminate these expenditures.

2. Similarly, both fire districts spend a considerable amount of time every month preparing for Fire Board meetings. This is estimated to cost each district $9,000 per month (including legal expenses), or $108,000 annually. Consolidation eliminates the duplication.
3. Nampa Fire District has a firefighter who covers absences throughout the District. Under consolidation the floater would save approximately $75,000 in Kuna Fire firefighter overtime.
4. Lastly, there are a variety of duplicate annual costs for items such as professional subscriptions, software, and other contracts. This is estimated to be $150,000 annually.

EXISTING CAPACITIES

After consolidation, the district will complete an updated deployment model to understand exactly what units can be moved. But it is expected that the larger consolidated fleet will be more efficient, flexible, and provide a better level of service to all residents. Additionally, the consolidated district will have more reserve vehicles allowing for better maintenance turnaround. Until an updated deployment model is prepared, the savings is unknown, but it could be significantly considering the costs to purchase additional fire apparatus.

OPERATIONAL & CAPITAL OVERLAP SAVINGS

This section identifies overlap in the future staffing needs for both independent districts. In this case, these expenditures would be needed for both districts, but under consolidation there would be savings from avoiding the duplication. The fleet manager position would be a new staff member in consolidation, however, there would be savings when compared to the costs the districts currently budget for third-party vehicle maintenance. Specifically, combined, the districts are paying approximately $400,000 to third-party auto mechanics. By hiring a fleet manager to perform the maintenance in-house there is an assumed savings of $300,000 annually.

- Three battalion chiefs: $480,000
- New fleet manager (savings in contracts): $300,000
- Deputy fire marshal: $110,000
- Training captain: $100,000
- HR/Other admin support : $55,000
- IT admin support: $55,000

Furthermore, both districts have needs to expand their training facilities and consolidation would allow for a more efficient facility plan including having the training site being strategically located. In the Nampa Fire capital improvement plan (CIP) two future training sites are identified totaling $6.5 million. In the Kuna Kire CIP includes a $2.2 million training center. Although not precisely known until after consolidation, the training center overlap would save the district at least $2 million. Furthermore, this savings would be in the form of impact fee collection, allowing the savings to be directed towards other facilities, expediting the CIP.

Summary of Savings

After examining these four elements of savings through consolidation, the analysis estimates an annual operational savings of $1.6 million. Additionally, $783,000 is estimated to be direct savings in consolidation (fleet manager, workload, subscriptions, overtime, and commission meetings) while $800,000 is savings from overlap in future needs. There is also an anticipated savings of at least $2 million in the consolidated district CIP from overlapping training center needs which would allow for other capital projects to be constructed sooner.

Consolidated District Staffing Needs

Although there is significant savings from consolidation, the new district will continue to grow and will need to expand operations to continue its levels of service. Below is a combination of the needs the two independent districts are anticipating over the next five years along with estimated salary required:

- Additional staff for Kuna Fire Station #2 - $390,000
- Staffing for Kuna Fire Station #3 - $1,500,000
- Staffing for Nampa Fire Station #7 - $1,500,000
- Three battalion chiefs - $480,000
- Deputy fire marshal - $110,000
- Training captain - $100,000
- HR admin support - $55,000
- IT admin support - $55,000
- Other admin support - $55,000

By 2030, the additional staffing costs total $4,245,000 annually. Importantly, only after consolidation will the district be able to run a new level of service study detailing future station needs. It is possible that through consolidation future stations can be located more strategically resulting in one less station being constructed in the next five years.

Five-Year Property Tax Revenue Projection

The estimated property tax revenue for the consolidated district over the next five years is detailed in Figure 6. The property tax estimate in Year 1 is the sum of the property tax revenue in the current budgets along with new construction. Furthermore, the property tax rate is adjusted to account for the combined tax base between Nampa and Kuna Fire. This is the reason that the revenue beyond Year 1 slightly differs from the sum of the revenue projections in the previous Figure 3 and Figure 4.

By Year 5, the consolidated district's property tax revenue is projected to grow from $27.4 million to $34 million, a 24 percent increase. Of the revenue increase between Year 1 and Year 5 ($6.7 million), $3.4 million is related to the 3 percent increase for inflation and $3.3 million is related to new construction.

Furthermore, the Year 1 property tax rate is 0.106 per $100 and resulting in a property tax bill for a $400,000 home of $292. Over the next five years, the levy rate is projected to grow by 9 percent, while the tax bill increases by $44.

