



# LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT AGENDA

**Wednesday, June 11, 2025**

**7:30 am**

Highland City Hall, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland, Utah 84003

## **7:30 AM REGULAR MEETING**

Call to Order: Chair Kim Rodela

Invocation: Board Member Kurt Ostler

### **1. UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES**

Please limit comments to three minutes per person. Please state your name.

### **2. CONSENT AGENDA**

#### **a. Approval of Meeting Minutes**

Regular Lone Peak Public Safety District Meeting – April 29, 2025

### **3. PUBLIC HEARING/RESOLUTION: FY2025 BUDGET ADJUSTMENTS**

The Board will hold a public hearing and consider a proposal to adjust the fiscal year 2024-2025 budget for multiple items.

### **4. MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING – UTAH COUNTY RETENTION OF EVIDENCE**

The Board will consider a Memorandum of Understanding with Utah County regarding retention of evidence.

### **5. LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT FACILITATOR**

The Board will select a firm to facilitate a discussion amongst Alpine and Highland cities regarding a possible change to the fire financing formula in the interlocal agreement.

### **6. DEPARTMENT REPORTS**

#### **a. Administration**

##### **i. Fraud Risk Assessment**

#### **b. Police Department**

#### **c. Fire Department**

### **7. CLOSED SESSION**

The Board may recess to convene in a closed session for the purpose of discussing items as provided by Utah Code Annotated §52-4-205.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

In accordance with Americans with Disabilities Act, Lone Peak Public Safety District will make reasonable accommodations to participate in the meeting. Requests for assistance can be made by contacting the Recorder at (801) 772-4505 at least three days in advance of the meeting.

**ELECTRONIC PARTICIPATION**

Members of the Governing Board may participate electronically during this meeting.

**CERTIFICATE OF POSTING**

I, Stephannie Cottle, the duly appointed Recorder, certify that the foregoing agenda was posted at the principal office of the public body, on the Utah State website (<http://pmn.utah.gov>), and on Lone Peak Public Safety District website ([www.lonepeakpublicsafety.org](http://www.lonepeakpublicsafety.org)).

Please note the order of agenda items are subject to change in order to accommodate the needs of the Governing Board, staff, and the public.

Posted and dated this agenda on the 9<sup>th</sup> day of June 2025.

Stephannie Cottle, CMC|UCC, Recorder

**THE PUBLIC IS INVITED TO PARTICIPATE IN ALL LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT BOARD MEETINGS.**



# LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT MINUTES

Wednesday, April 29, 2025

7:30 am

**Waiting Formal Approval**

Highland City Hall, 5400 West Civic Center Drive, Highland, Utah 84003

## 7:30 AM REGULAR MEETING

Call to Order: Chair Kim Rodela

Invocation: Board Member Kurt Ostler

The meeting was called to order by Chair Kim Rodela as a regular meeting at 7:44 am. The meeting agenda was posted on the *Utah State Public Meeting Website* at least 24 hours prior to the meeting.

**PRESIDING:** Kim Rodela, Chair

**BOARD MEMBERS:** Brittney P. Bills – present via Zoom  
Kurt Ostler – present  
Carla Merrill – present  
Jason Thelin – present

**STAFF PRESENT:** LPPSD Executive Director Erin Wells, LPPSD Assistant Executive Director Shane Sorensen, Fire Chief Brian Patten, Police Chief Brian Gwilliam, Deputy Recorder Heather White, Finance Director David Mortensen

**OTHERS PRESENT:** Doug Cortney, PJ Christensen, Amanda Jolley, Danny Campbell, Dustin Mitchell, Kayden Carter, Nancy Jones, Arlyn Ramsey, Chris Willden, Jameson Bangerter, Gregg Gardner, Jake Beck, Zach Burkard

Chair Kim Rodela called for Department Reports at the beginning of the meeting.

## 7. DEPARTMENT REPORTS

### a. Administration

### b. Police Department

Chief Gwilliam reported that skeletal remains were found in a park in Alpine; based on personal items found with the remains, the Police Department had an idea who the person was but is working to confirm the identity of the individual. The family of the individual has been contacted, and they are appreciative that they may have closure after searching for their loved one for the last 16 months. He expressed his gratitude to the Officers who have worked on that case for the past week.

### c. Fire Department

Chief Patten stated he had nothing to report this morning.

## 1. UNSCHEDULED PUBLIC APPEARANCES

Please limit comments to three minutes per person. Please state your name.

There were no public comments.

## 2. CONSENT AGENDA

### a. Approval of Meeting Minutes

Regular Lone Peak Public Safety District Meeting – March 12, 2025

*Board Member Merrill MOVED to approve the regular Lone Peak Public Safety District meeting minutes from March 12, 2025.*

*Board Member Ostler SECONDED the motion.*

*The vote was recorded as follows:*

<i>Board Member Kim Rodela</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Brittney P. Bills</i>	<i>not able to vote due to technical difficulties</i>
<i>Board Member Kurt Ostler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Carla Merrill</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Jason Thelin</i>	<i>Yes</i>

*The motion passed 4:0*

## 3. ACTION: AGREEMENT TO HOLD A FUTURE WORK SESSION ON THE TOPIC OF THE LEVEL OF SERVICE OF THE DISTRICT AND THE INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT

The Board will discuss the potential for a future meeting regarding staffing and financing of the Lone Peak Public Safety District.

Board Member Ostler stated that as a part of the recent budget process, District Board Members have raised several questions related to District staffing, financing, and levels of service. He stated the Board would like to pursue these conversations at a future date outside of the budget process and it would be helpful to him if the Fire Department could provide a map identifying the location of the two Fire Stations in order to assist the Board in understanding minimum and maximum response times to points throughout the District.

There was a brief high-level discussion among Board Members Ostler and Thelin and Chief Patten regarding the different types of equipment that are used to respond to emergencies and transport patients from a scene; Chief Patten expressed a willingness to provide any documentation necessary to aid the Board in making decisions regarding staffing and levels of service.

*Board Member Ostler MOVED that the Lone Peak Public Safety District Board plan to hold a work session during the month of May (tentatively scheduled for May 14<sup>th</sup>) to discuss level of service and response times and then another work session during the month of August 2025 to discuss the District's level of service and the District Interlocal Agreement. The Alpine and Highland Mayors will jointly finalize the meeting plans, agenda, and format.*

*Board Member Merrill SECONDED the motion.*

Board Member Thelin wondered what kind of meeting needed to be held. The board members discussed the importance of being able to collect data and discuss levels of service as well as staffing needs before the regular board meeting on May 14<sup>th</sup>. They concluded to hold a work session, and they discussed optional locations for the meeting to be held.

