FIRE PROTECTION FEE UPDATE

Prepared for the

AMADOR FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT

Prepared by

Michael Baker INTERNATIONAL

2729 Prospect Park Drive, Suite 220
Rancho Cordova, CA 95670
Phone: (916) 361-8384
www.mbakerintl.com

FINAL Report: NOVEMBER 2021

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Table of Contents .... *i*

Executive Summary *3*

Background and Study Objectives 3

Population Projections 3

Fee Schedules and Revenues 4

Funds Needed to Complement Fee Program 5

Additional Considerations 5

1. Introduction *7*

Public Facilities Financing in California 7

Mitigation Fee Act and Required Findings 8

Facility Standards, Level of Service, and Deficiencies 8

2. Growth Projections *10*

Introduction 10

Occupancy Rates 10

Population, Housing, and Employment Estimates 11

Fire Protection Facilities Service Population 11

Land Use Categories 13

3. Fire Protection Facilities and Proposed Feees *15*

Existing Fire Protection Assets 15

Fire Facilities Master Plan Standard and Per Capita Costs 15

Proposed Fire Protection Fees 18

Fire Facilities for New Development and Use of Fee Revenues 18

4. Adoption and Implementation *20*

Amador Fire Protection District Board Approval 20

Programming Revenues and Projects with the CIP 20

Funds Needed to Complement Impact Fee Program 21

Inflation Adjustment 21

Compliance Requirements 21

List of Tables

Table 1.1: Population and Housing Projections 4

Table 1.2: Proposed and Current Fire Protection Fees 4

Table 1.3: Projected Impact Fee Revenues and Funds Needed from Other Sources 5
Table 2.1: Occupancy Assumptions 10
Table 2.2: Population, Employment, and Housing Projections 12
Table 2.3: Fire Protection Service Population 13
Table 3.1: Fire Stations 15
Table 3.2: Fire Protection Vehicles 16
Table 3.3: Fire Protection Equipment 17
Table 3.4: Personal Protection Equipment 17
Table 3.5: Fire Protection Costs and Costs per Capita 18
Table 3.6: Proposed Fire Protection Impact Fee Schedule 19

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report presents an analysis of the cost of providing facilities and equipment for fire protection in the Amador County Fire Protection District's (AFPD) service area. This report documents the justifiable impact fees that could be imposed on new development to recover the capital cost of fire protection in accordance with state law pursuant to California Government Code Section 66000.

BACKGROUND AND STUDY OBJECTIVES

This study documents the relationship between new development in the AFPD service area and the cost of fire protection facilities to serve growth through the year 2035. The study also provides estimates of the costs of facilities necessary for growth and calculates the updated facilities fees by land use type that would generate revenues equal to these costs. The cost estimates of the facilities required to serve growth assume that new development will provide facilities that, at a minimum, will ensure that the AFPD can maintain its current level of service standards.

For the past several decades, the passage of Proposition 13 and other state fiscal measures have reduced the revenue sources available to local agencies. These local revenue sources, such as property tax and sales tax, are currently used primarily for operations and maintenance and cannot be counted to fund public facilities and other capital improvements. Federal and state assistance has not replaced the decline in local revenue sources. These funding shortfalls have been a significant contributing factor in declining facility standards (i.e., the ratio of facility capacity to service population), which has accelerated the rate of physical deterioration, increased operating costs, and reduced the efficiency of existing facilities as well as threatened to reduce the level of service. Given these funding difficulties, and in the face of continued growth, most local agencies in California have adopted impact fee programs to provide the necessary funding for the capital facilities needed to serve growth.

The local agencies in California rely on their authority to levy impact fees under the police powers granted by the California Constitution pursuant to the procedures of the Mitigation Fee Act, contained in Government Code Section 66000 et seq. This report provides the necessary documentation for the adoption of updated fire protection impact fees by the AFPD Board of Directors and the Amador County Board of Supervisors.

POPULATION PROJECTIONS

Population and population growth are key factors in determining the need for new or expanded facilities. The population and employment projections to the year 2035 used in this analysis are summarized in **Table 1.1.** The projections are based on the draft Municipal Service Review for the AFPD and estimates prepared by California Department of Finance.

Table 1.1: Population and Housing Projections

	2021	2035	Net Growth
Population[1]	18,885	21,128	2,243
Housing			
Single-Family	7,634	8,510	876
Multi-Family Units	220	293	73
Mobile Homes	874	978	104
Total Occupied Units	8,728	9,781	1,053
Overall Occupancy	2.16	2.16	2.13

[1] Current population for AFPD is estimated from the draft Municipal Service Review and the California Department of Finance Estimate, Table E-5 as of 1/1/2021

FEE SCHEDULES AND REVENUES

The proposed fire protection facilities impact fees are calculated on the basis of cost per capita of facilities and the household occupancy and employment occupancy factors. The provision of fire protection and emergency services is impacted by the number of residents and employees of the businesses in the service area. Therefore, the occupancy factors are key in determining the relationship between the need for facilities and new development paying the impact fees. Each new home and business will increase the total service population approximately by the factors given in **Table 2.1**.

