

Folsom City Council Staff Report



MEETING DATE:	5/28/2024
AGENDA SECTION:	Public Hearing
SUBJECT:	Resolution No. 11186 – A Resolution to Adopt an Amended User Fee Schedule for Community Development Engineering and Building Services (Continued from 05/14/2024)
FROM:	Community Development Department

RECOMMENDATION / CITY COUNCIL ACTION

Staff recommends that the City Council adopt Resolution No. 11186 to adopt an amended user fee schedule for Community Development Engineering and Building services.

BACKGROUND / ISSUE

Since the user and processing fees for the Community Development Department’s services, including Building, Engineering and Planning, have not been comprehensively evaluated since at least 2006, the Department hired ClearSource Financial Consulting to analyze existing user fees, hourly rates, and staff time needed to perform fee-based tasks for Building, Engineering, and Planning services as well as for Special Event Permits. The study found that existing fees did not adequately cover the amount of staff time and resources associated with those processes and services. The study proposed a new fee schedule, with some modifications to the structure itself, to better capture the costs associated with fee-based services as well as an updated General Plan and Zoning Code Update fee to cover the increase associated with keeping these documents up to date with the frequent changes to State laws governing housing and land use. Based on Council and public feedback, as described below, staff is only recommending at this time changes to the user fees for Building and Engineering services.

In order to provide an opportunity for the Council and the public to provide input on the draft fee study, Community Development staff conducted a workshop on March 12, 2024 with the City Council. Staff provided the results of the fee study and discussed the proposed user fee updates for the services provided by the department. At the workshop, the City Council took in comments from the public regarding the proposed updated fee schedule. Public comments primarily focused

on concerns about new fees and current processes associated with special events from groups that put on events in the city and business owners that benefit from events being held. Members of the public also requested lower fees for appeals to ensure that the public is not priced out of appealing a project while still recognizing that staff's level of effort is not currently captured in the existing fee. Finally, the North State Building Industry Association requested a tiered roll-out of fees of 50 percent of the proposed increase initially and then implement the remainder of the fee increase six months later to reduce the immediate impact of fee increases on applicants.

The City Council discussed the proposed fee schedule update and provided comments to staff for consideration. While Council did not suggest modifications to any specific fees for Building or Engineering services, questions were raised about the necessity of the proposed technology fee and why it needed to be called out as a separate line item rather than included in the overall permit cost. That clarification has been made in the Analysis section of this report to address the comment received.

With regards to proposed fees for Planning services (which include appeal fees), Councilmembers stated that better explanations are needed for the various Planning processes and how often they are utilized to determine if all listed fees are still necessary. Councilmembers also stated that the proposed appeal fees were too high even though they captured staff's level of effort. With regards to special events, Councilmembers also noted that proposed Special Event Permit fees were too high and that more research was needed to determine what types of events and organizations, such as non-profits, should be charged less for events with community or economic development benefit. Additionally, the special event process, which is currently handled by Planning staff was also called into question with some suggestions that the Parks & Recreation or other City departments handle this process. Ultimately, Council concluded that updating fees for Planning processes and Special Event Permits should be handled separately from the Building and Engineering fee changes.

Ultimately, staff determined that it would be more effective to discuss Planning fees in tandem with the upcoming Zoning Code update. This update may come with modifications to, or even the elimination of, existing Planning processes that could in turn have effects on staff time and Planning fees. Staff believes that discussing proposed changes to processes in the Zoning Code update should go hand in hand with discussions of the fees associated with those processes to improve efficiency. Furthermore, additional work is needed to make changes to the Special Event Permit process and how fees should be charged for events. As such, staff is only proposing updates to fees for Building and Engineering services at this time. Updated Special Event Permit fees are anticipated to go in front of Council in summer/fall 2024 with a target effective date of January 1, 2025. To coincide with the Zoning Code update, planning process fees are anticipated to go in front of Council in first quarter 2025, with a target effective date of July 1, 2025.

POLICY / RULE

The objectives of the fee study, the methodology used to complete the study, and the formulation of outcomes and recommended fee updates were significantly influenced by Article XIII C of the California Constitution, Propositions 218 (1996) and 26 (2010), and Section 66014 of the California Government Code.

Article XIII C 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 XIII C 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 were 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 XIII C 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 shows 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

The Building Division’s modified fee schedule includes restructuring and new tiers and fee types so that the proposed fees 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 simpler for the public to understand and pay as well as easier for staff to administer. Staff found this to be consistent with other jurisdictions in the area.
- Restructuring the fees related to subdivision development to align with the amount of staff time utilized for each permit type. Production permits for homes in a subdivision are reviewed by all divisions in Community Development, though the current fee covers less than one hour of staff time.
- Revising the current fee table for valuation-based projects to account for the same percentage cost recovery at all valuations. The current fee table utilizes a sliding scale for cost recovery, which does not reflect the estimated hours utilized. The proposed fee table is instead based on the same percentage cost recovery for any project. The current table uses a different percentage cost recovery based on project valuation (i.e. 75% recovery for a \$25,000 project versus 90% recovery for a \$10 million project).
- Adding the Business License Fee, Certified Access Specialist (CAsp) Training Fund Fee and State Disability Access Fee to the fee schedule. These fees (the latter two of which are required by State law) have previously been collected along with the building permit fee but were not called out in the fee schedule.

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

- Encroachment permits were restructured with the intent of encouraging applicants to obtain permits for their intended use. Subcategories of encroachment permits were added based on length of time, needs, and various types of encroachment (e.g., utilities encroachment vs. temporary storage container encroachment).
- Annual permits for the purposes of general maintenance are to be billed on a time and materials basis. Since general maintenance can vary greatly in scope and effort, an initial deposit will be determined by the City Engineer for the purposes of estimating the necessary level of staff effort to support review and inspections of the proposed work.
- 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 City's overhead cost for contract administration.

- Landscape review for production homes was changed from being based on the valuation of the project to a fixed fee, as the existing valuation method did not reflect the detailed tasks and level of effort that goes into reviewing the plans.
- 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 the removal of three or more trees, and any tree removal for new construction, the fees have gone up significantly to reflect the level of staff time it takes to process and review these tasks. For tree work/removal that requires a permit that staff discovers has been done without a permit will be charged two times the permit amount.
- Based on public feedback (see comment letter from Morton & Pitalo in Attachment 3), staff revisited the proposed Final Map Amendment/Certificate of Correction fee. Because these two tasks are very different and require a different amount of time to process, staff has now proposed to split the fees. The new proposal is to charge the base Final Map fee for Final Map Amendments and a smaller Certificate of Correction/Certificate of Compliance deposit-based fee for these tasks. Staff believes that these modifications better reflect the time it takes to do these tasks and allow flexibility to charge more if needed for more challenging Certificates of Correction or Compliance.

Technology Fee

Based on feedback from the City Council, CDD has changed the way it is proposing to cover the cost of the technology required for online electronic plan and permit submittal, processing and review. The software systems that the department currently uses are moving to a cloud-based, fee-for-service model with an ongoing annual cost similar to how Microsoft’s Office 365 system works. While the department currently uses software packages that it purchased and was installed on City servers, CDD plans to eventually move from its current systems that involve large one-time costs, upgrade costs, and maintenance cost to a new annual subscription service. Rather than a separate technology fee, staff is proposing to treat the technology costs as part of the department’s overhead cost for building permits. As a result, staff hourly rates for building permits have been adjusted to reflect the updated overhead costs, and all building permit fees are therefore slightly higher than originally presented in the draft fee study on March 12. By treating the technology costs as part of the overhead cost for the department, this will allow the annual costs to be covered fully and will not result in costs to the General Fund. However, in the future, if the department was to add additional software or technology services, a new fee study would be required to update the department’s new overhead rate.

General Plan/Zoning Code Fee

While CDD already charges a three percent (3%) General Plan fee on most building permits, the department is also proposing an updated General Plan and Zoning Code fee. California Government Code Section 66014 states that fees collected by an agency "...may include the costs reasonably necessary to prepare and revise the plans and policies that a local agency is required to adopt before it can make any necessary findings and determinations." Every county and city in California is required by State law to have a General Plan, and the plan is required to be up to date. The General Plan discusses the City's goals, policies, and implementation actions regarding all future development. The Zoning Ordinance establishes the development regulations to implement the General Plan and must be consistent with the Plan.

Cities and counties throughout California often attempt to recover portions of the costs of updating and maintaining these plans through fees collected on various development projects. As the list below indicates, a similar fee is currently collected by several cities in the region. The list is not intended to be comprehensive. Cities in the region that collect a General Plan/Zoning Code Update Fee or Similar Fee include:

- Elk Grove
- Lincoln
- Rancho Cordova
- Roseville
- Sacramento

CDD is proposing a two percent increase in the fee. The new General Plan and Zoning Code Update fee would be five percent (5%) and would be applied to building permits for new construction, additions, tenant improvements, and residential remodels. Projects that require these types of permits rely on the General Plan and Zoning Code to establish the land use, density and development standards necessary for the projects to happen.

Based on the City's anticipated costs of updating/maintaining the General Plan and its various elements and the City's Zoning Code, only partial cost recovery (approximately 55 percent) is targeted from this fee to keep it in line with fees collected by other agencies within the region. While the entire community benefits from having a General Plan and Zoning Code, residential and commercial projects, in particular, benefit from these documents because these documents allow for development and contain the development locations and standards necessary for development to occur. 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. The revised fee increases the amount from 3 percent to 5 percent as the cost of preparing these documents has grown. However, because the current General Plan fee is collected for both the building permit fee and the plan check fee and the proposed General Plan and Zoning Code Update fee would only be collected for the building permit fee, this would result in approximately the same amount of funds that are currently being collected.

Conclusions

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 the actual staff costs associated with this work 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 provide greater detail for future revenue forecasting. The study also recommends that fees should continue to be updated on an annual basis using the Consumer Price Index (CPI). This is typical for other jurisdictions in the region and also similar to how other City fees are administered in Folsom. The study also recommends 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.

Regarding the North State Building Industry Association's request for a tiered roll-out of fees, staff is proposing a phasing of the fee changes. New Engineering and Building fees would go into effect on August 1, 2024. Planning fees are not proposed to be updated until the Zoning Code update is complete with new Planning fees proposed to go into effect on July 1, 2025 after adoption of the new code. As such, projects that are subject to Planning fees along with their Engineering and/or Building fees will not see an increase in Planning fees until several months after the Building and Engineering fees have gone into effect. Staff believes that this accomplishes the goals of a tiered roll-out by reducing the immediate impact of fee increases on applicants for larger projects. As such, no other formal tiered roll-out for Building and Engineering is proposed.