*Amended Motion:*

*Board Member Ostler MOVED that the Lone Peak Public Safety District Board plan to hold a work session on May 13<sup>th</sup> and a standard board meeting on May 14<sup>th</sup> to discuss level of service and response times and then another work session during the month of August 2025 to discuss the District's level of service and the District Interlocal Agreement. The Alpine and Highland Mayors will jointly finalize the meeting plans, agenda, and format.*

*Board Member Merrill SECONDED the amended motion.*

*The vote was recorded as follows:*

<i>Board Member Kim Rodela</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Brittney P. Bills</i>	<i>not able to vote due to technical difficulties</i>
<i>Board Member Kurt Ostler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Carla Merrill</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Jason Thelin</i>	<i>Yes</i>

*The motion passed 4:0*

#### **4. PUBLIC HEARING/RESOLUTION: FY2026 LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT TENTATIVE BUDGET**

The Board will hold a public hearing and consider the approval of the tentative budget for FY2026.

Chair Kim Rodela opened the public hearing at 8:10 a.m.

There was no public comment.

Chair Kim Rodela closed the public hearing at 8:10 am.

Executive Director Wells referred to a staff report included in the meeting packet, which discussed the proposed Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Tentative Budget for Lone Peak Public Safety District. In comparison with last year, the most significant changes proposed by staff are in personnel adjustments. These changes were proposed in consideration of the level of service of the District to its residents. The Board may at its discretion amend the proposed budget by cutting, delaying, or altering any of the proposed changes. She stated the proposed budget has decreased by \$23,067 since the version shared with the Board on April 9, 2025 and the staff memo provides details about major changes by department.

*Board Member Ostler MOVED that the Board approve the resolution adopting the proposed Fiscal Year 2025-2026 Tentative Budget for Lone Peak Public Safety District with the following changes:*

- 1. Police budget wage and benefit increase will be \$151,400*
- 2. Fire budget wage and benefit increase will be \$117,212*

3. *Police and Fire wage and benefit increases will be given as a lump sum to each so chiefs can determine appropriate individual increases*
4. *The public hearing and adoption of the final budget will take place on May 14, 2025*
5. *Remove funding for the proposed addition of 2 full-time and 1 part-time positions*

Board Member Ostler summarized the intent of his motion; each Chief will have a set dollar amount to divide among employees for wage adjustments as determined appropriate.

*Board Member Merrill SECONDED the motion.*

*The vote was recorded as follows:*

<i>Board Member Kim Rodela</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Brittney P. Bills</i>	<i>not able to vote due to technical difficulties</i>
<i>Board Member Kurt Ostler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Carla Merrill</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Jason Thelin</i>	<i>Yes</i>

*The motion passed 4:0*

Those decreases are due to dispatch providing updated assessment numbers. She also summarized major changes by department as follows:

- Administration:
  - Revenue adjustments:
    - Interest Earnings – Staff is projecting an increase of \$57,500 over budgeted interest earnings from the current fiscal year.
  - Adjustments to wages:
    - There is a proposed increase for salary adjustments of 3% for the Highland City staff who provide administrative services to the District. The percentage of each employee's time that is charged to the District is at the same allocations previously approved by the Board.
  - Operational adjustments:
    - Dispatch – Each City is responsible for its assessment from Central Utah 911. Dispatch fees are increasing by approximately \$39,000. Dispatch fees make up 58% of the administration budget.

Overall, the Administration budget request represents an increase of \$50,302 (12.4%) from FY2025.

- Police:
  - Revenue adjustments:
    - School Resource Officer Reimbursement – A \$5,000 increase to the contribution amount from Alpine School District for our 2 school resource officers.
  - Adjustments to wages:
    - Salaries – A proposed market adjustment of 5.5% to bring positions to average along with a 2.5% merit opportunity for employees.
    - Salary-related items – The salary increases above also increases overtime, call pay, retirement, and FICA/Medicare.
  - Operational adjustments:
    - Vehicle Lease – Decrease of approximately \$33,000 due to the timing of lease payments for police vehicles.

Overall, the Police request represents an expense increase of \$204,809 (4.4%) over FY2025.

- Fire/EMS

- Revenue adjustments:
  - Utah County Reimbursement – A \$52,000 increase due to the call volume and contracted amount for the Fire Department’s coverage of property in unincorporated Utah County including American Fork Canyon.
  - Ambulance Revenue – A \$25,000 increase in fees collected for service due to the increase in call volume.
  - Mental Health Grant – The use of \$23,000 of grant money received in the prior fiscal year for a mental health program.
- Proposed staffing adjustments:
  - Salaries – A proposed 3% merit adjustment for the department’s step and grade pay plan along with a market adjustment of 5% to bring the department’s salary ranges to average.
  - Engineer position – Promotion of 3 firefighter positions to Engineers to oversee the care of our heavy apparatus to prolong its life and minimize repairs.
  - Part-time salary increase – \$1.00 per hour increase for the part-time firefighters.
  - Staffing addition – Addition of 2 full-time and 1 part-time firefighter positions to bring the staffing level to 9 for each shift which will move the department closer to meeting industry standards and OSHA standards for the initial attack on a house fire.
  - Salary-Related Items – The staffing adjustments and salary increases above also increase overtime, holiday pay, retirement, and FICA/Medicare.
- Operational adjustments:
  - Professional Services – The creation of a mental health program offset by grant revenue.
  - Medical supplies – A \$6,580 increase due to increased call volume and the cost of supplies.
  - Training – A \$5,000 increase to pay for paramedic school and the increased cost of training and travel.

Overall, the Fire/EMS budget represents an expense increase of \$754,630 (17.8%) over FY2025.

- Wildland deployment:
  - Due to the unknown nature of wildland deployment, the budget is traditionally set at \$35,000 to compensate for the full-time position on the department’s wildland shift. As revenues and expenses come in through the year, the budget is trued up with a final year budget adjustment.
- City assessments:
  - Alpine: \$3,202,771
  - Highland: \$6,295,757
  - Total: \$9,498,528

The assessments are increasing by 8.1 percent for Alpine and 10.6 percent for Highland.

After agenda item six, Ms. Wells asked for clarification on the Board’s motion regarding the proposed budget; it was her understanding that the intention of the motion was to not fund the two new full-time and one part-time Fire Fighter positions, and to change the percentage wage increases to numbers that were discussed. She asked if everything else included in the budget was left as is, including the promotion to the Engineer positions.