The proposed and current fees as applied to a residential unit or a 1,000 square foot non-residential building are shown in **Table 1.2** The AFPD currently charges impact fees to new development for the purpose of funding the facilities necessary to serve new development within its service area. A residential impact fee of $250 is charged per dwelling unit. Commercial development is charged $650 per permit plus $0.25 to $0.60 per square foot of floor area, depending on the risk category. These fees have not been updated since they were established by the Amador County Board of Supervisors by Resolution No. 91-401, on September 3, 1991 shortly after the district was formed.

Table 1.2: Proposed and Current Fire Protection Fees for Building Projects

Land Use[1]	Proposed Fee	Current Fees
Residential, per each unit		
Single-Family	$1,400.06	$250.00
Multi-Family	$1,272.78	$250.00
Mobile Home	$954.58	$250.00
Accessory Dwelling Unit	$763.67	N/A
Accessory Structure in residential zone with no occupancy	$410.00	N/A
Non-residential, assumes a 1,000 sq. ft. building, interior floor area (except as otherwise noted)		
Commercial (Risk Category #1)	$945.00	$900.00
Office (Risk Category #2)	$1,100.00	$950.00
Retail (Risk Category #3)	$1,080.00	$1,050.00
Lodging (Risk Category #4)	$1,450.00	$1,250.00
Industrial/Warehouse (Risk Category #4)	$1,260.00	$1,250.00
Public/Institutional (Risk Category #4)	$1,370.00	$1,250.00

FUNDS NEEDED TO COMPLEMENT FEE PROGRAM

Government Code Section 66000 prohibits using impact fees to remedy an existing facility deficiency. Impact fees imposed on new development may pay for two forms of capital improvements:

(1) Additional facilities needed to accommodate growth and maintain the current standard of service; or,

(2) Facilities that provide an increase in the level of service or standard, if existing development also pays for its fair share of facilities needed to raise the standard.

The analysis indicates that existing users would benefit from planned capital improvements, such as two new stations, one in the Pine Grove area and another station/training center/emergency operations center in the Martell area. Construction of these new stations would increase the level of service to the entire AFPD service population. Therefore, existing development is obligated to pay for its fair share of the improvements. The impact fees presented in this report for these facilities may be imposed on new development only if existing development provides the funding necessary to augment existing facilities from sources other than the fee revenues. These funds may come from grants, Measure M taxes, and assessments imposed on current residents. The level of funding required from existing development is listed under Funds Needed from Other Sources in **Table 1.3**. If the entire fee program as presented herein is adopted, the total amount the AFPD and its current residents would need to contribute is approximately $6.8 million from sources other than impact fee revenues in order to provide facilities to existing residents at the same level of service proposed for new development.

Table 1.3: Projected Impact Fee Revenues and Funds Needed from Other Sources

Purpose of Funds	Projected Revenues from Proposed Impact Fees	Fund Needed from Other Sources	Program Total
Existing and Planned Facilities, Stations & Equipment	$1,419,516	$6,780,484	$8,200,000
New Personal Protective Equipment	$69,000	N/A	$69,000
Total	**$1,488,516**	**$6,780,484**	**$8,269,000**

ADDITIONAL CONSIDERATIONS

The AFPD at its sole discretion may reduce the recommended impact fees for one or more categories. However, the recommended fees are established based on the infrastructure required by new development. By reducing fees, it is inevitable that, over time, there will be a continued reduction in the levels of service provided by the public facilities funded by the impact fees unless other funds are used to replace these revenues.

Fee Updates

This impact fee study and the recommended fees assume a given level of development activity over the study period. The development that actually occurs may result in different impacts and fee revenues than those projected in this study. For that reason, regular updates are recommended to adjust the growth impact fee to match the needs created by the actual development. A maximum period of five-years between updates is recommended.

Annual Fee Increase

The costs in this report are shown in 2021 dollars based on the consultant's experience and actual construction and equipment costs where available. To ensure that the fee program stays current with the prevailing cost of construction and equipment, it is recommended that the AFPD adjust the adopted fees by a minimum of 2.5 percent automatically each year, or by a percentage increase indicated by a regional cost index factor. The automatic adjustment should be specified in the fee resolution.

1. INTRODUCTION

This report presents an analysis of the need and related cost of public facilities to accommodate new development in the Amador Fire Protection District (AFPD). This chapter explains the study approach and summarizes results under the following sections:

- Public Facilities Financing in California
- Mitigation Fee Act and Required Findings
- Facility Standards, Level of Service, and Deficiencies

PUBLIC FACILITIES FINANCING IN CALIFORNIA

The changing fiscal landscape in California over the past three decades has steadily undercut the financial capacity of local governments to fund infrastructure needed for growth. Three dominant trends stand out:

- The passage of a string of tax limitation measures, starting with Proposition 13 in 1978 and continuing through the passage of Proposition 218 in 1996.
- Declining popular support for bond measures to finance infrastructure for the next generation of residents and businesses.
- Steep reductions in federal and state assistance.

Faced with these trends, many cities and counties have had to shift the burden of funding infrastructure expansion from existing rate- and taxpayers to new development. This funding shift has been partly accomplished by the imposition of development impact fees, also known as public facility, capital facility, or mitigation fees. A key advantage of this approach in an era of voter approval requirements is that impact fees are not taxes and are thus exempt from the requirements of Proposition 218, needing only a majority vote of the legislative body for adoption.

