



FRUITLAND PARK FIRE SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE MEETING AGENDA

January 31, 2017

6:00 p.m.

City Hall Commission Chambers
506 W. Berckman Street
Fruitland Park, FL 34731

- 1. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE**
- 2. ROLL CALL**
- 3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
January 24, 2017
- 4. PRESENTATION – Fire Department – FY 2017-18 Budget**
- 5. COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS/COMMENTS**
- 6. STAFF COMMENTS**
- 7. NEW BUSINESS**
- 8. FUTURE MEETING DATES**
Next Meeting – Monday, February 13, 2017 – Special Assessment, Government Services Group Inc.
- 9. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

This section is reserved for members of the public to bring up matters of concern or opportunities for praise. Action may not be taken by the committee at this meeting; however, questions may be answered by staff or issues may be referred for appropriate staff action.

Note: Pursuant to F.S. 286.0114 and the City of Fruitland Park's Public Participation Policy adopted by Resolution 2013-023, members of the public shall be given a reasonable opportunity to be heard on propositions before the committee. Accordingly, comments, questions, and concerns regarding items listed on this agenda shall be received at the time the committee addresses such items during this meeting. Pursuant to Resolution 2013-023, public comments are limited to three minutes.

10. ADJOURNMENT

Any person requiring a special accommodation at this meeting because of disability or physical impairment should contact the City Clerk's Office at City Hall (352) 360-6727 at least three (3) days prior to the meeting. (§286.26 F.S.)

If a person decides to appeal any decision made by the City of Fruitland Park with respect to any matter considered at such meeting or hearing, he or she will need a record of the proceedings, and ensure that a verbatim record of the proceedings is made, which record includes the testimony and evidence upon which the appeal is to be based. The city does not provide verbatim records. (§286.0105, F.S.)

PLEASE TURN OFF ELECTRONIC DEVICES OR PLACE IN VIBRATE MODE.

**FRUITLAND PARK FIRE SERVICES ADVISORY COMMITTEE
MEETING MINUTES
January 24, 2017**

A meeting of the Fruitland Park Fire Services Advisory Committee was held at 506 W. Berckman Street, Fruitland Park, Florida 34731 on Tuesday, January 24, 2017 at 6:00 p.m.

Members Present: James P. Logan, representing District (Group) 5, Chair
Sydney “Dale” Arrowsmith, representing District (Group) 3
Edward R. Cihoski, Sr., representing District (Group) 2, Vice Chair
Edgar J. “Jerry” Elton, representing District (Group) 4
William “Bill” K. Galbreath, business owner representative, and
Gary Towne, representing District (Group) 1, and
Steven “Steve” Whitaker, fire chief representative

Also Present: Mayor Chris Cheshire, Vice Mayor John L. Gunter Jr., Commissioners Chris Bell, Ray Lewis, Rick Ranize; City Manager Gary La Venia, City Attorney Anita-Geraci-Carver; City Treasurer Jeannine Michaud-Racine; Interim Fire Chief Don Gilpin; Deputy Fire Chief Tim Yoder, Firefighters Chris Lewis, Madison Leary, Andrew Hall, **Campbell**, and Sean Parker, Fire Department, and City Clerk Esther B. Coulson.

1. CALL TO ORDER AND PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE

Chair Logan called the meeting to order at 6:00 p.m. and led in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

2. ROLL CALL

Ms. Coulson called the roll and a quorum was declared present.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

On motion of Mr. Galbreath, seconded by Mr. Towne and unanimously carried, the committee approved the January 17, 2017 minutes as submitted.

4. PRESENTATION

Mr. John Molenda, Public Safety Department Deputy Director, introduced Messrs. Stephen Koontz, Assistant County Manager/Fiscal and Administrative Services Department Director and John Jolliff, Public Safety Department Director and gave a power-point presentation outlining Lake County’s Fire Rescue Public Safety Department’s services; a copy of which is filed with the supplemental papers to the minutes of this meeting.