Board Member Ostler stated his understanding was that the budget included \$204,000 for the Police Department, but the motion was to approve \$151,400. He asked if the \$167,212 for the Fire Department included the Engineer promotions. Mr. Mortensen stated there is some confusion about the numbers for the Fire Department; the numbers he emailed to the Board prior to this morning’s meeting represented elimination of all new positions. If the two new full-time and one part-time Fire Fighter positions were removed from the budget, the original proposal would be decreased by \$167,212. Lowering the proposed wage increase from eight percent to six percent would result in an additional \$50,000 in savings. He is seeking clarification on the intentions of the Board.

Board Member Ostler inquired as to the cost of the promotions to the Engineer position. Chief Patten stated the budget included \$21,000 to \$24,000 for those promotions. Board Member Ostler asked why it is necessary to



promote someone to the Engineer position at a higher wage; he understands the employees in those positions have some increased responsibility in terms of vehicle oversight and maintenance. Chief Patten stated the Engineers are responsive for driving the vehicles and operating them on-scene. They are also responsible for day-to-day maintenance of the vehicles and having one person assigned to monitor one vehicle helps to prevent situations of improper maintenance or disrepair. Board Member Ostler asked if there will be an Engineer assigned to the new vehicles or to all vehicles. Chief Patten stated he will target the new trucks initially but eventually would like to have an Engineer for each vehicle. In the immediate future, he would promote three employees to the Engineer position, but he eventually needs six Engineers.

The Board discussed the matter of promotions to the Engineer position, and continued a brief debate of the appropriate wage increases for employees of the District. Ms. Wells suggested the Board reconsider the previous motion and restate it for clarity.

*Board Member Ostler MOVED to reconsider agenda item #4 Public Hearing/Resolution: FY 2026 Lone Peak Public Safety District Tentative Budget*

*Board Member Merrill SECONDED the motion.*

*The vote was recorded as follows:*

<i>Board Member Kim Rodela</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Brittney P. Bills</i>	<i>not able to vote due to technical difficulties</i>
<i>Board Member Kurt Ostler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Carla Merrill</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Jason Thelin</i>	<i>Yes</i>

*The motion passed 4:0*

*Board Member Ostler MOVED to approve the FY2025/2026 tentative budget for the Lone Peak Safety District as follows:*

- 1. Police Department proposed budget will decrease \$52,600*
- 2. Fire proposed budget will not fund 2 full-time and 1 part-time employees. Fire budget will decrease the budget by \$217,212*
- 3. This is to reflect a 6% increase for salaries and benefits in the police and fire budget over the past year*

Board Member Ostler explained that the intent was to keep the proposed Engineer promotions in the budget; additionally, the optional wage increases for employees should be six percent rather than eight percent.

*Board Member Thelin SECONDED the motion.*

*The vote was recorded as follows:*

<i>Board Member Kim Rodela</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Brittney P. Bills</i>	<i>not able to vote due to technical difficulties</i>
<i>Board Member Kurt Ostler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Carla Merrill</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Jason Thelin</i>	<i>Yes</i>

*The motion passed 4:0*



## 5. ACTION: POLICE DEPARTMENT VEHICLE SURPLUS

The Board will consider a request from the Lone Peak Police Department to surplus three vehicles.

Police Chief Gwilliam explained the Police Department proposes to surplus three Ford SUV patrol vehicles; the vehicles have been replaced with the three vehicles that were an authorized purchase in the current Fiscal Year budget.

Chair Rodela asked Chief Gwilliam how much he anticipates receiving for each of the vehicles. Chief Gwilliam stated he expects to receive \$7,000 to \$10,000 per vehicle. The cost of used vehicles sold at auction varies greatly depending on many different factors. Chair Rodela asked if the sales proceeds can be used to offset the purchase cost for the vehicle that is going to be discussed under agenda item six tonight. Chief Gwilliam stated he expects that is an option, but the additional vehicle to be purchased is a replacement of a vehicle that was involved in an accident and the District has received money from the insurance company for that vehicle. He concluded that he believes the proceeds of the sale will be used for other expenses included in his Department's budget.

*Board Member Ostler MOVED to surplus the vehicles discussed as recommended by Chief Gwilliam and be sent to auction.*

*Board Member Merrill SECONDED the motion.*

Board Member Merrill referenced Chair Rodela's question about the use of the proceeds of the sale of the vehicle; she asked if it is standard to use that kind of money for other expenses rather than to allocate it to a line item for vehicle purchases. Finance Director Mortensen stated that would be a policy decision for the Board to make; if the Board wants to restrict the use of the sales proceeds, that is an option. Board Member Merrill stated that she would prefer to use the sales proceeds for other vehicle purchases. Board Member Ostler agreed and indicated that would be more transparent, but he noted that if the sales proceeds are used for vehicle purchases/replacements, the money that was already budgeted for that purpose will be freed up to use in other areas of the budget. Mr. Mortensen agreed.

There was brief discussion about the practice of auctioning surplussed vehicles rather than trying to sell them independently. Chief Gwilliam indicated that selling a vehicle independently is very labor intensive and it is common practice for public entities throughout the State to auction their vehicles.

*The vote was recorded as follows:*

<i>Board Member Kim Rodela</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Brittney P. Bills</i>	<i>not able to vote due to technical difficulties</i>
<i>Board Member Kurt Ostler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Carla Merrill</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Jason Thelin</i>	<i>Yes</i>

*The motion passed 4:0*

## 6. ACTION: POLICE DEPARTMENT VEHICLE REPLACEMENT

The Board will consider a request from the Lone Peak Police Department to purchase a vehicle to replace the vehicle involved in an accident in March 2025.

Chief Gwilliam explained a Police Department employee was involved in a single vehicle accident on March 7, 2025 during a snow storm. The damage to the vehicle resulted in the insurance company totaling the vehicle.

The total settlement from the insurance company was \$58,701.02. The total replacement cost of the vehicle are as follows.

- 2024 Ford Interceptor (Police Package): \$47,656
- Outfit with lighting and Electronics: \$17,850

The difference between the insurance buyout and the cost to replace the vehicle is \$6,805. It is anticipated that these funds can be absorbed in the current budget, specifically in 10-45-74 Vehicle Lease.

Board Member Thelin inquired as to the model year of the vehicle, to which Chief Gwilliam answered 2023.