In most local agencies that have implemented impact fee programs, new development pays close to the full cost required to maintain existing level of service standards as growth occurs. If local agencies do not collect the full amount, the effect is often a decline in facility standards, though some communities are able to increase other revenue sources to compensate. In another typical situation, a local agency may have a policy that a certain level of service should be maintained for a given service or facility; however, the current level of service for that facility is less than the stated policy. In that event the local agency will have, in effect, a deficiency which must be remedied in order to collect fees from new development commensurate with the policy standard. The deficiency must be remedied using funds other than impact fee revenues and new development cannot be required to pay for an increase in the level of service for the benefit of existing development unless existing development commits to paying its share of the cost.

MITIGATION FEE ACT AND REQUIRED FINDINGS

Because of the growing use of impact fees after the passage of Proposition 13 and concern over inconsistencies in their application, the California state legislature passed the Mitigation Fee Act, starting with Assembly Bill 1600 in 1988. The act, contained in California Government Code Section 66000 et seq., establishes ground rules for the imposition and ongoing administration of impact fee programs. The act became law in April 1989 and requires local governments to document the following when adopting an impact fee:

1) Identify the purpose of the fee.

2) Identify the use of fee revenues.

3) Determine a reasonable relationship between the fee's use and the type of development paying the fee.

4) Determine a reasonable relationship between the need for the fee and the type of development paying the fee.

5) Determine a reasonable relationship between the amount of the fee and the cost of the facility attributable to development paying the fee.

This report complies with California Government Code Sections 66000 et seq. by providing the required documentation for the above findings and determinations that establish the basis for imposition of the recommended fees contained herein.

The fundamental premise of the Mitigation Fee Act is that the burden of the impact fees cannot total more than the actual cost of the public facilities and capital improvements needed to serve the development paying the fee. Also, fee revenues can only be used for their intended purposes. In addition, the act has specific accounting and reporting requirements, both annually and after every five-year period, for the use of fee revenues. These requirements are covered in more detail in Chapter 4 of this report.

In addition, the impact fee revenues may not be used for staffing, operations, and maintenance of either existing or new facilities.

FACILITY STANDARDS, LEVEL OF SERVICE, AND DEFICIENCIES

Throughout this report, the words "standard" and "level of service" are used (at times interchangeably) to describe the levels of investment in capital facilities that are needed to serve the community. A standard is defined as the adopted policy or benchmark that the AFPD plans to achieve for any particular facility. For example, the floor area of fire station space per firefighter would be a standard. On the other hand, level of service refers to the actual level of benefit that the current population experiences. Level of service may be different from the standard for a given facility. When the existing level of service is less than the standard—in other words, when the facility is over capacity relative to the stated or policy standard—a deficiency exists for that facility. If the opposite is the case—if there is a surplus of capacity—the AFPD may recoup a portion of its investment in that facility that is available to serve new development. Frequently there is no stated policy standard for a given facility, in which case the existing level of service becomes the de facto "current standard" and the terms may be interchangeable.

New development alone cannot be asked to improve the level of service provided by those facilities that serve both new and existing development. Additionally, new development alone cannot correct an existing facility deficiency. Either way, facility standards cannot be increased compared to the existing level of service solely by imposing impact fees on new development.

By policy, the AFPD can adopt its own reasonable facility standards to reduce, maintain, or increase the existing facility standard. However, basing an impact fee on a standard that is higher than the existing level of service is fair to new development only if the AFPD were to use alternative funds to increase the capacity in facilities that benefit existing development. This extra funding is needed to correct the existing deficiency.

The AFPD has indicated that additional facilities, including two fire stations and a training center, are planned that would enhance the overall level of service provided by the AFPD. Therefore, new development may be required to contribute to the funding of these new facilities in proportion to the benefit they receive from the new facilities that provide greater fire protection.

Existing development will also contribute its fair-share contribution for these facilities through existing funding mechanisms, such as Measure M, fire assessments on existing development, the AFPD general fund, and grant funding.

Use of these standards is not meant to label them as AFPD policy. Indeed, many jurisdictions consider their existing levels of service to be deficient compared to the policies stated in their general plans. The AFPD may, as a policy decision, raise any facility standard, and in doing so, possibly create a deficiency relative to the existing level of service.

2. GROWTH PROJECTIONS

INTRODUCTION

Estimates of existing development (number and type of housing and commercial floor area) and projections of growth are used to approximate the AFPD service area population and the cost per capita of new fire protection facilities. The growth of the service population is the primary factor in determining future facility needs. Over 60 percent of AFPD service calls are for emergency medical services, indicating that population is the major influence on service demand.[1] Current residential population estimates are based on the latest California Department of Finance county/city estimate dated January 2021. Current employment (jobs in the AFPD as opposed to employed residents who live in the AFPD but may work elsewhere) is derived from the California County-Level Economic Forecast 2017-2050 for Amador, published by the California Department of Transportation.

OCCUPANCY RATES

The use of occupancy rates ensures a reasonable relationship between the increase in service population and the amount of the fee. To do this, the fee must vary by the estimated service population generated by a specific development project. Developers pay the fee based on the number of additional housing units or building square feet, so the fee analysis must convert service population estimates to these measures of project size to derive a fee per unit of development. This conversion is done with average occupancy factors by land use category, shown in **Table 2.1**.