5. COMMITTEE MEMBER QUESTIONS/COMMENTS

Discussions ensued on the City of Clermont’s agreement with Lake County relating to its division of costs on building and operations; the county’s impact fees; the county’s fire services operations’ funds generated from the Municipal Service Taxing Unit, the fire assessment and Staffing for Adequate Fire and Emergency Response grants.

Later in the meeting, Mr. Galbreath requested that staff provide a proposal and report on advanced life support (ALS) to the committee at the next meeting.

After discussion and on behalf of the committee, Chair Logan thanked Messrs. Molenda, Koontz and Joliff for their presentation at this evening's meeting and their hard work.

6. STAFF COMMENTS

In response to Mr. La Venia's inquiry on the likelihood of combining emergency medical services (EMS) with fire services, Mr. Koontz noted the purpose of the emergency medical service study is to improve fire rescue services in the county's unincorporated area; gave assurance of the anticipated seamless transition process, and that there would be no negative impact to municipalities

Mr. Koontz referred to the May 25, 2016 memorandum from Nilgun Kamp and Steve Tindale, Tindale Oliver, consultants retained by the county, to conduct the Lake County Fire Assessment Update Study. He mentioned the county's plan to review the best possible scenario with the City of Fruitland Park as high priority ensuring that its community is addressed and taken care of and anticipated the stability of the rates. A copy of the study is filed with the supplemental papers to the minutes of this meeting.

Mr. La Venia requested that Mr. Koontz provide him with the costs he identified on the cost per square footage for warehouses, commercial properties and financial institutions.

After much discussion and in answer to Mr. La Venia's inquiry regarding the 800 MHz radio system for law enforcement and fire, Messrs. Molenda and Koontz cited reasons why the radios are not replaced individually; noted the county's method of utilizing bulk purchasing, and encouraged the city to apply for grant funding to implement same.

Mr. Molenda identified the county's goal for county fire rescue services facilities to operate as ALS by the end of the year and described the differences in operating as basic life support services to which Mr. La Venia recognized the operation of Lake EMS Inc. adjacent with the fire department.

7. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business before the committee at this time.

8. FUTURE MEETING DATES

Later in the meeting, Chair Logan determined that the next meeting will be held on January 31, 2017 where costs will be addressed.

9. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Mr. Paul Frost, City of Fruitland Park resident, voiced concerns on the operations of Lake County Fire Rescue Stations (LCFR) 53 and 59; acknowledged the same response provided by the city's fire department during the service calls, and expressed appreciation for the changes made since the last proposal.

Ms. Donna Seitter, City of Fruitland Park resident, voiced reasons why she believe funding ought to remain in the city and allocated to its fire department.

Later in the meeting, Chair Logan indicated that answers relating to the fire services costs to the citizens will be provided at a later date.

City of Fruitland Park Commissioner Rick Ranize voiced concerns on the deteriorating working relationship with the county and the city's fire department; questioned the outcome of the county executing an automatic aid agreement to assist the city if it decides to keep its fire department; and inquired about the existence of community outreach programs from the county.

Ms. Pat Guy, City of Fruitland Park resident, gave reasons why she believes the city would have the ability to be in control of its own fire department and its fire assessment and maintain a continued relationship with the county.

Mr. Mark Isom, City of Fruitland Park resident, recalled his service on the board along with Mr. Joliff, at the inception of the radios which the city did not pay for and the notion of its longevity was predicted for 20 years.

Ms. Rita Ranize, City of Fruitland Park resident, recognized the close proximity of the medical facilities and expressed preference for the city to keep control of its fire department.

Interim Fire Chief Gilpin questioned the condition of the Town of Lady Lake, Howey-in-the-Hills and Astitula with volunteer fire departments prior to the county's control of their fire services.

In referencing the presentation regarding LCFR 54 and 52 and after Interim Fire Chief Gilpin explained that no mention was made of LCFR 59, Mr. Joliff indicated that there was enough funds earmarked for two stations at once and addressed the ability to acquire grant funding to work on as many LCFRs as possible.

Interim Fire Chief Gilpin discussed with Messrs. Joliff and Molenda LCFR fire services vehicles and performance models and the determination to render basic life support or ALS based from responding to service calls received from dispatch.