Board Member Ostler asked if the Officer involved in the accident has made a full recovery. Chief Gwilliam answered yes and indicated the accident was not very bad and he was surprised that the insurance company totaled the vehicle.

*Board Member Thelin MOVED to authorize the purchase of the replacement vehicle spoken of by Chief Gwilliam.*

*Board Member Merrill SECONDED the motion.*

*The vote was recorded as follows:*

<i>Board Member Kim Rodela</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Brittney P. Bills</i>	<i>not able to vote due to technical difficulties</i>
<i>Board Member Kurt Ostler</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Carla Merrill</i>	<i>Yes</i>
<i>Board Member Jason Thelin</i>	<i>Yes</i>

*The motion passed 4:0*

## **7. DEPARTMENT REPORTS**

### **a. Administration**

There were no reports from Administration.

### **c. Police Department**

Police reports were heard at the beginning of the meeting.

### **c. Fire Department**

There were no reports from the Fire Chief.

## **8. CLOSED SESSION**

The Board may recess to convene in a closed session for the purpose of discussing items as provided by Utah Code Annotated §52-4-205.

## **ADJOURNMENT**

*Board Member Ostler MOVED to adjourn the regular meeting and Board Member Merrill SECONDED the motion. All voted in favor and the motion passed unanimously.*

*The meeting adjourned at 8:46 am.*

I, Stephannie Cottle, Recorder, hereby certify that the foregoing minutes represent a true, accurate and complete record of the meeting held on April 29, 2025. This document constitutes the official minutes for the Lone Peak Public Safety District Board Meeting.

Stephannie Cottle, CMC, UCC  
LPPSD Recorder



## LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT AGENDA REPORT #3

**DATE:** June 11, 2025

**TO:** Lone Peak Public Safety District Board Members

**FROM:** David Mortensen, Finance Director

**SUBJECT: RESOLUTION:** Year-End Budget Adjustments

---

### **PURPOSE:**

The Board will hold a public hearing and consider a proposal to adjust the fiscal year 2024-2025 budget for multiple items. The Board will take appropriate action.

### **BACKGROUND:**

State law requires that the district set a budget for all revenues and expenditures for the fiscal year. The adopted budget can be amended as needed through the end of the fiscal year to ensure that overall expenditures do not surpass the approved budget amount. While some line items may go over budget, each department: Admin, Police, Fire, and Wildland can not go over budget. None of the recommended adjustments require an increase of contributions from the cities. Neither do they use fund balance. They use increased revenue or decrease in spending in other line items to balance the budget. Staff felt the following adjustments were appropriate to bring to the Board for information and approval.

- Police grants – The police department received grants for early intervention, justice assistance, DUI enforcement, and cameras. There is a corresponding revenue and expense increase of \$9,786.
- Lease proceeds and payments – The District received the lease financing proceeds from Zions Bank for the police replacement vehicles and then paid those lease proceeds to the dealership for the purchase of the vehicles. There is a corresponding revenue and expense of \$171,032.
- Fire overtime – The fire department saw an increase in what was anticipated in overtime due mainly to the mid-year wage adjustment and more tenured (and thus higher paid) employees taking overtime shifts in comparison to newer, lower paid employees. That increase in the overtime budget is balanced with an increase in revenue from Utah County and ambulance

revenue along with a decrease in the part-time employees line item and holiday pay.

- Wildland – Staff is recommending we account for the revenue we have already billed or received this fiscal year - \$576,992. Expense adjustments in wildland include what we have currently spent along with an estimate as what could be spent in the next two weeks as crews are preparing for deployment on June 12. With these changes, wildland will still have a net revenue of \$64,992 which does not account for any revenue we will see from the June deployment.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The total budget impact of these adjustments is an increase in revenue of \$807,810 and an increase in expenditures of \$738,818 for a net revenue of \$68,992. This net revenue is primarily from wildland deployments. The actual net revenue from wildland deployments will likely be higher than this but for budget purposes, to ensure that the district does not surpass budget amounts, the wildland deployment budget amounts have been increased conservatively due to the unknown nature of the exact costs that will be incurred through the end of the fiscal year.

**PROPOSED MOTION:**

I move to approve the resolution adjusting the Lone Peak Public Safety District fiscal year 2024-2025 budget as proposed.

Lone Peak PSD

Year-End Budget Adjustments

Fiscal Year 2024-2025

Account Number	Account Name	Fund / Department	Revenue or Expense?	One-time or Ongoing	Approved Budget	Recommended Change	Proposed Adjusted Budget	Description	Funding Source	Date of Board Approval
10-35-20	Grants	Police	Revenue	One-time	\$ 8,000	\$ 9,786	\$ 17,786	Early Intervention, Justice Assistance, DUI, Camera Grants	N/A	N/A
10-35-25	Proceeds from Lease	Police	Revenue	One-time	\$ -	\$ 171,032	\$ 171,032	Proceeds from vehicle lease	N/A	N/A
10-37-05	Utah County	Fire	Revenue	Ongoing	\$ 23,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 73,000	Utah County earnings above budget	N/A	N/A
10-37-11	Charges for Services	Fire	Revenue	Ongoing	\$ 475,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 510,000	Ambulance Revenue above budget	N/A	
10-38-41	Aid Provided to Other Agencies	Wildland Deployment	Revenue	One-time	\$ 35,000	\$ 541,992	\$ 576,992	Revenue from wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A

Total Change in Revenue

\$ 807,810

10-45-35	Grant Expense	Police	Expense	One-time	\$ 8,000	\$ 9,786	\$ 17,786	Grant expenditures higher than budget	Grant Revenue	N/A
10-45-76	Vehicle Replacement	Police	Expense	One-time	\$ -	\$ 171,032	\$ 171,032	Purchase of 3 replacement vehicles	Lease Proceeds	N/A
10-47-11	Overtime Wages/Standby	Fire/EMS	Expense	One-time	\$ 142,155	\$ 120,000	\$ 262,155	Overtime higher than budget	Utah County, charges for services, reduced budget in PT and Holiday Pay	N/A
10-47-12	Part Time Employees	Fire/EMS	Expense	One-time	\$ 320,753	\$ (10,000)	\$ 310,753	Reduced to help cover overtime	N/A	N/A
10-47-13	Holiday Pay	Fire/EMS	Expense	One-time	\$ 76,189	\$ (29,000)	\$ 47,189	Reduced to help cover overtime	N/A	N/A
10-48-10	Wildland Deployment Wages	Wildland Deployment	Expense	One-time	\$ 35,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 335,000	Wages paid for wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A
10-48-14	Wildland Deployment PT Wages	Wildland Deployment	Expense	One-time	\$ -	\$ 11,000	\$ 11,000	PT wages paid to cover in Highland during wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A
10-48-20	Medical Benefits to Wildland	Wildland Deployment	Expense	One-time	\$ -	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500	Medical benefits paid for wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A
10-48-21	Retirement to Wildland	Wildland Deployment	Expense	One-time	\$ -	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500	Retirement benefits paid for wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A
10-48-22	FICA/Medicare to Wildland	Wildland Deployment	Expense	One-time	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	FICA/Medicare paid for wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A
10-48-58	Expense Aid Provided to Other Agencies	Wildland Deployment	Expense	One-time	\$ -	\$ 136,000	\$ 136,000	Supplies and misc. expenses paid for wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A

