



Folsom City Council Staff Report

| | |
|------------------------|---|
| MEETING DATE: | 3/12/2024 |
| AGENDA SECTION: | New Business |
| SUBJECT: | Community Development Department Fee Study Workshop |
| FROM: | Community Development Department |

RECOMMENDATION / CITY COUNCIL ACTION

Staff recommends that the City Council take the following actions:

1. Conduct a workshop with Community Development Department (CDD) staff and the public to discuss the CDD Development Processing Fee Study and proposed changes to the CDD fee schedule.
2. Consider public and staff input regarding the proposed development processing fees and provide staff with direction on challenges, concerns or modifications. Staff will review, potentially revise, and return to City Council with an updated fee study and a resolution to adopt an updated CDD Development Processing Fee Schedule at the April 23, 2024 City Council meeting.

BACKGROUND / ISSUE

Generally, issues with the existing Community Development Department (CDD) development processing fee schedule include the following:

1. Staff was unable to fully determine the basis by which the current development processing fees were established.
2. Current fees do not accurately reflect actual staff time and effort spent on the various processes.
3. Over the course of the study, it was determined that the City of Folsom development processing fees are on the low end of what is charged for similar processes regionally.

4. As a new service since the last fee study and update, permit intake, tracking, and plan review are now done electronically, but staff does not have a long-term funding source for necessary equipment and software upgrades as part of the electronic review service.

Reasons for Fee Study

Recognizing the City's goals for Financial Stability and Sustainability through heightened efficiency, increased revenue, and cost recovery (Strategic Goal A, Strategy 1), CDD recognizes the opportunity in doing a comprehensive fee study for processes and services sought by individual parties. In review of the current processing fees, originally adopted by resolution in 2006 and adjusted for inflation in 2020, it was determined that current CDD staff does not have full access to or knowledge of previous formal studies of said fees. Based on that information, it appears a formal study of development processing user and regulatory fees for CDD has not occurred in approximately 17 years. Within that timeframe, significant organizational and industry changes have occurred with profound effects on justifiable fee amounts and structure, as well as cost recovery needs of the City, particularly the General Fund.

Not only have underlying cost drivers changed, but the way in which service is provided has also changed with improved efficiency to streamline practices, technology availability, the regulatory environment, and customer expectations, to name only a few (Strategic Plan Goal B, Strategy 9). Furthermore, the fiscal realities of the City have shifted to a position where many services are expected to fully recover costs to avoid subsidy by constrained general resources needed for uses of broader public benefit. While the City has endeavored to maintain fees annually along the pace of cost inflation, these underlying contributors to cost of service and cost recovery are material to the overall effectiveness of the current fee structure, both in terms of service categories and fee and financial impacts.

As such, CDD retained ClearSource Financial Consulting to perform a comprehensive Development Processing Fee Study. ClearSource has performed several similar studies around the state for jurisdictions of comparable size, including local studies in Lincoln and Roseville. Staff funded this study using Local Early Action Plan (LEAP) grant funding from the California Department of Housing and Community Development via Senate Bill 2 (2017).

Development Processing Fee Issues

CDD consists of three divisions: Planning, Engineering (including the City Arborist/Urban Forester), and Building. The current fee schedule used by CDD does not reflect the time and cost that staff incur in processing permits and projects. For example, as shown in the Cost of Service Analysis included in Appendix B of the attached fee study, Planning fees for appeals, Single-Family Design Reviews and Special Event Permits only cover between 2 to 15 percent of staff time spent on average for each of these processes. On the other hand, new Multi-Family Commercial Design Reviews, Planned Development Permit Modifications and Tentative Map Amendments over-recover costs by between 172 and 249 percent. Similarly, Engineering's fees for Wet Utilities/Service Connections, Dry Utility Annual Permits, Long-Term/Revocable Encroachments and Commercial Landscape Plan Review only recover between 2 to 23 percent of staff time, while short-term encroachment permits and active work zone permit extensions over-recover by 270 percent. In Building, current fees and cost recovery vary depending on project

valuation, but do not reflect average staff time to review plans and process permits. For example, accessory dwelling units only take in a fraction of the fees of a new single-family residence but take a similar amount of staff effort to review, and production home permits take in a low flat fee but are subject to review by several different staff members and departments.

The fee study determined that aggregate cost recovery level for fee-collecting processes is currently 55% for Planning, 83% for Engineering and 84% for Building. The mismatch in fees charged and staff expenditures taken on to review and process permits and projects results in an estimated \$1.3 million deficit in the form of annual General Fund subsidies needed to operate the CDD at full staffing. With limited resources available from the General Fund, CDD is not currently able to retain enough in-house or contract staff to operate at these levels. This results in staff not being able to meet all expected turnaround times, thereby delaying the start of development activities and business operations.

Regionally, the fee study looked at other mid-sized cities in the area (Elk Grove, Rancho Cordova, Rocklin and Roseville) and found that Folsom's existing Planning fees were consistently on the low-end of what is charged in these other jurisdictions. The regional comparison found that existing Building and Engineering plan check and inspections fees were within the mid-range of what is seen in these jurisdictions.

Finally, CDD staff has transitioned to a fully electronic plan check and permit tracking system (currently ComDev/eTrakit and ProjectDox). While the initial costs of implementing these systems and some annual maintenance costs have been previously accounted for, there are currently no long-term funding sources for major periodic maintenance, software updates, or replacement of these systems, nor is there long-term funding to purchase equipment to support these systems as they are upgraded and replaced. In recent budget analysis, it was determined that the costs of these programs for continuing at the current level of service are anticipated to potentially increase significantly and staff notes that it has been common practice in surrounding jurisdictions (including the cities of Roseville and Sacramento) to charge a technology fee as a percentage of the overall building permit fees to help support these technologies long-term. Furthermore, while staff collects a General Plan fee on building permits to help fund major periodic updates to the General Plan, no such fee exists to help fund major periodic Zoning Code updates.

POLICY / RULE

The objectives of the fee study, the methodology used to complete the study, and the formulation of outcomes and recommendations for future consideration were significantly influenced by Article XIIC of the California Constitution, Propositions 218 (1996) and 26 (2010), and Section 66014 of the California Government Code.

Article XIIC states that, *“the local government bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that a levy, charge, or other exaction is not a tax, that the amount is no more than necessary to cover the reasonable costs of the governmental activity, and that the manner in which those costs are allocated to a payor bear a fair or reasonable relationship to the payer’s burdens on, or benefits received from, the governmental activity.”* Additionally, Article XIIC identifies the following development processing fees as items that are not defined as taxes:

- A charge imposed for a specific benefit conferred or privilege granted directly to the payer that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of conferring the benefit or granting the privilege [Art. XIII,C , 1(e)(1)].
- A charge imposed for a specific government service or product provided directly to the payor that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of providing the service or product [Art. XIII,C, 1(e)(2)].
- A charge imposed for the reasonable regulatory costs to a local government for issuing licenses and permits, performing investigations, inspections, and audits, enforcing agricultural marketing orders, and the administrative enforcement and adjudication thereof [Art. XIII,C, 1(e)(3)].

Section 66014(a) of the California Government Code includes the following, “*Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when a local agency charges fees for zoning variances; zoning changes; use permits; building inspections; building permits; ...the processing of maps under the provisions of the Subdivision Map Act...; or planning services...; those fees may not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged, unless a question regarding the amount of the fee charged in excess of the estimated reasonable cost of providing the services or materials is submitted to, and approved by, a popular vote of two-thirds of those electors voting on the issue*”.

The outcomes and recommendations of the fee study are intended to comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws including providing confirmation that the proposed fees (“charges”) recommended as a result of the fee study are not taxes as defined in Article XIIC of the California Constitution and that the proposed fees are no more than necessary to cover the reasonable costs of the City’s activities and services addressed in the fees. Additionally, the fee study intended to show that the manner in which the costs are allocated to a payor bear a fair and reasonable relationship to the payor’s burdens on, or benefits received from the activities and services provided by the City.

ANALYSIS

Key points of the analysis prepared for a modified fee schedule include the following:

1. Most fees are based on an hourly rate for each division of CDD multiplied by the average amount of hours it takes staff to complete the processing and review of the tasks with which the fees are associated.
2. Full recovery of staff time is the baseline goal for development processing fees collected, though some fees have been strategically lowered to less than full cost recovery due to potential long-term benefits encouraging permit compliance and economic development purposes.

3. Flat fees that reflect the costs associated with an “average” permit or project are generally used rather than deposit-based fees given current staffing resources.
4. Staff has provided additional fee types and sub-categories to better capture types of work and costs associated with specific permit and project types, thereby more accurately charging for larger projects and permits while not overcharging for smaller ones.
5. Staff has provided a new technology fee and an updated General Plan/Zoning Code update fee on building permits to help better fund updates to these resources in the long-term.
6. New fee rates were found to be in the range of what is charged by surrounding and comparably sized jurisdictions.
7. Staff reached out to several groups and individuals who could be impacted by the new fee schedule to make them aware of staff’s plan to update fees and invite them to participate in the process, including the presented workshop under this agenda item.
8. Staff is seeking input and direction from Council for any modifications to the proposed fee schedule.

Determining Full Cost of Service

The fee study calculated the estimated reasonable cost of providing various fee-related services across the City organization. Generally, this can be calculated as the product of the composite fully burdened hourly labor rate of the division responsible for providing services and the estimated labor time required to process a typical request for service. The composite fully burdened hourly rates calculated in the fee study are based on the estimated annual hours spent providing fee related services, which include estimated labor, services and supplies, and citywide allocated overhead expenditures, sourced as follows:

- Labor expenditures for in-house personnel were based on budgeted salary and benefits expenditures.
- Contract service personnel and other services and supplies related costs were based on Fiscal Year 2023/24 adopted budgets and anticipated costs.
- Citywide overhead cost allocations were based on the City’s current overhead cost allocation plan.
- Estimated labor time spent providing fee related services were developed based on information from CDD staff and are in-line with typical direct service ratios experienced by the consultant via studies of similar municipalities throughout California. Commonly used industry data also aided in the development of time estimates and proposed fee structures.

ClearSource looked at direct services eligible for user fee methodology, as well as identification during the study of any relevant additions for services performed that are currently without a fee or for under-quantified or ineffectively structured fees. ClearSource then developed a “full cost of service” to represent the maximum limit for fees and cost recovery, inclusive of direct and indirect costs of services from participating agency divisions and centralized agency services.

Modifications to Fee Schedule

Using the full cost of service fees as a baseline, staff identified specific fees to strategically lower below full cost recovery. Almost all of the fees recommended to not obtain full cost recovery come from Planning. While the majority of the Planning fees are still significantly higher than what is currently being charged for the same processes, staff believes that there is value in reducing certain fees to below full cost recovery for a variety of reasons. There are also some additional considerations to be made for potential revisions to current processes that may improve the proposed cost recovery in the future through ministerial changes if deemed appropriate by the City Council. These fees, and the reasoning behind not seeking full cost recovery, include the following:

- Single-family variances and owner-occupied appeals: Less than full cost recovery to not burden a property owner with overly exorbitant costs associated with unique situations on the property on which they reside or are impacted by.
- Minor Design Reviews: Less than full cost recovery to encourage code compliance for property improvements that require these processes. Some minor projects that are subject to these processes could be moved down to staff-level review as part of the Zoning Code update, since a large percentage of these fees is related to staff report preparation and review, public noticing, and staff attendance at meetings related to projects that go before Commission for review.
- Preliminary Project Review and Opinion on a Planning Matter: Less than full cost recovery to encourage early staff involvement in proposed projects and save additional staff and applicant time in the long run by laying out potential project issues early in the process.
- Minor permits for small businesses and neighborhood events: Less than full cost recovery to incentivize compliance with regulations regarding these permits. Only a handful of these permit applications come in each year.
- Landmark Tree classification: Less than full cost recovery to incentivize nominations of eligible trees.
- Special Event Permits: Less than full cost recovery due to the community and economic benefit of events. Staff also added several new fees for larger and/or more time-intensive events to capture typical additional uses of staff time that goes into review of these events.

Even with the proposed reductions from full cost recovery for certain fees, staff recognizes that many of the proposed Planning fees are considerably higher than what is currently being charged for the same process. Staff attributes these significant fee increases to modifications in what is required to go through these Planning processes, including new local, state, and federal laws that complicate and lengthen these processes and a shift in priorities for what processes should be subsidized since the last time the fee schedule was updated in 2006. As mentioned previously, staff recommends that Council take this into consideration during the Zoning Code Update process to determine if certain smaller projects could be moved to a staff-level review, thereby streamlining processes for improved efficiency while reducing the amount of staff time and applicant fees associated with such projects.

The Building Division's modified fee schedule includes restructuring and new tiers and sub-types so fees could more accurately reflect the level of effort that is expected as projects grow in scale and detail. The restructuring and modifications included:

- Introducing flat rate fees for common residential permit types to be more straightforward and easier for staff to provide to the applicant. Staff found this to be consistent with other jurisdictions in the area.
- Proposing lower cost recovery for residential HVAC and water heater change-out permits to promote code compliance. These have been identified as projects for which people often avoid getting a permit. As such, lowering the cost of these types of projects encourages contractors and homeowners to obtain a permit to ensure the work is completed in accordance with the Building Code.
- Restructuring the fees related to subdivision development to align with the amount of staff time utilized for each permit type. Production permits are reviewed by all divisions in Community Development, though the current fee covers less than 1 hour of staff time.
- Revising the current valuation-based portion of the fee schedule to reflect estimated staff time. The cost recovery for valuation-based fees now estimates the same cost recovery percentage for all valuations rather than the existing sliding scale of cost recovery percentage based on valuation.

The Engineering Division also made several specific modifications to the fee schedule to reflect tracked costs associated with the permits and plan checks that they perform. Major proposed modifications include the following:

- Encroachment permits were restructured with the intent to encourage applicants to obtain permits and get the work done as quickly and efficiently as possible. Subcategories of encroachment permits were also added based on length of time and nature of the work which the encroachment will occur.

- Annual permits for general maintenance are proposed to be billed on a time and materials basis, with the initial deposit determined by the City Engineer, based on anticipated scope of work. This is due to the inconsistent level of staff effort for this type of work since it is difficult to predict without knowing the scope of work.
- Landscape review for production homes was changed from being based on valuation of the project to a fixed fee, as the existing valuation method was found to not reflect the detailed tasks and level of effort that goes into reviewing the plans.
- Fees that are primarily for work performed by the Contract City Surveyor were modified to reflect the actual billable rate of the Surveyor plus the overhead taken on for contract administration.
- Currently, a flat rate of \$38 is used for all tree work/removal permits, regardless of the number of trees being removed. The tree removal permit fee structure was completely revamped to ensure that when tree work or minor removal (up to two trees or any “in-decline” tree) on occupied properties is proposed, the fees are kept relatively low, as this does not take a significant amount of staff time to review and code compliance is encouraged. However, for either three or more trees being removed, any tree removal for new construction, or tree work/removal done without a permit, the fees have gone up significantly to reflect the level of staff time it takes to process and review these tasks.

Flat Fees vs. Deposit-Based Fees

Staff considered using mostly deposit-based fees that would reflect the actual staff time spent on each project or permit for Planning and Engineering fees. There are several jurisdictions in the area that utilize deposit-based fees, including Rancho Cordova, Elk Grove and Roseville. However, CDD is not currently set up with the staffing, accounting bookkeeping, and monitoring resources to track both departmental hours and hours from other departments and process the refunds and invoices for the volume of permits and projects that are seen annually. As such, the majority of fees proposed are flat fees. These flat fees were developed based on the estimated time it takes to process an “average” project or permit of that type. Furthermore, the additional fee sub-types and fee schedule restructuring described above help provide a more realistic set of fees that better capture staff time spent processing and reviewing permits and projects.

While deposit-based fees were not deemed feasible for most permits and projects, staff did identify certain more complex projects to be administered using a “time and materials” billing approach. For these fees, staff would collect an initial deposit and bill against that deposit for the costs of outside consultant review and support, and in-house labor efforts, and either request replenishment of funds or refund the unused deposit amount as appropriate. Examples of deposit-based fees include annexation and development agreement processing, environmental (CEQA) review, and annual Engineering permits. Staff has also included “time and materials” fees for costs associated with outside agency review/services, outside expertise related to appeals, and special events that require additional resources beyond those covered in the scope of the fee schedule. These are

considered pass through fees with administrative oversight. If it's the Council's desire to pursue implementing a deposit-based fee structure, additional staffing would be needed to support that effort.

Technology and General Plan/Zoning Code Fees

CDD is proposing a new technology fee to be applied to all building permits. This fee is based on the estimated long-term costs of software and licensing fees, hardware upgrades, implementation, and a ten percent contingency. While a six percent permit fee would recover 100 percent of the estimated cost allocation of the technology updates and maintenance, staff ultimately chose a rate of five percent, which would recover approximately 90 percent of cost allocation. Since Building Permit rates would also increase as part of the updated fee schedules, staff concluded that lowering the technology fee slightly below full cost recovery would be warranted to limit the fee burden of applicants and to be more in alignment with other regional cities of similar size.

CDD is also proposing a modified General Plan and Zoning Code fee to be applied to all building permits. Currently, a fee of three percent of building permit and plan check fees is collected as a General Plan Update fee. However, there is no fee collected for Zoning Code updates or maintenance. The new proposed fee would help fund major periodic General Plan, Housing Element and Zoning Code updates as well as in-house maintenance of these documents. While a nine percent permit fee would recover 100 percent of the estimated cost allocation, staff ultimately chose a rate of five percent, which would recover approximately 55 percent of cost allocation. Staff again chose a lower rate with the intent of not overburdening applicants with additional costs and to stay in line with what is being charged in the region for similar fees.

Comparison to Surrounding Communities

In order to provide the City Council with additional information as it considers potential adjustments to fees, current and proposed fees were compared to amounts collected by other agencies within the region. City policymakers often consider fees established by other regional agencies for similar services when evaluating proposed fees. ClearSource provided comparison information for several fee categories commonly seen from agency to agency in order to give the City Council a reasonable sense of changes expected. These comparisons are included in the tables starting on page 11 of the fee study (provided in Attachment 1). The comparison found that the majority of the proposed fees for Planning and Engineering would put Folsom in the mid-range of comparably sized cities in the region, with only Minor Conditional Use Permits and owner-occupied appeals being in the low range and Major Conditional Use Permits and non-owner-occupied appeals being in the high range. However, because three of these four jurisdictions utilize deposit-based fees, the applicants in those jurisdictions often incur more costs than the number shown on the fee schedule. Since most of the fees proposed in CDD's fee schedule are not deposit-based, applicants would not incur many of these additional costs they can expect to incur in other deposit-based jurisdictions. Staff ultimately determined that the proposed fees were within the range of similar fees charged in the region.

Public Outreach

To ensure that the applicants most likely to be impacted by the modified fee schedule were part of the process, staff reached out to the North State Building Industry Association (BIA), the Folsom Chamber of Commerce and Folsom Historic District Association and presented the proposed fee changes to these groups. Staff also reached out to the CDD’s General Plan and Zoning Code Update groups and users of CDD’s online systems to inform them of the proposed fee updates. Staff also invited each of these groups and individuals to workshop under this agenda item in the event that they wished to participate in the process and provide public comment.

Conclusions and Next Steps

The fee study concluded that the proposed new fees would result in an estimated additional \$1.3 million dollars annually for the General Fund. ClearSource performed a reasonableness test on the proposed fees using historical permit volume to forecast anticipated revenue from the fees. This test confirmed that the forecasted revenue from the fees did not exceed program costs and should therefore be in line with State law. The study recommends monitoring permit and application volume and applicant feedback to determine if any of the fee modifications are resulting in any unanticipated changes in project frequency and to increase the level of detail available for revenue forecasting. The study also recommends that fees should continue to be updated on an annual basis using the Consumer Price Index (CPI) representative of the region, similar to how other fees are administered within the City, and that a comprehensive fee study should be conducted periodically to ensure fee levels remain at or below legal limits and are consistent with evolving practices and local conditions.

In terms of the fee study workshop itself, staff invites City Council and the public to provide input and seeks City Council direction for any modifications to the proposed fee schedule, including whether any fees should be adjusted (as long as adjustments do not result in more than full cost recovery), and if any of the proposed new fee types should be modified or eliminated. CDD staff from each division and ClearSource staff will be available to discuss the details of the fee study and the proposed fee schedule. Staff will then bring forward to Council a resolution to adopt an updated CDD Development Processing Fee Schedule at the April 23, 2024 City Council meeting. If passed, the updated fee schedule will go into effect by July 1, 2024.