Mr. Carlisle C. Burch, City of Fruitland Park resident, mentioned his desire for the city, as it grows, make it a place for people to want to live and gave reasons why he believed that the city could maintain and control the fire department acknowledging the backup received. He mentioned his experience as a volunteer firefighter when Spring Lake Fire Station operated as a standalone and voiced preference for the choice to be towards the fire department.

Lieutenant Yoder pointed out the City of Inverness' reinstatement of its fire department from the county due to increase in revenue; the problems experienced with the loss of

control and funds expended, and mentioned other municipal governments that have undertaken the same process.

10. NEW BUSINESS

There was no new business to come before the committee.

11. ADJOURNMENT

There being no further business to come before the city commission at this time, on motion made, second and unanimously carried, the meeting adjourned at 7:20 p.m.

The minutes were approved at the January 31, 2017 meeting.

Signed _____
Esther B. Coulson, City Clerk

Signed _____
James P. Logan, Chair

MEMORANDUM

Date: May 25, 2016
To: John Jolliff, Lake County
From: Nilgün Kamp and Steve Tindale, Tindale Oliver
Subject: Lake County Fire Assessment Update Study

Lake County retained Tindale Oliver in 2015 to update the technical study supporting the County's fire assessment rate schedule. The study and associated rate schedule were adopted in September 2015. In 2016, Tindale Oliver was retained to provide an update study to confirm or revise the fire assessment schedule based on the most current available data. This memorandum summarizes the results of this work effort and includes the review of the following variables:

- Assessment factor
- Fire assessment funding requirement
- Incident data distribution by land use
- Fire assessment cost allocation
- Land use data
- Calculated assessment schedule

Assessment Factor

Consistent with the methodology used in the 2015 Technical Report, the distribution of incidents was analyzed in terms of advanced life support (ALS) versus fire and basic life support (BLS). The 2015 Technical Report included incident data from 2008 through 2014 calendar years and this update study includes those same years as well as incident data from 2015. Table 1 provides a summary of the seven-year average that incorporates the recent incident activity. Throughout this update study, a seven-year average is used to minimize temporary fluctuations. The portion of non-ALS incidents, measured through the allocation of total resources to these incidents, remained stable at 79 percent.

The remaining calculations included in this memorandum are based on the 79 percent allocation to illustrate the maximum assessment rates that can technically be supported.

DRAFT

Table 1
Distribution of Incidents

Criteria	Average of 2008-2015	
	ALS	Non-ALS
Frequency	21.1%	78.9%
Staff Time	21.1%	78.9%
Vehicle Time	21.1%	78.9%
Total Resources	21.1%	78.9%

Source: Lake County Fire Rescue; dates refer to calendar years

Fire Assessment Funding Requirement

In FY 2015, the assessable budget of \$16.9 million was used to calculate the fire assessment rates. Using the FY 2016 budget, the maximum assessable budget is estimated at \$19.3 million, which represents a 14-percent increase from the FY 2015 budget used as the basis for the adopted assessment levels. Table 2 provides a detailed breakdown of the FY 2016 assessable budget. Consistent with the methodology used in previous studies, if a given expenditure is associated with non-ALS services, the entire amount is included in the assessable budget. When an expenditure related to both ALS and non-ALS services, 79 percent of the amount is included in the assessable budget. In addition, all dedicated revenues were subtracted using the same approach. Finally, miscellaneous expenditures related to the assessment program were added to determine the full assessable budget.