FISCAL IMPACT

The fee study concluded that the proposed new Building and Engineering fees could result in an estimated additional \$1,100,000 annually for the General Fund, based on historical permit volume and development activity. Fee revenue could be higher or lower if actual experience differs from the assumptions used in the fee study.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution No. 11186 – A Resolution to Adopt an Amended User Fee Schedule for Community Development Engineering and Building Services
2. Development Processing Fee Study- Building and Engineering Fees, dated May 2024
3. Public Comments Received

Submitted,



PAM JOHNS
Community Development Director

ATTACHMENT 1

**RESOLUTION NO. 11186 – A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT AN
AMENDED USER FEE SCHEDULE FOR COMMUNITY
DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING AND BUILDING SERVICES**

RESOLUTION NO. 11186

A RESOLUTION TO ADOPT AN AMENDED USER FEE SCHEDULE FOR COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT ENGINEERING AND BUILDING SERVICES

WHEREAS, City of Folsom Municipal Code Section 3.50.020 states “The city manager is hereby directed to recommend to the council the adjustment of fees and charges to recover the percentage of costs reasonably borne in providing the regulation, products or services enumerated in this chapter and on the schedule of rate review as hereinafter established in this chapter”; and

WHEREAS, the City Council on May 28, 2024, held a public hearing on the proposed fee updates for the Community Development Department and considered public comment; and

WHEREAS Resolution No. 11110 adopted by City Council on October 10, 2023, set the most recent User Fee schedule for the City including the Community Development Department; and

WHEREAS, the City had a consultant that performed a reasonableness test on the proposed fees and this test confirmed that fees do not exceed the actual staff costs associated with this work and are consistent with State law; and

WHEREAS notice has been given at the time and in the manner required by State Law and City Code; and

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the City Council of the City of Folsom hereby Amends Resolution No. 11110 and adopts the amended user fee schedule for Community Development Engineering and Building services, as shown in Exhibit “A”.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 28th day of May 2024, by the following roll-call vote:

AYES: Councilmember(s):
NOES: Councilmember(s):
ABSENT: Councilmember(s):
ABSTAIN: Councilmember(s):

Michael D. Kozlowski, MAYOR

ATTEST:

Christa Freemantle, CITY CLERK

Exhibit A

Updated Community Development Department Fee Schedule for Building and Engineering
Services

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) LongTerm/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/Final Map Amendment	\$11,500	Fixed Fee	
	ii. Plus, Per Lot Fee	\$144	Fixed Fee	
	c) Certificate of Correction/Certificate of Compliance	\$2,000	T & M with Initial Deposit	
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)	2x permit amount	Fixed Fee	
	Double the Permit Rate			
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	\$230	per permit		Y
2 Water Heater Change-Out - Residential	\$184	per permit		Y
3 Residential Re-Roof	\$368	per permit		Y
4 Siding Replacement	\$322	per permit		Y
5 Service Panel Upgrade - Residential	\$276	per permit		Y
6 Battery Backup Storage	\$368	per permit		Y
7 Electric Vehicle Charger	\$368	per permit		Y
8 Generator	\$368	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	\$184	per permit		Y
12 Swimming Pool Replaster / Equipment Change-Out	\$460	per permit		Y
13 Swimming Pool Remodel (e.g., Changing Pool Shape, Adding Cabo Shelf, etc.)	\$920	per permit		Y
14 Retaining Wall				
a) One Type of Retaining Wall Type/Configuration	\$552	per permit		Y
b) Each Additional Wall Type/Configuration	\$276	per permit		Y
15 Window / Sliding Glass Door - Retrofit / Repair				
a) Up to 5	\$184	per permit		Y
b) Per Window Over 5 Windows	\$37	per permit		Y
16 Fences Requiring a Building Permit	\$368	per permit		Y
17 Electrical and Irrigation Pedestals per pedestal	\$276	per permit		Y
18 Detached and Attached ADUs	\$4,600	per permit		Y
19 Junior ADUs	\$2,208	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	\$138.00				
\$2,001 to \$25,000	\$138.00 for the first \$2,000	plus \$10.00	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000		N
\$25,001 to \$50,000	\$368.00 for the first \$25,000	plus \$11.04	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000		N
\$50,001 to \$100,000	\$644.00 for the first \$50,000	plus \$9.20	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000		N
\$100,001 to \$500,000	\$1,104.00 for the first \$100,000	plus \$7.36	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000		N
\$500,001 to \$1,000,000	\$4,048.00 for the first \$500,000	plus \$6.62	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000		N
\$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000	\$7,360.00 for the first \$1,000,000	plus \$5.52	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000,000		N
\$5,000,001 and up	\$29,440.00 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	\$1,472			Y
e) Production Permit for Fire permits and other misc. permits	\$460			Y
f) Alternate Materials and Methods Review (per hour)	\$184			Y
g) Excess Plan Review Fee (4th and subsequent) (per hour)	\$184			Y
h) Revisions to an Approved Permit (per hour)	\$184			Y
i) Deferred Submittal (per hour)	\$184			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	\$77		Y
2 Strong Motion Instrumentation (SMI) Fee Calculation		[a]	
a) Residential	\$0.50 or valuation x .00013	[a]	N
b) Commercial	\$0.50 or valuation x .00028	[a]	N
3 Building Standards (SB 1473) Fee Calculation (Valuation)		[a]	
a) \$1 - \$25,000	\$1	[a]	N
b) \$25,001 - \$50,000	\$2	[a]	N
c) \$50,001 - \$75,000	\$3	[a]	N
d) \$75,001 - \$100,000	\$4	[a]	N
e) Each Add'l \$25,000 or fraction thereof	Add \$1	[a]	N
4 Business License Fee	\$25		N
5 CASP Training Fund Fee	\$3.60		N
6 State Disability Access Fee	\$0.40		N
7 General Plan/Zoning Code Update Fee (percent of building permit fee)	5%	[b]	N
8 Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (Phasing Plan) Fee	\$920		Y
9 Permit Extension	\$0		Y
10 Permit Reactivation Fee			
a) Reactivation Fee if All Inspections Have Been Performed and Approved Up to But Not Including Final Inspection	\$184		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
11 Permit Reissuance Fee	\$184		Y
12 Damaged Building Survey (Fire, Flood, Vehicle Damage, Etc.) (per hour)	\$184		Y
Other Fees			
13 Phased Inspection Fee (per inspection)	\$184		Y
14 After Hours Inspection (per hour) (4-hour minimum)	\$221		Y
15 Re-inspection Fee (2nd Time or More) (each)	\$184	[c]	Y
16 Missed Inspection Fee	\$184		Y
17 Duplicate Copy of Permit	\$77		Y

City of Folsom
BUILDING FEES

E. Other Fees

Activity Description	Fee	Note	CPI
18 Duplicate Copy of Certificate of Occupancy	\$77		Y
19 Fees for Services Not Listed in this Fee Schedule (per 1/2 hour)	\$92		Y
Violation Fees			
20 Investigation Fee For Work Done Without Permits (In addition to applicable permit fees)	equal to permit fee		N

[a] Amounts established by State of California. In the case of discrepancy between this schedule and amounts established by the State, State amounts shall supersede these amounts.

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

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

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,	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

ATTACHMENT 2

**DEVELOPMENT PROCESSING FEE STUDY- BUILDING AND
ENGINEERING FEES, DATED MAY 2024**

CITY OF FOLSOM

MAY 2024

**DEVELOPMENT PROCESSING FEE STUDY
BUILDING AND ENGINEERING FEES**

clear 
source
FINANCIAL CONSULTING

CONTENTS

REPORTING

<u>Section</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Page #</u>
1	TRANSMITTAL	1
2	EXECUTIVE SUMMARY Overall Findings	2
3	PROJECT ORIENTATION Scope and Guidance	5
4	IMPLEMENTATION Considerations for Implementation	9

APPENDICES

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



May 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 that reads "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 \$3,468,000. This results in an aggregate cost recovery level of 82% and a General Fund subsidy of approximately \$622,000.
 - Full cost recovery is targeted for building fees.

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 Engineering Fees (i.e., Time & Materials Billings)

- Fees for some of the City's more complex 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

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

- 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.

Additional Cost Recovery from Proposed Adjustments to Fees

- The enhanced cost recovery anticipated from the proposed changes included in the fee schedule update is **\$1,100,000**.

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:

- ➔ **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.

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
\$25,000	Mid-Range	Mid-Range	\$330	\$368	\$375	\$456	\$158
\$50,000	Mid-Range	Mid-Range	\$530	\$644	\$600	\$751	\$757
\$100,000	Mid-Range	Mid-Range	\$880	\$1,104	\$1,050	\$1,158	\$1,162
\$500,000	Mid-Range	Mid-Range	\$3,280	\$4,048	varies (res v. non-res)	\$3,697	varies (res v. non-res)
\$1,000,000	Mid-Range	Mid-Range	\$6,030	\$7,360	\$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.

COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS



CITY OF
FOLSOM
DISTINCTIVE BY NATURE

User and Regulatory Fees

Fee-Related Cost of Service Analysis

City of Folsom

Cost of Service Analysis

Description	Page
Cost of Service Allocation - Community Development Administration	3
<hr/>	
Cost of Service Calculations	
Engineering and Encroachment Permits	5
Building	14
General Plan / Zoning Code Update	24
<hr/>	
Cost Allocation - Citywide Overhead	26
<hr/>	

User and Regulatory Fees
Cost of Service Calculations
Community Development - Administration

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 & Mtnc	\$ 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	Building	Code Enforcement	Engineering	Planning	Total	Notes
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 & Mtnc	\$ 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
Engineering and Encroachment Permits

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/Final Map Amendment	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) Certificate of Correction/Certificate of Compliance	8.50	x	\$288	=	\$2,444	\$2,899	varies	\$2,000	100%	T & M with Initial Deposit	(\$899)	
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/Final Map Amendment	Fixed Fee	\$10,719	\$11,500	\$11,500	93%	100%	
	ii. Plus, Per Lot Fee	Fixed Fee	\$0	\$144	\$144	0%	100%	
	c) Certificate of Correction/Certificate of Compliance	T & M with Initial Deposit	\$2,899	\$2,444	\$2,000	varies	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

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	\$ 122,500	\$ -	\$ 122,500	[c]
Annual In-House Maintenance of Zoning Code, Plans a	\$ 226,776	\$ -	\$ 226,776	[c]
Subtotal	\$ 414,276	\$ -	\$ 414,276	

Total

Description	Total	Notes
Recurring Divisional Expenditures	\$ 2,533,623	
Department Overhead	\$ 372,993	
Support from Other Departments	\$ 414,276	
Citywide Overhead	\$ 147,300	
Subtotal	\$ 3,468,191	

Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate

Description	Total	Note
Costs	\$ 3,468,191	
Direct Hours	18,853	[c]
Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate	\$ 184	

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	\$3,468,191	
Cost Recovery	82%	