ATTACHMENTS

- 1. Development Processing Fee Study, dated February 2024

Submitted,



PAM JOHNS
Community Development Director

ATTACHMENT 1

**DEVELOPMENT PROCESSING FEE STUDY, DATED
FEBRUARY 2024**

CITY OF FOLSOM

FEBRUARY 2024

**DEVELOPMENT PROCESSING
FEE STUDY**



CONTENTS

REPORTING

| <u>Section</u> | <u>Description</u> | <u>Page #</u> |
|----------------|--|---------------|
| 1 | TRANSMITTAL | 1 |
| 2 | EXECUTIVE SUMMARY Overall Findings | 2 |
| 3 | PROJECT OVERVIEW Scope and Guidance | 6 |
| 4 | IMPLEMENTATION Considerations for Implementation | 10 |

APPENDICES

| <u>Appendix</u> | <u>Description</u> |
|-----------------|--------------------------|
| A | REGIONAL FEE COMPARISON |
| B | COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS |
| C | PROPOSED FEES |



February 2024

CITY OF FOLSOM

Attn: Pam Johns, Community Development Director
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630

DEVELOPMENT PROCESSING FEE STUDY

Dear Ms. Johns:

ClearSource Financial Consulting submits the following report describing the findings of our preparation of a User and Regulatory Fee Study for the City of Folsom.

Please refer to the Executive Summary for the key findings of the analysis and estimated impacts to City funds. The balance of the report and its appendices provide the necessary documentation to support those outcomes.

Thank you for the opportunity to serve the City on this topic. We are happy to continue discussion on this study as the need arises or consult with you on additional topics.

Sincerely,

A handwritten signature in blue ink, appearing to read "Terry Madsen".

TERRY MADSEN, PRESIDENT | CLEARSOURCE FINANCIAL CONSULTING

PHONE: 831.288.0608

EMAIL: TMADSEN@CLEARSOURCEFINANCIAL.COM

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

STUDY OVERVIEW

The City of Folsom provides many services to ensure safe, orderly and aesthetically pleasing development and construction within the City. The broad categories of these services include, but are not limited to, project entitlement review, improvement plan check, map check, permits (building, grading, encroachment and driveway), and land action review (i.e. dedications, parcel mergers and lot line adjustments). User fees and regulatory fees are the mechanism by which the City may recoup a portion of or all of the costs associated with these services.

The City of Folsom has completed a **User and Regulatory Fee Study**. California cities regularly conduct these studies to justify fee amounts imposed and to optimize the overall portfolio of revenues available to the municipality to fund its services.

Industry practice and fiscal conditions in the state have led most cities to link cost recovery for services of individual action, cause, or benefit to that same individual through user fee revenue, relieving the agency's general revenues as much as possible for use toward services of broader community benefit.

USER AND REGULATORY FEES

Cities derive annual revenue from a number of sources. These include, but are not limited to, property taxes, sales taxes, license fees, franchise fees, fines, rents, and user and regulatory fees. **User and regulatory fees are intended to cover all, or a portion of, the costs incurred by the City for providing fee-related services and activities that are not otherwise provided to those not paying the fee.**

California law provides guidance regarding the amounts the City may charge for fee-related services and activities. Specifically, in order to avoid being considered taxes, the **fees charged shall not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the services**, activities, or materials for which fees are charged.

COST RECOVERY POLICY AND PRACTICE

Recovering the costs of providing fee-related services directly influences the City's fiscal health and increases the City's ability to meet the service level expectations of fee payers.

The services for which the City imposes a user or regulatory fee typically derive from an individual person or entity's action, request, or behavior. Therefore, except in cases where there is an overwhelming public benefit generated by the City's involvement in the individual action, **a fee for service ensures that the individual bears most, if not all, of the cost incurred by the City to provide that service.** When a fee targets "100% or full cost recovery," the individual bears the entirety of the cost. When a fee targets less than full cost recovery, another City revenue source – in most cases, the General Fund – subsidizes the individualized activity.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

FINDINGS AND PROPOSED ACTION

During the course of study, information and analysis was generated and is discussed substantively throughout this report and its technical appendices. However, summarized in the following findings statements by broad fee category, are outcomes and proposals of particular interest to City policymakers.

Building Fees

- Current fees recover less than the City's full cost of providing fee-related services.
 - The Division collects approximately \$2,845,000 annually in fee revenues. Fee-related expenditures are anticipated to be approximately \$3,385,000. This results in an aggregate cost recovery level of 84% and a General Fund subsidy of approximately \$540,000.
 - Full cost recovery is targeted for most building fees with exceptions for minor permits for residential HVAC change-out and water heater change-outs.

Planning Fees

- Current fees recover less than the City's full cost of providing fee-related services.
 - The Division collects approximately \$435,000 annually in fee revenues. Fee-related expenditures are approximately \$785,000. This results in an aggregate cost recovery level of 55% and a General Fund subsidy of approximately \$350,000.
- Staff is recommending adjustments to most fees to target full cost recovery. Exceptions to full cost recovery include certain appeals, minor reviews, permitting for certain temporary uses, etc.:
 - Owner-occupied Appeal
 - Minor Design Review
 - Entertainment Permitting
 - Landmark Tree Classification
 - Opinion on a Planning Matter
 - Sidewalk Vendor Permit
 - Special Event Permitting
 - Temporary Outdoor Dining Permit
 - Variance for Single Family Dwelling

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Land Development Engineering Fees and Encroachment Permit Fees

- Current fees recover less than the City's full cost of providing fee-related services. Many of the City's current fees are fixed at amounts that reflect less than the City's cost of providing services (examples include, but are not limited to, tree permitting and landscape plan review).
 - The Division collects approximately \$2,400,000 annually in fee revenues. Fee-related expenditures are approximately \$2,880,000. This results in an aggregate cost recovery level of 83% and a General Fund subsidy of approximately \$480,000.
- Recalibrate fees to encourage cost recovery of City staff and outside service provider costs.
- Full cost recovery is targeted from engineering and encroachment permit fees.

Deposit-Based Planning and Engineering Fees (i.e., Time & Materials Billings)

- Fees for some of the City's more complex planning and land development review projects are proposed to be administered using a "time and materials" billing approach. The City will collect an initial deposit and bill against that deposit for the costs of outside consultant review and support, and in-house labor efforts. If the deposit is drawn down before project completion, staff contacts the applicant to request replenishment of funds. If deposit amounts remain at the completion of the project, the applicant is refunded the unused deposit amount. Comprehensive tracking and billing for deposit-based projects should billing for project time such as:
 - Intake and Initial Processing and Review
 - Initial Meetings
 - Project Correspondence
 - Multiple Rounds of Review
 - Report Preparation
 - Decision Making, Meeting Preparation
 - Project Close-Out and Documentation Actions

Regional Fee Comparison

- Similar fees are collected by communities throughout the region and the State. The proposed fee amounts do not exceed the City's cost of service and are in-range of amounts charged by other jurisdictions. Regional fee comparison information is included in Appendix A of this report.

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

Additional Cost Recovery from Proposed Adjustments to Fees

- The enhanced cost recovery anticipated from the proposed changes included in the fee schedule update is **\$1,300,000**.

Fairly allocating costs to the services provided and recovering some, or all, of these costs from service recipients creates value and predictability for City customers and reimburses the City for services provided to a single party, as compared to the public at large. Collecting fees for services:

- ➔ Increases the availability of General Fund revenues to be used for services and activities available to all residents and businesses, such as public safety and public works services.
- ➔ Helps meet fee-payer service level expectations by collecting fees to fund the existing level of services provided.

Please continue to the following technical report and appendices for further discussion of this User and Regulatory Fee Study.

PROJECT ORIENTATION

SCOPE OF STUDY

The City of Folsom has completed a **User and Regulatory Fee Study**, which represents an external review of prevailing practices and development of an updated **Schedule of User Fees and Charges**. ClearSource Financial Consulting has prepared this analysis during Fiscal Year 2023/24 and will be available to answer questions as the City proceeds in implementing findings as it chooses.

Key tasks expected by the City from this study included the following:

- ➔ Review eligible fee-related services citywide to establish the reasonable relationship between current fees for service and the underlying costs of service.
- ➔ Calculate the full cost of service, including estimated citywide overhead costs.
- ➔ Recommend fees to be charged for each service.
- ➔ Recommend cost recovery strategies and best practices in setting fees, while considering the complexities and demands of responsible programs or departments.
- ➔ Identify underlying billable rates for cost recovery opportunities and as the basis for user fees.
- ➔ Maintain a thoroughly documented analysis to ensure compliance with Proposition 26, and other statutes, as applicable.

DIRECT SERVICES UNDER REVIEW

Fee Categories

City fees under review in this project focused on direct services eligible for user fee methodology, as listed in the City's published fee schedules. Additionally, the project was tasked with identifying any relevant additions for services performed without a fee or for under-quantified or ineffectively structured fees. Current services shown in the City's various prevailing fee schedules and addressed in this study are summarized as follows:

- ➔ **Planning** – Services include entitlement review and permitting.
- ➔ **Engineering** – Services include encroachment permitting, development plan review and inspection.
- ➔ **Building** – Building plan review, permitting, and inspection for construction and sub-trades.

PROJECT ORIENTATION

REASON FOR STUDY

Cities derive annual revenue from a number of sources. These include, but are not limited to, property taxes, sales taxes, franchise fees, fines, rents, and user and regulatory fees. User and regulatory fees are intended to cover all, or a portion of, the costs incurred by a city for providing fee-related services and activities that are not otherwise provided to those not paying the fee.

California cities regularly conduct fee studies to justify fee amounts imposed and to optimize the overall body of revenues available to the municipality to fund its services. Widespread industry practice and fiscal conditions in the state have led most cities to link cost recovery for services of individual action, cause, or benefit to that individual through user fee revenue, relieving the agency's general revenues for services of broader community benefit.

PREVAILING GUIDANCE

The objectives of this study, the methodology used to complete the study, and the formulation of outcomes and recommendations for future consideration were significantly influenced by Article 13C of the California Constitution and Section 66014 of the California Government Code.

Article 13C states that the local government bears the burden of proving by a preponderance of the evidence that a levy, charge, or other exaction is not a tax, that the amount is no more than necessary to cover the reasonable costs of the governmental activity, and that the manner in which those costs are allocated to a payer bear a fair or reasonable relationship to the payer's burdens on, or benefits received from, the governmental activity. Additionally, Article 13C identifies the following as items that are not defined as taxes:

- A charge imposed for a specific benefit conferred or privilege granted directly to the payer that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of conferring the benefit or granting the privilege.
- A charge imposed for a specific government service or product provided directly to the payer that is not provided to those not charged, and which does not exceed the reasonable costs to the local government of providing the service or product.
- A charge imposed for the reasonable regulatory costs to a local government for issuing licenses and permits, performing investigations, inspections, and audits, enforcing agricultural marketing orders, and the administrative enforcement and adjudication thereof.
- A charge imposed for entrance to or use of local government property, or the purchase, rental, or lease of local government property.
- A fine, penalty, or other monetary charge imposed by the judicial branch of government or a local government, as a result of a violation of law.
- A charge imposed as a condition of property development.

PROJECT ORIENTATION

- Assessments and property-related fees imposed in accordance with the provisions of Article XIII D.

Section 66014(a) of the California Government Code includes the following, “Notwithstanding any other provision of law, when a local agency charges fees for zoning variances; zoning changes; use permits; building inspections; building permits; ...the processing of maps under the provisions of the Subdivision Map Act...; or planning services...; those fees may not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged, unless a question regarding the amount of the fee charged in excess of the estimated reasonable cost of providing the services or materials is submitted to, and approved by, a popular vote of two-thirds of those electors voting on the issue.

The outcomes and recommendations of the study are intended to comply with applicable federal, state, and local laws including providing confirmation that the proposed fees (“charges”) recommended as a result of this study are not taxes as defined in Article 13C of the California Constitution and that the proposed fees are no more than necessary to cover the reasonable costs of the City’s activities and services addressed in the fees. Additionally, this report is intended to show that the manner in which the costs are allocated to a payer bear a fair and reasonable relationship to the payer’s burdens on, or benefits received from the activities and services provided by the City.

METHODOLOGY AND DATA SOURCES

This study calculated the estimated reasonable cost of providing various fee-related services across the City organization. Generally, the estimated reasonable cost of providing the fee-related services and activities examined in this study can be calculated as the product of the composite fully-burdened hourly labor rate of the division responsible for providing services and the estimated labor time required to process a typical request for service.

The composite fully-burdened hourly rates calculated in this study are based on the estimated annual hours spent providing fee related services, and estimated labor, services and supplies, and citywide overhead expenditures, sourced as follows:

- Labor expenditures for in-house personnel were based on budgeted salary and benefits expenditures.
- Contract service personnel and other services and supplies related costs were based on Fiscal Year 2023/24 adopted budgets and anticipated costs.
- Citywide overhead cost allocations were based on the City’s current overhead cost allocation plan.
- Estimated labor time spent providing fee related services were developed based on interviews with City staff and are in-line with typical direct service ratios experienced by the consultant via studies of similar municipalities throughout California. Commonly used industry data also aided in the development of time estimates and proposed fee structures.

Once cost of service levels are identified, the City may use this information to inform targeted cost recovery from fees. Fees set at the cost-of-service target full cost recovery. Fees set at any amount less than the cost-of-service target less than full cost recovery.

PROJECT ORIENTATION

An illustration of the methods used in this analysis is shown in [Exhibit 2](#).

EXHIBIT 2 | STEPS IN ANALYZING COSTS OF SERVICE AND USER FEES

| COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS – PROCESS AND METHODS | | |
|--|-----------------------------|---|
| 1 | ANNUAL LABOR TIME | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ IDENTIFY ANNUAL HOURS SPENT PROVIDING FEE SERVICES FOR EACH PARTICIPATING DIVISION ➤ INFORMATION IS DEVELOPED AND TESTED USING A COMBINATION OF INTERVIEWS, QUESTIONNAIRES, HISTORICAL PROJECT INFORMATION, AND HISTORICAL REVENUE INFORMATION |
| 2 | ANNUAL EXPENDITURES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ IDENTIFY ANNUAL COST OF PROVIDING FEE SERVICES FOR EACH PARTICIPATING DIVISION ➤ INFORMATION IS DEVELOPED AND TESTED USING A COMBINATION OF INFORMATION FOUND IN THE CITY'S ADOPTED BUDGET, EXPENDITURE HISTORY, AND THE OVERHEAD COST PLAN. |
| 3 | FULLY BURDENED HOURLY RATES | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CALCULATE THE ESTIMATED FULLY BURDENED HOURLY RATE USING INFORMATION FROM STEPS 1 AND 2 |
| 4 | SERVICE/ACTIVITY LABOR TIME | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ ESTIMATE LABOR TIME REQUIRED TO PROCESS INDIVIDUAL REQUEST FOR SERVICE ➤ INFORMATION IS DEVELOPED AND TESTED USING A COMBINATION OF INTERVIEWS, QUESTIONNAIRES, COMMONLY USED MEASURES, AND INFORMATION DEVELOPED IN STEP 1 |
| 5 | UNIT COST OF SERVICE | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CALCULATE THE ESTIMATED COST OF SERVICE USING INFORMATION FROM STEPS 3 AND 4 |
| 6 | CURRENT COST RECOVERY | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ CALCULATE CURRENT COST RECOVERY LEVEL FOR A SPECIFIC SERVICE |
| 7 | TARGETED COST RECOVERY | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ USE LAWS, INDUSTRY STANDARDS, GOALS AND POLICIES, AND HISTORICAL TRENDS TO DETERMINE TARGETED COST RECOVERY |
| 8 | TEST FOR REASONABLENESS | <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ➤ TEST TO CONFIRM FORECAST REVENUE FROM FEES WILL NOT EXCEED PROGRAM COSTS ➤ USE HISTORICAL PERMIT VOLUME AND PROPOSED FEES TO FORECAST ANTICIPATED REVENUE FROM FEES ➤ FORECASTED REVENUES SHOULD NOT EXCEED PROGRAM COSTS |

IMPLEMENTATION

CONSIDERATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

If the City decides to adopt or otherwise utilize outcomes generated through this study, it should:

- **Update Systems for Fee Outcomes** – Ensure that City staff begin using updated fees and associated outcomes once the updated schedule of fees becomes effective. Values should be included in all official fee schedules used throughout the City (e.g., departmental pamphlets, counter schedules, and online information). Additionally, ensure collections processes are updated, which may include coding in billing systems and training for personnel who handle fees directly with the public.
- **Actively Monitor the Use of Fees** – In order to recover accurate and eligible amounts expected, the City should be diligent about tracking time to projects for time and materials billings and ensuring fees are applied in the correct amount and using the correct and intended basis for fixed fee billings.
- **Monitor Feedback and Permit Statistics** – Monitor permit and application volume and applicant feedback to determine if fee modifications are resulting in any unanticipated changes in project frequency and to increase the level of detail available for revenue forecasting.
- **Annually Review and Adjust Fee Values** – In order to generally maintain pace with regional cost inflation and/or the City's salary cost inflation, the City should adjust its fees on an annual basis. A commonly used, reasonable inflation index is the annual change in the all-urban Consumer Price Index (CPI) representative of the region.
- **Periodically Perform Comprehensive Analysis** – A comprehensive fee study should be conducted periodically (e.g., every three to five years) to ensure fee levels remain at or below legal limits and are consistent with evolving service practices and local conditions.

APPENDIX A

REGIONAL FEE COMPARISON

In order to provide the City Council with additional information as it considers potential adjustments to fees, current and proposed fees were compared to amounts collected by other agencies within the region. City policymakers often consider fees established by other regional agencies for similar services when evaluating proposed fees.

The City of Folsom, consistent with other cities throughout the State, has an existing fee schedule that contemplates hundreds of potential unique requests for service. This can result in thousands of fee scenarios when comparing among multiple agencies. Consequently, an exhaustive comparison of the hundreds, and potentially thousands of scenarios is unrealistic. Instead, comparison information for several fee categories commonly seen from agency to agency are provided in order to provide City Council with a reasonable sense of changes expected.

For Folsom, outcomes will show that new fees may range from low, mid, to upper end of regional fee spectrum depending on the service provided. This is common among municipalities due to differing levels of service and review included among various fee categories.

Planning Fee Comparison

| Fee Description | Folsom - Current | Folsom - Proposed | Folsom - Current Fee | Folsom - Proposed Fee | Elk Grove | Rancho Cordova | Rocklin | Roseville |
|------------------------|------------------|--------------------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-----------------------------|
| Annexation | Low End | Mid-Range | \$5,641 | \$17,000 Deposit | \$18,800 | | \$17,949 | \$20,000 Deposit |
| Appeal | Low End | Low to Upper Range | \$251 - \$502 | \$1,700 - \$6,800 | \$2,500 - \$5,000 Deposit | \$2,590 - \$4,383 | \$4,257 - \$4,902 | \$2,080 - \$5,530 |
| Variance - SFR / Admin | Low End | Mid-Range | \$1,643 | \$2,500 | \$6,000 Deposit | \$10,000 Deposit | \$2,578 | \$1,530 |
| Variance - All Other | Low End | Mid-Range | \$1,643 | \$5,100 | \$6,000 Deposit | \$10,000 Deposit | \$6,948 | \$5,124 |
| Zone Change | Low End | Mid-Range | \$2,928 - \$5,847 | \$10,000 - \$13,000 | \$1,000 Deposit | \$15,000 Deposit | \$13,573 | \$10,000 - \$17,000 Deposit |
| General Plan Amendment | Low End | Mid-Range | \$4,272 - \$8,544 | \$10,000 - \$13,000 | \$1,000 Deposit | \$15,000 Deposit | \$14,209 | \$10,000 - \$17,000 Deposit |
| Conditional Use Permit | Low End | Low-Mid Range Depending on CUP | \$2,749 - \$5,798 | \$2,500 - \$5,100 | \$5,000 - \$10,000 Deposit | \$10,000 Deposit | \$6,480 - \$13,940 | \$9,000 Deposit |

APPENDIX A

Engineering Fee Comparison

| Fee Description | Folsom - Current | Folsom - Proposed | Folsom - Current Fee | Folsom - Proposed Fee | Elk Grove | Rancho Cordova | Rocklin | Roseville |
|---|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------|----------------|---------|-----------|
| Engineering Plan Check and Inspection Improvement Value Up to \$100K | Mid-Range | Mid-Range | 6% - 7% | 8% | 10.5% - 18% | 7% | 21% | 5% |
| Engineering Plan Check and Inspection Improvement Value \$100K - \$200K | Mid-Range | Mid-Range | 5% | 6.40% | 8.5% - 10% | 5% | 11% | 5% |
| Engineering Plan Check and Inspection Improvement Value \$200K - \$1M | Mid-Range | Mid-Range | 2% - 4% | 3.6% - 4.8% | 6% - 8.5% | 2% - 4% | 6% - 8% | 5% |

Building Fee Comparison

| Fee Description | Folsom - Current | Folsom - Proposed | Folsom - Current Fee | Folsom - Proposed Fee | Rancho Cordova | Rocklin | Roseville |
|---|------------------|-------------------|----------------------|-----------------------|-------------------------|---------|-------------------------|
| Building Permit for \$25,000 Project | Mid-Range | Mid-Range | \$330 | \$360 | \$375 | \$456 | \$158 |
| Building Permit for \$50,000 Project | Mid-Range | Mid-Range | \$530 | \$630 | \$600 | \$751 | \$757 |
| Building Permit for \$100,000 Project | Mid-Range | Mid-Range | \$880 | \$1,080 | \$1,050 | \$1,158 | \$1,162 |
| Building Permit for \$500,000 Project | Mid-Range | Mid-Range | \$3,280 | \$3,960 | varies (res v. non-res) | \$3,697 | varies (res v. non-res) |
| Building Permit for \$1,000,000 Project | Mid-Range | Mid-Range | \$6,030 | \$7,200 | \$7,511 | \$6,417 | \$6,180 |

* Fee amounts shown are for illustrative purposes. Actual fees collected will vary depending on services reviewed (e.g., new construction, plumbing, mechanical, electrical, structural, general plan update, technology fees, etc.). Amounts are intended to illustrate patterns and order of magnitude.