Figure 6. Consolidated Fire District Status Quo 5-Year Property Tax Projection

Consolidated District - Status Quo	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Property Tax Revenue	$27,352,000	$28,916,000	$30,549,000	$32,254,000	$34,035,000
Property Tax Levy Rate (per $100)	0.106	0.108	0.111	0.113	0.115
Property Tax on $400k Home*	$292	$303	$313	$324	$336

*Includes $125,000 reduction for homestead exemption and 1 percent annual increase

ADDITIONAL REVENUE/SAVINGS OPPORTUNITIES

Based on the current staffing levels at Nampa Fire and the available fire engines at Kuna Fire, a consolidated district will have a greater availability to response to wildfire contracts with state or federal agencies. Last year, Kuna Fire was able to offset $109,000 in salaries when staff and an engine responded to an out of state fire. Conservatively, the analysis estimates that the consolidated district could offset $750,000 annually.

In 2031, the Nampa Fire District is anticipating an increase of $1 million in property tax revenue related to an urban renewal district sunsetting. Although this would occur whether or not consolidation occurs, the influx of revenue would be able to shore up any remaining operational funding deficiencies.

Lastly, a few existing fire chiefs at Nampa Fire District are anticipating retiring over the next few years. It is unknown when exactly the retirements will occur, but the consolidated district would not hire additional staff to replace the chiefs. Until the consolidated organizational chart is prepared, it is unknown the extent of the savings, but the staffing attrition will reduce the burden on the operational revenues.

FISCAL RESULTS

Shown above in Year 5, there is an estimated increase of $6.6 million in property tax revenue, approximately half ($3.3 million) is attributed to the projected new construction in the district. The other half is attributed to the annual 3 percent inflation for all its existing expenditures, but there may be some existing costs that are relatively flat, resulting in more of the $6.6 million being able to fund expanded services. Additionally, there is $783,000 in direct savings by combining the two budgets and the potential of another revenue source by responding to outside state/federal wildfires (approximately $750,000 annually).

By summing these sources, the analysis finds there to be $4.8 million in revenue available to fund the future expenditures, while there is an estimated cost of $4,245,000. Thus, revenue growth trajectory allows for incremental hiring and completing the identified future staffing needs. This includes a significant cost of staffing a three new stations along with all other administrative staffing needs over the next five years. In addition, the expiring urban renewal revenue and staff attrition will be able to shore up any unexpected remaining operational funding deficiencies.

Scenario 3: Consolidated – Recalculated Base

This scenario models consolidation with immediate action to address all identified service needs. The consolidated district recalculates its property tax base to fund expanded operations in Year 1, **requiring a two-third voter approval since the property tax revenue is greater than the sum of the two independent districts.** This scenario enables immediate action on all identified service needs:

- Additional staff for Kuna Fire Station #2 - $390,000
- Staffing for Kuna Fire Station #3 - $1,500,000
- Staffing for Nampa Fire Station #7 - $1,500,000
- Three battalion chiefs - $480,000
- Deputy fire marshal - $110,000
- Training captain - $100,000
- HR admin support - $55,000
- IT admin support - $55,000
- Other admin support - $55,000

This additional staffing costs total $4,245,000 annually and is the same needs in Scenario 2 Status Quo.

Five-Year Property Tax Revenue Projection

Estimated property tax revenue for the consolidate district over the next five years is detailed in Figure 7. In Year 1, the property tax revenue is found by combining the revenue for the two independent districts plus the $4,245,000 needed to address their staffing needs in the next five years. This results in a revenue total of $31.6 million and is only possible with a super majority approval by the voters.

Furthermore, the annual increase over the next five years is only the 3 percent increase due to inflation since all staffing needs are addressed in Year 1. As a result, the district’s property tax revenue is projected to grow from $31.6 million to $35.6 million, a 13 percent increase.

Furthermore, the figure details the change in the consolidated district property tax rate and the property tax bill for a $400,000 home as the budget grows. Based on the growth and budget assumptions, the levy rate is going to grow by 4 percent over the next five years, while the tax bill increases by $14.

