

FIRE FACILITIES IMPACT FEE STUDY

DIAMOND SPRINGS- EL DORADO FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

**REVISED FINAL REPORT
JANUARY 1, 2010**

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|----|
| INTRODUCTION | 1 |
| FIRE FACILITIES SERVICE POPULATION | 2 |
| EXISTING FIRE FACILITIES | 3 |
| FIRE FACILITIES TO ACCOMMODATE NEW DEVELOPMENT..... | 6 |
| FIRE FACILITY STANDARDS | 7 |
| ALTERNATIVE FUNDING SOURCES | 9 |
| FEE SCHEDULE..... | 9 |
| PROGRAM IMPLEMENTATION | 10 |
| MITIGATION FEE ACT FINDINGS | 11 |

This page intentionally left blank.

Diamond Springs – El Dorado Fire Protection District Fire Facilities Impact Fee Study

Introduction

This report summarizes an analysis of the need for fire facilities by the Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District (District) to accommodate new development. The report documents a reasonable relationship between new development and an impact fee for funding these new facilities assets.

The District is a semi-rural fire district located directly west of Placerville. The District provides a comprehensive range of services including fire suppression, emergency medical services, and fire prevention activities.

The District receives the majority of its revenues from property tax. As with most local agencies, the District's property tax revenue stream has diminished in terms of real dollars over time since the imposition of Proposition 13 in 1978. Consequently, the District must manage its resources carefully to properly serve the projected influx of new residents and businesses to the region. The District implemented a Community Facilities District (Mello Roos) in 2006. This imposes a special tax on discretionary development to assist in offsetting the impacts and **on-going** operational needs caused by the expanding community. Revenue from the Community Facilities District will be proportionate to the development and remains only a minor revenue element.

The District currently has a fire facility impact fee in place, which was last calculated in 2006. The fee needs to be updated to take into account recent growth projections and the facilities needed to serve the future population.

The variety of funding sources utilized by the District, including support provided by the Diamond Springs - El Dorado Firefighter's Association, (Association) has allowed the District to maintain its level of service and facilities while addressing new development's demands upon the District so far. A continuing challenge facing the District will be the on-going transition from what was a primarily volunteer district towards an increasingly career staffed district. Although this report specifically addresses the need for fire facilities and not staffing (or other on-going operational costs), it is important to consider the need for additional fire facilities in the context of the need for space for career personnel (e.g., sleeping quarters). The District's other funding sources will increasingly be needed to address operational needs.

The District's boundaries only encompass unincorporated areas of El Dorado County. Per the *Mitigation Fee Act* contained in *Government Code* Section 66000 *et. seq.*, the County rather than the District has legal authority to impose impact fees on the District's unincorporated area. This report provides the necessary documentation for the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors to adopt a fire facilities impact fee for imposition within the Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District boundaries. It also provides a list of statutory findings pertaining to the imposition of the District fees.

Fire Facilities Service Population

The Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District serves homes and businesses as well as rural regions in its service area. Need for the District's services and associated facilities are measured by its service population, or the number of residents and workers within its service area. Service population reasonably represents the need for fire facilities because people requesting medical assistance generates the most calls for service. Structural fire suppression is the second most important mission of the fire district after the protection of life.

Table 1 provides estimates of the District's total service population in 2005 and 2025. Total service population is comprised of residents and employees working within the District. The 2005-2025 is occasionally validated with current growth data.

Table 1: Diamond Springs Fire Protected District Service Population

| | Residents | Workers | Service Population ¹ |
|----------------------------|---------------|---------------|---------------------------------|
| Existing (2005) TAZ | 15,900 | 5,900 | 20,000 |
| Future (2025) TAZ | 24,100 | 11,400 | 32,000 |
| Net Increase | 8,200 | 5,000 | 12,000 |
| Validation (2008)* | 17,146 | 5,900 | 23,046 |
| * Weighting Factor | 1.00 | 0.69 | |

Note: Service population weighting factors are based on the City of Phoenix service call data weighted by the relative proportions of residential and nonresidential land use in that City, allowing the results of the survey to be applied in other areas. ¹ Service population equals residents plus workers with each weighted by appropriate factor shown at the bottom of the table. Sources: United States Bureau of Census, Census 2000; California Department of Finance; DSED SOC, MuniFinancial and the El Dorado County Surveyor.