APPENDIX B

COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS



CITY OF
FOLSOM
DISTINCTIVE BY NATURE

User and Regulatory Fees

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

DRAFT

City of Folsom

Cost of Service Analysis

| Description | Page |
|---|------|
| Cost of Service Allocation - Community Development Administration | 3 |
| <hr/> | |
| Cost of Service Calculations | |
| Planning | 5 |
| Engineering and Encroachment Permits | 18 |
| Building | 27 |
| General Plan / Zoning Code Update | 37 |
| Development Specific Technology Enhancements / Land Management Tracking | 39 |
| <hr/> | |
| Cost Allocation - Citywide Overhead | 41 |
| <hr/> | |

User and Regulatory Fees

Cost of Service Calculations

Community Development - Administration

DRAFT

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Allocation of Divisional Expenses - Community Development - Administration

Allocation of In-House Labor

| Description | Building | Code Enforcement | Engineering | Planning | Total | Notes |
|------------------------------|----------|------------------|-------------|----------|-------|-------|
| Allocation of In-House Labor | 46% | 8% | 25% | 21% | 100% | [a] |
| FTE | 11 | 2 | 6 | 5 | 24 | [a] |

Recurring Expenditures

| Description | Total | Adjustments | Total |
|----------------------------|-------------------|--------------------|-------------------|
| Salaries - Permanent | \$ 360,290 | \$ - | \$ 360,290 |
| Annual Leave Account | \$ 5,197 | \$ - | \$ 5,197 |
| FICA | \$ 29,650 | \$ - | \$ 29,650 |
| PERS | \$ 139,520 | \$ - | \$ 139,520 |
| Deferred Comp - City Paid | \$ 16,095 | \$ - | \$ 16,095 |
| Automobile Allowance | \$ 6,000 | \$ - | \$ 6,000 |
| Combined Benefits | \$ 55,022 | \$ - | \$ 55,022 |
| Printing | \$ 4,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,000 |
| Dues & Publications | \$ 5,500 | \$ - | \$ 5,500 |
| Advertising | \$ 7,500 | \$ - | \$ 7,500 |
| Rents | \$ 55,500 | \$ - | \$ 55,500 |
| Training & Education | \$ 17,500 | \$ - | \$ 17,500 |
| Postage | \$ 358 | \$ - | \$ 358 |
| Telephone | \$ 2,500 | \$ - | \$ 2,500 |
| Cellular | \$ 10,000 | \$ - | \$ 10,000 |
| Internet | \$ 5,500 | \$ - | \$ 5,500 |
| Travel and Meetings | \$ 2,000 | \$ - | \$ 2,000 |
| Contracts | \$ 5,000 | \$ (5,000) | \$ - |
| Contracts - Pre Employment | \$ 500 | \$ - | \$ 500 |
| Vehicle Maintenance | \$ 4,000 | \$ - | \$ 4,000 |
| Equipment Maintenance | \$ 200 | \$ - | \$ 200 |
| Advisory | \$ 10,000 | \$ (10,000) | \$ - |
| Computer - Hardware | \$ 17,000 | \$ - | \$ 17,000 |
| Computer - Software | \$ 5,000 | \$ - | \$ 5,000 |
| Computer - License & Mtn | \$ 22,614 | \$ - | \$ 22,614 |
| Office Supplies | \$ 5,000 | \$ - | \$ 5,000 |
| Departmental Supplies | \$ 11,000 | \$ - | \$ 11,000 |
| Petroleum Supplies | \$ 7,533 | \$ - | \$ 7,533 |
| Insurance / Liability | \$ 18,824 | \$ - | \$ 18,824 |
| Subtotal | \$ 828,803 | \$ (15,000) | \$ 813,803 |

| Description | Code | | | | Total | Notes |
|----------------------------|-------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------|-------------------|---------|
| | Building | Enforcement | Engineering | Planning | | |
| Salaries - Permanent | \$ 165,133 | \$ 30,024 | \$ 90,073 | \$ 75,060 | \$ 360,290 | [b] |
| Annual Leave Account | \$ 2,382 | \$ 433 | \$ 1,299 | \$ 1,083 | \$ 5,197 | [b] |
| FICA | \$ 13,590 | \$ 2,471 | \$ 7,413 | \$ 6,177 | \$ 29,650 | [b] |
| PERS | \$ 63,947 | \$ 11,627 | \$ 34,880 | \$ 29,067 | \$ 139,520 | [b] |
| Deferred Comp - City Paid | \$ 7,377 | \$ 1,341 | \$ 4,024 | \$ 3,353 | \$ 16,095 | [b] |
| Automobile Allowance | \$ 2,750 | \$ 500 | \$ 1,500 | \$ 1,250 | \$ 6,000 | [b] |
| Combined Benefits | \$ 25,218 | \$ 4,585 | \$ 13,756 | \$ 11,463 | \$ 55,022 | [b] |
| Printing | \$ 1,833 | \$ 333 | \$ 1,000 | \$ 833 | \$ 4,000 | [b] |
| Dues & Publications | \$ 2,521 | \$ 458 | \$ 1,375 | \$ 1,146 | \$ 5,500 | [b] |
| Advertising | \$ 3,438 | \$ 625 | \$ 1,875 | \$ 1,563 | \$ 7,500 | [b] |
| Rents | \$ 25,438 | \$ 4,625 | \$ 13,875 | \$ 11,563 | \$ 55,500 | [b] |
| Training & Education | \$ 8,021 | \$ 1,458 | \$ 4,375 | \$ 3,646 | \$ 17,500 | [b] |
| Postage | \$ 164 | \$ 30 | \$ 90 | \$ 75 | \$ 358 | [b] |
| Telephone | \$ 1,146 | \$ 208 | \$ 625 | \$ 521 | \$ 2,500 | [b] |
| Cellular | \$ 4,583 | \$ 833 | \$ 2,500 | \$ 2,083 | \$ 10,000 | [b] |
| Internet | \$ 2,521 | \$ 458 | \$ 1,375 | \$ 1,146 | \$ 5,500 | [b] |
| Travel and Meetings | \$ 917 | \$ 167 | \$ 500 | \$ 417 | \$ 2,000 | [b] |
| Contracts | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | [b];[c] |
| Contracts - Pre Employment | \$ 229 | \$ 42 | \$ 125 | \$ 104 | \$ 500 | [b] |
| Vehicle Maintenance | \$ 1,833 | \$ 333 | \$ 1,000 | \$ 833 | \$ 4,000 | [b] |
| Equipment Maintenance | \$ 92 | \$ 17 | \$ 50 | \$ 42 | \$ 200 | [b] |
| Advisory | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | \$ - | [b];[c] |
| Computer - Hardware | \$ 7,792 | \$ 1,417 | \$ 4,250 | \$ 3,542 | \$ 17,000 | [b] |
| Computer - Software | \$ 2,292 | \$ 417 | \$ 1,250 | \$ 1,042 | \$ 5,000 | [b] |
| Computer - License & Mtn | \$ 10,365 | \$ 1,885 | \$ 5,654 | \$ 4,711 | \$ 22,614 | [b] |
| Office Supplies | \$ 2,292 | \$ 417 | \$ 1,250 | \$ 1,042 | \$ 5,000 | [b] |
| Departmental Supplies | \$ 5,042 | \$ 917 | \$ 2,750 | \$ 2,292 | \$ 11,000 | [b] |
| Petroleum Supplies | \$ 3,453 | \$ 628 | \$ 1,883 | \$ 1,569 | \$ 7,533 | [b] |
| Insurance / Liability | \$ 8,628 | \$ 1,569 | \$ 4,706 | \$ 3,922 | \$ 18,824 | [b] |
| Subtotal | \$ 372,993 | \$ 67,817 | \$ 203,451 | \$ 169,542 | \$ 813,803 | |
| | 46% | 8% | 25% | 21% | 100% | |

[a] Based on feedback received from Community Development Department. Amounts intended to serve as reasonable estimates. Allocated based on divisional FTE.

[b] Source: FY 23/24 adopted budget.

[c] Adjustment to exclude non-fee related expenses.

User and Regulatory Fees

Cost of Service Calculations

Planning

DRAFT

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Allocation of Annual Labor Effort - Planning

Authorized Staffing

| Position | FTE | Total Hours Per FTE | Less: Holiday & Leave | Hours Per FTE | Productive Hours | Indirect | Direct | Total | Indirect Hours | Total Direct Hours | Total Hours | Notes |
|--|-------------|------------------------|--------------------------|------------------|---------------------|----------|--------|-------|-------------------|-----------------------|--------------|---------|
| Planner I (Assistant) / Planner II (Associate) | 2.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 3,728 | 20% | 80% | 100% | 746 | 2,982 | 3,728 | [a];[b] |
| Planning Manager | 1.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 1,864 | 40% | 60% | 100% | 746 | 1,118 | 1,864 | [a];[b] |
| Principal Planner | 1.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 1,864 | 25% | 75% | 100% | 466 | 1,398 | 1,864 | [a];[b] |
| Senior Planner | 1.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 1,864 | 20% | 80% | 100% | 373 | 1,491 | 1,864 | [a];[b] |
| Total | 5.00 | | | | 9,320 | | | | 2,330 | 6,990 | 9,320 | |
| Total | | | | | | | | | 25% | 75% | 100% | |

[a] Staffing based on FY 23/24 adopted budget

[b] Allocation of hours intended to serve as reasonable estimate. Amount may vary from year-to-year and position to position.

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Allocation of Divisional Expenses - Planning

Recurring Divisional Expenditures [a]

| Description | Total | Adjustments | Total | Notes |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------|
| Salaries - Permanent | \$ 598,437 | \$ - | \$ 598,437 | |
| Annual Leave Account | \$ 8,513 | \$ - | \$ 8,513 | |
| FICA | \$ 47,441 | \$ - | \$ 47,441 | |
| PERS | \$ 237,225 | \$ - | \$ 237,225 | |
| Deferred Comp - City Paid | \$ 13,200 | \$ - | \$ 13,200 | |
| Combined Benefits | \$ 90,503 | \$ - | \$ 90,503 | |
| Contracts | \$ 125,000 | \$ (125,000) | \$ - | [b] |
| Insurance / Liability | \$ 37,648 | \$ - | \$ 37,648 | |
| Subtotal | \$ 1,157,967 | \$ (125,000) | \$ 1,032,967 | |

Allocation of Department and Citywide Overhead

| Description | Total | Adjustments | Total | Notes |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------|
| Department Overhead | \$ 169,542 | \$ - | \$ 169,542 | [c] |
| Citywide Overhead | \$ 309,329 | \$ - | \$ 309,329 | [c] |
| Subtotal | \$ 478,872 | \$ - | \$ 478,872 | |

Total

| Description | Total | Notes |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|
| Recurring Divisional Expenditures | \$ 1,032,967 | |
| Department Overhead | \$ 169,542 | |
| Citywide Overhead | \$ 309,329 | |
| Subtotal | \$ 1,511,839 | |

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

| Description | Total | Note |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|------|
| Costs | \$ 1,511,839 | |
| Direct Hours | 6,990 | [c] |
| Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate | \$ 216 | |

[a] Source: FY 23/24 adopted budget.

[b] Adjustment to exclude non-fee related amounts or amounts not used to inform hourly rate.

[c] See separate worksheets in this model. Amounts intended to serve as reasonable estimates.

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Planning Fees

Calculation of Estimated Cost of Service

| | Fee Description | Est. Labor Hours | | Hourly Rate | = | Est. Cost of Svc | Current Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Proposed Cost Recovery | Fee Structure | Fee Change | Note |
|---|---|------------------|---|-------------|---|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|---------|
| 1 | Annexation Processing | 80.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$17,280 | \$5,641 | 33% | \$17,000 | 98% | Deposit | \$11,359 | [a] |
| 2 | Appeal | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) Appeal of Staff Decision - Owner Occupied | 16.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$3,456 | \$251 | 7% | \$1,700 | 49% | Fixed Fee | \$1,449 | [b] |
| | b) Appeal of Staff Decision - by Developer/Other | 16.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$3,456 | \$502 | 15% | \$3,400 | 98% | Fixed Fee | \$2,898 | [b] |
| | c) Appeal of Commission Decision - Owner Occupied | 32.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$6,912 | \$251 | 4% | \$3,400 | 49% | Fixed Fee | \$3,149 | [b] |
| | d) Appeal of Commission Decision - by Developer/Other | 32.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$6,912 | \$502 | 7% | \$6,800 | 98% | Fixed Fee | \$6,298 | [b] |
| 3 | Code Amendment | 40.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$8,640 | \$2,238 | 26% | \$8,500 | 98% | Fixed Fee | \$6,262 | |
| 4 | Conditional Use Permit (CUP) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) CUP Review (Major) | 24.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$5,184 | \$5,798 | 112% | \$5,100 | 98% | Fixed Fee | (\$698) | |
| | b) CUP Review (Minor) | 12.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$2,592 | \$2,749 | 106% | \$2,500 | 96% | Fixed Fee | (\$249) | |
| | c) CUP Modification | 12.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$2,592 | \$1,605 | 62% | \$2,500 | 96% | Fixed Fee | \$895 | |
| 5 | Condominium Conversion Fee | 80.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$17,280 | \$11,410 | 66% | \$17,000 | 98% | Fixed Fee | \$5,590 | |
| 6 | Design Review/Architectural Review | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) New Multi-Family/Commercial (Commission Level) | 24.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$5,184 | \$2,154 | 42% | \$5,100 | 98% | Fixed Fee | \$2,946 | |
| | b) Minor Multi-Family/Commercial (Staff Level) | 4.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$864 | \$2,154 | 249% | \$500 | 58% | Fixed Fee | (\$1,654) | |
| | c) New Single and Two Family Dwelling | 6.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$1,296 | \$61 | 5% | \$800 | 62% | Fixed Fee | \$739 | |
| | d) Minor Single and Two Family Dwelling | 4.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$864 | \$61 | 7% | \$250 | 29% | Fixed Fee | \$189 | |
| | e) Historic District New Multi-Family/Commercial | 24.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$5,184 | \$2,154 | 42% | \$5,100 | 98% | Fixed Fee | \$2,946 | |
| | f) Historic District Minor Multi-Family/Commercial | 8.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$1,728 | \$2,154 | 125% | \$250 | 14% | Fixed Fee | (\$1,904) | |
| | g) Historic District New Single Family, Two-Family Dwelling and ADU >800 sq. ft. and/or 16 ft. tall | 16.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$3,456 | \$61 | 2% | \$3,400 | 98% | Fixed Fee | \$3,339 | |
| | h) Historic District Minor Single and Two Family Dwelling | 8.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$1,728 | \$61 | 4% | \$250 | 14% | Fixed Fee | \$189 | |
| 7 | Development Agreement Processing | 48.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$10,368 | \$5,267 | 51% | \$10,000 | 96% | Deposit | \$4,733 | [a] |
| 8 | Entertainment Permit | 2.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$432 | \$45 | 10% | \$200 | 46% | Fixed Fee | \$155 | |
| 9 | Environmental Review | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) Environmental Impact Review & Report | 48.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$10,368 | \$8,525 | 82% | \$10,000 | 96% | Deposit | \$1,475 | [a],[c] |
| | b) Environmental Mitigation Program Monitoring | 36.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$7,776 | \$6,284 | 81% | \$7,000 | 90% | Deposit | \$716 | [a],[c] |
| | c) Initial Environmental Study/Assessment | 36.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$7,776 | \$6,346 | 82% | \$7,000 | 90% | Deposit | \$654 | [a],[c] |
| | d) Notice of CEQA Determination | 1.5 | x | \$216 | = | \$324 | \$296 | 91% | \$300 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$4 | |

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Planning Fees
 Calculation of Estimated Cost of Service

| Fee Description | | Est. Labor Hours | Hourly Rate | Est. Cost of Svc | Current Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Proposed Cost Recovery | Fee Structure | Fee Change | Note |
|-----------------|--|------------------|-------------|------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|------|
| 10 | General Plan | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) General Plan Amendment < 5 acres | 48.0 | x \$216 | = \$10,368 | \$4,272 | 41% | \$10,000 | 96% | Fixed Fee | \$5,728 | |
| | b) General Plan Amendment 5 or more acres | 64.0 | x \$216 | = \$13,824 | \$8,544 | 62% | \$13,000 | 94% | Fixed Fee | \$4,456 | |
| 11 | Home Occupation Permit Fee | 0.3 | x \$216 | = \$65 | \$30 | 46% | \$60 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$30 | |
| 12 | Indoor Marijuana Cultivation Permit | 2.5 | x \$216 | = \$540 | \$253 | 47% | \$500 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$247 | |
| 13 | Landmark Tree Classification | 6.5 | x \$216 | = \$1,404 | \$287 | 20% | \$350 | 25% | Fixed Fee | \$63 | |
| 14 | Landmark Tree Declassification | 8.5 | x \$216 | = \$1,836 | \$287 | 16% | \$1,800 | 98% | Fixed Fee | \$1,513 | [d] |
| 15 | Large Family Day Care Home | 0.5 | x \$216 | = \$108 | \$26 | 24% | \$100 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$74 | |
| 16 | Lot Line Adjustment/Parcel Merger - Planning | 5.0 | x \$216 | = \$1,080 | \$989 | 92% | \$1,000 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$11 | [e] |
| 17 | Non-Residential Plan Check Fee | 10.0% | | | 10% of building permit fee | | 10% of building permit fee | | Fixed Fee | | |
| 18 | Opinion on a Planning Matter | 2.0 | x \$216 | = \$432 | \$251 | 58% | \$200 | 46% | Fixed Fee | (\$51) | |
| 19 | Preliminary Project Review | 12.0 | x \$216 | = \$2,592 | \$639 | 25% | \$1,000 | 39% | Fixed Fee | \$361 | |
| 20 | Planned Development | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) Planned Development Review | | | | | | | | | | |
| | i) Base Fee | 48.0 | x \$216 | = \$10,368 | \$8,941 | 86% | \$10,000 | 96% | Fixed Fee | \$1,059 | |
| | ii) Plus, Per Acre Fee | 2.5 | x \$216 | = \$540 | \$447 | 83% | \$500 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$53 | |
| | b) Planned Development Extension Review | 16.0 | x \$216 | = \$3,456 | \$3,135 | 91% | \$3,000 | 87% | Fixed Fee | (\$135) | |
| | c) Planned Development Modification Review | 24.0 | x \$216 | = \$5,184 | \$8,928 | 172% | \$5,000 | 96% | Fixed Fee | (\$3,928) | |
| 21 | Rezoning Request | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) Rezoning Request Review – 5 acres or less | 48.0 | x \$216 | = \$10,368 | \$2,928 | 28% | \$10,000 | 96% | Fixed Fee | \$7,072 | |
| | b) Rezoning Request Review – 5+ acres | 64.0 | x \$216 | = \$13,824 | \$5,847 | 42% | \$13,000 | 94% | Fixed Fee | \$7,153 | |
| 22 | Sidewalk Vendor Permit | 2.0 | x \$216 | = \$432 | \$50 | 12% | \$50 | 12% | Fixed Fee | \$0 | |

