## **CITY OF FOLSOM**

**APRIL 2025** 

# DEVELOPMENT PROCESSING FEE STUDY PLANNING FEES



# **CONTENTS**

### **REPORTING**

<u>Section</u>	<u>Description</u>	Page #
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>
Α	REGIONAL FEE COMPARISON
В	COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS
С	PROPOSED FEES



April 2025

### 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,

TERRY MADSEN, PRESIDENT | CLEARSOURCE FINANCIAL CONSULTING

-mel

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.

- Current fees recover less than the City's full cost of providing fee-related services.
- Staff is recommending adjustments to most fees to target full cost recovery. Exceptions to full
  cost recovery include certain appeals, minor reviews, permitting for certain temporary uses, etc.:
  - Owner-occupied Appeal
  - Minor Design Review
  - o Entertainment Permitting
  - Landmark Tree Classification
  - Opinion on a Planning Matter
  - Preliminary Project Review
  - o Sidewalk Vendor Permit
  - Temporary Outdoor Dining Permit
  - Temporary Use Permit
  - Variance for Single Family Dwelling
- Fees for some of the City's more complex planning review projects are proposed to be administered using a "time and materials" billing approach. The City will collect an initial deposit and bill against that deposit for the costs of outside consultant review and support, and in-house labor efforts. If the deposit is drawn down before project completion, staff contacts the applicant to request replenishment of funds. If deposit amounts remain at the completion of the project, the applicant is refunded the unused deposit amount. Comprehensive tracking and billing for deposit-based projects should billing for project time such as:
  - Intake and Initial Processing and Review
  - Initial Meetings
  - Project Correspondence
  - Multiple Rounds of Review
  - Report Preparation
  - Decision Making, Meeting Preparation
  - o Project Close-Out and Documentation Actions

# **EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

### **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 \$120,000.

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.

### **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 Years 2023/24 and 2024/25 and will be available to answer questions as the City proceeds in implementing findings as it chooses.

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

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

### **DIRECT SERVICES UNDER REVIEW**

### **Fee Categories**

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

Planning – Entitlement review, review for compliance with zoning code, planning permit issuance.

### **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.

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 the 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.

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**

	CO	T OF SERVICE ANALYSIS – PROCESS AND METHODS	ST OF SERV
1	ANNUAL LABOR TIME	<ul> <li>IDENTIFY ANNUAL HOURS SPENT PROVIDING FEE SERVICES FOR EACH PARTICIPATING DIVISION</li> <li>INFORMATION IS DEVELOPED AND TESTED USING A COMBINATION OF INTERVIEWS, QUESTIONNAIRES, HISTORICAL PROJECT INFORMATION, AND HISTORICAL REVENUE INFORMATION</li> </ul>	PAR D INFO QUE
2	ANNUAL EXPENDITURES	<ul> <li>IDENTIFY ANNUAL COST OF PROVIDING FEE SERVICES FOR EACH PARTICIPATING DIVISION</li> <li>INFORMATION IS DEVELOPED AND TESTED USING A COMBINATION OF INFORMATION FOUND IN THE CITY'S ADOPTED BUDGET, EXPENDITURE HISTORY, AND THE OVERHEAD COST PLAN.</li> </ul>	DIVI
3	FULLY BURDENED HOURLY RATES	CALCULATE THE ESTIMATED FULLY BURDENED HOURLY RATE USING INFORMATION FROM STEPS 1 AND 2	
4	SERVICE/ACTIVITY LABOR TIME	<ul> <li>ESTIMATE LABOR TIME REQUIRED TO PROCESS INDIVIDUAL REQUEST FOR SERVICE</li> <li>INFORMATION IS DEVELOPED AND TESTED USING A COMBINATION OF INTERVIEWS, QUESTIONNAIRES, COMMONLY USED MEASURES, AND INFORMATION DEVELOPED IN STEP 1</li> </ul>	⇒ INFO QUE
5	UNIT COST OF SERVICE	CALCULATE THE ESTIMATED COST OF SERVICE USING INFORMATION FROM STEPS 3 AND 4	0 0, 12
6	CURRENT COST RECOVERY	○ CALCULATE CURRENT COST RECOVERY LEVEL FOR A SPECIFIC SERVICE	⊃ CAL
7	TARGETED COST RECOVERY	USE LAWS, INDUSTRY STANDARDS, GOALS AND POLICIES, AND HISTORICAL TRENDS TO DETERMINE TARGETED COST RECOVERY	
8	TEST FOR REASONABLENESS	<ul> <li>TEST TO CONFIRM FORECAST REVENUE FROM FEES WILL NOT EXCEED PROGRAM COSTS</li> <li>USE HISTORICAL PERMIT VOLUME AND PROPOSED FEES TO FORECAST ANTICIPATED REVENUE FROM FEES</li> <li>FORECASTED REVENUES SHOULD NOT EXCEED PROGRAM COSTS</li> </ul>	COS  USE REV