Table 2.1: Occupancy Assumptions

Land Use	Occupancy Rate		Employees per 1,000 Square Feet or rooms
Residential			
Single-Family	2.20	persons per dwelling unit	—
Multi-Family	2.00	persons per dwelling unit	—
Mobile Home	1.50	persons per dwelling unit	—
Accessory Dwelling Unit	1.20	persons per dwelling unit	
Nonresidential[1]			
Office	250	building square feet per worker	4.00
Commercial	385	building square feet per worker	3.50
Retail	360	building square feet per worker	2.75
Hotel Rooms	0.33	rooms per worker	3.00
Industrial	570	building square feet per worker	1.75
Public/Gov't/Institutional /Health Services	400	building square feet per worker	2.50

[1] Amador Fire Protection District, 2021, Draft Municipal Service Review, 2020 base year service profile

POPULATION, HOUSING, AND EMPLOYMENT ESTIMATES

The 2035 projections for occupied housing, population, and employment are based on annual average growth rates for population and employment in AFPD. The population, housing, and employment estimates are summarized in **Table 2.2.**

The table shows modest population and employment growth rates of 0.80 percent and 0.53 percent, respectively, which are reasonable and consistent with 2035 population projections for Amador County as a whole. Note that the net growth in housing units is also based on a constant percentage growth rate and not on total buildout of the AFPD service area. The assumed 0.53 percent employment growth rate is also consistent with the 2035 projections for Amador County.[2] The lower rate of local job growth relative to overall population growth also accounts for the likelihood that a significant proportion of new residents will be commuting to jobs outside the County.

These population estimates are used as follows:

- Estimates of future growth provide a rough estimate of the total amount of public facilities required to accommodate growth over the planning horizon.
- Estimates of existing population and land development determine current facility standards, for example, square feet of public buildings per capita or average daily water use and wastewater generation.
- Future employment estimates establish the level of service and facilities that are applicable to future nonresidential development.

FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES SERVICE POPULATION

Different types of development use public facilities at different rates in relation to each other, depending on the services provided. The service population is calculated by weighting one land use category against another based on each land use category's demand for services.

When residents and workers are part of the same service population, it is reasonable to assume that one resident will place a greater demand on public services and associated facilities than one worker. Therefore, workers are factored for purposes of determining their relative demand and the demand that nonresidential development has on fire protection facilities.

The AFPD Fire Department provides fire protection services, emergency medical services, rescue services, fire prevention services, and public education services to residential and nonresidential populations within the AFPD service area. The fire service population is calculated in **Table 2.3**, with the impact of the nonresidential population factored at 24 percent of the residential population.

[2] California Department of Transportation, 2017, California County-Level Economic Forecast 2017-2050

Table 2.2: Population, Employment, and Housing Projections

	2021	2035	Net Growth	Average Annual Rate
Population	18,885	21,128	2,243	0.8%
Employment				
Office/Professional	186	200	14	0.52%
Retail	537	578	41	0.53%
Lodging & Hospitality	1,203	1,294	91	0.52%
Government & Public Administration	1,854	1,995	141	0.52%
Health and Social Services	205	221	16	0.54%
Arts, Entertainment and Recreation	63	68	5	0.55%
Private Education and Health Services	14	15	1	0.49%
Utilities, Construction, Manufacturing, Wholesale Trade	787	847	60	0.53%
Transportation, Warehousing, Wholesale Trade	101	109	8	0.55%
Extractive Industries (agriculture, forestry, fishing, quarrying, etc.)	133	143	10	0.52%
Other	161	173	12	0.51%
Total Employment	**5,244**	**5,643**	**399**	**0.53%**
Housing				
Single-Family	7,634	8,510	876	
Multi-Family Units	220	293	73	
Mobile Homes	874	978	104	
Total Occupied Units	8,728	9,781	1,053	**0.8%**
Overall Occupancy	2.16	2.16	2.13	

Table 2.3: Fire Protection Service Population

	Residents	Workers	Factored Workers[1]	Total Service Population	Relative Percentage
Existing (2021)	18,885	5,244	1,259	20,144	90.00%
New Development (2021-2035)	2,243	399	96	2,339	10.00%
Total 2035	21,128	5,643	1,355	22,483	100%
Weighting factor[1]	*1.00*	*0.24*			

[1] The resident-to-worker weighting factor is calculated by dividing a 40-hour workweek into 168 total hours in a week

LAND USE CATEGORIES

Measuring the impact of growth requires defining land use types to summarize different categories of new development. The land use types used in this analysis are defined below.

- **Single-Family:** Detached and attached (townhomes and condominiums) one-family dwelling units.
- **Multi-Family:** Dwelling units such as duplexes and condominiums (unless considered attached townhomes), apartments, and dormitories.
- **Accessory Dwelling Unit:** Any unit intended and permitted for human occupancy that is constructed on the same parcel as an existing home.
- **Accessory Structure:** An enclosed structure of 1,000 square feet or more not intended or permitted for human occupancy constructed on a parcel zoned for residential use, including, but not limited to, a home office, workshop, storage building, barn, garage or similar use.
- **Mobile Homes:** Includes manufactured housing units located in either mobile home parks or individual parcels.
- **Lodging:** All hotel and motel development.
- **Commercial/Retail:** All commercial development, restaurants, services and retail stores.
- **Office:** All professional office buildings, medical and dental, research and development centers, and business parks.
- **Industrial:** All manufacturing, fabrication, food processing, motor vehicle repair, warehousing, truck yards and warehousing terminals, and distribution centers. May also include business parks, research and development space, including "back office" uses, and ancillary employee-serving retail and services.
- **Public and Institutional:** All government, public education, hospitals, and residential care facilities.