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Planning Fees
 Calculation of Estimated Cost of Service

| Fee Description | | Est. Labor Hours | Hourly Rate | Est. Cost of Svc | Current Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Proposed Cost Recovery | Fee Structure | Fee Change | Note |
|-----------------|--|------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|------|
| 23 | Signs | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) Sign Permit - Staff | 0.7 | x \$216 | = \$151 | \$126 | 83% | \$150 | 99% | Fixed Fee | \$24 | |
| | b) Sign Permit Extension | 0.5 | x \$216 | = \$108 | \$58 | 54% | \$100 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$42 | |
| | c) Special Event Sign Permit | 0.5 | x \$216 | = \$108 | \$60 | 56% | \$100 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$40 | |
| | d) Historic District Sign Review (Staff Level) | 0.7 | x \$216 | = \$151 | \$61 | 40% | \$150 | 99% | Fixed Fee | \$89 | |
| | e) Historic District Sign Review (Commission Level) | 4.0 | x \$216 | = \$864 | \$61 | 7% | \$800 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$739 | |
| | f) Planned Development Sign Permit | 12.0 | x \$216 | = \$2,592 | \$1,253 | 48% | \$2,500 | 96% | Fixed Fee | \$1,247 | |
| | g) Temporary Sign Permit | 0.2 | x \$216 | = \$43 | \$10 | 23% | \$40 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$30 | |
| | h) On-Site Subdivision Signs | 1.0 | x \$216 | = \$216 | \$126 | 58% | \$200 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$74 | |
| | i) Off-Site Subdivision Signs | | | | | | | | | | |
| | i) base fee | 1.5 | x \$216 | = \$324 | \$171 | 53% | \$300 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$129 | |
| | ii) refundable deposit - per sign | n/a | x \$216 | = \$500 | \$500 | | \$500 | | Deposit | \$0 | |
| | j) Off-Site Weekend Directional Signs | | | | | | | | | | |
| | i) base fee | 1.5 | x \$216 | = \$324 | \$171 | 53% | \$300 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$129 | |
| | ii) refundable deposit | n/a | x \$216 | = \$200 | \$200 | | \$200 | | Deposit | \$0 | |
| | k) Uniform Sign Program | 2.0 | x \$216 | = \$432 | \$287 | 66% | \$400 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$113 | |
| 24 | Site Design Review | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) Site Design Review | 2.0 | x \$216 | = \$432 | \$294 | 68% | \$400 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$106 | |
| | b) Site Design Review – Planning Commission | 24.0 | x \$216 | = \$5,184 | \$4,672 | 90% | \$5,100 | 98% | Fixed Fee | \$428 | |
| 25 | Special Event Permit | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) Special Event Permit | 4.0 | x \$216 | = \$864 | \$61 | 7% | \$500 | 58% | Fixed Fee | \$439 | [f] |
| | b) Over 1,000 People Per Day (charged per thousand) | 2.0 | x \$216 | = \$432 | \$0 | 0% | \$432 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$432 | |
| | c) Consultation Meeting for Events Over 1,000 People Per Day | 4.0 | x \$216 | = \$864 | \$0 | 0% | \$200 | 23% | Fixed Fee | \$200 | |
| | d) Traffic Control Plan or Street Closure for New Event | 4.0 | x \$216 | = \$864 | \$0 | 0% | \$700 | 81% | Fixed Fee | \$700 | |
| | e) Traffic Control Plan or Street Closure for Repeated Event (No Substantial Changes from Previous Year) | 2.0 | x \$216 | = \$432 | \$0 | 0% | \$400 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$400 | |
| | f) Alcohol/ABC Permit | 1.5 | x \$216 | = \$324 | \$0 | 0% | \$324 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$324 | |
| | g) Fire Inspections | 2.0 | x \$216 | = \$432 | \$0 | 0% | \$400 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$400 | |
| | h) Block Party Permit | 3.0 | x \$216 | = \$648 | \$61 | 9% | \$100 | 15% | Fixed Fee | \$39 | |

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Planning Fees
 Calculation of Estimated Cost of Service

| Fee Description | Est. Labor Hours | | Hourly Rate | = | Est. Cost of Svc | Current Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Proposed Cost Recovery | Fee Structure | Fee Change | Note |
|---|------------------|---|-------------|---|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|------|
| 26 Specific Plan | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Specific Plan Review | 72.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$15,552 | \$6,268 | 40% | \$15,500 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$9,232 | |
| b) Specific Plan Amendment Review | 48.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$10,368 | \$6,895 | 67% | \$10,300 | 99% | Fixed Fee | \$3,405 | |
| 27 Street Name Review/Change | 4.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$864 | \$1,224 | 142% | \$800 | 93% | Fixed Fee | (\$424) | |
| 28 Temporary Outdoor Dining | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Initial Permit (Additional Revocable Permit Fees Apply) | 4.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$864 | \$280 | 32% | \$280 | 32% | Fixed Fee | \$0 | |
| b) Renewal | 2.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$432 | \$280 | 65% | \$140 | 32% | Fixed Fee | (\$140) | |
| 28 Temporary Use Permit | 2.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$432 | \$63 | 15% | \$300 | 69% | Fixed Fee | \$237 | |
| 29 Tentative Map/Parcel/Subdivision Map | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Tentative Parcel Map Review | 36.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$7,776 | \$5,564 | 72% | \$7,700 | 99% | Fixed Fee | \$2,136 | |
| b) Tentative Map Amendment Review | 24.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$5,184 | \$9,272 | 179% | \$5,100 | 98% | Fixed Fee | (\$4,172) | |
| c) Tentative Map Extension Review | 20.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$4,320 | \$3,983 | 92% | \$4,300 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$317 | |
| d) Tentative Subdivision Map Review | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i) Base Fee | 40.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$8,640 | \$6,547 | 76% | \$8,600 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$2,053 | |
| ii) Plus, Per Lot Fee | 0.5 | x | \$216 | = | \$108 | \$33 | 31% | \$50 | 46% | Fixed Fee | \$17 | |
| 30 Unattended Donation Box | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Initial Permit | 1.5 | x | \$216 | = | \$324 | \$196 | 60% | \$300 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$104 | |
| b) Renewal | 0.5 | x | \$216 | = | \$108 | \$48 | 44% | \$100 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$52 | |
| 31 Variance | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Variance Review – Single Family Dwelling | 24.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$5,184 | \$1,643 | 32% | \$2,500 | 48% | Fixed Fee | \$857 | |
| b) Variance Review - Other | 24.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$5,184 | \$1,643 | 32% | \$5,100 | 98% | Fixed Fee | \$3,457 | |
| 32 Zoning Verification Review | 2.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$432 | \$302 | 70% | \$400 | 93% | Fixed Fee | \$98 | |
| 33 For Services Requested of City Staff which have no fee listed in this Master Fee Schedule, the City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall determine the appropriate fee based on the following hourly rates for staff time involved in the service or activity (per hour) | 1.0 | x | \$216 | = | \$216 | \$101 | 47% | \$200 | 93% | Per Hour | \$99 | |

City of Folsom

User and Regulatory Fee Study

Planning Fees

Calculation of Estimated Cost of Service

| Fee Description | Est. Labor Hours | Hourly Rate | Est. Cost of Svc | Current Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Proposed Cost Recovery | Fee Structure | Fee Change | Note |
|-----------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|------|
|-----------------|------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|------|

* In addition to amounts shown above, applicant is responsible for all costs of outside agency review/services, including but not limited to, LAFCO, Board of Equalization Fees, Department of Fish and Wildlife Fees, etc.

[a] The amount shown represents the initial deposit and minimum fee payable. The City reserves the right to collect additional amounts when costs exceed minimum fee/initial deposit. Any requests for additional amounts due will be supported by time & materials billings.

[b] Depending on the subject of the appeal, specialized expertise may be solicited, at the expense of the applicant, for the purpose of providing input to the City Manager, Planning Commission, other Commission or Board, or City

[c] Applicant shall be responsible for additional costs of preparation of the required environment document.

[d] For non-development related declassifications, the fee will be waived if the urban forester finds/agrees the tree is dead/dying with no reasonable expectation of recovery and poses a risk to persons/property. For development-related declassifications, fee is amount shown.

[e] Additional fees apply for Engineering review. See Engineering fee schedule.

[f] Special events that require additional resources beyond those covered the scope of these fees will be charged on an hourly basis.

**City of Folsom
Planning Fees
Illustration of Current Fees, Maximum Fees, and Proposed Fees**

| # | Description | Proposed Fee Structure | Current Fee | Cost of Service (Max. Fee) | Proposed Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Cost Recovery | Note |
|---|---|------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------|
| 1 | Annexation Processing | Deposit | \$5,641 | \$17,280 | \$17,000 | 33% | 98% | [a] |
| 2 | Appeal | | | | | | | |
| | a) Appeal of Staff Decision - Owner Occupied | Fixed Fee | \$251 | \$3,456 | \$1,700 | 7% | 49% | [b] |
| | b) Appeal of Staff Decision - by Developer/Other | Fixed Fee | \$502 | \$3,456 | \$3,400 | 15% | 98% | [b] |
| | c) Appeal of Commission Decision - Owner Occupied | Fixed Fee | \$251 | \$6,912 | \$3,400 | 4% | 49% | [b] |
| | d) Appeal of Commission Decision - by Developer/Other | Fixed Fee | \$502 | \$6,912 | \$6,800 | 7% | 98% | [b] |
| 3 | Code Amendment | Fixed Fee | \$2,238 | \$8,640 | \$8,500 | 26% | 98% | |
| 4 | Conditional Use Permit (CUP) | | | | | | | |
| | a) CUP Review (Major) | Fixed Fee | \$5,798 | \$5,184 | \$5,100 | 112% | 98% | |
| | b) CUP Review (Minor) | Fixed Fee | \$2,749 | \$2,592 | \$2,500 | 106% | 96% | |
| | c) CUP Modification | Fixed Fee | \$1,605 | \$2,592 | \$2,500 | 62% | 96% | |
| 5 | Condominium Conversion Fee | Fixed Fee | \$11,410 | \$17,280 | \$17,000 | 66% | 98% | |
| 6 | Design Review/Architectural Review | | | | | | | |
| | a) New Multi-Family/Commercial (Commission Level) | Fixed Fee | \$2,154 | \$5,184 | \$5,100 | 42% | 98% | |
| | b) Minor Multi-Family/Commercial (Staff Level) | Fixed Fee | \$2,154 | \$864 | \$500 | 249% | 58% | |
| | c) New Single and Two Family Dwelling | Fixed Fee | \$61 | \$1,296 | \$800 | 5% | 62% | |
| | d) Minor Single and Two Family Dwelling | Fixed Fee | \$61 | \$864 | \$250 | 7% | 29% | |
| | e) Historic District New Multi-Family/Commercial | Fixed Fee | \$2,154 | \$5,184 | \$5,100 | 42% | 98% | |
| | f) Historic District Minor Multi-Family/Commercial | Fixed Fee | \$2,154 | \$1,728 | \$250 | 125% | 14% | |
| | g) Historic District New Single Family, Two-Family Dwelling and ADU >800 sq. ft. and/or 16 ft. tall | Fixed Fee | \$61 | \$3,456 | \$3,400 | 2% | 98% | |
| | h) Historic District Minor Single and Two Family Dwelling | Fixed Fee | \$61 | \$1,728 | \$250 | 4% | 14% | |
| 7 | Development Agreement Processing | Deposit | \$5,267 | \$10,368 | \$10,000 | 51% | 96% | [a] |
| 8 | Entertainment Permit | Fixed Fee | \$45 | \$432 | \$200 | 10% | 46% | |

**City of Folsom
Planning Fees
Illustration of Current Fees, Maximum Fees, and Proposed Fees**

| # | Description | Proposed Fee Structure | Current Fee | Cost of Service (Max. Fee) | Proposed Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Cost Recovery | Note |
|----|--|------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|----------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|---------|
| 9 | Environmental Review | | | | | | | |
| | a) Environmental Impact Review & Report | Deposit | \$8,525 | \$10,368 | \$10,000 | 82% | 96% | [a],[c] |
| | b) Environmental Mitigation Program Monitoring | Deposit | \$6,284 | \$7,776 | \$7,000 | 81% | 90% | [a],[c] |
| | c) Initial Environmental Study/Assessment | Deposit | \$6,346 | \$7,776 | \$7,000 | 82% | 90% | [a],[c] |
| | d) Notice of CEQA Determination | Fixed Fee | \$296 | \$324 | \$300 | 91% | 93% | |
| 10 | General Plan | | | | | | | |
| | a) General Plan Amendment < 5 acres | Fixed Fee | \$4,272 | \$10,368 | \$10,000 | 41% | 96% | |
| | b) General Plan Amendment 5 or more acres | Fixed Fee | \$8,544 | \$13,824 | \$13,000 | 62% | 94% | |
| 11 | Home Occupation Permit Fee | Fixed Fee | \$30 | \$65 | \$60 | 46% | 93% | |
| 12 | Indoor Marijuana Cultivation Permit | Fixed Fee | \$253 | \$540 | \$500 | 47% | 93% | |
| 13 | Landmark Tree Classification | Fixed Fee | \$287 | \$1,404 | \$350 | 20% | 25% | |
| 14 | Landmark Tree Declassification | Fixed Fee | \$287 | \$1,836 | \$1,800 | 16% | 98% | [d] |
| 15 | Large Family Day Care Home | Fixed Fee | \$26 | \$108 | \$100 | 24% | 93% | |
| 16 | Lot Line Adjustment/Parcel Merger - Planning | Fixed Fee | \$989 | \$1,080 | \$1,000 | 92% | 93% | [e] |
| 17 | Non-Residential Plan Check Fee | Fixed Fee | 10% of building permit fee | \$0 | 10% of building permit fee | | 0% | |
| 18 | Opinion on a Planning Matter | Fixed Fee | \$251 | \$432 | \$200 | 58% | 46% | |
| 19 | Preliminary Project Review | Fixed Fee | \$639 | \$2,592 | \$1,000 | 25% | 39% | |
| 20 | Planned Development | | | | | | | |
| | a) Planned Development Review | | | | | | | |
| | i) Base Fee | Fixed Fee | \$8,941 | \$10,368 | \$10,000 | 86% | 96% | |
| | ii) Plus, Per Acre Fee | Fixed Fee | \$447 | \$540 | \$500 | 83% | 93% | |
| | b) Planned Development Extension Review | Fixed Fee | \$3,135 | \$3,456 | \$3,000 | 91% | 87% | |
| | c) Planned Development Modification Review | Fixed Fee | \$8,928 | \$5,184 | \$5,000 | 172% | 96% | |

**City of Folsom
Planning Fees
Illustration of Current Fees, Maximum Fees, and Proposed Fees**

| # | Description | Proposed Fee Structure | Current Fee | Cost of Service (Max. Fee) | Proposed Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Cost Recovery | Note |
|----|---|------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------|
| 21 | Rezoning Request | | | | | | | |
| | a) Rezoning Request Review – 5 acres or less | Fixed Fee | \$2,928 | \$10,368 | \$10,000 | 28% | 96% | |
| | b) Rezoning Request Review – 5+ acres | Fixed Fee | \$5,847 | \$13,824 | \$13,000 | 42% | 94% | |
| 22 | Sidewalk Vendor Permit | Fixed Fee | \$50 | \$432 | \$50 | 12% | 12% | |
| 23 | Signs | | | | | | | |
| | a) Sign Permit - Staff | Fixed Fee | \$126 | \$151 | \$150 | 83% | 99% | |
| | b) Sign Permit Extension | Fixed Fee | \$58 | \$108 | \$100 | 54% | 93% | |
| | c) Special Event Sign Permit | Fixed Fee | \$60 | \$108 | \$100 | 56% | 93% | |
| | d) Historic District Sign Review (Staff Level) | Fixed Fee | \$61 | \$151 | \$150 | 40% | 99% | |
| | e) Historic District Sign Review (Commission Level) | Fixed Fee | \$61 | \$864 | \$800 | 7% | 93% | |
| | f) Planned Development Sign Permit | Fixed Fee | \$1,253 | \$2,592 | \$2,500 | 48% | 96% | |
| | g) Temporary Sign Permit | Fixed Fee | \$10 | \$43 | \$40 | 23% | 93% | |
| | h) On-Site Subdivision Signs | Fixed Fee | \$126 | \$216 | \$200 | 58% | 93% | |
| | i) Off-Site Subdivision Signs | | | | | | | |
| | i) base fee | Fixed Fee | \$171 | \$324 | \$300 | 53% | 93% | |
| | ii) refundable deposit - per sign | Deposit | \$500 | | \$500 | | | |
| | j) Off-Site Weekend Directional Signs | | | | | | | |
| | i) base fee | Fixed Fee | \$171 | \$324 | \$300 | 53% | 93% | |
| | ii) refundable deposit | Deposit | \$200 | | \$200 | | | |
| | k) Uniform Sign Program | Fixed Fee | \$287 | \$432 | \$400 | 66% | 93% | |
| 24 | Site Design Review | | | | | | | |
| | a) Site Design Review | Fixed Fee | \$294 | \$432 | \$400 | 68% | 93% | |
| | b) Site Design Review – Planning Commission | Fixed Fee | \$4,672 | \$5,184 | \$5,100 | 90% | 98% | |

**City of Folsom
Planning Fees
Illustration of Current Fees, Maximum Fees, and Proposed Fees**

| # | Description | Proposed Fee Structure | Current Fee | Cost of Service (Max. Fee) | Proposed Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Cost Recovery | Note |
|----|--|------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------|
| 25 | Special Event Permit | | | | | | | |
| | a) Special Event Permit | Fixed Fee | \$61 | \$864 | \$500 | 7% | 58% | [f] |
| | b) Over 1,000 People Per Day (charged per thousand) | Fixed Fee | \$0 | \$432 | \$432 | 0% | 100% | |
| | c) Consultation Meeting for Events Over 1,000 People Per Day | Fixed Fee | \$0 | \$864 | \$200 | 0% | 23% | |
| | d) Traffic Control Plan or Street Closure for New Event | Fixed Fee | \$0 | \$864 | \$700 | 0% | 81% | |
| | e) Traffic Control Plan or Street Closure for Repeated Event (No Substantial Changes from Previous Year) | Fixed Fee | \$0 | \$432 | \$400 | 0% | 93% | |
| | f) Alcohol/ABC Permit | Fixed Fee | \$0 | \$324 | \$324 | 0% | 100% | |
| | g) Fire Inspections | Fixed Fee | \$0 | \$432 | \$400 | 0% | 93% | |
| | h) Block Party Permit | Fixed Fee | \$61 | \$648 | \$100 | 9% | 15% | |
| 26 | Specific Plan | | | | | | | |
| | a) Specific Plan Review | Fixed Fee | \$6,268 | \$15,552 | \$15,500 | 40% | 100% | |
| | b) Specific Plan Amendment Review | Fixed Fee | \$6,895 | \$10,368 | \$10,300 | 67% | 99% | |
| 27 | Street Name Review/Change | Fixed Fee | \$1,224 | \$864 | \$800 | 142% | 93% | |
| 28 | Temporary Outdoor Dining | | | | | | | |
| | a) Initial Permit (Additional Revocable Permit Fees Apply) | Fixed Fee | \$280 | \$864 | \$280 | 32% | 32% | |
| | b) Renewal | Fixed Fee | \$280 | \$432 | \$140 | 65% | 32% | |
| 28 | Temporary Use Permit | Fixed Fee | \$63 | \$432 | \$300 | 15% | 69% | |
| 29 | Tentative Map/Parcel/Subdivision Map | | | | | | | |
| | a) Tentative Parcel Map Review | Fixed Fee | \$5,564 | \$7,776 | \$7,700 | 72% | 99% | |
| | b) Tentative Map Amendment Review | Fixed Fee | \$9,272 | \$5,184 | \$5,100 | 179% | 98% | |
| | c) Tentative Map Extension Review | Fixed Fee | \$3,983 | \$4,320 | \$4,300 | 92% | 100% | |
| | d) Tentative Subdivision Map Review | | | | | | | |
| | i) Base Fee | Fixed Fee | \$6,547 | \$8,640 | \$8,600 | 76% | 100% | |
| | ii) Plus, Per Lot Fee | Fixed Fee | \$33 | \$108 | \$50 | 31% | 46% | |
| 30 | Unattended Donation Box | | | | | | | |
| | a) Initial Permit | Fixed Fee | \$196 | \$324 | \$300 | 60% | 93% | |
| | b) Renewal | Fixed Fee | \$48 | \$108 | \$100 | 44% | 93% | |

**City of Folsom
Planning Fees
Illustration of Current Fees, Maximum Fees, and Proposed Fees**

| # | Description | Proposed Fee Structure | Current Fee | Cost of Service (Max. Fee) | Proposed Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Cost Recovery | Note |
|----|--|------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------|
| 31 | Variance | | | | | | | |
| | a) Variance Review – Single Family Dwelling | Fixed Fee | \$1,643 | \$5,184 | \$2,500 | 32% | 48% | |
| | b) Variance Review - Other | Fixed Fee | \$1,643 | \$5,184 | \$5,100 | 32% | 98% | |
| 32 | Zoning Verification Review | Fixed Fee | \$302 | \$432 | \$400 | 70% | 93% | |
| 33 | For Services Requested of City Staff which have no fee listed in this Master Fee Schedule, the City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall determine the appropriate fee based on the following hourly rates for staff time involved in the service or activity (per hour) | Per Hour | \$101 | \$216 | \$200 | 47% | 93% | |

* In addition to amounts shown above, applicant is responsible for all costs of outside agency review/services, including but not limited to, LAFCO, Board of Equalization Fees, Department of Fish and Wildlife Fees, etc.

[a] The amount shown represents the initial deposit and minimum fee payable. The City reserves the right to collect additional amounts when costs exceed minimum fee/initial deposit. Any requests for additional amounts due will be supported by time & materials billings.