The estimate of existing residential population and jobs for the year 2005 was taken from a Traffic Zone Analysis completed by MuniFinancial Inc. for El Dorado County. El Dorado County is divided into 267 Traffic Assessment Zones ("TAZ") for the purpose of modeling traffic impacts on roads and highways throughout the County. Residential data is expressed in number of households (occupied housing units), and nonresidential data is expressed in employment (jobs). The County Department of Transportation provided MuniFinancial with January 1, 1999 existing development data for each TAZ by land use type. MuniFinancial then updated the data to 2004 with building permit data provided by the County Building Department for the period of January 1, 1999 through August 1, 2004. This data, which covers growth in the County for the last five and a half years, was the basis of the forecasts.

Estimates of future residential population and jobs within the District were based on trends apparent in building permit data and current estimates of average persons per housing unit from the California Department of Finance. This data was included in the 2025 projection by TAZ used in this study. These data assumptions were revalidated and updated in 2009 using El Dorado County Surveyor's GIS Data. This data was obtained from a similar study that determined population levels in 2004 and 2008, projecting populations for 2010 by utilizing census tract block level data. Census data was then layered over the current (October 2009) developed and undeveloped parcels within the District.

To calculate service population for fire protection facilities, residents are weighted at 1.00. A worker is weighted at 0.69 of one resident to reflect the lower per capita need for fire services associated with businesses. Nonresidential buildings are typically occupied less intensively than

dwelling units, so it is reasonable to assume that average per-worker usage of services is less than average per-resident usage.

The specific 0.69 per-worker weighting used here is derived from an extensive study carried out by planning staff in the City of Phoenix. Data from that study is used to calculate a per capita factor that is independent of land use patterns. Because of the large geographical area covered by this study, it is the best source of data for application to other areas. It is reasonable to assume that relative demand for fire service between residents and workers does not vary substantially on a per capita basis across communities, enabling this data for use in other communities in the documentation of a fire facilities impact fee.

Using these weighting factors, the total existing service population for the Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District is estimated at about 20,000 as shown in **Table 1**. The projected 2025 service population is substantially larger at 32,000. The increase in service population is approximately 12,000.

Existing Fire Facilities

The District's inventory of existing and planned fire facilities was used as the basis for calculating the District's facility standard. This standard is used to determine new development's fair share obligation for expanded facilities as growth occurs. The District's existing fire protection facilities described in this section currently serve the entire District.

Tables 2 through 4 provide a detailed inventory of the District's stations, existing apparatus and special equipment. **Table 5** sums the District's current inventory. The estimated value of the District's inventory is based on unit cost assumptions with the exception of Station 49 (described in more detail below). Unit costs reflected in Tables 2, 3 and 4 include the following:

- ◆ **Land cost per acre.** Estimated cost per acre varies based on specific location of sites within the District. Cost estimates provided by the District.
- ◆ **Buildings.** Estimated replacement costs provided by MuniFinancial based on experience with other fire district clients. Estimated replacement cost of Station 46 is slightly higher than the other stations reflecting more recent original construction and/or recent remodeling.
- ◆ **Apparatus/Vehicles.** Estimated replacement cost of apparatus, vehicles and equipment carried on apparatus provided by the District. Replacement cost of older apparatus reflect secondary market prices, also provided by the District.

Table 2 highlights the District's existing facilities. The District currently serves the entire District area from five fire stations. The District owns all of the stations except for Station 49. In the case of Station 49, the land is owned by the Diamond Springs - El Dorado Firefighter's Association and leased to the District for one dollar a year on a ninety-nine year lease. The District's lease includes first right of refusal to purchase the land and station at market cost if sold, with the application of the District's existing equity (approximately \$2.2 million) in the facility towards the overall cost.