Applying the Impact Fees to Development Projects Involving More Than One Land Use

Some development projects may include more than one land use category, such as a mixed-use development with both residential and commercial uses. In these cases, the impact fee would be calculated separately for each land use category contained within the project.

The amount of impact fees payable should be evaluated prior to the issuance of a building permit and be based on the information in the permit application, including number and type of units, intended occupancy, and floor area per occupancy. In a single-use structure, the total fee would be the sum of each of the products of the fee rate for each facility category multiplied by the number of units or the floor area (1,000-square-foot increments, prorated for the actual size) in the structure. For a mixed-use project, wherein more than one use will occupy a single permitted structure, an impact fee calculation would apply the appropriate fee rate to each portion of the structure containing that identified use. For a commercial-residential structure, the applicable residential fee rates would be applied to each residential unit (the unit may be defined as either a single-family or multi-family unit depending on the type of construction) and the applicable nonresidential rates will be applied to each unit of nonresidential floor area.

3. FIRE PROTECTION FACILITIES AND PROPOSED FEES

This chapter summarizes the analysis of the need for fire facilities to accommodate new development. The chapter documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the potential justified impact fee for funding such facilities.

EXISTING FIRE PROTECTION ASSETS

The AFPD owns and/or operates the fire stations in **Table 3.1**, and the fire vehicles and equipment listed in **Tables 3.2** and **3.3,** respectively. Firefighting vehicles and equipment are included in the facility costs because they represent essential capital investment needed to provide fire protection services and have at least a five-year service life. The cost of personal protective equipment for additional firefighters is calculated in **Table 3.4.**

Table 3.1: Fire Stations

Stations	Current Estimated Value
111--26517 Meadow Drive, Pioneer	$115,350
112--23770 Van De Hei Ranch Road, Pioneer	$34,957
114--19840 Highway 88, Pine Grove	$286,607
116--Dalton Drive, Jackson Rancheria Reservation	$1,000,000
121--16850 Demartini Road, Plymouth	$167,000
122--18534 Sherwood Street, Plymouth	$750,000
123--14410 Jiboom Street, Fiddletown	$323,214
Total	$2,677,128
Current Service Population	20,144
Service Standard, Value per Capita	$132.90

FIRE FACILITIES MASTER PLAN STANDARD AND PER CAPITA COSTS

To ensure equity between the service level of existing facilities and the facilities for which new development is responsible, a per capita "Master Plan" standard is calculated based on existing fire stations, firefighting equipment plus planned new firefighting equipment, and facilities. The AFPD has begun the design of the new station in the Pine Grove area near the intersection of Mt. Zion Road and SR 88. The AFPD owns the parcel on which it will be built. The construction date is dependent on identifying a source of funding for the project. The estimated construction cost is $3-4 million. The AFPD is also interested in building a second new station, in the Martell area. The centrally located Martell station would also serve as a training center and emergency operations center. New apparatus and equipment for the new stations is estimated at $1.2 million.

The Master Plan standard, including these planned capital improvements, is shown in **Table 3.5**. The Master Plan standard reflects the overall increase in level of service that will benefit both the existing and future service populations. These service populations will pay their fair share of the cost of new facilities as shown in **Table 3.5,** which also shows the total cost per capita of fire protection facilities required for new development to the year 2035.

Table 3.2: Fire Protection Vehicles

Description	Year Acquired	Initial Cost	Service Life	Current Value 2021
02989 09FORD 250 PICK-UP	2008	$27,734	15	$9,240
WATER TENDER 5126 20	2006	$123,338	25	$64,140
WATER TENDER 5236	2006	$123,338	25	$64,140
4X4 1250 GPM PUMPER	1992	$151,650	25	$7,580
INTNL WATER TENDER 1	1997	$148,865	25	$23,820
1998 INTL FIRE TRUCK	1998	$151,640	25	$30,330
HME CHASSIS 5148	2003	$40,000	25	$16,000
HME 2003 FIRE TRUCK	2003	$189,375	25	$75,750
02096A BLD UP ENG #1	2003	$37,789	25	$15,120
HME CHASSIS 5221	2003	$40,000	25	$16,000
2003 HME FIRE TRUCK	2003	$189,375	25	$75,750
2003 FORD F350 4X4	2003	$65,000	25	$26,000
08 FORD F350 RESCUE	2007	$68,318	25	$38,260
08 FORD F550 MINI PU	2007	$91,163	25	$51,050
15 KENWORTH TANKER V	2014	$191,376	25	$160,760
FORD POLICE UTILITY	2014	$29,063	10	$17,440
2016 FORD F250 5103	2015	$48,136	25	$42,360
2010 FORD EXPEDITION	2016	$13,190	25	$12,130
2015 ROSENBAUER E-51	2016	$450,440	25	$414,400
2008 F7 FORD E-5364	2016	$50,000	25	$46,000
2007 F7 E ONE E-5368	2016	$100,000	25	$92,000
2016 ROSENBAUER E-53	2016	$445,551	25	$409,910
2018 ROSENBAUER WARR	2018	$548,949	25	$548,950
2000 HME WESTSTATES	2019	$40,000	25	$41,600
15 KENWORTH TANKER VE	2014	$191,376	25	$160,760
12 FORD EXPEDITION A	2012	$36,279	25	$27,570
11 FORD 25	2010	$34,097	15	$15,910
2001 International Type III Fire Engine [5123]	2021	$25,000	25	$28,000
1989 Pierce Ariel Truck – Ladder	2020	$45,000	25	$48,600
2008 Ford Utility Truck [5310]	2020	$35,000	15	$39,670
			Total	$2,619,240
		Current Service Population		20,144
		Value per Capita		**$130.03**