[b] Depending on the subject of the appeal, specialized expertise may be solicited, at the expense of the applicant, for the purpose of providing input to the City Manager, Planning Commission, other Commission or Board, or City Council.

[c] Applicant shall be responsible for additional costs of preparation of the required environment document.

[d] For non-development related declassifications, the fee will be waived if the urban forester finds/agrees the tree is dead/dying with no reasonable expectation of recovery and poses a risk to persons/property. For development-related declassifications, fee is amount shown.

[e] Additional fees apply for Engineering review. See Engineering fee schedule.

[f] Special events that require additional resources beyond those covered the scope of these fees will be charged on an hourly basis.

User and Regulatory Fees
Cost of Service Calculations
Engineering and Encroachment Permits
DRAFT

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Allocation of Annual Labor Effort - Engineering

Authorized Staffing

| Position | FTE | Total Hours Per FTE | Less: Holiday & Leave | Hours Per FTE | Productive Hours | Indirect | Direct | Total | Indirect Hours | Total Direct Hours | Total Hours | Notes |
|-------------------------------|-------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------|------------------|----------|--------|-------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|---------|
| Urban Forester | 1.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 1,864 | 20% | 80% | 100% | 373 | 1,491 | 1,864 | [a];[b] |
| City Engineer | 1.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 1,864 | 65% | 35% | 100% | 1,212 | 652 | 1,864 | [a];[b] |
| Senior Construction Inspector | 1.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 1,864 | 20% | 80% | 100% | 373 | 1,491 | 1,864 | [a];[b] |
| Engineering Tech I/II | 1.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 1,864 | 30% | 70% | 100% | 559 | 1,305 | 1,864 | [a];[b] |
| Senior Civil Engineer | 2.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 3,728 | 25% | 75% | 100% | 932 | 2,796 | 3,728 | [a];[b] |
| Total | 6.00 | | | | 11,184 | | | | 3,448 | 7,736 | 11,184 | |
| Total | | | | | | | | | 31% | 69% | 100% | |

Contract Services

| Description | Total | Notes |
|--------------------------|--------------|-------|
| Annual Contract Services | \$ 1,751,255 | [c] |

| Contract Services | Share | Est. Hrly Cost | Notes |
|-------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|
| Inspection | 50% | \$ 125 | [d] |
| Plan Review | 50% | \$ 205 | [d] |
| Total | 100% | 165 | [e] |

| Description | Total | Indirect | Direct | Indirect | Direct | Total | Notes |
|------------------------|--------|----------|--------|----------|--------|--------|-------|
| Contract Service Hours | 10,614 | 10% | 90% | 1,061 | 9,552 | 10,614 | [c] |

Divisional Total

| Position | Indirect | Direct | Total | Notes |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------|
| Authorized Staffing | 3,448 | 7,736 | 11,184 | |
| Contract Services | 1,061 | 9,552 | 10,614 | |
| Total | 4,510 | 17,288 | 21,798 | |
| Total | 21% | 79% | 100% | |

- [a] Staffing based on FY 23/24 adopted budget
- [b] Allocation of hours intended to serve as reasonable estimate. Amount may vary from year-to-year and position to position.
- [c] Source: Annual average FY 18/19 through FY 21/22.
- [d] Amounts intended to serve as reasonable estimates of market rates for contract service providers.
- [e] Average hourly rate for contract services received.

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Allocation of Divisional Expenses - Engineering

Recurring Divisional Expenditures [a]

| Description | Total | Adjustments | Total | Notes |
|---------------------------|---------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------|
| Salaries - Permanent | \$ 740,794 | \$ - | \$ 740,794 | |
| Annual Leave Account | \$ 10,730 | \$ - | \$ 10,730 | |
| Uniform Allowance | \$ 675 | \$ - | \$ 675 | |
| FICA | \$ 58,782 | \$ - | \$ 58,782 | |
| PERS | \$ 295,014 | \$ - | \$ 295,014 | |
| Deferred Comp - City Paid | \$ 16,200 | \$ - | \$ 16,200 | |
| Combined Benefits | \$ 118,434 | \$ - | \$ 118,434 | |
| Contracts | \$ 690,000 | \$ 1,061,255 | \$ 1,751,255 | [b] |
| Insurance / Liability | \$ 37,648 | \$ - | \$ 37,648 | |
| Subtotal | \$ 1,968,277 | \$ 1,061,255 | \$ 3,029,532 | |

Allocation of Department and Citywide Overhead

| Description | Total | Adjustments | Total | Notes |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------|
| Department Overhead | \$ 203,451 | \$ - | \$ 203,451 | [c] |
| Citywide Overhead | \$ 220,949 | \$ - | \$ 220,949 | [c] |
| Subtotal | \$ 424,400 | \$ - | \$ 424,400 | |

Total

| Description | Total | Notes |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|
| Recurring Divisional Expenditures | \$ 3,029,532 | |
| Department Overhead | \$ 203,451 | |
| Citywide Overhead | \$ 220,949 | |
| Subtotal | \$ 3,453,932 | |

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

| Description | Total | Note |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|------|
| Costs | \$ 3,453,932 | |
| Direct Hours | 17,288 | [c] |
| Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate | \$ 200 | |

[a] Source: FY 23/24 adopted budget.

[b] Adjustment to align to FY 22/23 actual contract service expenditures.

[c] See separate worksheets in this model. Amounts intended to serve as reasonable estimates.

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees
 Cost of Service Calculation

| Fee Description | | Est. Labor Hours | | Hourly Rate | = | Est. Cost of Svc | Current Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Proposed Cost Recovery | Fee Structure | Fee Change | Note |
|-----------------|---|------------------|---|-------------|---|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|------|
| 1 | Assessment District/CFD Payment Processing | 24.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$4,800 | \$2,578 | 54% | \$4,800 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$2,222 | |
| 2 | Encroachment Permit | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | a) Encroachment Contract for Parking/Staging | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | i. 0-6 calendar days | 0.25 | x | \$200 | = | \$50 | \$135 | 270% | \$50 | 100% | Fixed Fee | (\$85) | |
| | ii. 7-14 calendar days | 0.50 | x | \$200 | = | \$100 | \$135 | 135% | \$100 | 100% | Fixed Fee | (\$35) | |
| | iii. 14+days | 1.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$200 | \$135 | 68% | \$200 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$65 | |
| | b) Utility Work/Connections (Individual Permits) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | i. Wet Utilities/Service Connections | 3.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$600 | \$135 | 23% | \$600 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$465 | |
| | ii. Dry Utilities (per site/location) | 1.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$200 | \$135 | 68% | \$200 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$65 | |
| | iii. Misc. per LF of Trench in ROW/City Easement | 0.03 | x | \$200 | = | \$5.00 | \$1.96 | 39% | \$5.00 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$3.04 | |
| | iv. Inspections and Testing | 2.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$400 | | | \$400 | 100% | Fixed Fee | | |
| | c) Driveways/Minor Frontage Improvements | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | i. Residential (per driveway) | 2.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$400 | \$135 | 34% | \$400 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$265 | |
| | ii. Commercial (per driveway) | 2.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$400 | \$135 | 34% | \$400 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$265 | |
| | d) Pools and Spas (in ground) | 2.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$400 | \$135 | 34% | \$400 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$265 | |
| | e) Traffic Control/Equipment Staging | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | i. Isolated Site | 1.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$200 | \$135 | 68% | \$200 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$65 | |
| | ii. Multiple Closures/Staging | 5.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$1,000 | \$135 | 14% | \$1,000 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$865 | |
| | f) Permit Extensions | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | i. Active Work Zone | 0.25 | x | \$200 | = | \$50 | \$135 | 270% | \$50 | 100% | Fixed Fee | (\$85) | |
| | ii. Inactive Work Zone (4+ months inactivity) | 1.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$200 | \$135 | 68% | \$200 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$65 | |
| | g) Annual Permits | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | i. Wet Utilities | 30.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$6,000 | \$2,651 | 44% | \$6,000 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$3,349 | |
| | ii. Dry Utilities | 104.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$20,800 | \$2,651 | 13% | \$20,800 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$18,149 | |
| | iii. General Maintenance/Misc. (Not Wet or Dry Utilities) | 30.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$6,000 | \$2,651 | 44% | T&M | | Fixed Fee | | [a] |
| | iv. Vegetation Management (Utilities) | 104.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$20,800 | \$2,651 | 13% | \$20,800 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$18,149 | |
| | v. Long Term/Revocable Encroachments (paid annually) | 1.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$200 | \$135 | 68% | \$200 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$65 | |
| | h) Long Term/Revocable Encroachments (new permits only) | 12.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$2,400 | \$135 | 6% | \$2,400 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$2,265 | [b] |

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees
 Cost of Service Calculation

| Fee Description | Est. Labor Hours | | Hourly Rate | = | Est. Cost of Svc | Current Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Proposed Cost Recovery | Fee Structure | Fee Change | Note |
|---|------------------|---|-------------|---|------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|------|
| 3 Engineering and Landscape Plan Check and Inspection (Fee Includes Up to 3 Cycle Reviews - Hourly Billing Applies for Reviews Required Beyond 3rd Cycle) | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Project Value Up to \$10,000 | 4.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$800 | 6.00% | varies | 8.00% | varies | Fixed Fee | | |
| b) Project Value \$10,001 - \$100,000 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i. Base Fee for First \$10,000 | 4.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$800 | \$600 | 75% | \$800 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$200 | |
| ii. Fee for Each Add'l \$1 Up to \$100,000 | | | | = | 8.00% | 7.00% | 88% | 8.00% | 100% | Fixed Fee | | |
| c) \$100,001 - \$199,999 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i. Base Fee for First \$100,000 | 40.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$8,000 | \$6,900 | 86% | \$8,000 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$1,100 | |
| ii. Fee for Each Add'l \$1 Up to \$200,000 | | | | = | 6.40% | 5.00% | 78% | 6.40% | 100% | Fixed Fee | | |
| d) \$200,001 - \$299,999 | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i. Base Fee for First \$200,000 | 72.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$14,400 | \$11,900 | 83% | \$14,400 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$2,500 | |
| ii. Fee for Each Add'l \$1 Up to \$300,000 | | | | = | 4.80% | 4.00% | 83% | 4.80% | 100% | Fixed Fee | | |
| e) \$300,000 or more | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i. Base Fee for First \$300,000 | 96.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$19,200 | \$15,900 | 83% | \$19,200 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$3,300 | |
| ii. Fee for Each Add'l \$1 | | | | = | 3.60% | 2.00% | 56% | 3.60% | 100% | Fixed Fee | | |
| f) Landscape Plan Review | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i. Non-Development | 1.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$200 | \$38 | 19% | \$200 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$162 | |
| ii. Custom Home | 5.50 | x | \$200 | = | \$1,100 | \$414 | 38% | \$1,100 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$686 | |
| iii. Production Home/Subdivision | 11.50 | x | \$200 | = | \$2,300 | Valuation | varies | \$2,300 | 100% | Fixed Fee | Varies | |
| iv. Model Home Complex | 7.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$1,400 | Valuation | varies | \$1,400 | 100% | Fixed Fee | Varies | |
| v. Commercial, Streetscape, Other Development Projects | 8.00 | x | \$200 | = | \$1,600 | \$38 | 2% | \$1,600 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$1,562 | |
| vi. Development and Civil Improvements - Landscaping Review | 10.50 | x | \$200 | = | \$2,100 | \$38 | 2% | \$2,100 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$2,062 | |
| 4 Final Map and Parcel Map | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Parcel Map Check | 28.00 | x | \$288 | = | \$8,050 | \$5,742 | 71% | \$8,050 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$2,308 | |
| b) Final Map Check | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| i. Base Fee | 40.00 | x | \$288 | = | \$11,500 | \$10,719 | 93% | \$11,500 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$781 | |
| ii. Plus, Per Lot Fee | 0.50 | x | \$288 | = | \$144 | \$0 | 0% | \$144 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$144 | |
| c) Final Map Amendment/Certificate of Correction | 24.00 | x | \$288 | = | \$6,900 | \$2,899 | 42% | \$6,900 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$4,001 | |
| 5 Right of Ways (ROW) and Easements | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Review of ROW/Easement Documents | 12.00 | x | \$288 | = | \$3,450 | \$1,334 | 39% | \$3,450 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$2,116 | |
| b) ROW/Easement Abandonment | 20.00 | x | \$288 | = | \$5,750 | \$2,451 | 43% | \$5,750 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$3,299 | |
| 6 Subdivision Agreement Processing | 20.00 | x | \$288 | = | \$5,750 | \$1,083 | 19% | \$5,750 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$4,667 | |

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees
 Cost of Service Calculation

| Fee Description | Est. Labor Hours | Hourly Rate | Est. Cost of Svc | Current Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Proposed Cost Recovery | Fee Structure | Fee Change | Note |
|---|------------------|-------------|------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------------------------------|------------------------|---------------|------------|------|
| 7 Transportation Permit | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Permit | n/a | | | \$19 | | \$16 | | Fixed Fee | (\$3) | |
| b) Annual Permit | n/a | | | \$86 | | \$90 | | Fixed Fee | \$4 | |
| 8 Tree Removal/Work Permit | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Permitted Removal/Work | | | | | | | | | | |
| i. Existing Occupied Structure | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. 0-2 Trees | 0.50 | x \$200 = | \$100 | \$38 | 38% | \$100 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$62 | |
| b. 3+ Trees: See New Construction Rate Below | 6.00 | x \$200 = | \$1,200 | \$38 | 3% | \$1,200 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$1,162 | |
| c. "In Decline" Tree | 0.50 | x \$200 = | \$100 | \$38 | 38% | \$100 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$62 | |
| ii. New Construction (e.g. Custom Home, Subdivision, Parcel Map, Multi-family, Commercial, etc.): | | | | | | | | | | |
| a. 0-4 Trees | 6.00 | x \$200 = | \$1,200 | \$38 | 3% | \$1,200 | 100% | Fixed Fee | \$1,162 | |
| b. 5+ Trees | 7.00 | x \$200 = | \$1,400 | \$38 | 3% | \$1,400 + 10% per tree above 5 trees. | | Fixed Fee | varies | |
| iii. Misc. | 1.00 | x \$200 = | \$200 | \$38 | 19% | \$200 | 100% | Per Hour | \$162 | |
| b) w/o Permit (Does not include mitigation) Double the Permit Rate | 12.00 | x \$200 = | \$2,400 | \$438 | 18% | 2x permit amount | varies | Fixed Fee | | |
| Other Fees for Service | | | | | | | | | | |
| 9 Research of Engineering Records | 1.00 | x \$200 = | \$200 | \$103 | 52% | \$200 | 100% | Per Hour | \$97 | |
| 10 Miscellaneous Engineering Services | 1.00 | x \$200 = | \$200 | \$103 | 52% | \$200 | 100% | Per Hour | \$97 | |
| 11 Excess Plan Review Fee (4th and subsequent) | 1.00 | x \$200 = | \$200 | n/a | | \$200 | 100% | Per Hour | | |
| 12 Revisions | 1.00 | x \$200 = | \$200 | n/a | | \$200 | 100% | Per Hour | | |
| 13 After Hours Inspection (per hour) (2-hour minimum) | 1.20 | x \$200 = | \$240 | \$103 | 43% | \$240 | 100% | Per Hour | \$137 | |
| 14 Re-inspection Fee (2nd Time or More) (each) | 0.50 | x \$200 = | \$100 | n/a | | \$100 | 100% | Each | | |
| 15 Missed Inspection Fee | 0.50 | x \$200 = | \$100 | n/a | | \$100 | 100% | Each | | |
| 16 Expedited Services Fee | | | | 1.5x Regular Fee | | 1.5x Regular Fee | | Fixed Fee | | |
| 17 Residential Landscape Review | 1.00 | x \$200 = | \$200 | Hourly Rate of Arborist | | Hourly Rate of Arborist | | Per Hour | | |
| 18 Technical Assistance/Third Party Review or Inspection | | | | Actual Cost | | Actual Cost | | T & M | | |

[a] Use time and materials with initial deposit to be determined by City Engineer, based on anticipated scope of work.

[b] Encroachment agreement required in addition to insurance (e.g., parklets).

City of Folsom
Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees
Illustration of Current Fees, Maximum Fees, and Proposed Fees

| # | Description | Proposed Fee Structure | Current Fee | Cost of Service (Max. Fee) | Proposed Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Cost Recovery | Note |
|---|---|------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------|
| 1 | Assessment District/CFD Payment Processing | Fixed Fee | \$2,578 | \$4,800 | \$4,800 | 54% | 100% | |
| 2 | Encroachment Permit | | | | | | | |
| | a) Encroachment Contract for Parking/Staging | | | | | | | |
| | i. 0-6 calendar days | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$50 | \$50 | 270% | 100% | |
| | ii. 7-14 calendar days | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$100 | \$100 | 135% | 100% | |
| | iii. 14+days | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$200 | \$200 | 68% | 100% | |
| | b) Utility Work/Connections (Individual Permits) | | | | | | | |
| | i. Wet Utilities/Service Connections | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$600 | \$600 | 23% | 100% | |
| | ii. Dry Utilities (per site/location) | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$200 | \$200 | 68% | 100% | |
| | iii. Misc. per LF of Trench in ROW/City Easement | Fixed Fee | \$1.96 | \$5.00 | \$5.00 | 39% | 100% | |
| | iv. Inspections and Testing | Fixed Fee | | \$400 | \$400 | | 100% | |
| | c) Driveways/Minor Frontage Improvements | | | | | | | |
| | i. Residential (per driveway) | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$400 | \$400 | 34% | 100% | |
| | ii. Commercial (per driveway) | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$400 | \$400 | 34% | 100% | |
| | d) Pools and Spas (in ground) | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$400 | \$400 | 34% | 100% | |
| | e) Traffic Control/Equipment Staging | | | | | | | |
| | i. Isolated Site | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$200 | \$200 | 68% | 100% | |
| | ii. Multiple Closures/Staging | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$1,000 | \$1,000 | 14% | 100% | |
| | f) Permit Extensions | | | | | | | |
| | i. Active Work Zone | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$50 | \$50 | 270% | 100% | |
| | ii. Inactive Work Zone (4+ months inactivity) | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$200 | \$200 | 68% | 100% | |
| | g) Annual Permits | | | | | | | |
| | i. Wet Utilities | Fixed Fee | \$2,651 | \$6,000 | \$6,000 | 44% | 100% | |
| | ii. Dry Utilities | Fixed Fee | \$2,651 | \$20,800 | \$20,800 | 13% | 100% | |
| | iii. General Maintenance/Misc. (Not Wet or Dry Utilities) | Fixed Fee | \$2,651 | \$6,000 | T&M | 44% | | [a] |
| | iv. Vegetation Management (Utilities) | Fixed Fee | \$2,651 | \$20,800 | \$20,800 | 13% | 100% | |
| | v. Long Term/Revocable Encroachments (paid annually) | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$200 | \$200 | 68% | 100% | |
| | h) Long Term/Revocable Encroachments (new permits only) | Fixed Fee | \$135 | \$2,400 | \$2,400 | 6% | 100% | [b] |

City of Folsom
Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees
Illustration of Current Fees, Maximum Fees, and Proposed Fees

| # | Description | Proposed Fee Structure | Current Fee | Cost of Service (Max. Fee) | Proposed Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Cost Recovery | Note |
|---|---|------------------------|-------------|----------------------------|--------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------|
| 3 | Engineering and Landscape Plan Check and Inspection | | | | | | | |
| | a) Project Value Up to \$10,000 | Fixed Fee | 6.00% | \$800 | 8.00% | varies | varies | |
| | b) Project Value \$10,001 - \$100,000 | | | | | | | |
| | i. Base Fee for First \$10,000 | Fixed Fee | \$600 | \$800 | \$800 | 75% | 100% | |
| | ii. Fee for Each Add'l \$1 Up to \$100,000 | Fixed Fee | 7.00% | 8.00% | 8.00% | 88% | 100% | |
| | c) \$100,001 - \$199,999 | | | | | | | |
| | i. Base Fee for First \$100,000 | Fixed Fee | \$6,900 | \$8,000 | \$8,000 | 86% | 100% | |
| | ii. Fee for Each Add'l \$1 Up to \$200,000 | Fixed Fee | 5.00% | 6.40% | 6.40% | 78% | 100% | |
| | d) \$200,001 - \$299,999 | | | | | | | |
| | i. Base Fee for First \$200,000 | Fixed Fee | \$11,900 | \$14,400 | \$14,400 | 83% | 100% | |
| | ii. Fee for Each Add'l \$1 Up to \$300,000 | Fixed Fee | 4.00% | 4.80% | 4.80% | 83% | 100% | |
| | e) \$300,000 or more | | | | | | | |
| | i. Base Fee for First \$300,000 | Fixed Fee | \$15,900 | \$19,200 | \$19,200 | 83% | 100% | |
| | ii. Fee for Each Add'l \$1 | Fixed Fee | 2.00% | 3.60% | 3.60% | 56% | 100% | |
| | f) Landscape Plan Review | | | | | | | |
| | i. Non-Development | Fixed Fee | \$38 | \$200 | \$200 | 19% | 100% | |
| | ii. Custom Home | Fixed Fee | \$414 | \$1,100 | \$1,100 | 38% | 100% | |
| | iii. Production Home/Subdivision | Fixed Fee | Valuation | \$2,300 | \$2,300 | varies | 100% | |
| | iv. Model Home Complex | Fixed Fee | Valuation | \$1,400 | \$1,400 | varies | 100% | |
| | v. Commercial, Streetscape, Other Development Projects | Fixed Fee | \$38 | \$1,600 | \$1,600 | 2% | 100% | |
| | vi. Development and Civil Improvements - Landscaping Review | Fixed Fee | \$38 | \$2,100 | \$2,100 | 2% | 100% | |
| 4 | Final Map and Parcel Map | | | | | | | |
| | a) Parcel Map Check | Fixed Fee | \$5,742 | \$8,050 | \$8,050 | 71% | 100% | |
| | b) Final Map Check | | | | | | | |
| | i. Base Fee | Fixed Fee | \$10,719 | \$11,500 | \$11,500 | 93% | 100% | |
| | ii. Plus, Per Lot Fee | Fixed Fee | \$0 | \$144 | \$144 | 0% | 100% | |
| | c) Final Map Amendment/Certificate of Correction | Fixed Fee | \$2,899 | \$6,900 | \$6,900 | 42% | 100% | |
| 5 | Right of Ways (ROW) and Easements | | | | | | | |
| | a) Review of ROW/Easement Documents | Fixed Fee | \$1,334 | \$3,450 | \$3,450 | 39% | 100% | |
| | b) ROW/Easement Abandonment | Fixed Fee | \$2,451 | \$5,750 | \$5,750 | 43% | 100% | |
| 6 | Subdivision Agreement Processing | Fixed Fee | \$1,083 | \$5,750 | \$5,750 | 19% | 100% | |