Table 2: Diamond Springs Existing Fire Facilities

| | | Amount | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
|--------------------------------|--------|--------|-----------|------------------|
| Existing Facilities | | | | |
| Station 44 (Logtown) | | | | |
| Land | acres | 0.95 | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Building | sq.ft. | 2000 | 250 | 500,000 |
| Station 46 (El Dorado) | | | | |
| Land | acres | 0.3 | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Building | sq.ft. | 3000 | 250 | 750,000 |
| Station 47 (Sleepy Hollow) | | | | |
| Land | acres | 0.3 | 150,000 | 150,000 |
| Building | sq.ft. | 2000 | 250 | 500,000 |
| Station 48 (Missouri Flat) | | | | |
| Land | acres | 0.3 | 200,000 | 200,000 |
| Building | sq.ft. | 2000 | 250 | 500,000 |
| Station 49 (Diamond Spr.) | | | | |
| Land | acres | 3.5 | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| Building | sq.ft. | 14,700 | 150 | 2,205,000 |
| Total Existing Stations | | acres | 5.35 | 950,000 |
| | | sq.ft. | 23,700 | 6,660,000 |
| Total | | | | 5,405,000 |

¹ Based on replacement cost.

The District plans to relocate Station 48. The facility currently housing Station 47 will be retained by the District and used as resident or a seasonal facility. Station 48 will most likely be moved and the property sold. Consequently the estimated existing value of Station 48 is subtracted in the fee calculations (please see Table 7) as it is not envisioned as part of the overall fire facilities system eventually needed to accommodate existing and projected new development considered in this study.

Two of the stations (Logtown and Sleepy Hollow) are completely staffed by volunteers and resident firefighters. The Missouri Flat Station and the Diamond Springs Station are staffed by a combination of volunteers and career employees. The El Dorado Station was converted to combination staffing in 2006, but the down turn in the economy has jeopardized that career staffing level. While volunteers serve all of the stations, new development will provide justification and a need to employ more people in full time career positions.

Table 3 illustrates the inventory and estimated value of existing apparatus and vehicle cost estimates including the fire fighting, emergency medical, and communications equipment needed to stock each vehicle. The District owns a number of engines, a rescue truck, a tractor, several other vehicles and other miscellaneous fire protection and training equipment.

Table 3: Diamond Springs Fire District Existing Apparatus

| Vehicle Type and Make | Unit | Vehicle ¹ | Equipment ² | Total |
|-----------------------------------|-------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|------------------|
| Existing Equipment | | | | |
| Type / Engines | | | | |
| HME-2005-Type 1 | 700 | 285,000 | 78,000 | 363,000 |
| HME-2004-Type 2 | 4331 | 182,000 | 108,000 | 290,000 |
| HME-2000-Type 1 | 9152 | 250,000 | 78,000 | 328,000 |
| HME-2006-Type 1 | 851 | 300,000 | 78,000 | 378,000 |
| Pete-1991-Type 1 | 5515 | 230,000 | 78,000 | 308,000 |
| HME-2004-Type 2 | 7372 | 182,000 | 108,000 | 290,000 |
| VanPelt-1978-Type 1 | 5639 | 15,000 | 78,000 | 93,000 |
| VanPelt-1981-Type 1 | 5973 | 15,000 | 78,000 | 93,000 |
| Sub Total Engines | | 1,459,000 | 684,000 | 2,143,000 |
| Type / Ladder Trucks | | | | |
| VanPelt-1981-Type 2 | 5972 | 30,000 | 132,000 | 162,000 |
| Sub Total Trucks | | 30,000 | 132,000 | 162,000 |
| Command / Support | | | | |
| Ford-2006-Expe | 4620 | 35,000 | 7,000 | 42,000 |
| Chev-2008-Tahoe | 4446 | 35,000 | 7,000 | 42,000 |
| Ford-2006-Expe | 5673 | 25,000 | 7,000 | 32,000 |
| Ford-2005-Expe | 6916 | 25,000 | 7,000 | 32,000 |
| Ford-2001-F150 | 355 | 11,000 | 7,000 | 18,000 |
| Ford-2001-F150 | 658 | 5,500 | 7,000 | 12,500 |
| Ford-2001-F150 | 8626 | 11,000 | 7,000 | 18,000 |
| Toyo-2005-Tund | 2747 | 20,000 | 3,000 | 23,000 |
| Sub Total Support | | 167,500 | 52,000 | 219,500 |
| Misc. Equipment | | | | |
| Inte-1990-Type 1 | 9385 | 135,000 | 10,000 | 145,000 |
| HME-2002-Med USAR | 17 | 150,000 | 190,000 | 340,000 |
| 2000 Bob Cat 742 | | 5,000 | | 5,000 |
| Sub Total Equipment | | 290,000 | 200,000 | 490,000 |
| All Vehicles and Equipment | | 1,946,500 | 1,068,000 | 3,014,500 |