[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	\$184	=	\$230	varies	varies	100%	\$230	
2 Water Heater Change-Out - Residential	1.00	x	\$184	=	\$184	varies	varies	100%	\$184	
3 Residential Re-Roof	2.00	x	\$184	=	\$368	varies	varies	100%	\$368	
4 Siding Replacement	1.75	x	\$184	=	\$322	varies	varies	100%	\$322	
5 Service Panel Upgrade - Residential	1.50	x	\$184	=	\$276	varies	varies	100%	\$276	
6 Battery Backup Storage	2.00	x	\$184	=	\$368	varies	varies	100%	\$368	
7 Electric Vehicle Charger	2.00	x	\$184	=	\$368	varies	varies	100%	\$368	
8 Generator	2.00	x	\$184	=	\$368	varies	varies	100%	\$368	
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	\$184	=	\$184	varies	varies	100%	\$184	
12 Swimming Pool Replaster / Equipment Change-Out	2.50	x	\$184	=	\$460	varies	varies	100%	\$460	
13 Swimming Pool Remodel (e.g., Changing Pool Shape, Adding Cabo Shelf, etc.)	5.00	x	\$184	=	\$920	varies	varies	100%	\$920	
14 Retaining Wall										
a) One Type of Retaining Wall Type/Configuration	3.00	x	\$184	=	\$552	varies	varies	100%	\$552	
b) Each Additional Wall Type/Configuration	1.50	x	\$184	=	\$276	varies	varies	100%	\$276	
15 Window / Sliding Glass Door - Retrofit / Repair										
a) Up to 5	1.00	x	\$184	=	\$184	varies	varies	100%	\$184	
b) Per Window Over 5 Windows	0.20	x	\$184	=	\$37	varies	varies	100%	\$37	
16 Fences Requiring a Building Permit	2.00	x	\$184	=	\$368	varies	varies	100%	\$368	

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	\$184	=	\$276	varies	varies	100%	\$276	
18 Detached and Attached ADUs	25.00	x	\$184	=	\$4,600	varies	varies	100%	\$4,600	
19 Junior ADUs	12.00	x	\$184	=	\$2,208	varies	varies	100%	\$2,208	

[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	\$184	=	\$138	\$100	72%	\$138	100%		
2 \$2,001 - \$25,000	0.75	x	\$184	=	\$138	\$100	72%	\$138	100%		
3 \$25,001 - \$50,000	2.00	x	\$184	=	\$368	\$330	90%	\$368	100%		
4 \$50,001 - \$100,000	3.50	x	\$184	=	\$644	\$530	82%	\$644	100%		
5 \$100,001 - \$500,000	6.00	x	\$184	=	\$1,104	\$880	80%	\$1,104	100%		
6 \$500,001 - \$1,000,000	22.00	x	\$184	=	\$4,048	\$3,280	81%	\$4,048	100%		
7 \$1,000,001 - \$5,000,000	40.00	x	\$184	=	\$7,360	\$6,030	82%	\$7,360	100%		
8 \$5,000,001 - \$10,000,000	160.00	x	\$184	=	\$29,440	\$26,030	88%	\$29,440	100%		
9 \$10,000,001 - \$10,000,000	260.00	x	\$184	=	\$47,840	\$51,030	107%	\$47,840	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	\$184 = \$1,472	\$150	10%	\$1,472	100%	
e) Production Permit for Fire permits and other misc. permits	2.50	x	\$184 = \$460	\$150	33%	\$460	100%	
f) Alternate Materials and Methods Review (per hour)	1.00	x	\$184 = \$184			\$184	100%	
g) Excess Plan Review Fee (4th and subsequent) (per hour)	1.00	x	\$184 = \$184			\$184	100%	
h) Revisions to an Approved Permit (per hour)	1.00	x	\$184 = \$184			\$184	100%	
i) Deferred Submittal (per hour)	1.00	x	\$184 = \$184			\$184	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	\$184	=	\$77			\$77	100%		
2 Strong Motion Instrumentation (SMI) Fee Calculation											[a]
a) Residential								\$0.50 or valuation x .00013			[a]
b) Commercial								\$0.50 or valuation x .00028			[a]
3 Building Standards (SB 1473) Fee Calculation (Valuation)											[a]
a) \$1 - \$25,000								\$1			[a]
b) \$25,001 - \$50,000								\$2			[a]
c) \$50,001 - \$75,000								\$3			[a]
d) \$75,001 - \$100,000								\$4			[a]
e) Each Add'l \$25,000 or fraction thereof								Add \$1			[a]
4 Business License Fee						\$25		\$25			
5 CASP Training Fund Fee						\$3.60		\$3.60			
6 State Disability Access Fee						\$0.40		\$0.40			
7 General Plan/Zoning Code Update Fee (percent of building permit fee)					9%			5%	55%		[b]
8 Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (Phasing Plan) Fee	5.00	x	\$184	=	\$920			\$920	100%		
9 Permit Extension	0.50	x	\$184	=	\$92			\$0	0%		
10 Permit Reactivation Fee											
a) Reactivation Fee if All Inspections Have Been Performed and Approved Up to But Not Including Final Inspection	1.00	x	\$184	=	\$184			\$184	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			
11 Permit Reissuance Fee	1.00	x	\$184	=	\$184			\$184	100%		
12 Damaged Building Survey (Fire, Flood, Vehicle Damage, Etc.) (per hour)	1.00	x	\$184	=	\$184			\$184	100%		
Other Fees											
13 Phased Inspection Fee (per inspection)	1.00	x	\$184	=	\$184			\$184	100%		
14 After Hours Inspection (per hour) (4-hour minimum)	1.20	x	\$184	=	\$221			\$221	100%		
15 Re-inspection Fee (2nd Time or More) (each)	1.00	x	\$184	=	\$184			\$184	100%		[c]

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
16 Missed Inspection Fee	1.00	x	\$184	=	\$184			\$184	100%		
17 Duplicate Copy of Permit	0.42	x	\$184	=	\$77			\$77	100%		
18 Duplicate Copy of Certificate of Occupancy	0.42	x	\$184	=	\$77			\$77	100%		
19 Fees for Services Not Listed in this Fee Schedule (per 1/2 hour)	0.50	x	\$184	=	\$92			\$92	100%		
Violation Fees											
20 Investigation Fee For Work Done Without Permits (In addition to applicable permit fees)								equal to permit fee			

[a] Amounts established by State of California. In the case of discrepancy between this schedule and amounts established by the State, State amounts shall supersede these amounts.

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

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

User and Regulatory Fees

Cost of Service Calculations

General Plan / Zoning Code Update

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];[d]
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];[e]

Allocation Base

Description	Total	Notes
Estimated Building Permit Fees	\$ 1,910,758	[f]

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 Update Fee.
- [c] Recover annual costs, or portion of annual costs, via standard permit and plan review fees.
- [d] Amount calculated via analysis of planning cost of service. Amount represents 15% of total annual planning costs.
- [e] Assumes portion of General Plan Update costs will continue to be paid via General Fund resources.
- [f] Amounts represents multi-year average of building permit fee collection.

User and Regulatory Fees

Cost of Service Calculations

Allocation of Citywide Overhead

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.

PROPOSED FEES

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/Final Map Amendment	\$11,500	Fixed Fee	
	ii. Plus, Per Lot Fee	\$144	Fixed Fee	
	c) Certificate of Correction/Certificate of Compliance	\$2,000	T & M with Initial Deposit	
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	\$230	per permit		Y
2 Water Heater Change-Out - Residential	\$184	per permit		Y
3 Residential Re-Roof	\$368	per permit		Y
4 Siding Replacement	\$322	per permit		Y
5 Service Panel Upgrade - Residential	\$276	per permit		Y
6 Battery Backup Storage	\$368	per permit		Y
7 Electric Vehicle Charger	\$368	per permit		Y
8 Generator	\$368	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	\$184	per permit		Y
12 Swimming Pool Replaster / Equipment Change-Out	\$460	per permit		Y
13 Swimming Pool Remodel (e.g., Changing Pool Shape, Adding Cabo Shelf, etc.)	\$920	per permit		Y
14 Retaining Wall				
a) One Type of Retaining Wall Type/Configuration	\$552	per permit		Y
b) Each Additional Wall Type/Configuration	\$276	per permit		Y
15 Window / Sliding Glass Door - Retrofit / Repair				
a) Up to 5	\$184	per permit		Y
b) Per Window Over 5 Windows	\$37	per permit		Y
16 Fences Requiring a Building Permit	\$368	per permit		Y
17 Electrical and Irrigation Pedestals per pedestal	\$276	per permit		Y
18 Detached and Attached ADUs	\$4,600	per permit		Y
19 Junior ADUs	\$2,208	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	\$138.00				
\$2,001 to \$25,000	\$138.00	for the first \$2,000	plus \$10.00	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000	N
\$25,001 to \$50,000	\$368.00	for the first \$25,000	plus \$11.04	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000	N
\$50,001 to \$100,000	\$644.00	for the first \$50,000	plus \$9.20	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000	N
\$100,001 to \$500,000	\$1,104.00	for the first \$100,000	plus \$7.36	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000	N
\$500,001 to \$1,000,000	\$4,048.00	for the first \$500,000	plus \$6.62	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000	N
\$1,000,001 to \$5,000,000	\$7,360.00	for the first \$1,000,000	plus \$5.52	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$5,000,000	N
\$5,000,001 and up	\$29,440.00	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	\$1,472			Y
e) Production Permit for Fire permits and other misc. permits	\$460			Y
f) Alternate Materials and Methods Review (per hour)	\$184			Y
g) Excess Plan Review Fee (4th and subsequent) (per hour)	\$184			Y
h) Revisions to an Approved Permit (per hour)	\$184			Y
i) Deferred Submittal (per hour)	\$184			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	\$77		Y
2 Strong Motion Instrumentation (SMI) Fee Calculation		[a]	
a) Residential	\$0.50 or valuation x .00013	[a]	N
b) Commercial	\$0.50 or valuation x .00028	[a]	N
3 Building Standards (SB 1473) Fee Calculation (Valuation)		[a]	
a) \$1 - \$25,000	\$1	[a]	N
b) \$25,001 - \$50,000	\$2	[a]	N
c) \$50,001 - \$75,000	\$3	[a]	N
d) \$75,001 - \$100,000	\$4	[a]	N
e) Each Add'l \$25,000 or fraction thereof	Add \$1	[a]	N
4 Business License Fee	\$25		N
5 CASP Training Fund Fee	\$3.60		N
6 State Disability Access Fee	\$0.40		N
7 General Plan/Zoning Code Update Fee (percent of building permit fee)	5%	[b]	N
8 Temporary Certificate of Occupancy (Phasing Plan) Fee	\$920		Y
9 Permit Extension	\$0		Y
10 Permit Reactivation Fee			
a) Reactivation Fee if All Inspections Have Been Performed and Approved Up to But Not Including Final Inspection	\$184		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
11 Permit Reissuance Fee	\$184		Y
12 Damaged Building Survey (Fire, Flood, Vehicle Damage, Etc.) (per hour)	\$184		Y
Other Fees			
13 Phased Inspection Fee (per inspection)	\$184		Y
14 After Hours Inspection (per hour) (4-hour minimum)	\$221		Y
15 Re-inspection Fee (2nd Time or More) (each)	\$184	[c]	Y
16 Missed Inspection Fee	\$184		Y
17 Duplicate Copy of Permit	\$77		Y

City of Folsom

BUILDING FEES

E. Other Fees

Activity Description	Fee	Note	CPI
18 Duplicate Copy of Certificate of Occupancy	\$77		Y
19 Fees for Services Not Listed in this Fee Schedule (per 1/2 hour)	\$92		Y
Violation Fees			
20 Investigation Fee For Work Done Without Permits (In addition to applicable permit fees)	equal to permit fee		N

[a] Amounts established by State of California. In the case of discrepancy between this schedule and amounts established by the State, State amounts shall supersede these amounts.