## **IMPLEMENTATION**

### CONSIDERATIONS FOR IMPLEMENTATION

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

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

## **APPENDIX A**

### REGIONAL FEE COMPARISON

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

The City of Folsom, consistent with other cities throughout the State, has an existing fee schedule that contemplates hundreds of potential unique requests for service. This can result in thousands of fee scenarios when comparing among multiple agencies. Consequently, an exhaustive comparison of the hundreds, and potentially thousands of scenarios is unrealistic. Instead, comparison information for several fee categories commonly seen from agency to agency are provided in order to provide City Council with a reasonable sense of changes expected. For Folsom, outcomes will show that new fees may range from low, mid, to upper end of regional fee spectrum depending on the service provided. This is common among municipalities due to differing levels of service and review included among various fee categories.

### **Planning Fee Comparison**

Fee Description	Folsom - Current	Folsom - Proposed	Folsom - Current Fee	Folsom - Proposed Fee	Elk Grove	Rancho Cordova	Rocklin	Roseville
Annexation	Low End	Mid-Range	\$5,789	\$17,000 Deposit	\$18,800		\$17,949	\$20,000 Deposit
Appeal	Low End	Low to Upper Range	\$257 - \$522	\$2,500 - \$4,200	\$2,500 - \$5,000 Deposit	\$2,590 - \$4,383	\$4,257 - \$4,902	\$2,080 - \$5,530
Variance - SFR / Admin	Low End	Mid-Range	\$1,686	\$2,500	\$6,000 Deposit	\$10,000 Deposit	\$2,578	\$1,530
Variance - All Other	Low End	Mid-Range	\$1,686	\$5,100	\$6,000 Deposit	\$10,000 Deposit	\$6,948	\$5,124
Zone Change	Low End	Mid-Range	\$3,005 - \$6,000	\$10,000 - \$13,000	\$1,000 Deposit	\$15,000 Deposit	\$13,573	\$10,000 - \$17,000 Deposit
General Plan Amendment	Low End	Mid-Range	\$4,384 - \$8,768	\$10,000 - \$13,000	\$1,000 Deposit	\$15,000 Deposit	\$14,209	\$10,000 - \$17,000 Deposit
Conditional Use Permit	Low End	Low-Mid Range Depending on CUP	\$2,821 - \$5,950	\$2,500 - \$5,100	\$5,000 - \$10,000 Deposit	\$10,000 Deposit	\$6,480 - \$13,940	\$9,000 Deposit

# **APPENDIX B**

### **COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS**



### **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
Cost of Service Calculations	5
Cost Allocation - Citywide Overhead	16

### **User and Regulatory Fees**

Cost of Service Calculations

Community Development - Administration

### Allocation of In-House Labor

		Code				
Description	Building	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	Α	djustments	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