¹ Value based on current replacement values. Secondary market values used for older engines. ² Value of equipment based on recent District purchases.

Table 4 provides the inventory of special protective gear, communications equipment, training equipment, and other miscellaneous equipment shared by all stations. Replacement cost estimates were provided by the District for these items.

Table 4: Diamond Springs Fire District Existing Special Equipment

| | Cost per Unit | Units | Total |
|--------------------------------|----------------------|--------------|----------------|
| Turnout (inclusive) | 3,800 | 50 | 190,000 |
| Wildland Safety Equipment | 3,200 | 40 | 128,000 |
| SCBA | | | 212,000 |
| SCBA Support | 36,000 | N/A | 36,000 |
| Portable Radios | | | 40,000 |
| Portable Generators | 2,500 | 4 | 10,000 |
| Computers | | | 15,000 |
| Data Network | | N/A | 20,000 |
| Mobile Data System | 4,750 | 8 | 38,000 |
| Office Equipment | 30,000 | N/A | 30,000 |
| Fire Hose Inventory | 38,000 | N/A | 38,000 |
| Total Special Equipment | | | 757,000 |

Note: Values based on current replacement value. Protective clothing is all inclusive. 2 Projectors, computers and IT capitol are included in this category.

Table 5 displays the sum of the estimated value of the District’s existing fire facilities. The District currently owns the equivalent of almost \$11 million in fire protection facilities, apparatus and equipment to meet the needs of its existing service population.

Table 5: Estimated Total Value of District Existing Inventory

| Description | Value |
|--------------------|------------------|
| Facilities | 5,405,000 |
| Apparatus | 3,014,500 |
| Equipment | 757,000 |
| Total | 9,176,500 |

Fire Facilities To Accommodate New Development

Preliminary planning for future fire facilities was also included in the analysis. The purpose of the preliminary facilities planning conducted for this study was to estimate the cost of future facility needs and to estimate if the projected fire impact fee revenues would adequately fund those needs. The District is in the process of updating its master plan. When completed, should the updated master plan identify needed facilities and estimated costs that differ significantly from those estimated here, the impact fee documentation would need to be updated accordingly.

Table 6 documents preliminary planned facilities and planned modifications to existing facilities. The District identified fire protection facilities that would be needed to accommodate the magnitude of new residential and commercial development represented by the development

projections presented above.

Currently there are two major facility changes planned to accommodate new development. The first major facility change is the relocation of the Missouri Flat Station to a more suitable location. While the exact location has not yet been determined, preliminary planning has indicated that the station needs to be located between Missouri Flat Road and Green Stone Road near the Highway 50 corridor.

The second major facility improvement to accommodate new growth is the construction of a multi-use facility in the Sand Ridge area. The District desires to purchase land in the area for a staging area and potential fire training facility. Fire station capabilities may be warranted in the future as the area continues to increase in density. While the facility is still in an early conceptual planning stage, preliminary estimates are that it will cost approximately \$3 million to purchase the required land and construct the facilities.

District anticipates the need to add an additional engine and a ladder truck in order to accommodate the projected level of development in the District by 2025.