Table 3.3: Fire Protection Equipment

Description	Year Acquired	Initial Cost	Service Life	Current Value 2021
HOLMATRO POWER PLANT (2)	2018	$16,920	10	$16,920
HOLMATRO CUTTER (2)	2018	$13,458	10	$13,460
HOLMATRO SPREADER (2)	2018	$15,156	10	$15,160
BAUER AIR COMPRESSOR	2015	$54,996	10	$38,500
REPEATER LEAK SPRING	2015	$13,074	10	$9,150
Fit Tester - Porta Count	2015	$17,998	10	$12,600
Lifepak IS Monitor/Defibrillator (Stryker) (2)	2015	$55,102	10	$38,570
Fire Hose Tester	2015	$2,586	10	$1,810
Holmatro Extrication Equipment	2015	$1,000	10	$700
SPREADER 30CX & POWER	2000	$27,741	10	$1,390
			Total	$148,260
		Current Service Population		20,144
		Value per Capita		$7.36

The total cost is based on the cost for each set of turnout gear and the projected additional firefighters based on the current staffing per 1,000 service population.

Table 3.4: Personal Protection Equipment

Description	No. of Items	Cost per Item	Total Cost of Equipment for Growth
Protective Clothing & Equipment including Communications[2]	6	$6,000	$36,000
Breathing Apparatus	6	$5,500	$33,000
		Total	$69,000
Projected Growth in Service Population			2,339
Cost per Capita for New Development			**$29.50**
Current Firefighters (including full-time and active volunteers, chief, battalion commanders, and engineers)	48		
Current Service Population (Residents + Factored Workers)	20,144		
Firefighters per 1,000 service population	2.4		
Projected Growth in Service Population	2,339		
Additional positions for growth	6		

Source: AFPD

Table 3.5: Fire Protection Costs and Costs per Capita

Fire Protection Assets	Costs and Costs per Capita	Projected Fee Revenue
Current Value of Fire Station Facilities, Buildings, and Land	$2,677,128	
Existing Fire & Emergency Vehicles and Equipment	$2,767,500	
Proposed New Pine Grove and Martell Fire Stations[1]	$7,000,000	
New Equipment for Planned Stations	$1,200,000	
Total Value of Master Plan (current plus planned facilities)	$13,644,628	
2035 Service Population	22,483	
Planned Standard per Capita, Facilities	$606.89	$1,419,516
Personal Protective Equipment (required for new firefighting personnel), Cost per Capita	$29.50	$69,000
Cost per Capita for New Development	**$636.39**	
Service Population Growth 2021-2035	2,339	
Total Cost for Growth		**$1,488,516**
Master Plan (less existing stations and equipment)	**$8,200,000**	

[1] According to the 2021 draft Municipal Service Review, the estimated cost of Pine Grove Station to be constructed on district property is $3.5 million. A similar cost is estimated for the proposed Martell area station.

PROPOSED FIRE PROTECTION FEES

The proposed fire protection fees are shown in **Table 3.6.** The components of the fee are the per capita charge calculated above multiplied by the either the residential occupancy (person per average household) or employee occupancy (employees per 1,000 square feet of non-commercial floor area), to equal the “occupancy charge” and, for non-residential development, an updated risk category factor per square foot of floor area is added to the occupancy charge. The updated risk category rates were determined by indexing the original 1991 rates by the increase in the Engineering News Record Building Cost Index of 165% over the past 30 years.

FIRE FACILITIES FOR NEW DEVELOPMENT AND USE OF FEE REVENUES

The AFPD may use fee revenues for projects that expand the district’s ability to deliver fire services to accommodate new development. Use of the fee in this manner maintains a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenue. The AFPD may alter the scope of the planned facility improvement projects or substitute new projects and/or equipment as long as the improvements and acquisitions continue to represent an expansion of the district’s capabilities. If the total cost of all planned projects varies from the total cost used as a basis for the fee, the AFPD should revise the fee accordingly. The fire protection impact fee revenues may be used to purchase land for future expansions and/or to construct new facilities, upgrade existing facilities, purchase vehicles and equipment with a minimum five-year life span, enhance the utility of existing systems, and/or perform refurbishment within the parameters allowed by Government Code Section 66000.