Total Change in Expense

\$ 738,818

Surplus/(Deficit)

\$ 68,992

**RESOLUTION NO. R-2025-**

**A RESOLUTION OF THE LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT BOARD  
AMENDING THE FISCAL YEAR 2024-2025 BUDGET**

**WHEREAS**, Utah Law allows for the amendment of the budgets of interlocal entities to reflect changes in revenues and expenditures and to make transfers between departments to meet the best interests of the district; and

**WHEREAS**, Lone Peak Public Safety District has complied with the notice and public hearing requirements of Utah Law in considering an amendment of its 2024- 2025 fiscal year budgets; and

**WHEREAS**, the Board of the Lone Peak Public Safety District has determined that an amendment to its fiscal year 2024-2025 budget is in the best interest of the District and its residents and in order for the budget to match the actual revenues and expenditures of the District.

**NOW THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY RESOLVED** that the amended Lone Peak Public Safety District Budget as attached hereto, for the 2024-2025 fiscal year is hereby adopted.

**ADOPTED AND RESOLVED** by the Board of Lone Peak Public Safety District this 11<sup>th</sup> day of June, 2025.

LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT

---

Kim Rodela  
Chair

ATTEST:

---

Stephannie Cottle  
City Recorder



**Lone Peak PSD**  
**Year-End Budget Adjustments**  
**Fiscal Year 2024-2025**

Account Number	Account Name	Fund / Department	Revenue or Expense?	One-time or Ongoing	Approved Budget	Recommended Change	Proposed Adjusted Budget	Description	Funding Source	Date of Board Approval
10-35-20	Grants	Police	Revenue	One-time	\$ 8,000	\$ 9,786	\$ 17,786	Early Intervention, Justice Assistance, DUI, Camera Grants	N/A	N/A
10-35-25	Proceeds from Lease	Police	Revenue	One-time	\$ -	\$ 171,032	\$ 171,032	Proceeds from vehicle lease	N/A	N/A
10-37-05	Utah County	Fire	Revenue	Ongoing	\$ 23,000	\$ 50,000	\$ 73,000	Utah County earnings above budget	N/A	N/A
10-37-11	Charges for Services	Fire	Revenue	Ongoing	\$ 475,000	\$ 35,000	\$ 510,000	Ambulance Revenue above budget	N/A	
10-38-41	Aid Provided to Other Agencies	Wildland Deployment	Revenue	One-time	\$ 35,000	\$ 541,992	\$ 576,992	Revenue from wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A

**Total Change in Revenue \$ 807,810**

10-45-35	Grant Expense	Police	Expense	One-time	\$ 8,000	\$ 9,786	\$ 17,786	Grant expenditures higher than budget	Grant Revenue	N/A
10-45-76	Vehicle Replacement	Police	Expense	One-time	\$ -	\$ 171,032	\$ 171,032	Purchase of 3 replacement vehicles	Lease Proceeds	N/A
10-47-11	Overtime Wages/Standby	Fire/EMS	Expense	One-time	\$ 142,155	\$ 120,000	\$ 262,155	Overtime higher than budget	Utah County, charges for services, reduced budget in PT and Holiday Pay	N/A
10-47-12	Part Time Employees	Fire/EMS	Expense	One-time	\$ 320,753	\$ (10,000)	\$ 310,753	Reduced to help cover overtime	N/A	N/A
10-47-13	Holiday Pay	Fire/EMS	Expense	One-time	\$ 76,189	\$ (29,000)	\$ 47,189	Reduced to help cover overtime	N/A	N/A
10-48-10	Wildland Deployment Wages	Wildland Deployment	Expense	One-time	\$ 35,000	\$ 300,000	\$ 335,000	Wages paid for wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A
10-48-14	Wildland Deployment PT Wages	Wildland Deployment	Expense	One-time	\$ -	\$ 11,000	\$ 11,000	PT wages paid to cover in Highland during wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A
10-48-20	Medical Benefits to Wildland	Wildland Deployment	Expense	One-time	\$ -	\$ 16,500	\$ 16,500	Medical benefits paid for wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A
10-48-21	Retirement to Wildland	Wildland Deployment	Expense	One-time	\$ -	\$ 8,500	\$ 8,500	Retirement benefits paid for wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A
10-48-22	FICA/Medicare to Wildland	Wildland Deployment	Expense	One-time	\$ -	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000	FICA/Medicare paid for wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A
10-48-58	Expense Aid Provided to Other	Wildland Deployment	Expense	One-time	\$ -	\$ 136,000	\$ 136,000	Supplies and misc. expenses paid for wildland deployments	Intergovernmental revenue from aid provided to other agencies	N/A

**Total Change in Expense \$ 738,818**

**Surplus/(Deficit) \$ 68,992**

# LONE PEAK POLICE

Chief Brian J. Gwilliam



## Memorandum

Date: June 9, 2025

To: LPPSD Board Members

From: Chief Brian J. Gwilliam

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Brian J. Gwilliam', is positioned to the right of the 'From' line.

Subject: MOU Utah County Evidence Retention in Misdemeanor Cases

### Request:

The Utah County Attorney, in coordination with the Utah County Sheriff's Office, has proposed that each city within the county sign a Memorandum of Understanding (MOU) regarding the disposal of evidence related to misdemeanor offenses. This MOU is being pursued under the authority granted by Utah State Code 77-11c-202(2)(b), which permits prosecutors and law enforcement agencies to enter into agreements for the disposal of evidence.

### Key Details:

- The proposed MOU aims to create a consistent, county-wide framework for the management and disposal of misdemeanor evidence.
- This initiative is administrative in nature, potentially to ensure compliance with evidence retention standards, improve efficiency, or provide for future shared services.