DRAFT

**Table 2
LCFR Maximum Assessable Budget (FY 2016)**

Description	Fiscal Year 2016 (Maximum)		
	Total Budget	Adjustment Factor	Assessable Budget
Expenditures⁽¹⁾			
Personnel	\$17,629,227	78.9%	\$13,909,460
Operating:			
- Non-ALS	\$481,000	100%	\$481,000
- ALS and Non-ALS	\$3,397,102	78.9%	\$2,680,313
Administrative Cost Allocation	\$1,072,273	78.9%	\$846,023
Capital Outlay:			
- Non-ALS	\$65,000	100%	\$65,000
- ALS and Non-ALS	\$403,698	78.9%	\$318,518
<i>Subtotal - Expenditures</i>	<i>\$23,048,300</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>\$18,300,314</i>
Less: Revenues⁽¹⁾			
Federal Forestry Grant	\$0	100%	\$0
Fire Fighters Supplemental	\$41,760	100%	\$41,760
Motor Fuel Tax Rebate	\$12,000	78.9%	\$9,468
Fire Inspection Fees	\$300	100%	\$300
Donations	\$2,000	100%	\$2,000
<i>Subtotal - Revenues</i>	<i>\$56,060</i>	<i>-</i>	<i>\$53,528</i>
Total Net Expenditures⁽²⁾	\$22,992,240	-	\$18,246,786
Miscellaneous Assessment Expenditures			
Statutory Discount ⁽³⁾			\$638,638
Assessment Collection Costs ⁽⁴⁾			\$364,936
<i>Subtotal - Misc Assessment Expenditures</i>			<i>\$1,003,574</i>
Total Assessment Funding Requirement⁽⁵⁾			\$19,250,360
Total Assessment Funding Requirement, FY 2015⁽⁶⁾			\$16,887,000
Percent Change			14%

- 1) Lake County Fire Rescue and Budget Division
- 2) Total expenditures less total revenue (Item 1)
- 3) Reflects a 3.5 percent reimbursement of the total net expenditures for the collection of the fire assessment (3.5 percent represents the historical average for 2008 through 2015)
- 4) Reflects a 2.0 percent reimbursement of the total net expenditures for the collection costs related to the fire assessment
- 5) Sum of the total net expenditures and miscellaneous assessment expenditures
- 6) Source: *Lake County Fire Assessment Study, June 2015; Table 10*

DRAFT

Incident Data Distribution by Land Use

As was noted during the 2015 update study, demand for fire rescue services by land use continued to indicate a shift away from residential land uses primarily toward institutional and industrial/warehouse land uses. Table 3 presents this information.

**Table 3
Distribution of Total Resources by Land Use**

Land Use	Total Resources		
	Average 2008-2014	Average 2008-2015	% Change
Residential	84.9%	84.3%	-0.7%
Hotel/Motel/RV Park	1.9%	1.9%	0.0%
Commercial	5.1%	5.1%	0.0%
Industrial/Warehouse	1.0%	1.1%	10.0%
Institutional	7.1%	7.6%	7.0%

Source: Lake County Fire Rescue; dates refer to calendar years

Fire Assessment Cost Allocation

Total resource distribution shown in Table 3 is used to determine the portion of budget allocated to each land use. As mentioned previously, the total budget increased by 14 percent. Changes for each land use also reflect the changes in resource distribution, which a slight reduction of 0.7 percent of service demand from residential to industrial/warehouse and institutional land uses. Table 4 also highlights the percent change in the budget allocation for each land use due to the budget increases since the previous report.

**Table 4
Fire Protection and First Response Assessed Cost Allocation – Maximum Budget**

Land Use	FY 2016 Portion of Total Resources ⁽¹⁾	Share of FY 2016 Maximum Assessable Budget ⁽²⁾	FY 2015 Report Distribution ⁽³⁾	FY 2015 Assessable Budget ⁽³⁾	Percent Change from FY 2015 ⁽⁴⁾
Residential	84.3%	\$16,228,054	84.9%	\$14,337,063	13.2%
Hotel/Motel/RV Park	1.9%	\$365,757	1.9%	\$320,853	14.0%
Commercial	5.1%	\$981,768	5.1%	\$861,237	14.0%
Industrial/Warehouse	1.1%	\$211,754	1.0%	\$168,870	25.4%
Institutional	7.6%	\$1,463,027	7.1%	\$1,198,977	22.0%
Total	100.0%	\$19,250,360	100.0%	\$16,887,000	14.0%

- 1) Source: Average of total resource distribution from 2008 through 2015 (calendar years)
- 2) Total assessable adopted budget from Table 2 multiplied by portion of the resources (Item 1)
- 3) Source: *Lake County Fire Assessment Study, June 2015*; Table 10
- 4) Percent difference between the FY 15 budget (Item 3) and FY 16 budget (Item 2)

DRAFT

Land Use Data

The distribution of property units remained relatively stable. Tables 5 and 6 present this information for different land use types.