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

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

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

ATTACHMENT 3

PUBLIC COMMENTS RECEIVED

May 10, 2024

City Council
City of Folsom
50 Natoma Street
Folsom, CA 95630

RE: Resolution No. 11186 – A Resolution to Adopt an Amended User Fee Schedule for Community Development Engineering and Building Services

Dear Mayor Kozlowski & Members of Folsom's City Council:

I am writing you regarding your consideration of Resolution No. 11186, particularly as it concerns increased fees for review of Certificates of Correction. A Certificate of Correction is a simple document intended to provide constructive notice of errors on subdivision maps, as outlined pursuant to Sections 66469 through 66472.1 of the Subdivision Map Act (SMA). As outlined by Appendix B, Page 9 of the User & Regulatory Fees study, the City's current review fee for a Certificate of Correction submittal is \$2899. Pursuant to the resolution under consideration, the review fee is set to rise to \$6900.

I would like to lend my perspective, as the managing surveyor employed at Morton & Pitalo in Folsom. Our firm provides Civil Engineering and Survey Mapping services throughout the region. Over the years, I've been proud to work on projects in Folsom that have had a direct benefit on our community.

The aforementioned Sections from the SMA outline two vehicles to revise recorded maps: 1) the Certificate of Correction and 2) the Amended Final / Parcel Map. The City's fee for review of these documents does not differentiate between the two.

- ✓ A Certificate of Correction, in many cases, is a one or two page document indicating that there is an error on the filed map and the "correction" is then stated and recorded. An example of a Certificate of Correction recently processed by our office involved a simple correction to the "net" area identified on the map.
- ✓ With an Amended Final / Parcel Map, the map is reproduced with the errors corrected on the map. In the case of an amended map, the review performed by the City may be more robust, and require a substantially larger effort/fee.

I am supportive of the proposed increase as it applies to Amended Maps. I believe the fee for a Certification of Correction is excessively high. For comparison, the review cost for Certificates of Correction in neighboring jurisdictions varies as follows:

- City of Sacramento: Review of a Certificate of Correction (CoC) or an Amended Map (AM) is an \$800 flat fee.
- Rancho Cordova: Review of a Coc is \$1374 plus a 7% Technology fee; An AM is \$1693 plus a 7% Technology fee.
- Elk Grove: Review of a CoC is a \$600 fixed fee; An Amended Map is a \$2500 fixed fee.
- City of Roseville: Review of a Coc is a \$125 fee.
- Placer County: Review of a CoC is a \$51 fee, plus a 3.5% Technology fee.
- Sacramento County does not charge a fee to review or record a Certificate of Correction.

I ask the City Council to review the proposed fee schedule as it applies to Certificates of Correction.

Sincerely,



Michael J. Chiara, PLS 9068

Desmond Parrington

From: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2024 7:32 AM
To: Desmond Parrington; Christa Freemantle
Cc: Pam Johns; Stephanie Henry
Subject: Re: City of Folsom - Major Planning Items on 4/22 and 4/23

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Desmond and/or Christa:

The Staff Report for Item 9 of tonight's City's Council meeting is dated with today's date, 4/23/2024. That item is for a hearing to consider amendments to Building and Engineering fees and my understanding is that such a hearing is subject to Folsom Municipal Code section 3.50.060 which states, "[p]ursuant to the California Government Code, **at least ten days prior to the required public hearing set out herein, the city manager shall make available to the public appropriate data indicating the cost, or estimated cost required to support the fees and charges for which changes are proposed to be made or fees or charges imposed.**"

Can you confirm that the staff report (dated 4/23/2024) or the data required pursuant to 3.50.060 was made available to the public at least ten days ago and, if so, can you let me know when and how that was accomplished?

Thank you,
-Bob

Bob Delp
916-812-8122
bdelp@live.com

From: Desmond Parrington <dparrington@folsom.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 2:17 PM
To: Desmond Parrington <dparrington@folsom.ca.us>
Cc: Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>; Stephanie Henry <shenry@folsom.ca.us>
Subject: City of Folsom - Major Planning Items on 4/22 and 4/23

The City of Folsom has three major upcoming planning items including: 1) a proposed annexation concept; 2) recommended Building and Engineering fee changes, and 3) an EIR and proposed amendments to the City's General Plan for additional housing capacity. Of those three items, two (conceptual annexation proposal and recommended feed changes) will be going before the City Council for consideration tomorrow, **Tuesday, April 23 at 6:30 pm in Council Chambers at City Hall** (50 Natoma St.). The third is available for review for next 45 days.

1. **Community for Health and Independence – Conceptual Annexation Proposal:** The Folsom City Council will hold a public workshop on Tuesday, April 23 to consider a preliminary request from AKT and UC Davis Health for their conceptual annexation proposal. The proposed project is a master-planned community south of Folsom, located in Sacramento and El Dorado counties. The developer will present the project concept and request feedback from both the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors and the Folsom City

Council at separate meetings on April 23 to inform future decisions and any necessary next steps. No formal action by City Council is required or allowed at this time. Instead, this workshop creates an early vetting opportunity for the developer to hear from the community and City Council about the proposed annexation proposal. Learn more: [Conceptual Annexation Proposal | Folsom, CA](#). Refer to [Item #11 for the staff report in the agenda packet](#).

2. **Community Development Department – Recommended Building and Engineering Fee Changes:** The Folsom City Council will hold a public hearing on proposed fee changes to CDD’s Building and Engineering user and processing fees. The Building and Engineering fee recommendations come out of a Council workshop on the user fee study held on March 12. The changes are designed to better reflect the scope of work involved and to cover staff costs associated with the processing and review of permits. No impact fees are proposed for change. If approved, these new Building and Engineering user and processing fees would go into effect on July 1, 2024. For a copy of the fee study and the staff report, see [Item # 9 in the staff report](#) (PDF). Planning fees, including Special Event Permit fees, are not proposed to change at this time. Planning fee changes will be presented to City Council in the first quarter of 2025.
3. **Notice of Availability – Public Review Draft of General Plan Amendments and EIR for Increased Housing Capacity:** As part of the implementation for the City’s 2021-2029 Housing Element, the City is amending the General Plan and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) to allow for more intensive multi-family residential development in targeted areas including the East Bidwell Corridor, areas near the Glenn and Iron Point light rail stations and in the Folsom Plan Area. An environmental impact report (EIR) along with the amended General Plan and FPASP documents are available for review and comment for 45 days between [April 22 and Friday, June 6, 2024](#). The Notice of Availability is attached and the documents along with more information about the project and how to submit a comment is available at www.folsom.ca.us/housingstudy.



CITY OF
FOLSOM
DISTINCTIVE BY NATURE



Desmond Parrington, AICP

Planning Manager

City of Folsom

50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630

dparrington@folsom.ca.us

c:916-461-6233 c:916-216-2813

www.folsom.ca.us

Desmond Parrington

From: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2024 10:37 AM
To: Mike Kozlowski; Sarah Aquino; Anna Rohrbough; YK Chalamcherla; Rosario Rodriguez; City Clerk Dept
Cc: Pam Johns; Elaine Andersen; Steven Wang; Desmond Parrington
Subject: Comments re Agenda Item 9 re: General Plan and Zoning Code Surcharge

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

This message is to urge the City Council to reject staff's recommended imposition of a 5% General Plan/Zoning Code Update (GPZCU) fee on engineering and building permit fees unless and until the City demonstrates a clear relationship between the permits that would be subject to the GPZCU fee and the use of the funds that would be collected from that fee. Without providing evidence of a clear relationship, the 5% fee would impose a tax on permit applicants and would violate Section 66014 of the California Government Code. Instead, the City could avoid the need for the funds intended to be obtained through the impermissible tax by simply implementing cost recovery for permit application processing as required by the Folsom Municipal Code.

Agenda Item 9 staff report (pg. 5; packet pg. 39) has a section discussing "Technology and General Plan/Zoning Code Fees" that provides no rationale to support the legality of the proposed 5% GPZCU fee. Staff states that the proposed GPZCU fee "would help fund major periodic General Plan, Housing Element and Zoning Code updates as well as in-house maintenance of these documents." However, there is no explained or obvious connection between the permits that would be subject to the 5% fee and the use of revenue from that fee for General Plan maintenance and/or Zoning Code updates.

In fact, the staff report notes "because General Plan and Zoning Code updates *benefit the entire community rather than just project applicants*, staff wanted to ensure that such applicants were not taking on the full burden of paying for such updates." As outlined in the first two bullets on staff report pg. 3 (packet pg. 37), the fees must have a relationship to a specific benefit or service/product that is not provided to those not charged. The proposed 5% GPZCU surcharge does not meet that test and is impermissible regardless of whether it places the full burden or even part of the burden on permit applicants.

The staff report presents an example of an HVAC changeout permit (pg. 6; packet pg. 40) which under staff's recommendation would include a \$12.54 City General Plan [and Zoning Code Update] surcharge. Yet, the staff report provides no explanation of how an HVAC changeout places any increased burden or cost on the City's maintenance of the General Plan or the City's updates to the Zoning Code.

As I have noted in previous and separate input to the Council, the City would be much better served if it would simply implement the cost recovery for permit application processing required by existing FMC section 3.50. Yet, staffs' recommended fees fall well short of that and require the City to use General Fund monies to subsidize permit processing costs. Staff's HVAC example is illustrative here also. Staff suggests that to encourage more people to obtain HVAC changeout permits, the fee for such permits should be artificially lowered to not achieve full cost recovery. By not charging the full cost, the City's cost for processing an HVAC changeout permit must be subsidized by the General Fund. Ironically, although recommending that the fee should be artificially lowered, staff then recommends that the HVAC changeout fee should be burdened with a

5% GPZCU surcharge. Instead, if the HVAC changeout permit fee and other planning and building permit fees aren't artificially lowered to less than full cost recovery, then the General Fund wouldn't need to be used for subsidizing those permit processing costs and those General Fund monies would be available for things like General Plan maintenance, Zoning Code updates, and many other important City services.