City of Folsom
Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees
Illustration of Current Fees, Maximum Fees, and Proposed Fees

| # | Description | Proposed Fee Structure | Current Fee | Cost of Service (Max. Fee) | Proposed Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Cost Recovery | Note |
|----|---|------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------|------------------------|------|
| 7 | Transportation Permit | | | | | | | |
| | a) Permit | Fixed Fee | \$19 | | \$16 | | | |
| | b) Annual Permit | Fixed Fee | \$86 | | \$90 | | | |
| 8 | Tree Removal/Work Permit | | | | | | | |
| | a) Permitted Removal/Work | | | | | | | |
| | i. Existing Occupied Structure | | | | | | | |
| | a. 0-2 Trees | Fixed Fee | \$38 | \$100 | \$100 | 38% | 100% | |
| | b. 3+ Trees: See New Construction Rate Below | Fixed Fee | \$38 | \$1,200 | \$1,200 | 3% | 100% | |
| | c. "In Decline" Tree | Fixed Fee | \$38 | \$100 | \$100 | 38% | 100% | |
| | ii. New Construction (e.g. Custom Home, Subdivision, Parcel Map, | | | | | | | |
| | a. 0-4 Trees | Fixed Fee | \$38 | \$1,200 | \$1,200 | 3% | 100% | |
| | b. 5+ Trees | Fixed Fee | \$38 | \$1,400 | \$1,400 + 10% per tree | 3% | | |
| | iii. Misc. | Per Hour | \$38 | \$200 | \$200 | 19% | 100% | |
| | b) w/o Permit (Does not include mitigation) Double the Permit Rate | Fixed Fee | \$438 | \$2,400 | 2x permit amount | 18% | varies | |
| | Other Fees for Service | | | | | | | |
| 9 | Research of Engineering Records | Per Hour | \$103 | \$200 | \$200 | 52% | 100% | |
| 10 | Miscellaneous Engineering Services | Per Hour | \$103 | \$200 | \$200 | 52% | 100% | |
| 11 | Excess Plan Review Fee (4th and subsequent) | Per Hour | n/a | \$200 | \$200 | | 100% | |
| 12 | Revisions | Per Hour | n/a | \$200 | \$200 | | 100% | |
| 13 | After Hours Inspection (per hour) (2-hour minimum) | Per Hour | \$103 | \$240 | \$240 | 43% | 100% | |
| 14 | Re-inspection Fee (2nd Time or More) (each) | Each | n/a | \$100 | \$100 | | 100% | |
| 15 | Missed Inspection Fee | Each | n/a | \$100 | \$100 | | 100% | |
| 16 | Expedited Services Fee | Fixed Fee | 1.5x Regular Fee | | 1.5x Regular Fee | | | |
| 17 | Residential Landscape Review | Per Hour | Hourly Rate of Arborist | \$200 | Hourly Rate of Arborist | | | |
| 18 | Technical Assistance/Third Party Review or Inspection | T & M | Actual Cost | | Actual Cost | | | |

[a] Use time and materials with initial deposit to be determined by City Engineer, based on anticipated scope of work.

[b] Encroachment agreement required in addition to insurance (e.g., parklets).

User and Regulatory Fees

Cost of Service Calculations

Building

DRAFT

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Allocation of Annual Labor Effort - Building

Authorized Staffing

| Position | FTE | Total Hours Per FTE | Less: Holiday & Leave | Hours Per FTE | Productive Hours | Indirect | Direct | Total | Indirect Hours | Total Direct Hours | Total Hours | Notes |
|--------------------------------|--------------|---------------------|-----------------------|---------------|------------------|----------|--------|-------|----------------|--------------------|---------------|---------|
| Building Inspector I/II | 3.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 5,592 | 20% | 80% | 100% | 1,118 | 4,474 | 5,592 | [a];[b] |
| Building Plans Coordinator | 2.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 3,728 | 20% | 80% | 100% | 746 | 2,982 | 3,728 | [a];[b] |
| Building Technician I/II | 2.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 3,728 | 50% | 50% | 100% | 1,864 | 1,864 | 3,728 | [a];[b] |
| Plan Check Engineer | 1.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 1,864 | 20% | 80% | 100% | 373 | 1,491 | 1,864 | [a];[b] |
| Building Inspection Supervisor | 1.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 1,864 | 40% | 60% | 100% | 746 | 1,118 | 1,864 | [a];[b] |
| Principal Civil Engineer | 1.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 1,864 | 50% | 50% | 100% | 932 | 932 | 1,864 | [a];[b] |
| Senior Civil Engineer | 1.00 | 2,080 | 216 | 1,864 | 1,864 | 20% | 80% | 100% | 373 | 1,491 | 1,864 | [a];[b] |
| Total | 11.00 | | | | 20,504 | | | | 6,151 | 14,353 | 20,504 | |
| Total | | | | | | | | | 30% | 70% | 100% | |

| Position | Indirect | Direct | Total |
|--------------------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|
| Building Inspector I/II | 1,118 | 4,474 | 5,592 |
| Building Plans Coordinator | 746 | 2,982 | 3,728 |
| Building Technician I/II | 1,864 | 1,864 | 3,728 |
| Plan Check Engineer | 373 | 1,491 | 1,864 |
| Building Inspection Supervisor | 746 | 1,118 | 1,864 |
| Principal Civil Engineer | 932 | 932 | 1,864 |
| Senior Civil Engineer | 373 | 1,491 | 1,864 |
| Total | 6,151 | 14,353 | 20,504 |

Contract Services

| Description | Total | Notes |
|--------------------------|------------|-------|
| Annual Contract Services | \$ 650,000 | [c] |

| Contract Services | Share | Est. Hrly Cost | Notes |
|-------------------|-------------|----------------|------------|
| Inspection | 33% | \$ 110 | [d] |
| Plan Review | 67% | \$ 140 | [d] |
| Total | 100% | 130 | [e] |

| Description | Total | Indirect | Direct | Indirect | Direct | Total | Notes |
|------------------------|-------|----------|--------|----------|--------|-------|-------|
| Contract Service Hours | 5,000 | 10% | 90% | 500 | 4,500 | 5,000 | [c] |

Divisional Total

| Position | Indirect | Direct | Total | Notes |
|---------------------|--------------|---------------|---------------|-------|
| Authorized Staffing | 6,151 | 14,353 | 20,504 | |
| Contract Services | 500 | 4,500 | 5,000 | |
| Total | 6,651 | 18,853 | 25,504 | |
| Total | 26% | 74% | 100% | |

- [a] Staffing based on FY 23/24 adopted budget
- [b] Allocation of hours intended to serve as reasonable estimate. Amount may vary from year-to-year and position to position.
- [c] Source: Annual average FY 18/19 through FY 21/22.
- [d] Amounts intended to serve as reasonable estimates of market rates for contract service providers.
- [e] Average hourly rate for contract services received.

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Allocation of Divisional Expenses - Building

Recurring Divisional Expenditures [a]

| Description | Total | Adjustments | Total | Notes |
|---------------------------|---------------------|-------------------|---------------------|-------|
| Salaries - Permanent | \$ 1,032,925 | \$ - | \$ 1,032,925 | |
| Salaries - Temporary | \$ 50,000 | \$ - | \$ 50,000 | |
| Annual Leave Account | \$ 15,125 | \$ - | \$ 15,125 | |
| Uniform Allowance | \$ 2,025 | \$ - | \$ 2,025 | |
| FICA | \$ 82,121 | \$ - | \$ 82,121 | |
| PERS | \$ 412,624 | \$ - | \$ 412,624 | |
| Deferred Comp - City Paid | \$ 23,400 | \$ - | \$ 23,400 | |
| Combined Benefits | \$ 208,931 | \$ - | \$ 208,931 | |
| Contracts | \$ 265,000 | \$ 385,000 | \$ 650,000 | [b] |
| Insurance / Liability | \$ 56,472 | \$ - | \$ 56,472 | |
| Subtotal | \$ 2,148,623 | \$ 385,000 | \$ 2,533,623 | |

Allocation of Department and Citywide Overhead

| Description | Total | Adjustments | Total | Notes |
|---------------------|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------|
| Department Overhead | \$ 372,993 | \$ - | \$ 372,993 | [c] |
| Citywide Overhead | \$ 147,300 | \$ - | \$ 147,300 | [c] |
| Subtotal | \$ 520,293 | \$ - | \$ 520,293 | |

Support from Other Departments

| Description | Total | Adjustments | Total | Notes |
|---|-------------------|-------------|-------------------|-------|
| Plan Review and Permit Support from Other Depts | \$ 65,000 | \$ - | \$ 65,000 | [c] |
| Annual In-House Technology Licensing | \$ 40,000 | \$ - | \$ 40,000 | [c] |
| Annual In-House Maintenance of Zoning Code, Plans & | \$ 226,776 | \$ - | \$ 226,776 | [c] |
| Subtotal | \$ 331,776 | \$ - | \$ 331,776 | |

Total

| Description | Total | Notes |
|-----------------------------------|---------------------|-------|
| Recurring Divisional Expenditures | \$ 2,533,623 | |
| Department Overhead | \$ 372,993 | |
| Support from Other Departments | \$ 331,776 | |
| Citywide Overhead | \$ 147,300 | |
| Subtotal | \$ 3,385,691 | |

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

| Description | Total | Note |
|-----------------------------------|---------------|------|
| Costs | \$ 3,385,691 | |
| Direct Hours | 18,853 | [c] |
| Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate | \$ 180 | |

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Allocation of Divisional Expenses - Building

Cost Recovery Overview

| Description | Org Key | Object | Actual 2012/13 | Actual 2013/14 | Actual 2014/15 | Actual 2015/16 | Actual 2016/17 | Actual 2017/18 | Actual 2018/19 | Actual 2019/20 | Actual 2020/21 | Actual 2021/22 | 10-Year Avg | Percentage | Notes |
|---------------------------|---------|---------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|--------------------|-------------|-------|
| Building Permit Fees | 0102320 | 3224000 | \$1,090,143 | \$1,391,334 | \$1,435,293 | \$1,160,275 | \$1,215,167 | \$1,757,983 | \$2,022,669 | \$2,259,054 | \$3,143,495 | \$3,632,168 | \$1,910,758 | 67% | |
| Building Reinspection Fee | 0102320 | 3440401 | \$1,320 | \$1,080 | \$2,400 | \$3,000 | \$2,405 | \$1,680 | \$1,330 | \$1,985 | \$240 | \$1,080 | \$1,652 | 0% | |
| Structure Plan Check Fees | 0102320 | 3444100 | \$565,642 | \$866,826 | \$727,668 | \$966,213 | \$988,989 | \$839,076 | \$899,484 | \$919,517 | \$1,298,637 | \$1,234,323 | \$930,637 | 33% | |
| Seismic Training Fee | 0102320 | 3444300 | \$897 | \$859 | \$766 | \$2,300 | \$1,864 | \$320 | \$2,413 | \$469 | \$0 | \$7,070 | \$1,696 | 0% | |
| State Bldg Standards Fund | 0102320 | 3444400 | \$430 | \$638 | \$515 | \$550 | \$698 | \$403 | \$4,051 | \$331 | \$0 | \$3,338 | \$1,095 | 0% | |
| Total | | | \$1,658,432 | \$2,260,737 | \$2,166,642 | \$2,132,338 | \$2,209,123 | \$2,599,462 | \$2,929,947 | \$3,181,356 | \$4,442,372 | \$4,877,979 | \$2,845,839 | 100% | |

Cost Recovery Analysis

| Description | Total | Note |
|----------------------|-------------|------|
| Average Revenues | \$2,845,839 | |
| Annualized Costs | \$3,385,691 | |
| Cost Recovery | 84% | |

[a] Source: FY 23/24 adopted budget.

[b] Adjustment to align to FY 22/23 actual contract service expenditures.

[c] See separate worksheets in this model. Amounts intended to serve as reasonable estimates.

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Building Fees
 Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

| Fee Description | Total | | Hourly Rate | = | Cost of Svc | Current Fee | Current Est. Cost Recovery | Proposed Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Note |
|---|-------|---|-------------|---|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|---------|
| 1 HVAC Change-Out - Residential | 1.25 | x | \$180 | = | \$225 | varies | varies | 100% | \$225 | |
| 2 Water Heater Change-Out - Residential | 1.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$180 | varies | varies | 100% | \$180 | |
| 3 Residential Re-Roof | 2.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$360 | varies | varies | 100% | \$360 | |
| 4 Siding Replacement | 1.75 | x | \$180 | = | \$315 | varies | varies | 100% | \$315 | |
| 5 Service Panel Upgrade - Residential | 1.50 | x | \$180 | = | \$270 | varies | varies | 100% | \$270 | |
| 6 Battery Backup Storage | 2.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$360 | varies | varies | 100% | \$360 | |
| 7 Electric Vehicle Charger | 2.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$360 | varies | varies | 100% | \$360 | |
| 8 Generator | 2.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$360 | varies | varies | 100% | \$360 | |
| 9 Residential Solar Photovoltaic System - Solar Permit | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Plan Review | | | | | | | | | | |
| i) Base Fee for 15kW or Less | | | | | | varies | varies | | \$200 | [a],[b] |
| ii) Fee for Each Additional kW above 15kW | | | | | | varies | varies | | \$15 | [a],[b] |
| b) Permit | | | | | | varies | varies | | \$250 | [a],[b] |
| 10 Commercial Solar Photovoltaic System - Solar Permit | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Plan Review | | | | | | | | | | |
| i) Base Fee 50kW or Less | | | | | | varies | varies | | \$444 | [a],[b] |
| ii) Fee for Each Add'l kW above 50kW up to 250kW | | | | | | varies | varies | | \$7 | [a],[b] |
| ii) Fee for Each Add'l kW above 250kW | | | | | | varies | varies | | \$5 | [a],[b] |
| b) Permit | | | | | | varies | varies | | \$556 | [a],[b] |
| 11 Pool Solar | 1.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$180 | varies | varies | 100% | \$180 | |
| 12 Swimming Pool Replaster / Equipment Change-Out | 2.50 | x | \$180 | = | \$450 | varies | varies | 100% | \$450 | |
| 13 Swimming Pool Remodel (e.g., Changing Pool Shape, Adding Cabo Shelf, etc.) | 5.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$900 | varies | varies | 100% | \$900 | |
| 14 Retaining Wall | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) One Type of Retaining Wall Type/Configuration | 3.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$540 | varies | varies | 100% | \$540 | |
| b) Each Additional Wall Type/Configuration | 1.50 | x | \$180 | = | \$270 | varies | varies | 100% | \$270 | |
| 15 Window / Sliding Glass Door - Retrofit / Repair | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Up to 5 | 1.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$180 | varies | varies | 100% | \$180 | |
| b) Per Window Over 5 Windows | 0.20 | x | \$180 | = | \$36 | varies | varies | 100% | \$36 | |
| 16 Fences Requiring a Building Permit | 2.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$360 | varies | varies | 100% | \$360 | |

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Building Fees
 Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

| Fee Description | Total | | Hourly Rate | = | Cost of Svc | Current Fee | Current Est. Cost Recovery | Proposed Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Note |
|---|-------|---|-------------|---|-------------|-------------|----------------------------|------------------------|--------------|------|
| 17 Electrical and Irrigation Pedestals per pedestal | 1.50 | x | \$180 | = | \$270 | varies | varies | 100% | \$270 | |
| 18 Detached and Attached ADUs | 25.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$4,500 | varies | varies | 100% | \$4,500 | |
| 19 Junior ADUs | 12.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$2,160 | varies | varies | 100% | \$2,160 | |

[a] Total fees shall not exceed amounts outlined in California Government Code 66015(a)(1).

[b] The City will not collect additional permit processing fees. Amounts shown are total amount due for permit processing, plan review, and permit.

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Building Fees
 Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

| Fee Description | Est. City Staff Labor Hrs | | Fully-Burdened Hourly | = | Est. Cost of Service | Current Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Proposed Cost Recovery | Unit | Notes |
|---|---------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------|------------------------|------|-------|
| Permit Fee for New Buildings, Additions, Tenant Improvements, Residential Remodels, and Combined Mechanical, Electrical, and/or Plumbing Permits | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1 \$1 - \$2,000 | 0.75 | x | \$180 | = | \$135 | \$100 | 74% | \$135 | 100% | | |
| 2 \$2,001 - \$25,000 | 0.75 | x | \$180 | = | \$135 | \$100 | 74% | \$135 | 100% | | |
| 3 \$25,001 - \$50,000 | 2.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$360 | \$330 | 92% | \$360 | 100% | | |
| 4 \$50,001 - \$100,000 | 3.50 | x | \$180 | = | \$630 | \$530 | 84% | \$630 | 100% | | |
| 5 \$100,001 - \$500,000 | 6.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$1,080 | \$880 | 81% | \$1,080 | 100% | | |
| 6 \$500,001 - \$1,000,000 | 22.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$3,960 | \$3,280 | 83% | \$3,960 | 100% | | |
| 7 \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000 | 40.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$7,200 | \$6,030 | 84% | \$7,200 | 100% | | |
| 8 \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | 160.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$28,800 | \$26,030 | 90% | \$28,800 | 100% | | |
| 9 \$10,000,001 - \$10,000,000 | 260.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$46,800 | \$51,030 | 109% | \$46,800 | 100% | | |

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Building Fees
 Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

| Fee Description | Est. City Staff Labor Hrs | | Fully-Burdened Hourly | Est. Cost of Service | Current Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Proposed Cost Recovery | Notes |
|--|------------------------------|---|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|--------------------------------|------------------------|-------|
| 1 Building Plan Check Fees - Building | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Plan Review Fee, if applicable | 80% | | | | | | 80% | 100% | [a] |
| b) Expedited Plan Check - At Application Submittal (when applicable) | 1.5x standard plan check fee | | | | | | 1.5x standard plan check fee | 100% | |
| c) Tract Home / Master Plan Construction (Production Units) | 20% | | | | \$150 | varies | 20% of standard plan check fee | 100% | [b] |
| d) Production Permit for Multi-family permit | 8.00 | x | \$180 | = \$1,440 | \$150 | 10% | \$1,440 | 100% | |
| e) Production Permit for Fire permits and other misc. permits | 2.50 | x | \$180 | = \$450 | \$150 | 33% | \$450 | 100% | |
| f) Alternate Materials and Methods Review (per hour) | 1.00 | x | \$180 | = \$180 | | | \$180 | 100% | |
| g) Excess Plan Review Fee (4th and subsequent) (per hour) | 1.00 | x | \$180 | = \$180 | | | \$180 | 100% | |
| h) Revisions to an Approved Permit (per hour) | 1.00 | x | \$180 | = \$180 | | | \$180 | 100% | |
| i) Deferred Submittal (per hour) | 1.00 | x | \$180 | = \$180 | | | \$180 | 100% | |

[a] Includes up to three plan checks. The City will bill hourly for additional plan review required.

[b] For identical buildings built by the same builder on the same lot or in the same tract and for which building permits are issued at the same time.