	Code				
Building	forcement	gineering	Planning	Total	Notes
\$ 165,133	\$ 30,024	\$ 90,073	\$ 75,060	\$ 360,290	[b]
\$ 2,382	\$ 433	\$ 1,299	\$ 1,083	\$ 5,197	[b]
\$ 13,590	\$ 2,471	\$ 7,413	\$ 6,177	\$ 29,650	[b]
\$ 63,947	\$ 11,627	\$ 34,880	\$ 29,067	\$ 139,520	[b]
\$ 7,377	\$ 1,341	\$ 4,024	\$ 3,353	\$ 16,095	[b]
\$ 2,750	\$ 500	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,250	\$ 6,000	[b]
\$ 25,218	\$ 4,585	\$ 13,756	\$ 11,463	\$ 55,022	[b]
\$ 1,833	\$ 333	\$ 1,000	\$ 833	\$ 4,000	[b]
\$ 2,521	\$ 458	\$ 1,375	\$ 1,146	\$ 5,500	[b]
\$ 3,438	\$ 625	\$ 1,875	\$ 1,563	\$ 7,500	[b]
\$ 25,438	\$ 4,625	\$ 13,875	\$ 11,563	\$ 55,500	[b]
\$ 8,021	\$ 1,458	\$ 4,375	\$ 3,646	\$ 17,500	[b]
\$ 164	\$ 30	\$ 90	\$ 75	\$ 358	[b]
\$ 1,146	\$ 208	\$ 625	\$ 521	\$ 2,500	[b]
\$ 4,583	\$ 833	\$ 2,500	\$ 2,083	\$ 10,000	[b]
\$ 2,521	\$ 458	\$ 1,375	\$ 1,146	\$ 5,500	[b]
\$ 917	\$ 167	\$ 500	\$ 417	\$ 2,000	[b]
\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	[b];[c]
\$ 229	\$ 42	\$ 125	\$ 104	\$ 500	[b]
\$ 1,833	\$ 333	\$ 1,000	\$ 833	\$ 4,000	[b]
\$ 92	\$ 17	\$ 50	\$ 42	\$ 200	[b]
\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -	[b];[c]
\$ 7,792	\$ 1,417	\$ 4,250	\$ 3,542	\$ 17,000	[b]
\$ 2,292	\$ 417	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,042	\$ 5,000	[b]
\$ 10,365	\$ 1,885	\$ 5,654	\$ 4,711	\$ 22,614	[b]
\$ 2,292	\$ 417	\$ 1,250	\$ 1,042	\$ 5,000	[b]
\$ 5,042	\$ 917	\$ 2,750	\$ 2,292	\$ 11,000	[b]
\$ 3,453	\$ 628	\$ 1,883	\$ 1,569	\$ 7,533	[b]
\$ 8,628	\$ 1,569	\$ 4,706	\$ 3,922	\$ 18,824	[b]
\$ 372,993	\$ 67,817	\$ 203,451	\$ 169,542	\$ 813,803	
46%	8%	25%	21%	100%	

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

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

<sup>[</sup>c] Adjustment to exclude non-fee related expenses.

### **User and Regulatory Fees**

Cost of Service Calculations
Planning

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

### **Authorized Staffing**

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

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

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

### Recurring Divisional Expenditures [a]

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

#### Allocation of Department and Citywide Overhead

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

#### Total

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

### **Fully-Burdened Hourly Rate**

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

- [a] Source: FY 23/24 adopted budget.
- [b] Adjustment to exclude non-fee related amounts or amounts not used to inform hourly rate.
- [c] See separate worksheets in this model. Amounts intended to serve as reasonable estimates.