In summary, the 5% General Plan/Zoning Code Update permit surcharge is an impermissible tax that should be eliminated from the engineering and building permit cost structure. Full cost recovery for permit processing should be implemented by the Council and would protect the General Fund from being used to subsidize costs that should be borne by applicants.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Bob Delp
916-812-8122
bdelp@live.com

Desmond Parrington

From: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2024 11:20 AM
To: Mike Kozlowski; Sarah Aquino; YK Chalamcherla; Anna Rohrbough; Rosario Rodriguez; City Clerk Dept
Cc: Elaine Andersen; Pam Johns; Steven Wang; Desmond Parrington; Christa Freemantle
Subject: Comments to Council re 4-23-24 Agenda Items 9 and 10
Attachments: Planning Fees CC 3-08-11.pdf

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

On April 19, the City distributed an email newsletter with a headline "**FOLSOM FACES FISCAL CROSSROADS: CITY COUNCIL DIRECTS BUDGET EDUCATION PROGRAM**", followed by an article warning that, "**The city is facing a financial shortfall that could impact public safety, public services, and the quality of life in Folsom. ... Amidst the projected structural deficit, the city faces compounding infrastructure and building maintenance needs that require a dedicated funding source. There is an estimated \$20 million annual shortfall in funding for infrastructure improvements, park and facility repairs, equipment maintenance and replacements, trail maintenance and repairs, and staffing needs.**"

Yet, in the midst of this dire financial reality, City staff is recommending the continued and expanded use of the General Fund to subsidize the cost for the City's processing of private applications for permits and other entitlements. For Item 9 on your 4/23/2024 agenda, I urge the Council to direct staff to revise and return with a full fee schedule for Development Services funding that achieves fee recovery for all services at the percentages specified in the existing FMC section 3.50. For agenda Item 10, I urge the Council to reject staffs' recommended amendments to FMC 3.50 and leave FMC 3.50's sound fiscal policy directives in place. Staffs' recommendations would increase use of the General Fund to subsidize private development proposals, diverting those funds from important public safety, public services, and quality of life programs that are hallmarks of the City of Folsom.

At its March 12 meeting, the Council heard a presentation from staff and its consultant regarding fee schedules for Community Development services. Although some questions were asked and concerns expressed regarding certain fees, I heard no one suggest that the City should not strive to comply with the existing FMC 3.50 provisions that direct the City Manager to recover costs at the percentages outlined in the FMC 3.50.040 Schedule of Fees and Service Charges and I heard no one suggest that the existing FMC 3.50.040 fee percentages should be eliminated. Further, documentation for and discussion during the March 12 meeting acknowledged that the City's fee structure has not been achieving the required cost recovery and that increasing the fees to be at least more in-line with FMC 3.50 requirements is necessary to minimize impacts on the City's General Fund.

Now, just a few weeks later, staff has modified the proposed fee schedule (Agenda Item 9) recommending that the Council adopt a fee schedule revision limited to certain engineering and building permits while leaving all other fees unadjusted, including those known to be clearly insufficient for funding the City's costs and complying with FMC 3.50. Moreover, staff now also recommends (Agenda Item 10) that FMC 3.50 be revised to eliminate the existing requirement to achieve specific cost recovery percentages.

Is this what the Council wants; to continue insufficient recovery of costs for development application processing and building permits and to continue to shift that burden onto Folsom's citizenry by robbing the General Fund?

I hope staff has read the Council wrong on this one and that the Council will reject staff's proposals and direct staff to return with a fee schedule that fully recovers development/permit application processing and one that includes provisions to implement the full cost recovery program requested by staff and approved by the Council in 2011 (attached) that after 13 years is still sitting on the sidelines waiting to be implemented.

Thank you for considering my input.

Bob Delp
916-812-8122
bdelp@live.com

From: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, March 12, 2024 9:56 AM
To: Mike Kozlowski <mkozlowski@folsom.ca.us>; Rosario Rodriguez <rrodriguez@folsom.ca.us>; Sarah Aquino <saquino@folsom.ca.us>; YK Chalamcherla <ykchalamcherla@folsom.ca.us>; Anna Rohrbough <annar@folsom.ca.us>; Christa Freemantle <cfreemantle@folsom.ca.us>
Cc: Elaine Andersen <eandersen@folsom.ca.us>; Steven Wang <swang@folsom.ca.us>; Sari Dierking <sdierking@folsom.ca.us>; Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>; Desmond Parrington <dparrington@folsom.ca.us>
Subject: Comments to Council re 3-12-24 Agenda Item 5 - Planning Fees

For distribution to City Council:

Dear Council:

Regarding agenda item 5 of tonight's City Council meeting, this message is to urge the City Council to direct staff to implement a full cost recovery program for processing development applications **consistent with the process described in the attached March 2, 2011, staff report and adopted by the Folsom City Council in 2011 through Resolution 8801** (attached). Through such a process, individual applicants would pay for the actual and full cost for processing their individual applications – neither subsidizing nor being subsidized by other applicants and without being subsidized by the City's General Fund.

In 2011, the Community Development Department and City Council wisely determined that through implementation of a full cost recovery system for application processing, the City *"would protect its General Fund monies from subsidizing private development applications."*

Staff's 2011 analysis of the financial impact of the full cost recovery program found that, *"The cost recovery program would allow the City to more accurately cover the actual costs for development permits from the applicants. Although the actual savings to the General Fund are cannot be quantified, this fee recovery program will result in a positive impact to the General Fund and provide direct costs charges to contribute to the General Fund to more accurately fund development processing costs."*

Staff's basis for its 2011 recommendation concisely described the situation that existed then and that still persists today, noting, *"the range of complexity in development applications can vary widely and some projects can remain "active" or "in process" for years because projects are substantially revised and resubmitted (sometimes with years passing in between) in an attempt by applicants to obtain City approval.*

Staff sometimes must effectively begin processing all over with each resubmittal but is unable to request new project fees because the project is still technically active. It is these types of projects that staff seeks to target to ensure that staff costs are fully recovered." These persisting circumstances beg for a system based on actual costs, not flat fees.

Yet, the system requested by CDD and approved by the Council in 2011 still has not been implemented and CDD's current 3/12/24 staff report to the Council for agenda item 5 of tonight's meeting provides a recommendation predominated by "flat fees" which are inherently inequitable and a drain on the City's resources. The current staff report makes no mention of the 2011 Resolution and provides no compelling rationale for abandoning the sound approach that the Council directed be implemented in 2011.

Please direct staff to fulfill the directives of Resolution 8801 and implement the full cost recovery system for development application processing that requires individual applicants to fully fund the costs of processing their applications.

Thank you for considering my input.

Bob Delp
916-812-8122
bdelp@live.com

From: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 11:12 AM
To: Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>
Cc: Elaine Andersen <eandersen@folsom.ca.us>; Steven Wang <swang@folsom.ca.us>; Scott Johnson <sjohnson@folsom.ca.us>; Sari Dierking <sdierking@folsom.ca.us>; Mike Kozlowski <mkozlowski@folsom.ca.us>; Sarah Aquino <saquino@folsom.ca.us>; Rosario Rodriguez <rrodriguez@folsom.ca.us>; YK Chalamcherla <ykchalamcherla@folsom.ca.us>; kerri@atlanticcorrosionengineers.com <kerri@atlanticcorrosionengineers.com>
Subject: Re: Funding for Development Application Processing

Thanks, Pam. I appreciate the response, but what you describe doesn't strike me as being consistent with the direction of the 2011 resolution. You state that staff doesn't have the discretion to charge more than the fees set by the counsel even if a project exceeds that cost, however, my read of the 2011 resolution is that if a full cost recovery project was being implemented as directed by that resolution, staff would not just have the authority but would also have the obligation to charge an applicant for the actual cost, including City Attorney fees, instead of subsidizing the private project's costs.

I know you'll have your hands full with other things this week, but I (and others) would like more clarity on this. Maybe in the next few weeks you could provide an example of how you track staff time/costs for application projects - perhaps Folsom Prison Brews/Barley Barn since it's a good example of the type of project described in the 2011 staff report requesting the full cost recovery program (I previously submitted a public records request for that project, but I don't recall that any of the documents I received had any records of staff time or of applicant payments).

Thanks,
-Bob

Bob Delp
916-812-8122
bdelp@live.com

From: Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, November 15, 2021 10:05 AM
To: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Cc: Elaine Andersen <eandersen@folsom.ca.us>; Steven Wang <swang@folsom.ca.us>; Scott Johnson <sjohnson@folsom.ca.us>
Subject: RE: Funding for Development Application Processing

Hi Bob,

I'm just back from unexpected leave and wanted to follow up on your email.

Development processing fees are set by the City Council in an amount that cannot exceed the reasonable cost of providing the service. Accordingly, and generally speaking, staff does not have discretion to charge more than the fees set by the Council even if a particular application takes more time to process than others. Overall, planners and engineers in Community Development track their time working on development applications and also to properly account for deposit-based fees. When it appears that the fees set by the City Council no longer reflect the reasonable cost of providing the service, staff would recommend that the fees be re-evaluated and adjusted.

Pam
Pam Johns
Community Development Director

From: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Sent: Friday, October 22, 2021 5:01 PM
To: Elaine Andersen <eandersen@folsom.ca.us>
Cc: Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>; Scott Johnson <sjohnson@folsom.ca.us>; Rosario Rodriguez <rrodriguez@folsom.ca.us>; kerri@atlanticcorrosionengineers.com; Sarah Aquino <saquino@folsom.ca.us>; Mike Kozlowski <mkozlowski@folsom.ca.us>; YK Chalamcherla <ykchalamcherla@folsom.ca.us>; Christa Freemantle <cfreemantle@folsom.ca.us>
Subject: Fw: Funding for Development Application Processing

Ms. Andersen:

City Council Resolution 8801 of 2011 is attached with the associated March 2, 2011 staff report, as provided to me by Scott Johnson on October 6, 2021. Mr. Johnson was responding to my Oct 1 request (in string below) for information regarding funding for development applications. Neither Mr. Johnson nor Ms. Johns have yet been able to tell me if or how the Community Development Department has implemented the full cost recovery program for staff time as directed by the Council in Reso 8801.

If such a program is not in place, then taxpaying members of this community have been subsidizing what I expect would amount to hundreds of thousands of dollars of staff time and expenses associated with processing private development applications over the past 10 years when, instead, as directed by the City Council in 2011, those costs should have been directly paid for by applicants.

I am asking that you investigate, provide an explanation to the community, and address this matter as a top priority and that you direct staff to immediately suspend any further processing of current and future applications until a reimbursement agreement for full cost recover is in place.

Thank you,
-Bob Delp

Bob Delp
916-812-8122
bdelp@live.com

From: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Sent: Sunday, October 17, 2021 7:34 PM
To: Scott Johnson <sjohnson@folsom.ca.us>; Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>
Cc: Elaine Andersen <eandersen@folsom.ca.us>
Subject: Re: Funding for Development Application Processing

Hi, Pam and Scott (Elaine now cc'd). I'm concerned that you haven't yet been able to confirm that the full cost recovery system is in place and being implemented. This is likely a matter of tens of thousands of dollars each year for staff costs that - based on city council 2011 direction - should be covered by applicant reimbursements. Please confirm ASAP that the system is in place.