Table 5
Distribution of Property Units by Rate Category
(Residential and Transient Land Uses)

Property Rate Category	Unit	Number of Units		
		2016	2015	% Change (2015 to 2016)
<i>Residential & Transient</i>				
Residential	dwelling unit	83,396	81,813	1.93%
Hotel/Motel/RV Park	room or RV space	6,561	6,682	-1.81%

Source: Lake County Budget Office

Table 6
Distribution of Property Units by Rate Category
(Non-Residential Land Uses)

Building Classification	Number of Buildings – 2016			Number of Buildings – 2015			% Change (2015-2016)		
	Commercial	Industrial / Warehouse	Institutional	Commercial	Industrial / Warehouse	Institutional	Commercial	Industrial / Warehouse	Institutional
<250	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a	n/a
251-1,999	539	145	407	541	144	410	-0.4%	1%	-1%
2,000 - 3,499	241	117	127	242	116	128	-0.4%	1%	-1%
3,500 - 4,999	107	81	84	108	80	85	-0.9%	1%	-1%
5,000 - 9,999	141	177	110	141	174	111	0.0%	2%	-1%
10,000 - 19,999	62	102	68	63	101	68	-1.6%	1%	0%
20,000 - 29,999	10	33	8	10	33	8	0.0%	0%	0%
30,000 - 39,999	2	14	4	2	14	4	0.0%	0%	0%
40,000 - 49,999	3	8	2	3	8	2	0.0%	0%	0%
50,000 or greater	13	23	5	13	23	5	0.0%	0%	0%
Total	1,118	700	815	1,123	693	821	-0.4%	1%	-1%

Source: Lake County Budget Office

DRAFT

Calculated Assessment Schedule – Maximum Budget

Due to the changes in the distribution of total resources by land use as well as the increase in the Fire Department's assessable budget, the assessment schedule indicates an 11-percent increase in the rate for the residential land use, a 17-percent increase for hotel/motel/RV parks, and 15 percent to 25 percent increase for other non-residential land uses. The calculated assessment schedules and differences are provided in Tables 7 and 8.

Table 7
Calculated Fire Assessment Rate Schedule – Maximum Assessable Budget
(Residential and Transient Land Uses)

Property Rate Category	Unit	FY 2017 Maximum Calculated Assessment Rate ⁽¹⁾	FY 2016 Adopted Assessment Rate ⁽²⁾	% Change (2016-2017) ⁽³⁾
<i>Residential & Transient</i>				
Residential	dwelling unit	\$195	\$175	11.4%
Hotel/Motel/RV Park	room or RV space	\$56	\$48	16.7%

- 1) Share of assessable budget from Table 4 divided by number of units from Table 5
- 2) Source: Technical Report titled "Lake County Fire Assessment Update Study, June 2015"
- 3) Percent change between FY 2016 and FY 2017 assessment rates