Figure 7. Consolidated Fire District Calculated Base 5-Year Property Tax Projection

Consolidated District - Recalculated Base	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
Property Tax Revenue	$31,590,000	$32,537,700	$33,513,831	$34,519,246	$35,554,823
Property Tax Levy Rate (per $100)	0.123	0.122	0.121	0.121	0.121
Property Tax on $400k Home*	$337	$340	$344	$347	$351

*Includes $125,000 reduction for homestead exemption and 1 percent annual increase

Fiscal Results

Shown above in Year 5, there is an estimated increase of $4 million in property tax revenue, all of which is to address inflation in existing costs and the future costs that were included in Year 1. Since the analysis assumes that the consolidated district is able to recalculate its base property tax revenue, no new construction property tax revenue is included. As a result of the voter approval in Year 1 to raise additional property tax revenue for new anticipated costs in the next five years, under this scenario the consolidated district is fiscal sustainable from Year 1.

Election Requirement

A critical revision was made in 2025 to the Idaho Code §31-1423. House Bill 208 removed language that treated a consolidation as an annexation of fire districts. Under this limitation, there were very few fire district consolidations in Idaho which were fiscally advantageous. Now, a consolidated fire district's first year property tax revenue can be the sum of the formerly independent districts. In addition, the tax base of the consolidated district is the sum of the formerly independent districts.

However, since Scenario 3 examines the fiscal results of a consolidated district which addresses all its staffing needs in Year 1, the recalculated property tax would be greater than the sum of Nampa and Kuna Fire Districts. Thus, the district would have to pose a ballot question to the voters to recalculate property tax base. Detailed in the language from Idaho Code §63-802(1)(i) and §63-802(1)(h), a consolidated district cannot exceed the sum of the property tax of the independent districts unless there is a two-thirds approval by the voters:

When a nonschool district consolidates with another non-school district or dissolves and a new district performing similar governmental functions as the dissolved district forms with the same boundaries within three (3) years, the maximum amount of a budget of the district from property tax revenues shall not be greater than the sum of the amounts that would have been authorized by this section for the district itself or for the districts that were consolidated or dissolved and incorporated into a new district. §63-802(1)(i)

A taxing district may submit to the electors within the district the question of whether the budget from property tax revenues may be increased beyond the amount authorized in this section, but not beyond the levy authorized by statute. The additional amount must be approved by sixty-six and two-thirds percent (66 2/3%) or more of the voters voting on the question at an election… §63-802(1)(h)

Comparative Analysis

The following section summarizes the findings from above and highlights notable differences. Below are notable advantages to consolidation.

- **Operational Efficiencies:** Consolidation can eliminate redundant administrative positions such as duplicate fire chiefs, battalion chiefs, training officers, fire marshals, and administrative staff.
- **Fleet & Facility Efficiencies:** Consolidation would allow for existing available capacities within the fleet or facilities resolve existing needs and elevate level of service without additional costs.

- **Equipment and Fleet Management:** A unified fleet management program can reduce maintenance costs through economies of scale and potentially reduce the need for third-party contracts.
- **Technology and Subscriptions:** Consolidating IT systems, software subscriptions, and technology platforms eliminates duplicate licensing costs.
- **Reduced Governance Costs:** A single board replaces multiple boards, reducing commission preparation time, legal costs, and administrative overhead.
- **Enhanced Service Capacity:** Larger districts may qualify for additional funding sources, such as wildfire response team contracts with state or federal agencies.
- **Improved Staffing Flexibility:** A larger workforce allows for more efficient scheduling, potentially reducing overtime costs and improving coverage.
- **Property Tax Revenue Potential:** A consolidated district may use the higher levy rate of the combining districts (subject to certain conditions), potentially increasing overall revenue capacity.

Five-Year Revenue Comparison

Based on the growth assumptions and future operational needs, the Nampa Fire District is anticipated to be able to cover its staff needs, incrementally over the next five years. However, there is a funding deficit of $1.9 million at the Kuna Fire District.

Figure 8. Summary of Fiscal Results for Status Quo

Scenario	Nampa Fire - Status Quo	Kuna Fire - Status Quo
5-Year Staffing Needs	($2,355,000)	($2,635,000)
5-Year Property Tax New Const. Rev.	$2,489,000	$730,000
5-Year Staffing Needs Funded	**Yes (phased)**	**No**

After the consideration for current and future operational overlap, the consolidated district has a need of $4.2 million in staffing costs and new construction is estimated to generate $3.3 million in annual property tax revenue. In addition, there is $783,000 in direct budget savings and $750,000 in savings from wildfire response. There is also another $3.4 million in property tax revenue related to annual inflation increases. As a result, the analysis has determined that a consolidated scenario would be able to fund all the staffing needs of both independent districts. Importantly, after consolidation the district can run a new deployment study detailing future station needs. It is possible that through consolidation future stations can be located more strategically resulting in one less station being constructed in the next five years.