City of Folsom User and Regulatory Fee Study Planning Fees

					П			Current		Proposed			
	E. Beredelle	Est. Labor		Hourly	П	Est. Cost of	C 5	Cost	Proposed	Cost	Fee	Fee	Note
1	Fee Description Annexation Processing	Hours 80.0	¥	Rate \$216		\$vc \$17,280	Current Fee \$5,789	Recovery 34%	Fee \$17,000	Recovery 100%	Structure Deposit	\$11,211	Note [a]
_	A WHICKAGOTT TOCCSSING	00.0	ľ	<b>7210</b>		<b>Ϋ17,200</b>	<i>\$3,763</i>	3470	717,000	100%	Берозіс	711,211	[0]
2	Appeal												
	a) Appeal of Staff Decision - Owner Occupied	20.0	х	\$216	=	\$4,320	\$258	6%	\$2,500	58%	Fixed Fee	\$2,242	[b]
	b) Appeal of Staff Decision - by Developer/Other	20.0	х	\$216	=	\$4,320	\$515	12%	\$2,500	58%	Fixed Fee	\$1,985	[b]
	c) Appeal of Commission Decision - Owner Occupied	28.0	х	\$216	=	\$6,048	\$257	4%	\$4,200	69%	Fixed Fee	\$3,943	[b]
	d) Appeal of Commission Decision - by Developer/Other	28.0	х	\$216	=	\$6,048	\$522	9%	\$4,200	69%	Fixed Fee	\$3,678	[b]
3	Code Amendment	40.0	x	\$216	=	\$8,640	\$2,297	27%	\$8,500	98%	Fixed Fee	\$6,203	
4	Conditional Use Permit (CUP)												
	a) CUP Review (Major)	24.0	х	\$216	=	\$5,184	\$5,950	115%	\$5,100	98%	Fixed Fee	(\$850)	
	b) CUP Review (Minor)	12.0	х	\$216	=	\$2,592	\$2,821	109%	\$2,500	96%	Fixed Fee	(\$321)	
	c) CUP Modification	12.0	х	\$216	=	\$2,592	\$1,647	64%	\$2,500	96%	Fixed Fee	\$853	
5	Condominium Conversion Fee	80.0	x	\$216	=	\$17,280	\$11,709	68%	\$17,000	98%	Fixed Fee	\$5,291	
6	Design Review/Architectural Review												
	a) New Multi-Family/Commercial Structure/Single-Family Subdivision	24.0	х	\$216	=	\$5,184	\$2,210	43%	\$5,100	98%	Fixed Fee	\$2,890	
	b) Existing Multi-Family/Commercial Structure	12.0	х	\$216	=	\$2,592	\$2,210	85%	\$2,210	85%	Fixed Fee	\$0	
	c) New Single and Two Family Dwelling	6.0	х	\$216	=	\$1,296	\$63	5%	\$800	62%	Fixed Fee	\$737	
	d) Existing Single and Two Family Dwelling/Accessory Structure/Non-Exempted ADU	3.0	х	\$216	=	\$648	\$63	10%	\$400	62%	Fixed Fee	\$337	
	e) New Historic District Multi-Family/Commercial Structure	24.0	х	\$216	=	\$5,184	\$2,210	43%	\$5,100	98%	Fixed Fee	\$2,890	
	f) Existing Historic District Multi-Family/Commercial Structure	16.0	х	\$216	=	\$3,456	\$2,210	64%	\$2,210	64%	Fixed Fee	\$0	
	g) New Historic District Single Family, Two-Family Dwelling and Non-Exempted ADU	16.0	х	\$216	=	\$3,456	\$63	2%	\$800	23%	Fixed Fee	\$737	
	h) Existing Historic District Single and Two Family Dwelling/Accessory Structure/Demolition	12.0	х	\$216	=	\$2,592	\$63	2%	\$400	15%	Fixed Fee	\$337	
7	Development Agreement Processing	48.0	х	\$216	=	\$10,368	\$5,405	52%	\$10,000	100%	Deposit	\$4,595	[a]
8	Entertainment Permit	2.0	х	\$216	=	\$432	\$46	11%	\$200	46%	Fixed Fee	\$154	