DRAFT

**Table 8
Calculated Fire Assessment Rate Schedule – Maximum Assessable Budget
(Non-Residential Land Uses)**

Building Classification	FY 2017 Maximum Calculated Assessment Rates ⁽¹⁾		
	Commercial	Industrial/ Warehouse	Institutional
<250	n/a	n/a	n/a
251-1,999	\$262	\$41	\$523
2,000 - 3,499	\$523	\$83	\$1,047
3,500 - 4,999	\$917	\$145	\$1,832
5,000 - 9,999	\$1,309	\$207	\$2,617
10,000 - 19,999	\$2,618	\$414	\$5,235
20,000 - 29,999	\$5,233	\$828	\$10,461
30,000 - 39,999	\$7,854	\$1,242	\$15,691
40,000 - 49,999	\$10,472	\$1,654	\$20,921
50,000 or greater	\$13,088	\$2,069	\$26,159
Building Classification	FY 2016 Adopted Assessment Rates ⁽²⁾		
	Commercial	Industrial/ Warehouse	Institutional
<250	n/a	n/a	n/a
251-1,999	\$228	\$33	\$426
2,000 - 3,499	\$456	\$66	\$852
3,500 - 4,999	\$798	\$116	\$1,490
5,000 - 9,999	\$1,140	\$166	\$2,129
10,000 - 19,999	\$2,280	\$331	\$4,259
20,000 - 29,999	\$4,562	\$663	\$8,522
30,000 - 39,999	\$6,831	\$994	\$12,769
40,000 - 49,999	\$9,107	\$1,325	\$17,045
50,000 or greater	\$11,401	\$1,656	\$21,291
Building Classification	% Change (2016-2017) ⁽³⁾		
	Commercial	Industrial/ Warehouse	Institutional
<250	n/a	n/a	n/a
251-1,999	14.9%	24.2%	22.8%
2,000 - 3,499	14.7%	25.8%	22.9%
3,500 - 4,999	14.9%	25.0%	23.0%
5,000 - 9,999	14.8%	24.7%	22.9%
10,000 - 19,999	14.8%	25.1%	22.9%
20,000 - 29,999	14.7%	24.9%	22.8%
30,000 - 39,999	15.0%	24.9%	22.9%
40,000 - 49,999	15.0%	24.8%	22.7%
50,000 or greater	14.8%	24.9%	22.9%

- 1) Share of assessable budget from Table 4 divided by the number of buildings in each tier
- 2) Source: Technical Report titled "Lake County Fire Assessment Update Study, June 2015"
- 3) Percent change between FY 2016 and FY 2017 assessment rates

DRAFT

Calculated Assessment Schedule – Staff Recommended Budget

This section of the memo presents the calculated assessment rates based on a reduced budget as recommended by County staff.

Staff Recommended Fire Assessment Funding Requirement

As presented in Table 9, the staff recommended FY 2016 assessment funding represents approximately a 10-percent decrease over the maximum assessment funding requirement previously documented. The following tables provide updated assessment rate calculations based on this reduced budget.

**Table 9
Lake County Fire Rescue Staff Recommended Budget**

Description	Figure
Total FY 2016 Maximum Assessment Funding Requirement ⁽¹⁾	\$19,250,360
Staff Recommended FY 2016 Assessment Funding Requirement ⁽²⁾	\$17,263,113

1) Source: Table 2

2) Source: Lake County Fire Rescue

Fire Assessment Cost Allocation

Table 10 presents the fire rescue assessed cost allocation utilizing the staff recommended FY 2016 assessment funding requirement.

**Table 10
Assessable Budget by Land Use – Staff Recommended Budget**

Land Use	FY 2016 Portion of Total Resources ⁽¹⁾	Share of FY 2016 Assessable Budget ⁽²⁾	FY 2015 Report Distribution ⁽³⁾	FY 2015 Assessable Budget ⁽³⁾	Percent Change from FY 2015 ⁽⁴⁾
Residential	84.3%	\$14,552,804	84.9%	\$14,337,063	1.5%
Hotel/Motel/RV Park	1.9%	\$327,999	1.9%	\$320,853	2.2%
Commercial	5.1%	\$880,419	5.1%	\$861,237	2.2%
Industrial/Warehouse	1.1%	\$189,894	1.0%	\$168,870	12.4%
Institutional	7.6%	\$1,311,997	7.1%	\$1,198,977	9.4%
Total	100.0%	\$17,263,113	100.0%	\$16,887,000	2.2%

1) Source: Table 3, average of total resource distribution from 2008 through 2015 (calendar years)

2) Total staff recommended budget from Table 9 multiplied by the portion of total resources (Item 1)

3) Source: *Lake County Fire Assessment Study, June 2015*; Table 10

4) Percent difference between the FY15 budget (Item 3) and the FY16 budget (Item 2)

DRAFT

Calculated Assessment Schedule – Staff Recommended Budget

Tables 11 and 12 present the calculated rates based on the reduced budget.