Strictly consolidating without recalculating the property tax base, the district would have to incrementally increase its staff. While, after a two-third approval by the voters, recalculating the base would allow for the consolidated scenario to immediately address all its needs.

Figure 9. Summary of Fiscal Results for Consolidation

Scenario	Consolidated - Status Quo	Consolidated - Recalculated Based
5-Year Staffing Needs	($4,245,000)	($4,245,000)
5-Year Property Tax New Const. Rev.	$3,250,000	$4,245,000
Total Operational Savings	$1,583,000	$1,583,000
Direct Budget Savings	$783,000	$783,000
Wildfire Revenue	$750,000	$750,000
5-Year Staffing Needs Funded	**Yes (immediate)**	**Yes (immediate)**

Taxpayer Impact

Comparing property tax impacts for an average homeowner provides a tangible metric for community communication (Figure 10). For a typical $400,000 home (applying the homeowner's exemption), the following illustrates the relative tax bill impact under each scenario. Actual amounts depend on final levy rates and assessed values. In both consolidation scenarios, the tax burden decreases for current Nampa Fire residents while the tax burden increases for current Kuna Fire residents.

Importantly, the Kuna Fire District will need a supplemental levy to account for its funding deficit. The levy is estimated to add $94 annually. Thus, when compared to the tax burden with the supplemental levy, consolidation is projected to decrease the overall burden.

Figure 10. Impact on Taxpayer

Scenario	Nampa Resident	Kuna Resident
Status Quo	No change	No change (or +$94/yr with levy)
Consolidated (Status Quo)	Decrease, $22	Increase, $81
Consolidated (Recalculated)	Decrease, $7	Increase, $96

Maximum Construction Limits

Lastly, although the analysis assumes new construction at rates that does not exceed the 5 percent cap under State Statute a consolidated district has a higher maximum compared to the two separate districts. For illustrative purposes, Figure 11 projects the tax base for each district if new construction hit the 5 percent cap every year. Specifically, the existing tax base for the Nampa Fire District could increase by $912 million annually; the Kuna Fire District could increase by $251 million annually; and a consolidated district could increase by $1.2 billion annually.

This hypothetical example highlights the limitation in State Statute for the rapidly growing Kuna Fire District and also the maximum potential of a consolidated district to be able to bring in more new construction value. For example, neither fire district has the capacity to absorb the full potential if there was a $1 billion in new construction in one year (accounting for the 90 percent limitation by State Statue). The Kuna Fire District would lose out in approximately $750 million of value in that case. However, in a consolidated scenario, the district would be able to “bring in” the full new construction value.

Figure 11. Tax Base Projections at Annual Maximum Construction Limit

Jurisdiction Tax Base (millions)	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Avg. Annual New Construction Value*
Nampa Fire District @ Max Construction Limit	$21,155	$22,213	$23,324	$24,490	$25,714	$912
Kuna Fire District @ Max Construction Limit	$5,818	$6,109	$6,414	$6,735	$7,072	$251
Consolidated District @ Max Construction Limit	$26,973	$28,322	$29,738	$31,225	$32,786	$1,163

*Respresents the 5 percent new construction maximum

Figure 12 continues the hypothetical scenario if new construction were to hit the 5 percent maximum every year. In this case, the Nampa Fire District property tax revenue would grow by $8.5 million in five years, Kuna Fire District revenue would grow by $1.8 million, and the consolidated district would grow by $10.3 million.

Figure 12. Estimated Property Tax Revenue at Maximum Construction Limit

Property Tax Revenue	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	5-Year Change in Max Tax Revenue*
Nampa Fire District @ Max Construction Limit	$23,528,000	$25,416,000	$27,455,000	$29,657,000	$32,035,000	$8,507,000
Kuna Fire District @ Max Construction Limit	$4,442,000	$4,838,000	$5,267,000	$5,730,000	$6,231,000	$1,789,000
Consolidated District @ Max Construction Limit	$27,970,000	$30,254,000	$32,722,000	$35,387,000	$38,266,000	$10,296,000

*Respresents the 5 percent new construction maximum plus the 3 percent for inflation

Figure 11 and Figure 12 make it clear that the growth potential for the consolidated district is amplified when significant growth occurs in the Kuna District. Under the existing limitations established by the Idaho State legislature, the Kuna Fire District is at a substantial risk of not being able to capture tax revenue from new construction. This will result in a combination of delayed hiring of first responders (degrading response times) and the need to raise taxes on existing residents.