-Bob
916-812-8122
bdelp@live.com

On Oct 6, 2021, at 8:59 PM, Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com> wrote:

Thanks, Scott. The key thing I see from the 2011 staff report and resolution is the council's direction for staff to implement a full cost recovery fee system. The staff report describes precisely the type of situation I was asking about and seems to provide a clear remedy - full cost recovery. Was that full cost recovery system implemented and where would I find a description of how it's implemented?

-Bob
916-812-8122
bdelp@live.com

On Oct 6, 2021, at 9:36 PM, Scott Johnson <sjohnson@folsom.ca.us> wrote:

Mr. Delp,

Attached is the staff report and resolution adopted by the City Council on 3-08-11 relative to Planning Fees. Approval of this resolution changed our fee structure for planning services to be deposit based for the majority of entitlements.

Scott A. Johnson, AICP
Planning Manager

From: Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 1:17 PM
To: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>

Cc: Scott Johnson <sjohnson@folsom.ca.us>
Subject: RE: Funding for Development Application Processing

Hi Bob.

I've copied Scott Johnson here so he can respond or call you about our planning entitlement fee structure. Thank you.

Pam

From: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 11:50 AM
To: Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>
Subject: Re: Funding for Development Application Processing

Thanks, Pam. That's good to know and answers part of my question. But I'm also interested in knowing if staff time/costs are tracked and reimbursed by applicants. In particular, projects like 603 Sutter Street and 608 1/2 Sutter Street (*Catchy-Name-Here* Brews) have been submitted with substantial staff time invested in reviews, preparing staff reports, preparing for hearings, etc., but then the applicants have decided to pull back the projects and make substantial revisions. I'm sure that even a once-through application requires substantial staff time, and layering in multiple rounds obviously then takes that much more time. So I'm interested in knowing if applicants are funding staff costs for their projects or if I and other taxpayers are paying for staff time to review private projects.

Bob Delp
916-812-8122
bdelp@live.com

From: Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, October 5, 2021 11:22 AM
To: Bob Delp <bdelp@LIVE.COM>
Subject: RE: Funding for Development Application Processing

Hi Bob.

Consultant costs are covered entirely by applicant. Contracts are run through the City because we manage the consultant work consistent with approved scopes of work. Just like any city-run project, any cost overages by a consultant for work that is out of scope must be approved by the city in advance of the work and additional costs are the responsibility of the developer. Does that answer your question?

Pam

From: Bob Delp <bdelp@LIVE.COM>
Sent: Friday, October 1, 2021 10:46 AM

To: Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>

Subject: Funding for Development Application Processing

Pam:

I'm interested in understanding the source of funding for City and any City-retained consultant costs associated with your Department's review of development projects. I know there are established fees for certain project types, but I also know that the actual time/cost can be much higher than those fees would cover. Does the City absorb that cost or do you require reimbursement agreements with applicants for them to cover the actual cost?

Thanks,

-Bob

Bob Delp

916-812-8122

bdelp@live.com

<Planning Fees CC 3-08-11.pdf>

**PUBLIC HEARING
Agenda Item No.: 8a
CC Mtg.: 03/08/2011**

DATE: March 2, 2011
TO: Mayor and City Council Members
FROM: David E. Miller, AICP, Community Development Director
SUBJECT: **RESOLUTION NO. 8801 - A RESOLUTION MODIFYING RESOLUTION NO. 8301 TO CONVERT NOTED PLANNING FEES TO DEPOSITS AND DIRECTING STAFF TO IMPLEMENT A PROGRAM FOR FULL COST PLANNING SERVICE FEES**

BACKGROUND /ISSUE

The Planning Department Service Fees were last updated in October 2008. The fees generally reflect the average cost to provide development application processing services. However, the range of complexity in development applications can vary widely and some projects can remain "active" or "in process" for years because projects are substantially revised and resubmitted (sometimes with years passing in between) in an attempt by applicants to obtain City approval. Staff sometimes must effectively begin processing all over with each resubmittal but is unable to request new project fees because the project is still technically active. It is these types of projects that staff seeks to target to ensure that staff costs are fully recovered. As the Council is well aware, in our current fiscal climate the General Fund is unable to cover any unnecessary development service related costs.

Another major issue associated with development application fees is the continuing reduction in General Fund revenues. Over the past three years, the City's General Fund expenses have exceeded the General Fund revenue by approximately \$13 million. The City's General Fund cannot subsidize development applications. Given significant increases in productivity and expediting development permits, the expense to process development permits has dropped in many cases. Nevertheless, the General Fund continues to significantly subsidize development permit activity.

Therefore, staff is proposing to implement a program where staff would track time spent on each planning application and begin charging applicants monthly if and when the application fees were exceeded. In addition, a fee would be implemented to cover planning staff time to review building permits. In this manner, the City would protect its General Fund monies from subsidizing private development applications.

POLICY / RULE

Folsom Municipal Code Section 3.50.020 directs the City Manager to recommend to the Council the adjustment of fees and charges to recover the percentage of costs reasonably borne in providing the regulation, products or services enumerated in Chapter 3.50.

Folsom Municipal Code Section 3.50.030 provides direction on calculating “costs reasonably borne” to include the following elements: direct costs (wages, overtime, benefits, overhead, etc), indirect costs (building maintenance, computers, printing, etc.), fixed assets, general overhead, department overhead, and any debt service costs.

Folsom Municipal Code Section 3.50.040 requires fee adjustments be approved by the City Council. It also specifies the percentage of City service costs to be recovered through fees. The majority of Planning Service Fees are directed to be 100% cost recoverable through its fee structure. Building Permit fees are also directed to be 100% cost recovered.

ANALYSIS

Staff recommends that the City Council direct staff to implement a full cost recovery program modeled after one that’s been used by the City of Roseville Planning and Redevelopment Department since 2003. The following is the proposed program outline:

Base Cost

The base cost for processing a full cost application represents the minimum amount of staff time invested by City staff. This base cost is determined by an analysis of actual costs and is non-refundable. Staff recommends that Folsom’s existing fee structure adopted October 1, 2008 be used as this base cost so that no new costly analysis process is required.

Project Initiation

Concurrent with the start-up of a project, the applicant enters into an agreement for full cost billing. Per this agreement, the applicant would pay the base costs associated with the individual entitlements associated with the project.

Full Cost Billing

Following project initiation and payment of the base cost fee, staff will record time spent working on the project against the base cost. If staff time exceeds that covered under the base cost, the applicant shall be billed an hourly rate thereafter on a monthly basis.

The hourly billing rate charged to projects would be a factor of the staff salary to cover costs as enumerated in Folsom Municipal Code Section 3.50.030, including: direct costs (wages, overtime, benefits, overhead, etc), indirect costs (building maintenance, computers, printing, etc.), fixed assets, general overhead, department overhead, and any debt service costs. The Finance Department has completed a full analysis of overhead charges and has submitted rates for all Community Development staff.

These charges are based on the current staff costs per adopted City labor contracts, plus a factor for direct and indirect costs. Included in the monthly billing would be any costs incurred by other departments such as the City Attorney’s Office, Public Works, Utilities, Housing and Redevelopment, Parks and Recreation, etc.

Consultants

As may be required for project evaluation or environmental review, all consultant work shall be paid for by the project applicant and would be included in the payment agreement. The City would charge an administrative cost equal to 10% of the contract amount, which is a typical markup rate industry wide.

Non-Residential Plan Check Fee

Planning staff must review every building permit for compliance with conditions of any project approval (such as a Design Review or Planned Development Permit) to ensure all the Planning Commission and City Council conditions have been complied with. In addition, permits must be reviewed for compliance with the Zoning Code and any other applicable ordinance. Staff recommends that an additional planning review fee equal to 15% of the permit fee (same as City of Roseville fee) be charged to cover planning staff review time for non-residential projects because currently this cost is not being covered and is a drain on the General Fund.

Residential Landscape Review Fee

Due to recent state legislation (AB 1881) all landscape plans are required to be reviewed for water conservation standards. While commercial landscape plan review is covered by the existing fee structure, residential landscaping plans are not. Staff proposes to require a residential fee for each residential landscape plan review and inspection based on the hourly rate of the City Arborist.

As shown in the table below, the proposed fee deposits for typical entitlements are similar to other jurisdictions in the region.

Entitlement	Folsom	Roseville	Sacramento	Elk Grove	Rancho Cordova
General Plan Amendment	\$3,651-\$7,300	\$4,934-\$13,074	\$20,000	\$12,371	\$15,000
Rezone	\$2,502-\$4,997	\$5,154-\$13,338	\$8,000-\$20,000	\$10,176	\$15,000
Specific Plan Amendment	\$5,892	\$5,139-\$13,075	\$10,000	\$3,443	\$5,000
Tentative Parcel Map	\$4,754	\$1,698	\$500 per lot	\$4,854	\$10,000
Tentative Subdivision Map	\$5,721+\$30 per lot	\$3,338-\$4,832	\$500 per lot	\$7,533	\$10,000-\$20,000
Planned Development Permit	\$7,640+\$38 2 per acre	\$4,627	\$6,200	\$5,281	\$10,000
Conditional Use Permit	\$4,954	\$4,085	\$4,000-\$9,000	\$5,223	\$10,000
Variance	\$1,405	\$2,430	\$3,000	\$3,228	\$10,000

Staff recommends the Planning Service Fees convert to this deposit/cost recovery system in accordance with those services specifically identified in Section 3.50.040 to be full cost recovery. Exceptions to full cost recovery identified in this section include appeals (identified costs to be 10% recovered) and tree removal permits/special events permits (by omission from the schedule of Development Services to recover costs reasonably borne).

FINANCIAL IMPACT

The cost recovery program would allow the City to more accurately cover the actual costs for development permits from the applicants. Although the actual savings to the General Fund are cannot be quantified, this fee recovery program will result in a positive impact to the General Fund and provide direct costs charges to contribute to the General Fund to more accurately fund development processing costs.

ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW

This Resolution is categorically exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act under Public Resources Code §21080, sub. (b)(8) and CEQA Guidelines §15273, establishment, modification, structuring or approval of rates, tolls fares, or other charges by public agencies which the public agency finds are for the purpose of meeting operating expenses. The modification of permit fees has not potential environmental impact upon the environment so does not constitute a project under CEQA.


ATTACHMENTS

1. Resolution No. 8801 – A Resolution Modifying Resolution No. 8301 to Convert Noted Planning Fees to Deposits and Directing Staff to Implement a Program for Full Cost Planning Service Fees
2. City of Roseville Planning Fee Schedule – Effective July 1, 2010 (which includes procedures for Full Cost Fees)
3. City of Roseville Planning Department Sample Agreement for Full Cost Billing.

RECOMMENDATION/CITY COUNCIL ACTION

Staff recommends that the City Council adopt Resolution No. 8801 – A Resolution Modifying Resolution No. 8301 to Convert Noted Planning Fees to Deposits and Directing Staff to Implement a Program for Full Cost Planning Fees.