City of Folsom User and Regulatory Fee Study Planning Fees

				П	5 · 0 · 6		Current		Proposed	_	_	
Fee Description	Est. Labor Hours		Hourly Rate	П	Est. Cost of Svc	Current Fee	Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Cost Recovery	Fee Structure	Fee Change	Note
9 Environmental Review	110015		Hate		310	Carreneree	necovery		nesovery	oti dotai e	change	11010
a) Environmental Impact Review & Report	48.0	x	\$216	=	\$10,368	\$8,748	84%	\$10,000	100%	Deposit	\$1,252	[a],[c]
b) Environmental Mitigation Program Monitoring	36.0	x	\$216	=	\$7,776	\$6,449	83%	\$7,000	100%	Deposit	\$551	[a],[c]
c) Initial Environmental Study/Assessment	36.0	x	\$216	=	\$7,776	\$6,512	84%	\$7,000	100%	Deposit	\$488	[a],[c]
d) Notice of CEQA Determination	1.5	х	\$216	=	\$324	\$304	94%	\$300	93%	Fixed Fee	(\$4)	
10 General Plan												
a) General Plan Amendment < 5 acres	48.0	x	\$216	=	\$10,368	\$4,384	42%	\$10,000	96%	Fixed Fee	\$5,616	
b) General Plan Amendment 5 or more acres	64.0	х	\$216	=	\$13,824	\$8,768	63%	\$13,000	94%	Fixed Fee	\$4,232	
11 Home Occupation Permit Fee	0.3	x	\$216	=	\$65	\$31	48%	\$60	93%	Fixed Fee	\$29	
12 Indoor Marijuana Cultivation Permit	2.5	x	\$216	=	\$540	\$253	47%	\$500	93%	Fixed Fee	\$247	
13 Landmark Tree Classification	6.5	x	\$216	=	\$1,404	\$295	21%	\$350	25%	Fixed Fee	\$55	
14 Landmark Tree Declassification	8.5	x	\$216	=	\$1,836	\$295	16%	\$1,800	98%	Fixed Fee	\$1,505	[d]
15 Large Family Day Care Home	0.5	x	\$216	=	\$108	\$26	24%	\$100	93%	Fixed Fee	\$74	
16 Lot Line Adjustment/Parcel Merger - Planning	5.0	х	\$216	=	\$1,080	\$1,015	94%	\$1,000	93%	Fixed Fee	(\$15)	[e]
17 Minor Administrative Modification	2.0	х	\$216	=	\$432	\$0	0%	\$400	93%	Fixed Fee	\$400	
18 Non-Residential Plan Check Fee	10.0%				10.0%	10% of building	100%	10% of building	100%	Fixed Fee	0%	
19 Opinion on a Planning Matter	2.0	x	\$216	=	\$432	permit fee \$258	60%	permit fee \$200	46%	Fixed Fee	(\$58)	
20 Preliminary Project Review	12.0	x	\$216	=	\$2,592	\$656	25%	\$1,000	39%	Fixed Fee	\$344	
21 Planned Development												
a) Planned Development Review												
i) Base Fee	48.0	х	\$216	=	\$10,368	\$9,175	88%	\$10,000	96%	Fixed Fee	\$825	
ii) Plus, Per Acre Fee	2.5	х	\$216	=	\$540	\$458	85%	\$500	93%	Fixed Fee	\$42	
b) Planned Development Extension Review	16.0	х	\$216	=	\$3,456	\$3,217	93%	\$3,000	87%	Fixed Fee	(\$217)	
c) Planned Development Modification Review	24.0	x	\$216	=	\$5,184	\$9,162	177%	\$5,000	96%	Fixed Fee	(\$4,162)	

City of Folsom User and Regulatory Fee Study Planning Fees

			П		П			Current		Proposed			
	Fee Description	Est. Labor Hours		Hourly Rate	Ш	Est. Cost of Svc	Current Fee	Cost Recovery	Proposed Fee	Cost Recovery	Fee Structure	Fee Change	Note
22	Rezoning Request	110013		Nate		340	Current rec	Recovery	100	Necovery	Structure	Change	Note
	a) Rezoning Request Review – 5 acres or less	48.0	х	\$216	=	\$10,368	\$3,005	29%	\$10,000	96%	Fixed Fee	\$6,995	
	b) Rezoning Request Review – 5+ acres	64.0	х	\$216	=	\$13,824	\$6,000	43%	\$13,000	94%	Fixed Fee	\$7,000	
23	Sidewalk Vendor Permit	2.0	х	\$216	=	\$432	\$50	12%	\$50	12%	Fixed Fee	\$0	
24	Signs												
	a) Sign Permit - Staff	0.7	x	\$216	=	\$151	\$129	85%	\$150	99%	Fixed Fee	\$21	
	b) Sign Permit Extension	0.5	х	\$216	=	\$108	\$60	56%	\$100	93%	Fixed Fee	\$40	
	c) Special Event Sign Permit	0.5	х	\$216	=	\$108	\$63	58%	\$100	93%	Fixed Fee	\$37	
	d) Historic District Sign Review (Staff Level)	0.7	х	\$216	=	\$151	\$63	42%	\$150	99%	Fixed Fee	\$87	
	e) Historic District Sign Review (Commission Level)	4.0	х	\$216	=	\$864	\$63	7%	\$800	93%	Fixed Fee	\$737	
	f) Planned Development Sign Permit	12.0	х	\$216	=	\$2,592	\$1,286	50%	\$2,500	96%	Fixed Fee	\$1,214	
	g) Temporary Sign Permit	0.2	х	\$216	=	\$43	\$10	23%	\$40	93%	Fixed Fee	\$30	
	h) On-Site Subdivision Signs	1.0	х	\$216	=	\$216	\$126	58%	\$200	93%	Fixed Fee	\$74	
	i) Off-Site Subdivision Signs												
	i) base fee	1.5	х	\$216	=	\$324	\$171	53%	\$300	93%	Fixed Fee	\$129	
	ii) refundable deposit - per sign	n/a	х	\$216	=		\$500		\$500		Deposit	\$0	
	j) Off-Site Weekend Directional Signs												
	i) base fee	1.5	х	\$216	=	\$324	\$175	54%	\$300	93%	Fixed Fee	\$125	
	ii) refundable deposit	n/a	х	\$216	=		\$200		\$200		Deposit	\$0	
	k) Uniform Sign Program	2.0	х	\$216	=	\$432	\$295	68%	\$400	93%	Fixed Fee	\$105	
25	Site Design Review												
	a) Site Design Review	2.0	х	\$216	=	\$432	\$302	70%	\$400	93%	Fixed Fee	\$98	
	b) Site Design Review – Planning Commission	24.0	х	\$216	=	\$5,184	\$4,794	92%	\$5,100	98%	Fixed Fee	\$306	
26	Specific Plan												
	a) Specific Plan Review	72.0	х	\$216	=	\$15,552	\$6,432	41%	\$15,500	100%	Deposit	\$9,068	
	b) Specific Plan Amendment Review	48.0	х	\$216	=	\$10,368	\$7,076	68%	\$10,300	99%	Deposit	\$3,224	
27	Street Name Review/Change	4.0	х	\$216	=	\$864	\$1,256	145%	\$800	93%	Fixed Fee	(\$456)	