Figure 12 summarizes notable items of the analysis and if the analysis determines that projected revenues will be able to offset the projected staffing expenditures.

Figure 13. Summary of Feasibility Analysis

	Scenario 1			Scenario 2	Scenario 3
Scenarios	**Nampa Fire - Status Quo**	**Kuna Fire - Status Quo**	**Kuna Fire - Status Quo w/Supp. Levy**	**Consolidated - Status Quo**	**Consolidated - Recalculated Based**
5-Year Staffing Needs	($2,355,000)	($2,635,000)	($2,635,000)	($4,245,000)	($4,245,000)
5-Year Property Tax New Const. Rev.	$2,489,000	$730,000	$2,635,000	$3,250,000	$4,245,000
Total Operational Savings	-	-	-	$1,583,000	$1,583,000
Direct Budget Savings	-	-	-	$783,000	$783,000
Wildfire Revenue	-	-	-	$750,000	$750,000
5-Year Staffing Needs Funded	**Yes (phased)**	**No**	**Yes (phased)**	**Yes (phased)**	**Yes (immediate)**
Estimated Tax Bill for $400k Home (Year 5)	$358	$255	$349	$336	$351
Tax Bill Difference from Consolidated - Status Quo	Decrease by $22	Increase by $81	Decrease by $13	-	Decrease by $15

APPENDIX A: FISCAL ASSUMPTIONS

The analysis incorporated the following assumptions:

1. **Growth Trend:** Annual new construction is modeled as the average of the prior three years. The estimates include the State limitation that only 90 percent of new construction can be included in the annual property tax increase. Below are the 3-year trends in new construction.
    a. **Nampa Fire 3-Year Trend:** $494.3 million
    b. **Kuna Fire 3-Year Trend:** $161.2 million
    c. **Consolidated 3-Year Trend:** $655.5 million
2. **Property Value Inflation:** 1 percent annual increase in both the current tax base and the estimated new construction value.
    a. Although property values increased above the long-term trend between 2020-2022, values have held relatively constant since the spike and recent market reports suggest the stabilization will continue in the short-term.
3. **Annual Property Tax Increase:** Nampa and Kuna Fire Boards have recently been increasing their property tax revenue by the allowable 3 percent to account for inflation and up to 5 percent for new construction. The analysis assumes this to continue.

The following figures detail the projected tax base and resulting property tax revenue for the three scenarios. Specifically, the Nampa Fire District tax base is projected to increase from $20.1 billion to $23 billion; the Kuna Fire District tax base increases from $5.5 billion to $6.4 billion; and a consolidate district would increase from $25.7 billion to $29.4 billion. This represents an annual average of $571 million for Nampa Fire, $178 million for Kuna Fire, and $749 million for the consolidate district. The increase includes new construction and inflation.

Figure 14. Tax Base Projections

Jurisdiction Tax Base (millions)	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Avg. Annual Increase*
Nampa Fire District	$20,148	$20,844	$21,551	$22,271	$23,003	$571
Kuna Fire District	$5,541	$5,758	$5,978	$6,202	$6,430	$178
Consolidated District	$25,689	$26,601	$27,529	$28,473	$29,433	$749

*Annual increase is based on the past three-year annual new construction average plus 1 percent increase in overall property values

The annual property tax revenue for each scenario is listed in Figure 14. As a result of the projected growth in new construction not exceeding the 5 percent maximum, the consolidated district in the Status Quo Scenario is very close to the sum of the two independent districts. However, in the Recalculated Base Scenario, the consolidated district starts in Year 1 at a higher level than the sum of the two independent districts allowing for the average annual increase to be greater.

Figure 15. Property Tax Revenue Projections

Property Tax Revenue	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5	Avg. Annual Increase
Nampa Fire District - Status Quo	$22,986,000	$24,245,000	$25,559,000	$26,930,000	$28,360,000	$1,074,800
Kuna Fire District - Status Quo	$4,359,000	$4,657,000	$4,968,000	$5,294,000	$5,636,000	$255,400
Consolidated District - Status Quo	$27,352,000	$28,916,000	$30,549,000	$32,254,000	$34,035,000	$1,336,600
Consolidated District - Recalculated Base	$31,590,000	$32,537,700	$33,513,831	$34,519,246	$35,554,823	$792,965