Table 3.6: Proposed Fire Protection Impact Fee Schedule

Land Use[1]	Costs per Capita[1] (a)	Occupancy Rate[2] (b)	Occupancy Charge (c = a x b)	Non-residential Risk Category Surcharge for Floor Area[4] (d)	Proposed Fee[3] (c + d)
Residential					
Single Family	$636.39	2.20	$1,400.06	N/A	$1,400.06
Multi-family	$636.39	2.00	$1,272.78	N/A	$1,272.78
Mobile Home	$636.39	1.50	$954.58	N/A	$954.58
Accessory Dwelling Unit	$637.12	1.20	$763.67	N/A	$763.67
Accessory Structure, per 1,000 sq. ft.	N/A	N/A	N/A	$410.00	$410.00
Non-residential[4]					
Commercial (Risk Category #1)	$152.73	0.00350	$0.53	$0.41	$0.94
Office (Risk Category #2)	$152.73	0.00400	$0.61	$0.49	$1.10
Retail (Risk Category #3)	$152.73	0.00275	$0.42	$0.66	$1.08
Lodging (Risk Category #4)	$152.73	0.00300	$0.46	$0.99	$1.45
Industrial/Warehouse (Risk Category #4)	$152.73	0.00175	$0.27	$0.99	$1.26
Public/Institutional (Risk Category #4)	$152.73	0.00250	$0.38	$0.99	$1.37

[1]Cost per capita for non-residential is factored at 24% of the residential cost per capita.

[2]Persons per dwelling unit are estimated future rates set to equate projected population with housing units. Employees per one square foot for non-residential land uses

[3] Per dwelling unit for residential uses and per square foot for non-residential land uses

[4]Non-residential Risk Category rates per square foot:

	1991	2021
•Category 1:	$0.25	$0.41
•Category 2:	$0.30	$0.49
•Category 3:	$0.40	$0.66
•Category 4:	$0.60	$0.99
Building Cost Index:	2,720	7,201
Percent Increase		165%

4. ADOPTION AND IMPLEMENTATION

This chapter identifies tasks that the AFPD should complete when implementing the fee program.

If the AFPD Board concurs with and chooses to increase the fee as provided for in this study, the following process should be followed for fee implementation.

AMADOR FIRE PROTECTION DISTRICT BOARD APPROVAL

The AFPD Board should adopt a resolution and make a recommendation to the Amador County Board of Supervisors to adopt this fee pursuant to the County's "police powers" under Article XI, Section 7 of the California Constitution.

COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS APPROVAL

The Amador County Board of Supervisors shall adopt the proposed fee schedule in compliance with California Government Code Sections 66016 through 66018. The County shall:

- Send a notice of a public hearing at least 14 days prior to the hearing to any party that has submitted a written request for such a notice. Have this report and all supporting documentation available for review by the public at least 10 days prior to the hearing.
- Publish notice of the public hearing in a newspaper of general circulation at least 10 days prior to the scheduled hearing, with a second notice published at least 5 days after the first hearing notice. The notice should include the time and place of the meeting as well as a general explanation of the matter to be considered.
- Hold the public hearing to consider adoption of the development impact fee.
- Adopt an implementing ordinance to establish the County's and AFPD's authority to impose the proposed fee and automatically adjust the fee annually for inflation and adopt a resolution or ordinance to set the fee.
- Begin collecting the fee no sooner than 60 days following adoption of the fee ordinance and resolution.

After adoption, there is a mandatory 60-day waiting period before the fees go into effect, unless an urgency ordinance, valid for 30 days, is adopted making certain findings regarding the urgency being claimed. The ordinance must be readopted at the end of the first period (and possibly at the end of the second period, depending on County Board of Supervisors meeting dates) to cover the next 30 days and therefore the entire 60-day waiting period. Fees adopted by urgency go into effect immediately. This procedure must also be followed for fee increases.

PROGRAMMING REVENUES AND PROJECTS WITH THE CIP

The AFPD should consider preparing a Capital Improvement Program (CIP) and regularly update the CIP to identify specific projects and program fee revenues going to those projects. Use of the CIP in this manner documents a reasonable relationship between new development and the use of fee revenues.

For the planning period of the CIP, the AFPD should allocate all existing fund balances and projected fee revenue to facilities projects. The AFPD should plan its CIP expenditures at least five years in advance and show where all collected development impact fee revenues will be spent. The AFPD can hold funds in a project account for longer than five years, if necessary, to collect sufficient funds to complete a given project. See Compliance Requirements below for the specific CIP update requirements stated in Government Code Section 66002.

FUNDS NEEDED TO COMPLEMENT IMPACT FEE PROGRAM

In adopting the fees as presented in this report, additional funds will need to be identified to fund the share of costs not related to new development. **Table 1.4** identifies the funding projected by new development versus funding that needs to be provided by other sources for the improvements. The Other Sources column identifies the funding amount for each category that the AFPD needs to obtain to cover the existing population's share of improvements.

INFLATION ADJUSTMENT

The costs in this report are shown in 2021 dollars based on the consultant's experience and actual construction costs where available. To ensure that the fee program stays current with the prevailing cost of construction, the AFPD should identify appropriate inflation indexes in the fee ordinance and include an automatic annual inflation adjustment in the fee ordinance for those facilities or systems that have not been completed. In addition, for those facilities for which the AFPD is recouping funds for having built-in excess capacity, no annual adjustment factor is recommended. For these projects, the annual adjustment factor is not necessary because the facilities have been constructed and the costs have been incorporated into the analysis.

A construction cost index can be based on the AFPD's recent capital project experience or taken from any reputable source, such as the *Engineering News-Record*.