Table 6: Diamond Springs Fire District Planned Fire Facilities

| Planned Facilities | Amount | Unit Cost | Total Cost |
|---------------------------------|----------------|------------------|-------------------|
| Station 48 relocation | 5.00 acres | 300,000 | 300,000 |
| Station | 12,000 sq.ft. | 300 | 3,600,000 |
| Warehouse | 4,000 sq. ft. | 200 | 800,000 |
| Subtotal | 16,000 sq. ft. | | 4,700,000 |
| Station 44 remodel | | | 30,000 |
| Sand Ridge Multi Use | | | 3,000,000 |
| Equipment | | | |
| Type 3 Engine | 1 | 340,000 | 340,000 |
| Type 1 Engine | 1 | 478,000 | 478,000 |
| Type 1 Truck | 1 | 908,000 | 908,000 |
| SCBA Support | 1 | 15,000 | 15,000 |
| SCBA Replacement | 40 | 5,300 | 250,000 |
| Communications | 40 | 1,500 | 60,000 |
| Total Cost of Facilities | | | 14,481,000 |

Fire Facility Standards

The fire facilities impact fees calculated in this report are based on a system plan facilities standard approach. The system plan standard incorporates all existing and projected new development, and all existing and planned facilities designed to serve that development. (See **Table 6.**) The system plan facilities standard represents the average per capita cost of all facilities to serve the entire projected service population. Using this per capita standard as a basis for the impact fee ensures an equitable distribution of total system costs between existing and new development. The District's facilities standard (calculated on a cost per capita basis) is

shown in **Table 7**. Note that the estimated value of existing Station 48 has been subtracted from the system standard per capita calculations because of the District’s plans to relocate that station. The facility standard is shown separately for residents and workers because their respective demand for services is weighted differently. (See service population discussion.)

Table 7: Diamond Springs Fire District System Plan Standard

| | |
|-------------------------------------|-------------------|
| Existing Public Facilities | |
| Vehicles | 3,014,500 |
| Equipment | 758,000 |
| Structures | 5,405,000 |
| Subtotal 1 | 9,176,500 |
| Planned Public Facilities | |
| Vehicles | 1,726,000 |
| Equipment | 325,000 |
| Structures | 12,430,000 |
| Subtotal | 14,481,000 |
| Total Public Facilities | 23,659,500 |
| Service Population 2025 | 32,000 |
| | |
| Facility Standard per Capita | \$739 |
| Cost per Worker 2 | \$510 |

The District’s fire facilities impact fees could also have been calculated based using an existing inventory facilities standard approach. This method is based on the existing facilities – or the investment in facilities summarized in Table 4 - per existing service population. The existing inventory approach yields a lower facility standard per capita (\$510)¹ than the system plan facility approach (\$739). Hence, the District’s planned facilities effectively increase its facility standards. This is acceptable as long as new development is not required to contribute more than its fair share of the planned facilities. The District also has to have enough alternative sources of funding for existing development’s share of these planned facilities. (See alternative funding sources section.)

The allocation of costs for planned facilities to new development within the District is shown in **Table 8**. The bottom line of **Table 8** shows that to complete future facilities as currently planned there is a need for approximately \$5.6 million in revenue from non-fee (and/or previously collected impact fee) sources. This revenue requirement amounts to about 39 percent of planned facilities and represents the cost of planned facilities to increase facility standards for existing development. If the District does not make this level of investment in addition to future impact fee revenue, then the planned facility standard will not be realized and new development would have paid too high a fee.

Table 8: Projected Fee Revenue

| | |
|--|--------------------|
| Facility Standard per Capita | 739 |
| Projected Service Population Within the District (2005-2025) | 12000 |
| Total Public Facilities To Serve Growth | 8,868,000 |
| Total Cost of Planned Facilities | 14,481,000 |
| Need for Non-Fee Revenue Contribution | (5,613,000) |

¹ Estimated value of exiting inventory (\$9,176,500 from Table 5) divided by existing service population (23,046 from Table 1) equals \$398 per capita.

Alternative Funding Sources

The District does not anticipate developing any other on-going sources of revenue for capital facilities besides impact fees and existing General Fund revenue. General Fund revenue is derived from the District’s share of the constitutionally imposed one percent property tax rate that varies throughout the District. Any new or increased special tax would require two-thirds voter approval. Any new or increased assessment would require a majority property owner approval. Any new or increased property-related charge or fee would require a majority voter approval.

The Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District currently has approximately \$800,000 in reserves and no debt. The District anticipates that the sale of existing Station 48 site will also provide significant funding to assist with remedying the identified deficiency. (Recall that the estimated value of Station 48 was deducted from the system plan per capita standard.) The District estimates that with its existing fund balance, the anticipated sale of assets, and some additional general fund revenue contributions it shall be able to provide the revenue required to fund the increase in facility standards for its existing service population (see Table 8).

Fee Schedule

Table 9 shows the fire facilities impact fee for new development throughout the District based on the facilities cost per capita shown in Table 7. The cost per capita is converted to a fee per square foot of development based on dwelling unit and building space densities (persons per dwelling unit and workers per 1,000 square feet of building space). The estimate of residential densities is based on the most recent available data for unincorporated El Dorado County from the California State Department of Finance. Employment densities are consistent with those used in the Traffic Analysis Zone (TAZ) study recently completed for the County by MuniFinancial. (See page 2.) The residential fee per square foot was calculated based on the average unit size of units recently being constructed in the District determined from District permit fee collection records for 2002 through 2005. Density factors also include an adjustment for vacant space so they can apply uniformly to all new construction. Unoccupied agricultural areas will be treated as residential property as long as property is not used as commercial property by a special use permit.

A two percent administrative charge, which will be retained by the District, is included to cover expenses associated with documenting, collecting and accounting for the fee. The fee does not

include any charge for any of the District’s other (non-fee related) administrative costs.

Table 9: Diamond Springs Fire Protection District Fire Facilities Proposed Impact Fee Schedule

| Land Use | Cost p/Cap | Density ¹ | Occupancy ² | Cost du v sf | Av sf ³ | Cost sf | Admin ⁴ | Total Fee |
|-------------|------------|----------------------|------------------------|----------------|--------------------|---------|--------------------|---------------|
| Residential | \$739 | 2.66 | 94% | \$2,020 | 3100 | 0.60 | 0.02 | \$0.62 |
| Commercial | \$510 | 2.5 | N/A | \$1,275 | 1000 | | 0.02 | |
| Office | \$510 | 2.86 | N/A | \$1,459 | 1000 | | 0.02 | |
| Industrial | \$510 | 1.67 | N/A | \$852 | 1000 | | 0.02 | |
| | | | | \$1,195 | 1000 | 1.20 | 0.02 | \$1.22 |

1 Persons per dwelling unit for residential land uses and employees per 100 sq.ft. for non-residential uses. 2 Residential occupancy rates assumed to be similar to the rates for the City of Placerville and like communities. Non-residential density rates incorporate occupancy assumptions. 3 Based on 2006-2009 District impact fee and permit data for residential land uses. 4 Two percent administrative fee pursuant to Govt. Code 60000.

Program Implementation

The fire facilities impact fee would be collected at time of building permit issuance. Because the District does not have the statutory authority to adopt a fee, it must rely on the County Board of Supervisors for the authority. In addition, to implement the fee the District, in cooperation with the County, should:

- Seek to acquire the necessary property for new stations through purchase or dedication and maintain an updated master plan indicating fire facility standards and the types of facilities anticipated to accommodate growth;
- Identify funding sources to complement impact fee revenues to fully fund planned facilities;
- Maintain an annual Capital Improvement Program budget or another accounting mechanism to indicate where fees are being expended to accommodate growth;
- Maintain records on use of the administrative charge to justify the amount;
- Comply with the annual and five-year reporting requirements of *Government Code* 66001 and 66006; and
- Identify appropriate inflation indexes in the fee ordinance and allow an automatic inflation adjustment to the fee annually.

For inflation indexes, the District should use separate indexes for land and construction. Calculating the land index may require use of a property appraiser every several years. The construction index can be based on the District's recent capital project experience or taken from any reputable published source, such as the *Engineering News Record*. To calculate the fee increase, total planned facility costs represented by land or construction, as appropriate, should weight each index.