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Building Fees
 Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

| Fee Description | Est. City Staff Labor Hrs | Fully-Burdened Hourly | Est. Cost of Service | Current Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Proposed Cost Recovery | Unit | Notes |
|--|---------------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---|------------------------|------|-------|
| 1 Permit Processing Fee | 0.42 | x \$180 = | \$75 | | | \$75 | 100% | | |
| 2 Strong Motion Instrumentation (SMI) Fee Calculation | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Residential | | | | | | \$0.50 or valuation x .00013 | | | |
| b) Commercial | | | | | | \$0.50 or valuation x .00028 | | | |
| 3 Building Standards (SB 1473) Fee Calculation (Valuation) | | | | | | | | | |
| a) \$1 - \$25,000 | | | | | | \$1 | | | |
| b) \$25,001 - \$50,000 | | | | | | \$2 | | | |
| c) \$50,001 - \$75,000 | | | | | | \$3 | | | |
| d) \$75,001 - \$100,000 | | | | | | \$4 | | | |
| e) Each Add'l \$25,000 or fraction thereof | | | | | | Add \$1 | | | |
| 4 General Plan and Zoning Code Update Fee (percent of building permit fee) | | | 9% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 55% | | [b] |
| 5 Technology Fee (percent of permit fee) | | | 9% | 0% | 0% | 5% | 56% | | [b] |
| 6 Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (per 30 Days) | 3.00 | x \$180 = | \$540 | | | \$540 | 100% | | |
| 7 Permit Extension | 0.50 | x \$180 = | \$90 | | | \$0 | 0% | | |
| 8 Permit Reactivation Fee | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Reactivation Fee if All Inspections Have Been Performed and Approved Up to But Not Including Final Inspection | 1.00 | x \$180 = | \$180 | | | \$180 | 100% | | |
| b) Reactivation Fee - All Other Scenarios | | | | | | | | | |
| i) Permit Expired Up to One Year | | | | | | 50% of Original Base Building Permit Fee | | | |
| ii) Permit Expired More than One Year | | | | | | 100% of Original Base Building Permit Fee | | | |
| 9 Permit Reissuance Fee | 1.00 | x \$180 = | \$180 | | | \$180 | 100% | | |
| 10 Damaged Building Survey (Fire, Flood, Vehicle Damage, Etc.) (per hour) | 1.00 | x \$180 = | \$180 | | | \$180 | 100% | | |
| Other Fees | | | | | | | | | |
| 11 Phased Inspection Fee (per inspection) | 1.00 | x \$180 = | \$180 | | | \$180 | 100% | | |
| 12 After Hours Inspection (per hour) (4-hour minimum) | 1.20 | x \$180 = | \$216 | | | \$216 | 100% | | |
| 13 Re-inspection Fee (2nd Time or More) (each) | 1.00 | x \$180 = | \$180 | | | \$180 | 100% | | [a] |

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Building Fees
 Cost of Service Calculation - At Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

| Fee Description | Est. City Staff Labor Hrs | | Fully-Burdened Hourly | = | Est. Cost of Service | Current Fee | Current Cost Recovery | Proposed Fee | Proposed Cost Recovery | Unit | Notes |
|--|---------------------------|---|-----------------------|---|----------------------|-------------|-----------------------|---------------------|------------------------|------|-------|
| 14 Missed Inspection Fee | 1.00 | x | \$180 | = | \$180 | | | \$180 | 100% | | |
| 15 Duplicate Copy of Permit | 0.42 | x | \$180 | = | \$75 | | | \$75 | 100% | | |
| 16 Duplicate Copy of Certificate of Occupancy | 0.42 | x | \$180 | = | \$75 | | | \$75 | 100% | | |
| 17 Fees for Services Not Listed in this Fee Schedule (per 1/2 hour) | 0.50 | x | \$180 | = | \$90 | | | \$90 | 100% | | |
| Violation Fees | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 18 Investigation Fee For Work Done Without Permits (In addition to applicable permit fees) | | | | | | | | equal to permit fee | | | |
| Refunds | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 19 Refunds | | | | | | | | | | | |
| a) Fees Erroneously Paid or Collected by the City | | | | | | | | 100% refund | | | |
| b) Refund of Plan Review Fees - Prior to Plan Review Commencing | | | | | | | | up to 80% refund | | | |
| c) Refund of Permit Fees - Prior to Inspection Commencing | | | | | | | | up to 80% refund | | | |
| d) 180 Days After Payment of Fees | | | | | | | | no refund | | | |

[a] Reinspection fee applies after the first re-inspection.

[b] Fee applies to new construction, additions, tenant improvements, and residential remodels requiring building permits.

[c] Fee applies to all permits.

User and Regulatory Fees

Cost of Service Calculations

General Plan / Zoning Code Update

DRAFT

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Study
 Cost of Service Calculation - General Plan Update / Zoning Code Update Costs

Estimated Expenditures

| Description | Total | Amortization / Update Frequency | Annual Cost | Cost Type | Notes |
|----------------------|---------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| General Plan Update | \$ 2,000,000 | 20 | \$ 100,000 | Periodic | [a];[b] |
| Housing Element | \$ 500,000 | 8 | \$ 62,500 | Periodic | [a];[b] |
| Zoning Code | \$ 500,000 | 5 | \$ 100,000 | Periodic | [a];[b] |
| In-House Maintenance | \$ 226,776 | 1 | \$ 226,776 | Annual | [a];[c] |
| Total | \$ 3,226,776 | | \$ 489,276 | | |

Cost Allocation

| Description | Total | Share to Recover | Target Cost Recovery | Notes |
|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------------|---------|
| Periodic Costs | \$ 262,500 | 67% | \$ 175,000 | [a];[d] |

Allocation Base

| Description | Total | Notes |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------|
| Estimated Building Permit Fees | \$ 1,910,758 | [e] |

Fee at Full Cost Recovery

| Description | Total | Notes |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------|
| Target Recovery | \$ 175,000 | |
| Estimated Building Permit Fees | \$ 1,910,758 | |
| Total | 9% | |

Cost Recovery Alternative Scenarios

| Description | Total | Total | Total | Notes |
|--------------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-------|
| % of Permit Fee | 0% | 5% | 9% | |
| Estimated Building Permit Fees | \$ 1,910,758 | \$ 1,910,758 | \$ 1,910,758 | |
| Forecast Revenue | \$ - | \$ 95,538 | \$ 175,000 | |
| Annual Revenue Requirement | \$ 175,000 | \$ 175,000 | \$ 175,000 | |
| Cost Recovery | 0.00% | 54.59% | 100.00% | |

Notes:

- [a] Source: Conservative estimates of update costs. Amounts will likely be higher.
- [b] Target recovery of periodic costs, or portion of periodic costs, via General Plan/Zoning Code Update Fee.
- [c] Recover annual costs, or portion of annual costs, via standard permit and plan review fees.
- [d] Assumes portion of General Plan/Zoning Code Update costs will continue to be paid via General Fund resources.
- [e] Amounts represents multi-year average of building permit fee collection.

User and Regulatory Fees

Cost of Service Calculations

Development Specific Technology Enhancements / Land Management Tracking

DRAFT

Estimated Expenditures

| Description | Total | Amortization / Update Frequency | Annual Cost | Cost Type | Note |
|------------------------|------------------|---------------------------------|-------------------|-----------|---------|
| Software and Licensing | \$40,000 | 1 | \$ 40,000 | Annual | [a];[b] |
| Hardware Upgrades | \$50,000 | 5 | \$ 10,000 | Periodic | [a];[c] |
| Implementation | \$750,000 | 5 | \$ 150,000 | Periodic | [a];[c] |
| Contingency (10%) | \$50,000 | 5 | \$ 10,000 | Periodic | [a];[c] |
| Total | \$890,000 | | \$ 210,000 | | |

Cost Allocation

| Description | Total | Share to Recover | Target Cost Recovery | Notes |
|----------------|------------|------------------|----------------------|-------|
| Periodic Costs | \$ 170,000 | 100% | \$ 170,000 | |

Allocation Base

| Description | Total | Notes |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------|
| Estimated Building Permit Fees | \$ 1,910,758 | [d] |

Fee at Full Cost Recovery

| Description | Total | Notes |
|--------------------------------|--------------|-------|
| Target Recovery | \$ 170,000 | |
| Estimated Building Permit Fees | \$ 1,910,758 | |
| Total | 9% | |

Current Cost Recovery

| Description | Total | Total | Total | Notes |
|--------------------------------|--------------|---------------|----------------|-------|
| % of Permit Fee | 0% | 5% | 9% | |
| Estimated Building Permit Fees | \$ 1,910,758 | \$ 1,910,758 | \$ 1,910,758 | |
| Forecast Revenue | \$ - | \$ 95,538 | \$ 170,000 | |
| Annual Revenue Requirement | \$ 170,000 | \$ 170,000 | \$ 170,000 | |
| Cost Recovery | 0.00% | 56.20% | 100.00% | |

- [a] Useful life and ongoing licensing costs, and annual revenues estimated by ClearSource. Amounts are intended to represent reasonable estimates.
- [b] Recover annual costs, or portion of annual costs, via standard permit and plan review fees.
- [c] Target recovery of periodic costs, or portion of periodic costs, via Technology Fee.
- [d] Amounts represents multi-year average of building permit fee collection.

User and Regulatory Fees

Cost of Service Calculations

Allocation of Citywide Overhead

DRAFT

City of Folsom
 User and Regulatory Fee Analysis
 Estimated Citywide Overhead (for Cost of Service Calculation Purposes Only)

Central Service Center - General Fund Allocation [a]

| Department | Annual Expenses | Notes |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-------|
| City Council | \$117,437 | |
| City Manager | \$1,256,732 | |
| City Attorney | \$1,234,309 | |
| City Clerk | \$681,049 | |
| Human Resources | \$886,511 | |
| Management and Budget | \$6,246,759 | |
| Fleet Management | \$1,674,868 | |
| Total | \$12,097,665 | |

City Staffing Position Total [a],[b]

| Department | Total | Adjustment for Direct Svc Depts Only | Adjusted Staffing for Cwide OH Alloc | Share of Cwide OH Alloc | Cwide OH Alloc | Notes |
|-----------------------|---------------|--------------------------------------|--------------------------------------|-------------------------|----------------------|-------|
| City Council | 5.00 | (5.00) | - | 0% | \$ - | |
| City Manager | 4.00 | (4.00) | - | 0% | \$ - | |
| City Attorney | 4.00 | (4.00) | - | 0% | \$ - | |
| City Clerk | 3.00 | (3.00) | - | 0% | \$ - | |
| Community Development | 27.00 | - | 27.00 | 6% | \$ 736,498 | |
| Fire Department | 90.00 | - | 90.00 | 20% | \$ 2,454,994 | |
| Human Resources | 6.00 | (6.00) | - | 0% | \$ - | |
| Library | 12.00 | - | 12.00 | 3% | \$ 327,333 | |
| Management and Budget | 25.00 | (25.00) | - | 0% | \$ - | |
| Parks and Recreation | 49.00 | - | 49.00 | 11% | \$ 1,336,608 | |
| Police Department | 113.50 | - | 113.50 | 26% | \$ 3,096,020 | |
| Public Works | 34.55 | - | 34.55 | 8% | \$ 942,445 | |
| Water Resources | 58.00 | - | 58.00 | 13% | \$ 1,582,107 | |
| Solid Waste | 59.45 | - | 59.45 | 13% | \$ 1,621,660 | |
| Total | 490.50 | (47.00) | 443.50 | 100% | \$ 12,097,665 | |

Estimated Citywide Alloc to Community Development Direct Service Units

| Dept/Division | Share of Allocation | Share of Allocation | Notes |
|------------------|---------------------|---------------------|-------|
| Building | 20% | \$ 147,300 | [c] |
| Code Enforcement | 8% | \$ 58,920 | [c] |
| Engineering | 30% | \$ 220,949 | [c] |
| Planning | 42% | \$ 309,329 | [c] |
| Total | 100% | \$ 736,498 | |

* This represents a conservative indirect cost rate calculation. This estimate was developed for purposes of user and regulatory fee cost of service analysis. As part of day-to-day operations, staff may categorize, assign, or quantify indirect costs using different criteria and methods.

[a] Source: FY 23/24 adopted budget.

[b] Indirect cost allocation basis is staffing levels of direct service departments.

[c] Based on feedback received from Community Development Department. Amounts intended to serve as reasonable estimates.

APPENDIX C

PROPOSED FEES

City of Folsom

PLANNING FEES

| # | Description | Fee | Fee Structure | Note |
|---|---|----------|---------------|---------|
| 1 | Annexation Processing | \$17,000 | Deposit | [a] |
| 2 | Appeal | | | |
| | a) Appeal of Staff Decision - Owner Occupied | \$1,700 | Fixed Fee | [b] |
| | b) Appeal of Staff Decision - by Developer/Other | \$3,400 | Fixed Fee | [b] |
| | c) Appeal of Commission Decision - Owner Occupied | \$3,400 | Fixed Fee | [b] |
| | d) Appeal of Commission Decision - by Developer/Other | \$6,800 | Fixed Fee | [b] |
| 3 | Code Amendment | \$8,500 | Fixed Fee | |
| 4 | Conditional Use Permit (CUP) | | | |
| | a) CUP Review (Major) | \$5,100 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) CUP Review (Minor) | \$2,500 | Fixed Fee | |
| | c) CUP Modification | \$2,500 | Fixed Fee | |
| 5 | Condominium Conversion Fee | \$17,000 | Fixed Fee | |
| 6 | Design Review/Architectural Review | | | |
| | a) New Multi-Family/Commercial (Commission Level) | \$5,100 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Minor Multi-Family/Commercial (Staff Level) | \$500 | Fixed Fee | |
| | c) New Single and Two Family Dwelling | \$800 | Fixed Fee | |
| | d) Minor Single and Two Family Dwelling | \$250 | Fixed Fee | |
| | e) Historic District New Multi-Family/Commercial | \$5,100 | Fixed Fee | |
| | f) Historic District Minor Multi-Family/Commercial | \$250 | Fixed Fee | |
| | g) Historic District New Single Family, Two-Family Dwelling and ADU >800 sq. ft. and/or 16 ft. tall | \$3,400 | Fixed Fee | |
| | h) Historic District Minor Single and Two Family Dwelling | \$250 | Fixed Fee | |
| 7 | Development Agreement Processing | \$10,000 | Deposit | [a] |
| 8 | Entertainment Permit | \$200 | Fixed Fee | |
| 9 | Environmental Review | | | |
| | a) Environmental Impact Review & Report | \$10,000 | Deposit | [a],[c] |
| | b) Environmental Mitigation Program Monitoring | \$7,000 | Deposit | [a],[c] |
| | c) Initial Environmental Study/Assessment | \$7,000 | Deposit | [a],[c] |
| | d) Notice of CEQA Determination | \$300 | Fixed Fee | |

City of Folsom

PLANNING FEES

| # | Description | Fee | Fee Structure | Note |
|----|--|----------------------------|---------------|------|
| 10 | General Plan | | | |
| | a) General Plan Amendment < 5 acres | \$10,000 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) General Plan Amendment 5 or more acres | \$13,000 | Fixed Fee | |
| 11 | Home Occupation Permit Fee | \$60 | Fixed Fee | |
| 12 | Indoor Marijuana Cultivation Permit | \$500 | Fixed Fee | |
| 13 | Landmark Tree Classification | \$350 | Fixed Fee | |
| 14 | Landmark Tree Declassification | \$1,800 | Fixed Fee | [d] |
| 15 | Large Family Day Care Home | \$100 | Fixed Fee | |
| 16 | Lot Line Adjustment/Parcel Merger - Planning | \$1,000 | Fixed Fee | [e] |
| 17 | Non-Residential Plan Check Fee | 10% of building permit fee | Fixed Fee | |
| 18 | Opinion on a Planning Matter | \$200 | Fixed Fee | |
| 19 | Preliminary Project Review | \$1,000 | Fixed Fee | |
| 20 | Planned Development | | | |
| | a) Planned Development Review | | | |
| | i) Base Fee | \$10,000 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii) Plus, Per Acre Fee | \$500 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Planned Development Extension Review | \$3,000 | Fixed Fee | |
| | c) Planned Development Modification Review | \$5,000 | Fixed Fee | |
| 21 | Rezoning Request | | | |
| | a) Rezoning Request Review – 5 acres or less | \$10,000 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Rezoning Request Review – 5+ acres | \$13,000 | Fixed Fee | |
| 22 | Sidewalk Vendor Permit | \$50 | Fixed Fee | |

City of Folsom

PLANNING FEES

| # | Description | Fee | Fee Structure | Note |
|----|--|----------|---------------|------|
| 23 | Signs | | | |
| | a) Sign Permit - Staff | \$150 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Sign Permit Extension | \$100 | Fixed Fee | |
| | c) Special Event Sign Permit | \$100 | Fixed Fee | |
| | d) Historic District Sign Review (Staff Level) | \$150 | Fixed Fee | |
| | e) Historic District Sign Review (Commission Level) | \$800 | Fixed Fee | |
| | f) Planned Development Sign Permit | \$2,500 | Fixed Fee | |
| | g) Temporary Sign Permit | \$40 | Fixed Fee | |
| | h) On-Site Subdivision Signs | \$200 | Fixed Fee | |
| | i) Off-Site Subdivision Signs | | | |
| | i) base fee | \$300 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii) refundable deposit - per sign | \$500 | Deposit | |
| | j) Off-Site Weekend Directional Signs | | | |
| | i) base fee | \$300 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii) refundable deposit | \$200 | Deposit | |
| | k) Uniform Sign Program | \$400 | Fixed Fee | |
| 24 | Site Design Review | | | |
| | a) Site Design Review | \$400 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Site Design Review – Planning Commission | \$5,100 | Fixed Fee | |
| 25 | Special Event Permit | | | |
| | a) Special Event Permit | \$500 | Fixed Fee | [f] |
| | b) Over 1,000 People Per Day (charged per thousand) | \$432 | Fixed Fee | |
| | c) Consultation Meeting for Events Over 1,000 People Per Day | \$200 | Fixed Fee | |
| | d) Traffic Control Plan or Street Closure for New Event | \$700 | Fixed Fee | |
| | e) Traffic Control Plan or Street Closure for Repeated Event (No Substantial Changes from Previous Year) | \$400 | Fixed Fee | |
| | f) Alcohol/ABC Permit | \$324 | Fixed Fee | |
| | g) Fire Inspections | \$400 | Fixed Fee | |
| | h) Block Party Permit | \$100 | Fixed Fee | |
| 26 | Specific Plan | | | |
| | a) Specific Plan Review | \$15,500 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Specific Plan Amendment Review | \$10,300 | Fixed Fee | |

City of Folsom

PLANNING FEES

| # | Description | Fee | Fee Structure | Note |
|----|--|---------|---------------|------|
| 27 | Street Name Review/Change | \$800 | Fixed Fee | |
| 28 | Temporary Outdoor Dining | | | |
| | a) Initial Permit (Additional Revocable Permit Fees Apply) | \$280 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Renewal | \$140 | Fixed Fee | |
| 28 | Temporary Use Permit | \$300 | Fixed Fee | |
| 29 | Tentative Map/Parcel/Subdivision Map | | | |
| | a) Tentative Parcel Map Review | \$7,700 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Tentative Map Amendment Review | \$5,100 | Fixed Fee | |
| | c) Tentative Map Extension Review | \$4,300 | Fixed Fee | |
| | d) Tentative Subdivision Map Review | | | |
| | i) Base Fee | \$8,600 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii) Plus, Per Lot Fee | \$50 | Fixed Fee | |
| 30 | Unattended Donation Box | | | |
| | a) Initial Permit | \$300 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Renewal | \$100 | Fixed Fee | |
| 31 | Variance | | | |
| | a) Variance Review – Single Family Dwelling | \$2,500 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Variance Review - Other | \$5,100 | Fixed Fee | |
| 32 | Zoning Verification Review | \$400 | Fixed Fee | |
| 33 | For Services Requested of City Staff which have no fee listed in this Master Fee Schedule, the City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall determine the appropriate fee based on the following hourly rates for staff time involved in the service or activity (per hour) | \$200 | Per Hour | |

* In addition to amounts shown above, applicant is responsible for all costs of outside agency review/services, including but not limited to, LAFCO, Board of Equalization Fees, Department of Fish and Wildlife Fees, etc.

[a] The amount shown represents the initial deposit and minimum fee payable. The City reserves the right to collect additional amounts when costs exceed minimum fee/initial deposit. Any requests for additional amounts due will be supported by time & materials billings.

[b] Depending on the subject of the appeal, specialized expertise may be solicited, at the expense of the applicant, for the purpose of providing input to the City Manager, Planning Commission, other Commission or Board, or City Council.

[c] Applicant shall be responsible for additional costs of preparation of the required environment document.

[d] For non-development related declassifications, the fee will be waived if the urban forester finds/agrees the tree is dead/dying with no reasonable expectation of recovery and poses a risk to persons/property. For development-related declassifications, fee is amount shown.

[e] Additional fees apply for Engineering review. See Engineering fee schedule.