COMPLIANCE REQUIREMENTS

The California Mitigation Fee Act (Government Code Section 66000 et seq.) mandates procedures for administration of impact fee programs, including collection, accounting, refunds, updates, and reporting. The AFPD must comply with the annual and five-year reporting requirements. For facilities to be funded with a combination of impact fees and other revenues, the AFPD must identify the source and amount of the other revenues. The AFPD must also identify when the other revenues are anticipated to be available to fund the project. The AFPD's compliance obligations vis-à-vis the act include but are not limited to the following specific requirements:

Collection of Fees. Section 66007 provides that a local agency shall not require payment of fees by developers of residential projects prior to the date of final inspection or issuance of a certificate of occupancy, whichever comes first. In a residential development of more than one dwelling unit, the local agency may choose to collect fees either for individual units or for phases upon final inspection, or for the entire project upon final inspection of the first dwelling unit when it is completed. The local agency may require the payment of those fees or at an earlier time if:

> (A) the local agency determines that the fees will be collected for public improvements or facilities for which an account has been established and funds appropriated and for which the local agency has adopted a proposed construction schedule or plan prior to final inspection or issuance of the certificate of occupancy; or
>
> (B) the fees are to reimburse the local agency for expenditures previously made. "Appropriated," as used in this section, means authorization by the governing body of the local agency for which the fee is collected to make expenditures and incur obligations for specific purposes.

Fee Exemptions, Reductions, and Waivers. If a development project is found to have no impact on facilities for which fees are charged, such project must be exempted from the fees. If a project has characteristics that indicate its impacts on a public facility or infrastructure system will be significantly and permanently smaller than the average impact used to calculate impact fees in this study, the fees should be reduced accordingly.

In some cases, the AFPD may desire to voluntarily waive or reduce impact fees that would otherwise apply to a project to promote goals such as affordable housing or economic development. Such a waiver or reduction may not result in increased costs to other development projects and are allowable only if the AFPD offsets the lost revenue from other funding sources.

Credit for Improvements by Developers. If the AFPD requires a developer, as a condition of approval, to construct or otherwise provide facilities, improvements, or fire protection equipment for which impact fees have been or will be charged, the impact fee imposed on that development project for that type of facility must be adjusted to reflect a credit for the cost of facilities, improvements, or equipment constructed or otherwise provided by the developer. If the reimbursement would exceed the amount of the fee to be paid by the development for that type of facility, the AFPD may seek to negotiate a reimbursement agreement with the developer.

Earmarking of Fee Revenues. Section 66006 mandates that the AFPD "deposit … fees for the improvement in a separate capital facilities account or fund in a manner to avoid any commingling of the fees with other revenues and funds of the AFPD, except for temporary investments." Fees must be expended solely for the purpose for which they were collected. Interest earned on the fee revenues must also be placed in the capital account and used for the same purpose. The Mitigation Impact Fee Act is not clear as to whether depositing fees "for the improvements" refers to a specific capital improvement or a class of improvements (e.g., fire stations or equipment). Recommended practice is for the AFPD is to maintain separate funds or accounts for impact fee revenues but not necessarily for individual projects.

Reporting. Section 66006 requires that once each year, within 180 days of the close of the fiscal year, the AFPD must make available to the public the following information for each account established to receive impact fee revenues:

1. The amount of the fee.
2. The beginning and ending balance of the account or fund.
3. The amount of the fees collected, and interest earned.
4. Identification of each improvement on which fee revenues were expended and the amount of the expenditures on each improvement, including the percentage of the cost of the public improvement that was funded with fee revenues.
5. Identification of the approximate date by which the construction of a public improvement will commence, if the AFPD determines sufficient funds have been collected for financing of an incomplete public improvement.
6. A description of each interfund transfer or loan made from the account or fund, including interest rates, repayment dates, and a description of the improvements on which the transfer or loan will be expended.
7. The amount of any refunds or allocations made pursuant to Section 66001, paragraphs (e) and (f).

The above information must be reviewed by the AFPD Board at its next regularly scheduled public meeting, but not less than 15 days after the statements are made public.

Findings and Refunds. Section 66001 requires that, for the fifth fiscal year following the first deposit of any impact fee revenue into an account or fund as required by Section 66006, and every five years thereafter, the AFPD must make all the following findings for any fee revenues that remain unexpended, whether committed or uncommitted:

1. Identify the purpose to which the fee will be put.

2. Demonstrate the reasonable relationship between the fee and the purpose for which it is charged.
3. Identify all sources and amounts of funding anticipated to complete financing of incomplete improvements for which the impact fees are to be used.
4. Designate the approximate dates on which the funding necessary to complete financing of those improvements will be deposited into the appropriate account of fund.

Annual Update of Capital Improvement Plan. Section 66002 provides that if the AFPD adopts a CIP to identify the use of impact fees, that program must be adopted and updated annually by a resolution of the governing body at a noticed public hearing. The alternative is to identify improvements in other public documents, such as an Impact Fee Nexus Study itself.

Amador County LAFCO. 2021. Draft Municipal Service Review for the Amador Fire Protection District.

California Department of Finance. 2021. Demographics Research Unit, January 1, 2021, DOF Table E-5.

California Department of Transportation. 2021. County-Level Economic Forecast 2017-2050.

Natelson Company. 2001. *Employment Density Study Summary Report.* Prepared for the Southern California Association of Governments.