This issue was initially sent to each city to consider. Given that this matter directly relates to public safety and the handling of misdemeanor evidence, I recommend that the issue be brought before this body for discussion.

### Impact:

The cities of Highland and Alpine and the Lone Peak Police Department have not historically relied on the Utah County Sheriff's Office for evidence collection or retention services.

As such, the practical benefit or operational need for entering into this MOU may be limited for the cities of Highland and Alpine. After reviewing the MOU, there appears to be no harm in signing the agreement. It does not impose new operational obligations, nor does it require the police department to change our current practices. Rather, it provides a framework should coordination with the County ever become necessary in the future.

### Recommendation:

I recommend that the Lone Peak Public Safety Board approve the Chair to sign the MOU regarding the disposal of evidence with the Utah County Sheriffs Office.

**MEMORANDUM OF UNDERSTANDING BETWEEN THE UTAH COUNTY  
SHERIFF’S OFFICE AND \_\_\_\_\_ [City] REGARDING THE RETENTION OF  
EVIDENCE IN MISDEMEANOR CASES**

This Memorandum of Understanding is entered into on the last date listed below between the Utah County Sheriff’s Office (“UCSO”) and \_\_\_\_\_ (“CITY”) regarding the retention and disposition of evidence in misdemeanor cases.

WHEREAS, Utah Code 77-11c-202(3)(b) and 203(7) exempts a law enforcement agency, such as the UCSO, from complying with certain evidence retention requirements set forth in those Sections when the agency and the prosecuting attorney, such as the CITY, enter into a memorandum of understanding; and

WHEREAS, UCSO and CITY desire to enter into this memorandum of understanding for those evidence retention purposes.

NOW THEREFORE, the UCSO and CITY agree as follows:

Upon 60 days after sentencing of a criminal case with no notice of appeal, UCSO may inform the prosecuting attorney for CITY in writing of its intention to dispose of the evidence of that misdemeanor case. Unless the prosecuting attorney notifies the UCSO within 5 business days from receiving UCSO’s notice that the evidence must be retained, the UCSO may dispose of the evidence in accordance with its policies and procedures.

\_\_\_\_\_  
City

\_\_\_\_\_  
Utah County Sheriff

\_\_\_\_\_  
Utah County Commission Chair

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date

\_\_\_\_\_  
Date



## LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT AGENDA REPORT #5

**DATE:** June 11, 2025

**TO:** Lone Peak Public Safety District Board Members

**FROM:** Erin Wells, Executive Director

**SUBJECT: ACTION:** Selection of a Contractor to Facilitate the Discussion of the Fire Financing Formula Contained in the Interlocal Agreement

---

### **PURPOSE:**

The Board will select a firm to facilitate a discussion amongst Alpine and Highland cities regarding a possible change to the fire financing formula in the interlocal agreement.

### **BACKGROUND:**

The Board has recently been discussing the financing formula for the fire department and some board members have expressed a desire to see a change. In the May 14, 2025 board meeting, staff was directed to obtain proposals for hiring a facilitator to guide these conversations.

Staff drafted Request for Proposal and based upon recommendations from other cities, sought bids from 14 different firms. Ultimately, 4 proposals were received.

Some members of the Board and staff met on Monday, June 9 to discuss the proposals. The recommendation was to contract with LRB Public Financial Advisors for the scenario and data analysis piece of this project, but first to work with a retired fire chief to get a better understanding of what factors we should consider in the financing formula. There is a particular individual the group is recommending for this role based on him going through a very similar scenario in a different entity in Utah. At the time of the writing of this report, staff has not been able to speak to him to confirm his willingness to participate, however he was one of the individual's staff discussed the RFP with and while he did not choose to submit a proposal, did previously indicate his willingness to help with the project. Staff was able to speak to LRB about this potential change in plans and they were supportive.

**FISCAL IMPACT:**

The total cost of this study is currently unknown as staff is not sure what/if the retired fire chief will charge for his services. LRB's proposal was for \$13,720, however we do feel like the final cost for their services will be less as their scope of work included things we now hope to work on with the retired fire chief.

As this is a one-time expense, staff recommends the cost be taken from the fund balance of the interlocal. The fund balance at the end of FY25 was approximately \$2.6 million and we do not anticipate using any fund balance in FY26. As such, there is sufficient funding available.

**ATTACHMENTS:**

- Request for Proposals
- LRB's Proposal



# Request For Proposals

## Facilitated Review of Fire Allocation Formula

### Overview

Lone Peak Public Safety District (the District) is seeking to hire a facilitator to guide conversations amongst members of the Governing Board on the potential change of the assessment calculation Alpine and Highland cities pay for fire and emergency medical services.

### Background

The cities of Alpine and Highland have entered into an interlocal agreement to provide joint public safety services including police, fire, and emergency medical response to their residents. The District has existed since 1996 and has undergone changes in services and scope during that time. The most recent version of the interlocal agreement was adopted in August of 2023 and serves as an attachment to this Request for Proposal.

Funding for the District largely comes from direct assessments paid for by the cities. The Board has recently had conversations centered around the formula that calculates the direct assessment for fire and emergency medical services. Per the interlocal agreement, that calculation is as follows:

*The portion of the annual budget for fire, ambulance, or emergency medical services ("EMS"), which is not funded by other sources of revenue, shall be funded by direct assessment and payment from the Cities and shall be calculated as follows. Ten percent (10%) of the annual fire, ambulance, and EMS budget shall be assessed equally among the Cities; this 10% shall be known as the "base rate." Fifty percent (50%) of the remaining fire, ambulance, and EMS budget (45% of the total annual fire, ambulance, and EMS budget) shall be assessed proportionally based on the respective populations of the Cities. Each City's proportionate share of this assessment shall be equal to that City's proportionate share of the population of the District. The population numbers shall be determined by the Management Committee using a calculation based on the US Census, average persons per household, and new building permits, as approved by the Board as part of the*

*Budget. The remaining fifty percent (50%) of the fire, ambulance, and EMS budget (the other 45% of the total) shall be assessed to each City based on Equivalent Residential Units (ERUs) within each City. This assessment shall be calculated by determining the ratio between the number of ERUs within the boundaries of the District and within each City. An ERU is defined as follows:*

- (i) Each residential unit, including apartments or accessory apartments;*
- (ii) Each 10,000 square-foot of retail space; and*
- (iii) Each 10,000 square-foot portion of any other nonresidential structure, excluding buildings accessory to residential units.*

Some members of the Governing Board have recently questioned whether population and ERU's are the proper metrics to use in determining financial impact for fire services and ultimately cost distribution. As such, the District is seeking a facilitator who is knowledgeable in fire department operations and costs to guide a discussion on a potential change to the assessment formula.