Submitted,



David E. Miller, AICP
Community Development Director

Attachment #1
City Council Resolution

RESOLUTION NO. 8801

A RESOLUTION MODIFYING RESOLUTION NO. 8301 AS SHOWN IN THE ATTACHED FEE SCHEDULE AND DIRECTING STAFF TO IMPLEMENT A PROGRAM FOR FULL COST PLANNING SERVICE FEES

WHEREAS, Folsom Municipal Code Section 3.50.020 directs the City Manager to recommend to the Council the adjustment of fees and charges to recover the percentage of costs reasonably borne in providing the regulation, products or services as enumerated in Chapter 3.50; and

WHEREAS, Folsom Municipal Code Section 3.50.030 provides direction on calculating costs reasonably borne to include the following elements: direct costs (wages, overtime, benefits, overhead, etc.), indirect costs (building maintenance, computers, printing, etc.), fixed assets, general overhead, department overhead, and any debt service costs; and

WHEREAS, Folsom Municipal Code Section 3.50.040 requires fee adjustments be approved by the City Council; and

WHEREAS, Folsom Municipal Code Section 3.50.040 also directs that the majority of Planning Service Fees and Building Permit Fees shall be 100% cost recoverable through its fee structure; and

WHEREAS, the range of complexity in Planning Department development applications can vary widely; and

WHEREAS, in our current fiscal climate the General Fund is unable to cover any unnecessary development service related costs; and

NOW THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Folsom that Resolution No. 8301 be modified as shown in the attached fee schedule, effective 60 days from the date of adoption of this Resolution on May 8, 2011 and directs City staff to implement a program for full cost planning service fees as attached and described in the staff report.

PASSED AND ADOPTED this 8th day of March 2011, by the following roll-call vote:

AYES: Council Member(s):

NOES: Council Member(s):

ABSENT: Council Member(s):

ABSTAIN: Council Member(s):

Andrew J. Morin, MAYOR

ATTEST:

Christa Freemantle, CITY CLERK

#	Department Service	Base Fee (Non-Refundable Deposit)
	Planning	
PE-1	Preliminary Project Review (deposit)	\$ 545
PE-2	Tentative Parcel Map Review (Deposit)	\$ 4,754
PE-3	Tentative Subdivision Map Review (deposit)	\$5,751 + \$30/Lot
PE-4	Tentative Map Amendment Review (deposit)	\$ 7,923
PE-5	Final Map Amend/Cert of Correction	\$ 2,599
PE-6	Tentative Map Extension Review (deposit)	\$ 3,404
PE-7	Site Design Review - Planning Comm. (deposit)	\$ 3,992
PE-8	Planned Development review (deposit)	\$7,640 + \$382/acre
PE-9	Planned Development Mod. Review (deposit)	\$ 7,628
PE-10	Planned Development Ext. Review (deposit)	\$ 2,678
PE-11	Specific Plan Review (deposit)	\$ 5,356
PE-12	Specific Plan Amend. Review (deposit)	\$ 5,892
PE-13	Initial Environmental Study/Assmnt (deposit)	\$ 5,423
PE-15	Environmental Impact Review & Report*	\$ 7,285
PE-16	Notice of CEQA determination	\$ 252
PE-18	Envtl Mitigation Prog. Monitoring*	\$ 5,369
PE-20	Historic Dist SFD Design Rvw (deposit)	\$ 54
PE-21	H.D. Mult Fam/Comm Design Rvw (deposit)	\$ 1,841
PE-22	Arch Review - SFD (deposit)	\$ 54
PE-23	Arch Review - Mult-Fam/Comm. (deposit)	\$ 1,841
PE-24	Historic Dist Sign Review (deposit)	\$ 54
PE-25	Sign Permit - Staff	\$ 107
PE-26	PD Permit Sign Only (deposit)	\$ 1,071
PE-27	Zoning Verification Review (deposit)	\$ 258
PE-28	Rezoning Request Review- < 5 acres (deposit)	\$ 2,502
PE-29	Rezoning Request Review- 5+ acres (deposit)	\$ 4,997
PE-20	Lot Line Adj./Parcel Merger (planning) (deposit)	\$ 844
PE-31	Annexation Processing (deposit)*	\$ 4,280
PE-32	Variance Review- SFD (deposit)	\$ 1,405
PE-33	Variance Review- Other (deposit)	\$ 1,405
PE-35	Appeal - Admin	\$ 214
PE-36	Appeal - by other (deposit)	\$ 429
PE-37	Code Amendment (deposit)*	\$ 1,912
PE-38	General Plan Amendment <5 acres (deposit)	\$ 3,651
PE-39	General Plan Amendment >5 acres (deposit)	\$ 7,300
PE-40	Temporary Use Permit Review	\$ 54
PE-41	Conditional Use Permit Review (deposit)	\$ 4,954
PE-43	Street Name Review/Change (deposit)	\$ 1,071
PE-44	Devl. Agreement Processing (deposit)*	\$ 4,607
PE-45	Non-residential Plan Check Fee	15% of building permit fee
PE-46	Residential Landscape Review Fee	Hourly rate of City Arborist

Attachment #2
City of Roseville Planning Fee Schedule
Effective July 1, 2010



PLANNING and REDEVELOPMENT
311 VERNON STREET * ROSEVILLE, CA 95678

Planning Fee Schedule - Effective July 1, 2010

Adopted by Resolution No. 96-239 - Amended by Resolution No. 97-287 - Amended by Resolution No. 99-507 - Amended by Resolution No. 02-02 - Amended by Resolution No. 02-224
Amended by Resolution No. 04-485 - Amended by Resolution No. 05-176, Amended by resolution 09-124

ENTITLEMENT (APPLICATION TYPE):	FEE	Full Cost Base Cost	ENTITLEMENT (APPLICATION TYPE):	FEE	Full Cost Base Cost
APPEALS			SIGNS		
1. Planning Director's Decision	\$454		1. Standard Sign Permit	\$117	
2. PC/DC Decision to City Council	\$425		2. Planned Sign Permit Program	\$512	
ANNEXATIONS			3. Sign Permit/Program - Public Hearing Req.	\$1,010	
1. Annex/PZ/Detach/SOI/(FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$11,786	4. Administrative Permit for Sign Exception ²	\$717	
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS			5. PSP Minor Modification ³	\$58	
1. Adoption of Specific Plan (FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$6,837	SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT		
2. Amendment of SPA (FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$6,837	1. SPA Adoption, Map/Text (FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$11,786
3. Associated with Affordable Housing	\$1,244		2. SPA 10 Acres or LESS, Map or Text	\$5,139	
4. Associated with Single Topic Item	\$2,474		3. SPA 11+ Acres, Map/Text (FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$13,075
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW			4. SPA Text/Policy Deposit (FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$13,075
1. Exemption WITHOUT Initial Study	\$176		SUBDIVISIONS/CONDOMINIUMS*		
2. Exemption WITH Initial Study	\$425		1. Grading Plan / Minor	\$1,201	
3. Negative Declaration with NO Mitigation	\$630		2. Grading Plan / Major	\$2,489	
4. Tiered Negative Declaration WITH Mitigation	\$1,288		3. Lot Line Adjustment	\$1,201	
5. EIR Deposit (FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$11,786	4. Extension to a Tentative Map	\$1,201	
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT			5. Voluntary Merger	\$1,201	
1. Entitlement Fee - GPA 10 Acres of LESS, Map/Text	\$4,934		6. Reversion to Acreage	\$1,698	
2. GPA 11+ Acres, Map/Text (FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$13,074	7. Minor Modification to a Tentative Map	\$1,201	
3. GPA - Text Policy Amend (FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$13,074	8. Major Modification to a Tentative Map	\$2,796	
PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT ABANDONMENT			9. Tentative Parcel Map with 4 or fewer Lots	\$1,698	
1. Summary Vacation	\$1,259		10. Tentative Map, 5 through 99 Lots	\$3,338	
2. General Vacation	\$1,772		11. Tentative Map, 100 through 499 Lots	\$4,832	
			12. Tentative Map, 500+ Lots (FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$12,254

KEY: ¹Full Cost/Base Cost to be collected at submittal. An estimate of processing cost will be provided at PEM. Applicant to pay 100% of Actual Cost to process requested Entitlement.

*Condominium subdivision category has been added to assist in the processing and tracking of condominium units

² Previously processed as Sign Variance

³ Previously processed as ZCC

600000

ENTITLEMENT (APPLICATION TYPE:	FEE	Full Cost Base Cost
ZONING ORDINANCE ENTITLEMENTS		
1. Administrative Permit	\$717	
2. Conditional Use Permit	\$4,085	
3. CUP Extension or Modification	\$2,650	
4. Design Review Permit	\$4,627	
5. DRP/Minor Approved at Public Counter	\$102	
6. DRP/Residential Subdivision w/other Permit	\$2,870	
7. DRP Extension or Modification	\$2,650	
8. CUP/DRP Process with another Permit	\$2,225	
9. Flood Encroachment Permit	\$3,719	
10. MPP Stage 1 or Stages 1 & 2 (FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$14,846
11. MPP Stage 2, Mod/Exten of Stage 1 &/or 2	\$2,650	
12. MPP Administrative Modification	\$776	
13. Planned Development Permit	\$4,627	
14. TP Admin - Approved at Public Counter	\$88	
15. TP - Req. Public Hear for SFD or 10 trees/Less	\$1,772	
16. TP - Req. Public Hear for DRP/TM or 11+ trees	\$2,723	
17. Administrative Variance	\$600	
18. Variance to Develop Standards Req. Public Hearing	\$2,035	
19. Variance to Parking Standards	\$2,430	
20. Zoning Clearance Approved Public Counter	\$58	
21. Zoning Interpretation - Hearing Required	\$1,537	
22. Zoning Interpretation - Non Hearing Item	\$73	
ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS		
1. Zoning Text Amend (Zoning, Subd, Sign) (FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$7,965
2. Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10 Acres or LESS	\$5,154	
3. Zoning Map Change (RZ) 11+ Acres (FULL COST/Deposit) ¹		\$13,338
OTHER		
1. New Non-Residential Plan Check ²		15% of Building Plan Check Fee
2. Commercial Plan Check - T1 ²	\$58	
2. Planning Dept. Plot Plan Review (Bundles of 10)	\$58	
3. Radius List Prep-Previously Developed Area	\$58	
4. Preparation Undeveloped Area/Mailing	\$146	
5. Farmer's Market Permit	\$410	

PROCEDURES FOR FULL COST FEES**I. Base Cost**

The base costs for processing a full cost application represents the minimum amount of staff time invested by the Planning and Redevelopment Department in processing a certain entitlement. This base fee has been generated based on a time-motion analysis that is available upon request from the Planning and Redevelopment Department. This base cost is non-refundable.

II. Project Initiation

Concurrent with the start-up of a Full Cost project, the applicant shall enter into an agreement for Full Cost billing. This agreement shall be provided to the applicant from the Planning and Redevelopment Department. Per the provisions of this agreement, the applicant shall pay the base costs associated with the individual entitlements associated with the project.