Table 11
Calculated Fire Assessment Rate Schedule – Staff Recommended Budget
(Residential and Transient Land Uses)

Property Rate Category	Unit	FY 2017 Calculated Assessment Rate ⁽¹⁾	FY 2016 Adopted Assessment Rate ⁽²⁾	% Change (2016-2017) ⁽³⁾
<i>Residential & Transient</i>				
Residential	dwelling unit	\$175	\$175	0.0%
Hotel/Motel/RV Park	room or RV space	\$50	\$48	4.2%

- 1) Share of assessable budget from Table 10 divided by number of units from Table 5
- 2) Source: Technical Report titled "Lake County Fire Assessment Update Study, June 2015"
- 3) Percent change between FY 2016 and FY 2017 assessment rates

DRAFT

Table 12
Calculated Fire Assessment Rate Schedule – Staff Recommended Budget
(Non-Residential Land Uses)

Building Classification	FY 2017 Calculated Assessment Rates ⁽¹⁾		
	Commercial	Industrial / Warehouse	Institutional
<250	n/a	n/a	n/a
251-1,999	\$235	\$37	\$469
2,000 - 3,499	\$469	\$74	\$939
3,500 - 4,999	\$822	\$130	\$1,643
5,000 - 9,999	\$1,174	\$185	\$2,347
10,000 - 19,999	\$2,347	\$371	\$4,694
20,000 - 29,999	\$4,693	\$742	\$9,381
30,000 - 39,999	\$7,043	\$1,114	\$14,071
40,000 - 49,999	\$9,391	\$1,484	\$18,762
50,000 or greater	\$11,737	\$1,855	\$23,459

Building Classification	FY 2016 Adopted Assessment Rates ⁽²⁾		
	Commercial	Industrial / Warehouse	Institutional
<250	n/a	n/a	n/a
251-1,999	\$228	\$33	\$426
2,000 - 3,499	\$456	\$66	\$852
3,500 - 4,999	\$798	\$116	\$1,490
5,000 - 9,999	\$1,140	\$166	\$2,129
10,000 - 19,999	\$2,280	\$331	\$4,259
20,000 - 29,999	\$4,562	\$663	\$8,522
30,000 - 39,999	\$6,831	\$994	\$12,769
40,000 - 49,999	\$9,107	\$1,325	\$17,045
50,000 or greater	\$11,401	\$1,656	\$21,291

Building Classification	% Change (2016-2017) ⁽³⁾		
	Commercial	Industrial / Warehouse	Institutional
<250	n/a	n/a	n/a
251-1,999	3.1%	12.1%	10.1%
2,000 - 3,499	2.9%	12.1%	10.2%
3,500 - 4,999	3.0%	12.1%	10.3%
5,000 - 9,999	3.0%	11.4%	10.2%
10,000 - 19,999	2.9%	12.1%	10.2%
20,000 - 29,999	2.9%	11.9%	10.1%
30,000 - 39,999	3.1%	12.1%	10.2%
40,000 - 49,999	3.1%	12.0%	10.1%
50,000 or greater	2.9%	12.0%	10.2%

- 1) Share of assessable budget from Table 10 divided by the number of buildings in each tier
- 2) Source: Technical Report titled "Lake County Fire Assessment Update Study, June 2015"
- 3) Percent change between FY 2016 and FY 2017 assessment rates

DRAFT

Summary and Conclusions

This memo provides updated assessment rates based on the County's current adopted fire assessment methodology. The following is a summary of the primary findings:

- Portion of the incidents and total resources that are associated with non-ALS services remained stable.
- The maximum FY 2016 budget indicates a 14-percent increase from the FY 2015 budget that was used in the last technical study, while the staff recommended budget is within two (2) percent of the FY 2015 budget.
- Number of units for each land use remained relatively stable.
- In terms of resources used by each land use, there was a slight shift away from residential land uses toward non-residential uses, primarily toward the institutional and industrial/warehouse land use. Other than the budget increases, this shift is the main reason for changes in the rates calculated in this study.
- Given that most of the changes are relatively minor and no land use category is being overcharged, it is recommended that the County maintain the current adopted rates until the next update study.