[f] Special events that require additional resources beyond those covered the scope of these fees will be charged on an hourly basis.

City of Folsom

ENGINEERING AND ENCROACHMENT PERMIT FEES

| # | Description | Fee | Fee Structure | Note |
|---|---|----------|---------------|------|
| 1 | Assessment District/CFD Payment Processing | \$4,800 | Fixed Fee | |
| 2 | Encroachment Permit | | | |
| | a) Encroachment Contract for Parking/Staging | | | |
| | i. 0-6 calendar days | \$50 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. 7-14 calendar days | \$100 | Fixed Fee | |
| | iii. 14+days | \$200 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Utility Work/Connections (Individual Permits) | | | |
| | i. Wet Utilities/Service Connections | \$600 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. Dry Utilities (per site/location) | \$200 | Fixed Fee | |
| | iii. Misc. per LF of Trench in ROW/City Easement | \$5.00 | Fixed Fee | |
| | iv. Inspections and Testing | \$400 | Fixed Fee | |
| | c) Driveways/Minor Frontage Improvements | | | |
| | i. Residential (per driveway) | \$400 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. Commercial (per driveway) | \$400 | Fixed Fee | |
| | d) Pools and Spas (in ground) | \$400 | Fixed Fee | |
| | e) Traffic Control/Equipment Staging | | | |
| | i. Isolated Site | \$200 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. Multiple Closures/Staging | \$1,000 | Fixed Fee | |
| | f) Permit Extensions | | | |
| | i. Active Work Zone | \$50 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. Inactive Work Zone (4+ months inactivity) | \$200 | Fixed Fee | |
| | g) Annual Permits | | | |
| | i. Wet Utilities | \$6,000 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. Dry Utilities | \$20,800 | Fixed Fee | |
| | iii. General Maintenance/Misc. (Not Wet or Dry Utilities) | T&M | Fixed Fee | [a] |
| | iv. Vegetation Management (Utilities) | \$20,800 | Fixed Fee | |
| | v. Long Term/Revocable Encroachments (paid annually) | \$200 | Fixed Fee | |
| | h) Long Term/Revocable Encroachments (new permits only) | \$2,400 | Fixed Fee | [b] |

City of Folsom

ENGINEERING AND ENCROACHMENT PERMIT FEES

| # | Description | Fee | Fee Structure | Note |
|---|---|----------|---------------|------|
| 3 | Engineering and Landscape Plan Check and Inspection | | | |
| | a) Project Value Up to \$10,000 | 8.00% | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Project Value \$10,001 - \$100,000 | | | |
| | i. Base Fee for First \$10,000 | \$800 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. Fee for Each Add'l \$1 Up to \$100,000 | 8.00% | Fixed Fee | |
| | c) \$100,001 - \$199,999 | | | |
| | i. Base Fee for First \$100,000 | \$8,000 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. Fee for Each Add'l \$1 Up to \$200,000 | 6.40% | Fixed Fee | |
| | d) \$200,001 - \$299,999 | | | |
| | i. Base Fee for First \$200,000 | \$14,400 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. Fee for Each Add'l \$1 Up to \$300,000 | 4.80% | Fixed Fee | |
| | e) \$300,000 or more | | | |
| | i. Base Fee for First \$300,000 | \$19,200 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. Fee for Each Add'l \$1 | 3.60% | Fixed Fee | |
| | f) Landscape Plan Review | | | |
| | i. Non-Development | \$200 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. Custom Home | \$1,100 | Fixed Fee | |
| | iii. Production Home/Subdivision | \$2,300 | Fixed Fee | |
| | iv. Model Home Complex | \$1,400 | Fixed Fee | |
| | v. Commercial, Streetscape, Other Development Projects | \$1,600 | Fixed Fee | |
| | vi. Development and Civil Improvements - Landscaping Review | \$2,100 | Fixed Fee | |
| 4 | Final Map and Parcel Map | | | |
| | a) Parcel Map Check | \$8,050 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Final Map Check | | | |
| | i. Base Fee | \$11,500 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. Plus, Per Lot Fee | \$144 | Fixed Fee | |
| | c) Final Map Amendment/Certificate of Correction | \$6,900 | Fixed Fee | |
| 5 | Right of Ways (ROW) and Easements | | | |
| | a) Review of ROW/Easement Documents | \$3,450 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) ROW/Easement Abandonment | \$5,750 | Fixed Fee | |
| 6 | Subdivision Agreement Processing | \$5,750 | Fixed Fee | |
| 7 | Transportation Permit | | | |
| | a) Permit | \$16 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b) Annual Permit | \$90 | Fixed Fee | |

City of Folsom

ENGINEERING AND ENCROACHMENT PERMIT FEES

| # | Description | Fee | Fee Structure | Note |
|-------------------------------|---|-------------------------|---------------|------|
| 8 | Tree Removal/Work Permit | | | |
| | a) Permitted Removal/Work | | | |
| | i. Existing Occupied Structure | | | |
| | a. 0-2 Trees | \$100 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b. 3+ Trees: See New Construction Rate Below | \$1,200 | Fixed Fee | |
| | c. "In Decline" Tree | \$100 | Fixed Fee | |
| | ii. New Construction (e.g. Custom Home, Subdivision, Parcel) | | | |
| | a. 0-4 Trees | \$1,200 | Fixed Fee | |
| | b. 5+ Trees | \$1,400 + 10% per tree | Fixed Fee | |
| | iii. Misc. | \$200 | Per Hour | |
| | b) w/o Permit (Does not include mitigation) Double the Permit Rate | 2x permit amount | Fixed Fee | |
| Other Fees for Service | | | | |
| 9 | Research of Engineering Records | \$200 | Per Hour | |
| 10 | Miscellaneous Engineering Services | \$200 | Per Hour | |
| 11 | Excess Plan Review Fee (4th and subsequent) | \$200 | Per Hour | |
| 12 | Revisions | \$200 | Per Hour | |
| 13 | After Hours Inspection (per hour) (2-hour minimum) | \$240 | Per Hour | |
| 14 | Re-inspection Fee (2nd Time or More) (each) | \$100 | Each | |
| 15 | Missed Inspection Fee | \$100 | Each | |
| 16 | Expedited Services Fee | 1.5x Regular Fee | Fixed Fee | |
| 17 | Residential Landscape Review | Hourly Rate of Arborist | Per Hour | |
| 18 | Technical Assistance/Third Party Review or Inspection | Actual Cost | T & M | |

[a] Use time and materials with initial deposit to be determined by City Engineer, based on anticipated scope of work.

[b] Encroachment agreement required in addition to insurance (e.g., parklets).

City of Folsom

BUILDING FEES

A. Fees for Commonly Requested Building Permit Types. Fees shown in this section (Section A.) include all applicable inspection, and plan review fees. Additional permit processing fees apply. Additional fees may apply for services provided by other City Departments (e.g. Planning Review), and Fees Collected on Behalf of Other Agencies (e.g. State of California).

| Fee Description | Fee | Charge Basis | Note | CPI |
|---|---------|--------------|---------|-----|
| 1 HVAC Change-Out - Residential | \$225 | per permit | | Y |
| 2 Water Heater Change-Out - Residential | \$180 | per permit | | Y |
| 3 Residential Re-Roof | \$360 | per permit | | Y |
| 4 Siding Replacement | \$315 | per permit | | Y |
| 5 Service Panel Upgrade - Residential | \$270 | per permit | | Y |
| 6 Battery Backup Storage | \$360 | per permit | | Y |
| 7 Electric Vehicle Charger | \$360 | per permit | | Y |
| 8 Generator | \$360 | per permit | | Y |
| 9 Residential Solar Photovoltaic System - Solar Permit | | | | |
| a) Plan Review | | | | |
| i) Base Fee for 15kW or Less | \$200 | per permit | [a],[b] | N |
| ii) Fee for Each Additional kW above 15kW | \$15 | per permit | [a],[b] | N |
| b) Permit | \$250 | per permit | [a],[b] | N |
| 10 Commercial Solar Photovoltaic System - Solar Permit | | | | |
| a) Plan Review | | | | |
| i) Base Fee 50kW or Less | \$444 | per permit | [a],[b] | N |
| ii) Fee for Each Add'l kW above 50kW up to 250kW | \$7 | per permit | [a],[b] | N |
| ii) Fee for Each Add'l kW above 250kW | \$5 | per permit | [a],[b] | N |
| b) Permit | \$556 | per permit | [a],[b] | N |
| 11 Pool Solar | \$180 | per permit | | Y |
| 12 Swimming Pool Replaster / Equipment Change-Out | \$450 | per permit | | Y |
| 13 Swimming Pool Remodel (e.g., Changing Pool Shape, Adding Cabo Shelf, etc.) | \$900 | per permit | | Y |
| 14 Retaining Wall | | | | |
| a) One Type of Retaining Wall Type/Configuration | \$540 | per permit | | Y |
| b) Each Additional Wall Type/Configuration | \$270 | per permit | | Y |
| 15 Window / Sliding Glass Door - Retrofit / Repair | | | | |
| a) Up to 5 | \$180 | per permit | | Y |
| b) Per Window Over 5 Windows | \$36 | per permit | | Y |
| 16 Fences Requiring a Building Permit | \$360 | per permit | | Y |
| 17 Electrical and Irrigation Pedestals per pedestal | \$270 | per permit | | Y |
| 18 Detached and Attached ADUs | \$4,500 | per permit | | Y |
| 19 Junior ADUs | \$2,160 | per permit | | Y |

[a] Total fees shall not exceed amounts outlined in California Government Code 66015(a)(1).

[b] The City will not collect additional permit processing fees. Amounts shown are total amount due for permit processing, plan review, and permit.

City of Folsom

BUILDING FEES

Determination of Valuation for Fee-Setting Purposes

• Project valuations shall be based on the total value of all construction work, including all finish work, roofing, electrical, plumbing, heating, air conditioning, elevators, fire-extinguishing systems and any other permanent equipment. If, in the opinion of the Building Official, the valuation is underestimated on the application, the permit shall be denied, unless the applicant can show detailed estimates to meet the approval of the Building Official. Final building permit valuation shall be set by the Building Official. For determining project valuations for new construction, the Building Official may use data published by the International Code Council (ICC) (building valuation data table, typically updated in February and August of each year). The final building permit valuation shall be set at an amount that allows the City to recover its costs of applicant plan check, permit and inspection activities.

Note: For construction projects with permit fees calculated using Section B, additional fees apply for permit issuance. Additional fees may apply for services provided by other City Departments (e.g. Planning Review), and Fees Collected on Behalf of Other Agencies (e.g. State of California). Additional fees apply for plan review, when applicable.

B. Permit Fee for New Buildings, Additions, Tenant Improvements, Residential Remodels, and Combined Mechanical, Electrical, and/or Plumbing Permits

| Total Valuation | Permit Fee | | | CPI |
|----------------------------|-------------|---------------------------|--|-----|
| \$1 to \$2,000 | \$135.00 | | | |
| \$2,001 to \$25,000 | \$135.00 | for the first \$2,000 | plus \$9.78 for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000 | N |
| \$25,001 to \$50,000 | \$360.00 | for the first \$25,000 | plus \$10.80 for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000 | N |
| \$50,001 to \$100,000 | \$630.00 | for the first \$50,000 | plus \$9.00 for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000 | N |
| \$100,001 to \$500,000 | \$1,080.00 | for the first \$100,000 | plus \$7.20 for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000 | N |
| \$500,001 to \$1,000,000 | \$3,960.00 | for the first \$500,000 | plus \$6.48 for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000 | N |
| \$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000 | \$7,200.00 | for the first \$1,000,000 | plus \$5.40 for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000,000 | N |
| \$5,000,001 and up | \$28,800.00 | for the first \$5,000,000 | plus \$4.11 for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof over \$5,000,000 | N |

City of Folsom

BUILDING FEES

D. Building Plan Review Fees

| Activity Description | Fee | Charge Basis | Note | CPI |
|--|--------------------------------|--------------|------|-----|
| 1 Building Plan Check Fees - Building | | | | |
| a) Plan Review Fee, if applicable | 80% | | [a] | N |
| b) Expedited Plan Check - At Application Submittal (when applicable) | 1.5x standard plan check fee | | | N |
| c) Tract Home / Master Plan Construction (Production Units) | 20% of standard plan check fee | | [b] | N |
| d) Production Permit for Multi-family permit | \$1,440 | | | Y |
| e) Production Permit for Fire permits and other misc. permits | \$450 | | | Y |
| f) Alternate Materials and Methods Review (per hour) | \$180 | | | Y |
| g) Excess Plan Review Fee (4th and subsequent) (per hour) | \$180 | | | Y |
| h) Revisions to an Approved Permit (per hour) | \$180 | | | Y |
| i) Deferred Submittal (per hour) | \$180 | | | Y |

When applicable, plan check fees shall be paid at the time of application for a building permit.
The plan checking fee is in addition to the building permit fee

[a] Includes up to three plan checks. The City will bill hourly for additional plan review required.

[b] For identical buildings built by the same builder on the same lot or in the same tract and for which building permits are issued at the same time.

City of Folsom

BUILDING FEES

E. Other Fees

| Activity Description | Fee | Note | CPI |
|--|---|------|-----|
| 1 Permit Processing Fee | \$75 | | Y |
| 2 Strong Motion Instrumentation (SMI) Fee Calculation | | | |
| a) Residential | \$0.50 or valuation x .00013 | | N |
| b) Commercial | \$0.50 or valuation x .00028 | | N |
| 3 Building Standards (SB 1473) Fee Calculation (Valuation) | | | |
| a) \$1 - \$25,000 | \$1 | | N |
| b) \$25,001 - \$50,000 | \$2 | | N |
| c) \$50,001 - \$75,000 | \$3 | | N |
| d) \$75,001 - \$100,000 | \$4 | | N |
| e) Each Add'l \$25,000 or fraction thereof | Add \$1 | | N |
| 4 General Plan and Zoning Code Update Fee (percent of building permit fee) | 5% | [b] | N |
| 5 Technology Fee (percent of permit fee) | 5% | [b] | N |
| 6 Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (per 30 Days) | \$540 | | Y |
| 7 Permit Extension | \$0 | | Y |
| 8 Permit Reactivation Fee | | | |
| a) Reactivation Fee if All Inspections Have Been Performed and Approved Up to But Not Including Final Inspection | \$180 | | Y |
| b) Reactivation Fee - All Other Scenarios | | | |
| i) Permit Expired Up to One Year | 50% of Original Base Building Permit Fee | | N |
| ii) Permit Expired More than One Year | 100% of Original Base Building Permit Fee | | N |
| 9 Permit Reissuance Fee | \$180 | | Y |
| 10 Damaged Building Survey (Fire, Flood, Vehicle Damage, Etc.) (per hour) | \$180 | | Y |
| Other Fees | | | |
| 11 Phased Inspection Fee (per inspection) | \$180 | | Y |
| 12 After Hours Inspection (per hour) (4-hour minimum) | \$216 | | Y |
| 13 Re-inspection Fee (2nd Time or More) (each) | \$180 | [a] | Y |
| 14 Missed Inspection Fee | \$180 | | Y |
| 15 Duplicate Copy of Permit | \$75 | | Y |
| 16 Duplicate Copy of Certificate of Occupancy | \$75 | | Y |
| 17 Fees for Services Not Listed in this Fee Schedule (per 1/2 hour) | \$90 | | Y |

City of Folsom

BUILDING FEES

E. Other Fees

| Activity Description | Fee | Note | CPI |
|---|------------------------|------|-----|
| Violation Fees | | | |
| 18 Investigation Fee For Work Done Without Permits (In addition to applicable permit fees) | equal to permit fee | | N |
| Refunds | | | |
| 19 Refunds | | | |
| a) Fees Erroneously Paid or Collected by the City | 100% refund | | N |
| b) Refund of Plan Review Fees - Prior to Plan Review Commencing | up to 80% refund | | N |
| c) Refund of Permit Fees - Prior to Inspection Commencing | up to 80% refund | | N |
| d) 180 Days After Payment of Fees | no refund | | N |

[a] Reinspection fee applies after the first re-inspection.

[b] Fee applies to new construction, additions, tenant improvements, and residential remodels requiring building permits.

[c] Fee applies to all permits.

City of Folsom
BUILDING FEES

| Building Valuation Data Table | | | | | | | | | |
|--|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| Group (2021 International Building Code) | IA | IB | IIA | IIB | IIIA | IIIB | IV | VA | VB |
| A-1 Assembly, theaters, with stage | 335.89 | 324.58 | 316.94 | 304.93 | 286.87 | 278.00 | 295.62 | 266.02 | 257.55 |
| A-1 Assembly, theaters, without stage | 307.39 | 296.08 | 288.44 | 276.42 | 258.37 | 249.50 | 267.12 | 237.51 | 229.05 |
| A-2 Assembly, nightclubs | 269.94 | 261.93 | 254.48 | 245.85 | 230.56 | 223.99 | 237.02 | 209.57 | 202.79 |
| A-2 Assembly, restaurants, bars, banquet halls | 268.94 | 260.93 | 252.48 | 244.85 | 228.56 | 222.99 | 236.02 | 207.57 | 201.79 |
| A-3 Assembly, churches | 311.88 | 300.57 | 292.93 | 280.91 | 263.30 | 254.43 | 271.60 | 242.45 | 233.98 |
| A-3 Assembly, general, community halls, libraries, museums | 266.07 | 254.76 | 246.12 | 235.10 | 216.33 | 208.46 | 225.80 | 195.47 | 188.01 |
| A-4 Assembly, arenas | 306.39 | 295.08 | 286.44 | 275.42 | 256.37 | 248.50 | 266.12 | 235.51 | 228.05 |
| B Business | 260.69 | 251.13 | 241.86 | 231.65 | 210.99 | 202.73 | 222.56 | 186.21 | 177.81 |
| E Educational | 273.46 | 263.96 | 255.62 | 245.04 | 228.69 | 217.00 | 236.61 | 200.36 | 193.94 |
| F-1 Factory and industrial, moderate hazard | 160.20 | 152.78 | 143.34 | 138.64 | 123.55 | 117.41 | 132.48 | 102.44 | 95.93 |
| F-2 Factory and industrial, low hazard | 159.20 | 151.78 | 143.34 | 137.64 | 123.55 | 116.41 | 131.48 | 102.44 | 94.93 |
| H-1 High Hazard, explosives | 149.46 | 142.04 | 133.60 | 127.90 | 114.12 | 106.97 | 121.74 | 93.00 | 0.00 |
| H234 High Hazard | 149.46 | 142.04 | 133.60 | 127.90 | 114.12 | 106.97 | 121.74 | 93.00 | 85.50 |
| H-5 HPM | 260.69 | 251.13 | 241.86 | 231.65 | 210.99 | 202.73 | 222.56 | 186.21 | 177.81 |
| I-1 Institutional, supervised environment | 262.22 | 252.95 | 244.31 | 235.67 | 215.42 | 209.47 | 235.71 | 193.82 | 187.73 |
| I-2 Institutional, hospitals | 434.15 | 424.59 | 415.32 | 405.12 | 383.35 | 0.00 | 396.02 | 358.57 | 0.00 |
| I-2 Institutional, nursing homes | 302.01 | 292.45 | 283.18 | 272.97 | 253.83 | 0.00 | 263.88 | 229.05 | 0.00 |
| I-3 Institutional, restrained | 295.86 | 286.31 | 277.03 | 266.83 | 247.95 | 238.69 | 257.74 | 223.17 | 212.77 |
| I-4 Institutional, day care facilities | 262.22 | 252.95 | 244.31 | 235.67 | 215.42 | 209.47 | 235.71 | 193.82 | 187.73 |
| M Mercantile | 201.37 | 193.36 | 184.91 | 177.28 | 161.72 | 156.15 | 168.45 | 140.73 | 134.95 |
| R-1 Residential, hotels | 264.67 | 255.41 | 246.77 | 238.13 | 218.35 | 212.40 | 238.17 | 196.75 | 190.67 |
| R-2 Residential, multiple family | 221.32 | 212.06 | 203.42 | 194.78 | 175.96 | 170.01 | 194.82 | 154.36 | 148.28 |
| R-3 Residential, one- and two-family | 209.61 | 203.74 | 198.94 | 195.12 | 188.41 | 181.45 | 191.77 | 175.86 | 165.67 |
| R-4 Residential, care/assisted living facilities | 262.22 | 252.95 | 244.31 | 235.67 | 215.42 | 209.47 | 235.71 | 193.82 | 187.73 |
| S-1 Storage, moderate hazard | 148.46 | 141.04 | 131.60 | 126.90 | 112.12 | 105.97 | 120.74 | 91.00 | 84.50 |
| S-2 Storage, low hazard | 147.46 | 140.04 | 131.60 | 125.90 | 112.12 | 104.97 | 119.74 | 91.00 | 83.50 |
| U Utility, miscellaneous | 114.09 | 107.37 | 99.89 | 95.60 | 85.13 | 79.54 | 90.99 | 67.39 | 64.19 |