III. Full Cost Billing

Following project initiation and payment of the base cost fee, Planning and Redevelopment staff will record time spent working on the project against the base cost. Once staff time exceeds that covered under the base cost, the applicant shall be billed on a monthly basis. These charges will be based on current staff costs per adopted City labor contracts, plus a factor for direct and indirect costs. The Planning and Redevelopment Department can be contacted for current rates.

Included in the monthly billing will be the costs incurred by the following City departments: City Attorney, Housing, Community Development, Parks and Recreation and Planning and Redevelopment. These costs are outside of what is reflected in the Base Cost.

IV. Consultants

As may be required by the Planning Department for project evaluation or environmental review, all consultant work shall be paid for by the project applicant and shall be included in the payment agreement. The City shall charge 10% of the contract amount for City action. The cost for consultant fees will be paid as a one time cost.

V. Plan Check Fee

This fee shall be 15% of the building Plan Check Fee for New Non-Residential construction (Commercial and Multi-family). Fee to be collected with Building's Plan Check Fee.

REFUND POLICY

Application fees are not refundable except as follows:

1. Refund of 100% shall be made if a determination is made by the Planning Director that the permit and associated fee are not required by the City of Roseville Municipal Code or adopted City Resolution.
2. If an applicant requests withdrawal of a permit prior to the PEM, refund of 50% of the applicable fee shall also be refunded.
3. No refund of application fees shall be made after a Project Evaluation Meeting has been held, unless a fee waiver is approved by the Roseville City Council.

KEY

¹Full Cost/Deposit to be collected at submittal. Applicant to pay 100% of Actual Cost to process requested Entitlement. -See FULL COST Discussion

²Non-Residential - :Per Building Code, this includes Commercial and Multi-family developments. Plan Check Fees to be assessed as part of Building Department Plan Check Fee.

³Parking In Lieu Fee is an optional fee that non-residential uses in the Downtown Specific Plan Area can utilize instead of providing required parking on-site. Fees for the 1st stall will be \$800 (10%), 2nd stall \$2,000 (25%), 3rd stall (50%), 4th stall \$6,000(75%) and 5 or more stalls \$8,000 (100%) of the in lieu fee.

E:/budget/Fee Schedule Effective 07/01/2010

Attachment #3
City of Roseville Planning Department
Sample Agreement for Full Cost Billing

Agreement for Full Cost Billing

I understand that charges for staff time spent processing this application will be based on the current staff costs per adopted City labor contracts plus a factor for direct and indirect costs. Please contact the Planning Division for a handout of current billing rates.

I understand that my initial fee is considered to be a base cost for processing. This initial fee will set up an account that shall be charged at the current rate for all staff processing time. I understand that should the final costs be more than the initial fee, I will be billed quarterly for the additional charges. I also understand that payments received after the due date will be assessed a late fee equal to ten percent (10%) of the amount past due.

I understand that staff processing time may include, but is not limited to: Planning and Other City Departments: City Attorney, Housing, Community Development, and Parks & Recreation. This also includes but is not limited to; Pre-application review of plans; reviewing plans / submittal packages; routing plans to, and communicating with inter-office departments and outside agencies; researching documents relative to site history; site visits; consulting with applicant and/or other interested parties either in person by phone; preparing environmental documents; drafting of staff reports and resolutions; preparing pertinent maps, graphs and exhibits; and attending meetings / public hearings before the Design Committee/Planning Commission/City Council.

I also understand that receipt of all discretionary approvals does not constitute an entitlement to begin work. Non-discretionary approvals may be required from City development departments and outside agencies. I understand additional fees will be assessed for these approvals. Please refer to the City's Residential or Commercial Fee Schedule for other fees to be assessed prior to the issuance of project permits. These fees may include, but are not limited to: Building Permit fees; Improvement plan fees; Traffic Impact fees; Drainage fees; Parkland Dedication fees; Park Construction fees; Utility fees; Filing fees; and Mapping fees.

As applicant, I assume full responsibility for all costs leading to discretionary approvals (as listed above, incurred by the City in processing this application(s)).

PROJECT NAME: _____

PROJECT DESCRIPTION: _____

BILLING CONTACT INFORMATION:

NAME: _____
 COMPANY: _____
 ADDRESS: _____
 CITY, STATE: _____ ZIP: _____
 PHONE #: _____ FAX #: _____
 CELL #: _____ EMAIL: _____

OWNER ARCHITECT
 ENGINEER OTHER: _____

BILLING ADDRESS, IF DIFFERENT FROM CONTACT:

NAME: _____
 COMPANY: _____
 ADDRESS: _____
 CITY, STATE: _____ ZIP: _____
 PHONE #: _____ FAX #: _____
 CELL #: _____ EMAIL: _____

OWNER ARCHITECT
 ENGINEER OTHER: _____

PROPERTY OWNER OR AGENT AUTHORIZATION:

NAME: _____
 COMPANY: _____
 ADDRESS: _____
 CITY, STATE: _____ ZIP: _____
 PHONE #: _____ FAX #: _____
 EMAIL: _____

CHOOSE ONE:

- I am the property owner and hereby authorize the filling of this agreement.
- I am the applicant and am authorized by the owner to file this agreement.

SIGNATURE: _____

DATE: _____

For Staff Use Only	(Date Stamp)
PROJECT ADDRESS: _____	
JOB NUMBER: _____	
Total Deposit Fee: \$ _____	
Receipt #: _____	E:\forms\FULLCOSTBILLINGAGREEMENT.doc
Received By: _____	

Desmond Parrington

From: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2024 4:18 PM
To: Desmond Parrington
Cc: Pam Johns; Stephanie Henry; Christa Freemantle
Subject: Re: City of Folsom - Major Planning Items on 4/22 and 4/23

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Thank you, Desmond.

Bob Delp
916-812-8122
bdelp@live.com

From: Desmond Parrington <dparrington@folsom.ca.us>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2024 11:46 AM
To: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Cc: Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>; Stephanie Henry <shenry@folsom.ca.us>; Christa Freemantle <cfreemantle@folsom.ca.us>
Subject: RE: City of Folsom - Major Planning Items on 4/22 and 4/23

Bob:

The public notice, which was printed over 10 days ago in the *Folsom Telegraph* included a link to the fee study and also mentioned that a copy of the fee study is available at the Community Development Department permit counter. Attached is the public notice and proof of publication.

-Desmond



CITY OF
FOLSOM
DISTINCTIVE BY NATURE



Desmond Parrington, AICP
Planning Manager
City of Folsom
50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630
dparrington@folsom.ca.us
o:916-461-6233 c:916-216-2813
www.folsom.ca.us

From: Bob Delp <bdelp@live.com>
Sent: Tuesday, April 23, 2024 7:32 AM
To: Desmond Parrington <dparrington@folsom.ca.us>; Christa Freemantle <cfreemantle@folsom.ca.us>
Cc: Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>; Stephanie Henry <shenry@folsom.ca.us>
Subject: Re: City of Folsom - Major Planning Items on 4/22 and 4/23

CAUTION: This email originated from outside of the organization. Do not click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Desmond and/or Christa:

The Staff Report for Item 9 of tonight's City's Council meeting is dated with today's date, 4/23/2024. That item is for a hearing to consider amendments to Building and Engineering fees and my understanding is that such a hearing is subject to Folsom Municipal Code section 3.50.060 which states, "[p]ursuant to the California Government Code, **at least ten days prior to the required public hearing set out herein**, the city manager shall make available to the public appropriate data indicating the cost, or estimated cost required to support the fees and charges for which changes are proposed to be made or fees or charges imposed."

Can you confirm that the staff report (dated 4/23/2024) or the data required pursuant to 3.50.060 was made available to the public at least ten days ago and, if so, can you let me know when and how that was accomplished?

Thank you,
-Bob

Bob Delp
916-812-8122
bdelp@live.com

From: Desmond Parrington <dparrington@folsom.ca.us>
Sent: Monday, April 22, 2024 2:17 PM
To: Desmond Parrington <dparrington@folsom.ca.us>
Cc: Pam Johns <pjohns@folsom.ca.us>; Stephanie Henry <shenry@folsom.ca.us>
Subject: City of Folsom - Major Planning Items on 4/22 and 4/23

The City of Folsom has three major upcoming planning items including: 1) a proposed annexation concept; 2) recommended Building and Engineering fee changes, and 3) an EIR and proposed amendments to the City's General Plan for additional housing capacity. Of those three items, two (conceptual annexation proposal and recommended fee changes) will be going before the City Council for consideration tomorrow, **Tuesday, April 23 at 6:30 pm in Council Chambers at City Hall** (50 Natoma St.). The third is available for review for next 45 days.

1. **Community for Health and Independence – Conceptual Annexation Proposal:** The Folsom City Council will hold a public workshop on Tuesday, April 23 to consider a preliminary request from AKT and UC Davis Health for their conceptual annexation proposal. The proposed project is a master-planned community south of Folsom, located in Sacramento and El Dorado counties. The developer will present the project concept and request feedback from both the El Dorado County Board of Supervisors and the Folsom City Council at separate meetings on April 23 to inform future decisions and any necessary next steps. No formal action by City Council is required or allowed at this time. Instead, this workshop creates an early vetting opportunity for the developer to hear from the community and City Council about the proposed annexation proposal. Learn more: [Conceptual Annexation Proposal | Folsom, CA](#). Refer to [Item #11 for the staff report in the agenda packet](#).
2. **Community Development Department – Recommended Building and Engineering Fee Changes:** The Folsom City Council will hold a public hearing on proposed fee changes to CDD's Building and Engineering user and processing fees. The Building and Engineering fee recommendations come out of a Council workshop on the user fee study held on March 12. The changes are designed to better reflect the scope of work involved and to cover staff costs associated with the processing and review of permits. No impact

fees are proposed for change. If approved, these new Building and Engineering user and processing fees would go into effect on July 1, 2024. For a copy of the fee study and the staff report, see [Item # 9 in the staff report](#) (PDF). Planning fees, including Special Event Permit fees, are not proposed to change at this time. Planning fee changes will be presented to City Council in the first quarter of 2025.

- 3. Notice of Availability – Public Review Draft of General Plan Amendments and EIR for Increased Housing Capacity:** As part of the implementation for the City’s 2021-2029 Housing Element, the City is amending the General Plan and Folsom Plan Area Specific Plan (FPASP) to allow for more intensive multi-family residential development in targeted areas including the East Bidwell Corridor, areas near the Glenn and Iron Point light rail stations and in the Folsom Plan Area. An environmental impact report (EIR) along with the amended General Plan and FPASP documents are available for review and comment for 45 days between April 22 and Friday, June 6, 2024. The Notice of Availability is attached and the documents along with more information about the project and how to submit a comment is available at www.folsom.ca.us/housingstudy.



CITY OF
FOLSOM
DISTINCTIVE BY NATURE



Desmond Parrington, AICP
Planning Manager
City of Folsom
50 Natoma Street, Folsom, CA 95630
dparrington@folsom.ca.us
o:916-461-6233 c:916-216-2813
www.folsom.ca.us