### **Proposal Instructions**

Interested parties should submit a brief proposal that outlines the following:

- 1) Knowledge of the fire and emergency medical services particularly around cost allocation or impacts.
- 2) Skill and experience in facilitating a conversation amongst groups of individuals with strong and differing opinions.
- 3) References of similar work.
- 4) A high-level scope proposal including recommended meetings, information to be gathered, and timeline.
- 5) A cost proposal including hourly billable rates.

Parties should submit their proposal by email to the following individuals:

- Brian Patten, Lone Peak Fire Chief  
[bpatten@lonepeakfire.org](mailto:bpatten@lonepeakfire.org)
- Shane Sorenson, Alpine City Administrator  
[ssorensen@alpineut.gov](mailto:ssorensen@alpineut.gov)
- Erin Wells, Highland City Administrator  
[ewells@highlandut.gov](mailto:ewells@highlandut.gov)

Proposals are due by Monday, June 2, 2026 by 5:00PM. Late responses will not be considered.

The primary contact for questions regarding this Request for Proposals is Brian Patten, Lone Peak Fire Chief, [bpatten@lonepeakfire.org](mailto:bpatten@lonepeakfire.org), 801-763-5365.



**Selection**

Members of the Governing Board along with District staff plan to make a recommendation to the full Governing Board for final approval on Wednesday, June 11, 2026.

**Attachment**

Lone Peak Public Safety District Interlocal Agreement



PUBLIC  
FINANCE  
ADVISORS



LONE PEAK  
PUBLIC SAFETY  
DISTRICT

JUNE 2025

**PROPOSAL FOR:**  
FACILITATED REVIEW OF FIRE  
ALLOCATION FORMULA

**PREPARED BY:**



PUBLIC  
FINANCE  
ADVISORS

# PROJECT UNDERSTANDING

---


LRB understands Lone Peak Public Safety District (the District) is seeking to hire a facilitator to guide conversations amongst members of the Governing Board on the potential change of the assessment calculation Alpine and Highland cities pay for fire and emergency medical services. The following highlights our experience and scope.

## FIRM DISCRIPTION

LRB Public Finance Advisors (formerly Lewis Young Robertson & Burningham, inc.) was founded in 1995 to specifically address local governments' unmet needs for unbiased, professional project financing advice. We are an independent municipal financial advisory firm dedicated to providing local governments throughout Utah with innovative, cost-effective financial and consulting solutions for local governments. LRB has engaged in approximately 1,200 different consulting projects over the last ten years and is a registered broker-dealer, a registered Municipal Advisor and is a member of FINRA, MSRB and SIPC.

## LRB TEAM

The Consulting Team includes the following LRB team members.

	<b>LRB Focus:</b> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>▪ Impact Fee Development</li><li>▪ Utility Rate Stuties</li><li>▪ Economic Development</li><li>▪ Land Use Analysis</li><li>▪ Demographic Analysis</li><li>▪ Feasibility Analysis</li><li>▪ Cost/Benefit Analysis</li><li>▪ Tax Increment Analysis</li></ul>	<b>Fred Philpot</b> COO/Vice President	Project Lead/Management (E) Fred@lrbfinance.com
		<b>Logan Loftis</b> Analyst	Analytical Support (E) Logan@lrbfinance.com
		<b>April Greenwood</b> Analyst	Analytical Support (E) April@lrbfinance.com
		<b>Peter Maughan</b> Analyst	Analytical Support (E) Peter@lrbfinance.com



## RELAVENT KNOWLEDGE AND EXPERIENCE

The LRB Team has completed a broad range of feasibility studies, impact fee analysis, rate studies and financial plans. Provided below are a few similar examples along with references that show the breadth of our work and experience.

### 2005-PRESENT SOUTH JORDAN, UT PUBLIC SAFETY IMPACT FEES



LRB has assisted South Jordan prepare impact fees for public safety for the last 10 years. LRB worked with City staff to evaluate levels of service, data and response times, staffing levels, and capital costs in order to develop a defensible impact fee facilities plan. LRB also worked with prominent developers within the community to review all assumptions and findings to ensure a successful public hearing. In addition, LRB worked with the city council to ensure the analysis was understood and achievable. LRB received positive feedback from the developers who attended the public hearing, resulting in the adoption of proposed fees.

**Contact:** Don Tingey, Community Development Director  
(P) 801.254.3742  
(E) [dtingey@sjc.utah.gov](mailto:dtingey@sjc.utah.gov)

### 2018 LONE PEAK PUBLIC SAFETY DISTRICT WITHDRAWAL ANALYSIS

LRB has a detailed understanding of the District's funding formulas and interlocal agreement. The District engaged LRB to evaluate the distribution formula based on the withdrawal of Cedar Hills from the LPPSD. Cedar Hills received fire and EMS services, not police services from the District. Based on the District's existing Interlocal Agreement amended February 23, 2017, LRB completed the following tasks as part of this study:

- With assistance from the District, LRB prepared an inventory of fleet and equipment values.
- LRB determined the value of existing liabilities, including debt and any negative fund balance.
- LRB calculated the value of all contributions of all cities in LPPSD, beginning with the year 1996 and continuing through the year of dissolution and the five-year average proportionate percentage contribution of each member city based on the sum of total contributions. The



five-year average was used to capture a more blended proportionality relative to when the debt was initiated.

- Finally, LRB multiplied the proportionate percentage by the difference between assets and liabilities.

From this calculation, LRB provided a recommendation for redistribution of assets based on the net of all assets and liabilities.



#### ST. GEORGE CITY, UT PUBLIC SAFETY IMPACT FEE STUDIES

LRB completed a public safety impact fee facilities plan and impact fee analysis for all city services in 2020, including public safety. We are currently engaged to complete an update to these studies. We also engaged in several other studies, including business license fee study and development fee studies.