Mitigation Fee Act Findings

To guide the widespread imposition of development impact fees, the State Legislature adopted the *Mitigation Fee Act* (the *Act*) with Assembly Bill 1600 in 1988 and subsequent amendments. The *Act* is contained in *California Government Code* Section 66000 *et seq.* and establishes requirements for the imposition and administration of impact fee programs. The *Act* became law in January 1988 and requires local governments to document the five findings explained in the sections below when adopting an impact fee. For the fire facilities impact fee to be adopted by El Dorado County on behalf of the Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District, the findings are summarized here and supported in detail by the report that follows. All statutory references are to the *Act*.

Purpose of Fee

For the first finding the County must:

Identify the purpose of the fee. (§66001(a)(1))

The policy of El Dorado County, per Section 5.1.2.3 of the July 19, 2004 General Plan, is that “new development shall be required to pay its proportionate share of the costs of infrastructure improvements required to serve the project to the extent permitted by State Law.” The purpose of the Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District fire facilities impact fee is to implement this policy by providing a funding source from new development for capital improvements to serve that development. The fee advances a legitimate interest of the County by assuring that new development within the County is provided with adequate fire protection facilities and services.

Use of Fee Revenues

For the second finding the County must:

Identify the use to which the fee is to be put. If the use is financing public facilities, the facilities shall be identified. That identification may, but need not, be made by reference to a capital improvement plan as specified in Section 65403 or 66002, may be made in applicable general or specific plan requirements, or may be made in other public documents that identify the public facilities for which the fee is charged. (§66001(a)(2))

The fire facilities impact fee will fund expanded facilities to serve new development as identified below. All planned facilities will be located within the Diamond Springs - El Dorado Fire Protection District boundaries:

- Land for fire station and other related structures;
- Fire stations including furniture and other equipment;
- Fire apparatus including equipped engines and other vehicles;
- Medical response, hazardous materials, training, and other specialized fire fighting equipment.
- Potential financing costs associated with the above.

Planned fire facilities are preliminarily identified in this report. Additional planning will be

provided in the District's master plan and annual budgets. This report provides a preliminary description and cost estimate for planned facilities. The master plan and annual budgets will provide additional details and proposed timing for construction/acquisition of the facility.

Benefit Relationship

For the third finding the County must:

Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed. (§66001(a)(3))

The District will restrict fee revenues to the acquisition of land, construction of public buildings, and purchase of related equipment, furnishings, vehicles, and services that will serve new development and the additional residents and workers associated with that new development as part of a district-wide network of fire protection facilities and services. Thus, there is a reasonable relationship between the use of fee revenues and the residential and nonresidential types of new development that will pay the fee.

Burden Relationship

For the fourth finding the County must:

Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the need for the public facility and the type of development project on which the fee is imposed. (§66001(a)(4))

Service population provides an indicator of the demand for the facilities needed to accommodate growth. Service population is calculated based on residents associated with residential development and employment associated with nonresidential development. To calculate a single per capita standard, one worker is weighted less than one resident based on an analysis of the relative demand for fire facilities by land use type.

The need for the fee is based on the facility standards identified in this report and the growth in district-wide service population projected through 2025. Facilities standards represent the level of service that the District plans to provide its residents and businesses in 2025. Standards are based on the District's total existing and planned facilities allocated across the District's total service population in 2025.

See the *Fire Facilities Service Population* section, for a description of how service population and growth projections are calculated. Facility standards are described in the *Fire Facility Standards* section.

Proportionality

For the fifth finding the County must:

Determine how there is a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the public facility or portion of the public facility attributable to the development on which the fee is imposed. (§66001(b))

This reasonable relationship between the fire facility impact fee for a specific development project and the cost of the facilities attributable to that project is based on the estimated size of the service population that the project will accommodate. The total fee for a specific project is based on its size as measured by dwelling units or building square feet. The fee schedule

converts the estimated service population that a development project will accommodate into a fee based on the size of the project. Larger projects of a certain land use type will have a higher service population and pay a higher fee than smaller projects of the same land use type. Thus, the fee schedule ensures a reasonable relationship between the public facility fee for a specific development project and the cost of the facilities attributable to that project.

See the *Fee Schedule* section for a description of how service population is determined for different types of land uses. The *Fee Schedule* section also presents the fire facilities impact fee schedule.