**Contact:** Robert Myers, Budget and Financial Planning Director  
(P) 435.627.4917  
(E) robert.myers@sgcity.org

#### SOUTH DAVIS METRO FIRE FINANCIAL EVALUATION

LRB has worked with South Davis Metro Fire Agency in a variety of capacities. LRB assisted with the 2006, 2012 and 2017 Impact Fee Analysis. We have provided financial advisory services on the 2013 and 2017 revenue bonds. In addition, we have provided financial policy recommendations for the agency. In 2017 LRB completed a tax rate and financial analysis that addressed funding options and allocation of cost between member entities. LRB held regular meetings with representatives from each member entity (Bountiful, Centerville, Davis County, North Salt Lake, West Bountiful & Woods Cross) to discuss the appropriate methodology related to the tax levy that should be assessed by the agency, with consideration of a credit to Bountiful City for past contributions to the Agency.

**Contact:** Gary Hill, Bountiful City Manager  
(P) 801.298.6140  
(E) ghill@bountifulutah.gov



## ADDITIONAL EXPERIENCE

LRB has significant experience with feasibility studies and analysis of municipal services including water, sanitary sewer, storm drain, snow removal, solid waste collection, police, fire, parks, power, transportation, etc. We have assisted communities in identifying the expenditures related to these services, as well as the revenues required to maintain these service levels and adequately cover these expenditures. Provided below are several examples that illustrate our experience with incorporation and revenues and expenditures related to municipal services.

### MUNICIPAL INCORPORATION FEASIBILITY STUDIES

LRB has recently assisted the Lt. Governor's Office complete incorporation feasibility studies for the following communities:

- Kane Creek
- Ogden Valley
- Riddermark
- Spring Lake
- West Hills
- Benson

LRB assisted the Lt. Governor's office navigate complex elements related to the feasibility study, modified feasibility studies, public hearings, property exclusions and boundary adjustments. We believe our familiarity with the process and the staff involved with these studies ensure a defensible analysis and streamlined process.

**Contact:** Jordan Schwanke, Local Entity Specialist, Office of Lieutenant Governor  
(P) 801.538.1041  
(E) [jordanschwanke@utah.gov](mailto:jordanschwanke@utah.gov)



# PROPOSED APPROACH & FEE

---

## SCOPE OF WORK – FACILITATOR FOR FIRE/EMS ASSESSMENT FORMULA DISCUSSIONS

LRB will facilitate structured, informed, and collaborative discussions among the governing board of the Lone Peak Public Safety District regarding potential revisions to the assessment calculation method used to distribute costs for fire and emergency medical services (EMS) between Alpine and Highland cities.

### FACILITATOR RESPONSIBILITIES:

#### 1. PREPARATION AND ORIENTATION

Review the **2023 interlocal agreement** and related historical documentation regarding the District's budget and assessment formula. Meet with District leadership and/or staff to understand the current **budget structure, service delivery model, and assessment methodology**. Understand local context, priorities, and concerns from both Alpine and Highland stakeholders.

#### 2. STAKEHOLDER ENGAGEMENT

Conduct **individual or small group interviews** (as needed) with Board members and relevant city representatives to identify key concerns and desired outcomes. Ensure all relevant voices are acknowledged in preparation for facilitated sessions.

#### 3. FACILITATED WORK SESSIONS

Facilitate **3–5 structured Board work sessions**, each approximately 2–3 hours in duration. Provide **neutral guidance**, encourage respectful dialogue, and ensure a productive discussion atmosphere.

Focus on key decision points, such as:

- Evaluation of current formula (base rate, population, and ERU calculations)
- Potential alternative metrics (e.g., call volume, response times, service demands)
- Financial equity and sustainability
- Legal and operational implications

#### 4. TECHNICAL INSIGHT AND FRAMING

Present or guide discussion around **industry standards and best practices** for fire/EMS cost allocation. Help translate operational and budgetary complexities into accessible decision-making criteria.

#### 5. Provide financial comparison and/or cost/benefit analysis of governance options.

LRB will evaluate the financial impacts of proposed governance options and funding formula changes, as well as proportional allocation of the total fire, ambulance, and/or emergency medical services budget to each entity under proposed options.

#### 6. Documentation and Reporting

Provide clear **summaries of each meeting**, including decisions made, issues raised, and outstanding items.

Deliver a **final facilitation report** that includes:





- A summary of the process
- Key themes and insights
- Any consensus points or areas of divergence
- A summary of findings and changes in formula
- Recommendations for any next steps or further analysis

## ANTICIPATED TIMELINE:

### Estimated Duration: 8–12 weeks

PHASE	TASK	TIMELINE
Week 1–2	Review documents, stakeholder outreach, prep meeting	Initial orientation
Week 3–4	Session 1: Assessment formula overview and concerns	Early facilitation
Week 5–6	Session 2: Metrics evaluation and alternatives	Midpoint
Week 7–8	Session 3: Consensus-building and recommendations	Late-stage
Week 9–10	Optional additional sessions as needed	Contingency
Week 10–11	Financial Evaluation	Late-stage
Week 11–12	Draft and finalize summary report	Completion

## DELIVERABLES:

- Stakeholder engagement summary
- Facilitation plan and meeting agendas
- Meeting summaries (3–5 sessions)
- Final facilitation report with findings and recommendations

## PROPOSED FEES

The estimated price for the services described above is shown in the table below. If selected, LRB will work with the members of the Governing Board and District staff to adjust the proposed fee to best meet your needs. We understand that these types of projects can evolve based on discussions with stakeholders and we will be as flexible as needed to ensure you receive the best service at a reasonable price. This may result in a reduced cost from what is shown below. Costs that exceed the proposed scope will not be assessed until mutually agreed upon.

	DESCRIPTION	PRINCIPAL/SR. VP	SR. ANALYST	TOTAL
	HOURLY RATE	\$200	\$180	
Task 1	Kick-Off Meeting	2.00	2.00	\$760
Task 2	Assessment formula overview and analysis (1 Meeting)	4.00	5.00	\$1,700
Task 3	Alternative metrics evaluation (1 Meeting)	4.00	4.00	\$1,520
Task 4	Consensus building and recommendations (1 Meeting)	4.00	6.00	\$1,880
Task 5	Quantify fiscal impacts of formula changes (1 Meeting)	4.00	12.00	\$2,960
Task 6	Preliminary review with board (1 Meeting)	4.00	4.00	\$1,520
Task 7	Provide revised cost/benefit analysis of governance options	2.00	6.00	\$1,480
Task 8	Prepare final report	2.00	4.00	\$1,120
Task 9	Present findings to board (1 Meeting)	3.00	1.00	\$780
<b>Totals</b>		<b>29.00</b>	<b>44.00</b>	<b>\$13,720</b>