	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
28	Temporary Outdoor Dining	Hours		Nate		340	Currentiee	Recovery	166	Recovery	Structure	Change	Note
	a) Initial Permit (Additional Revocable Permit Fees Apply)	4.0	х	\$216	=	\$864	\$302	35%	\$400	46%	Fixed Fee	\$98	
	b) Renewal	2.0	x	\$216	=	\$432	\$302	70%	\$200	46%	Fixed Fee	(\$102)	
29	Temporary Use Permit	2.0	x	\$216	=	\$432	\$65	15%	\$300	69%	Fixed Fee	\$235	
30	Tentative Map/Parcel/Subdivision Map												
	a) Tentative Parcel Map Review	36.0	х	\$216	=	\$7,776	\$5,710	73%	\$7,700	99%	Fixed Fee	\$1,990	
	b) Tentative Map Amendment Review	24.0	x	\$216	=	\$5,184	\$9,515	184%	\$5,100	98%	Fixed Fee	(\$4,415)	
	c) Tentative Map Extension Review	20.0	х	\$216	=	\$4,320	\$4,087	95%	\$4,300	100%	Fixed Fee	\$213	
	d) Tentative Subdivision Map Review												
	i) Base Fee	40.0	x	\$216	=	\$8,640	\$6,718	78%	\$8,600	100%	Fixed Fee	\$1,882	
	ii) Plus, Per Lot Fee	0.3	х	\$216	=	\$54	\$34	63%	\$50	93%	Fixed Fee	\$16	
31	Unattended Donation Box												
	a) Initial Permit	1.5	х	\$216	=	\$324	\$201	62%	\$300	93%	Fixed Fee	\$99	
	b) Renewal	0.5	x	\$216	=	\$108	\$49	45%	\$100	93%	Fixed Fee	\$51	
32	Variance												
	a) Variance Review – Single Family Dwelling	24.0	х	\$216	=	\$5,184	\$1,686	33%	\$2,500	48%	Fixed Fee	\$814	
	b) Variance Review - Other	24.0	х	\$216	=	\$5,184	\$1,686	33%	\$5,100	98%	Fixed Fee	\$3,414	
33	Zoning Verification Review	2.0	х	\$216	=	\$432	\$310	72%	\$400	93%	Fixed Fee	\$90	
	For Services Requested of City Staff which have no fee listed in this Master Fee Schedule, the City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall determine the appropriate fee based on the following hourly rates for staff time involved in the service or activity (per hour)	1.0	x	\$216	=	\$216	\$101	47%	\$200	93%	Per Hour	\$99	

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

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

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

 $<sup>\</sup>label{eq:continuous} \textbf{[c] Applicant shall be responsible for additional costs of preparation of the required environment document.}$ 

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

 $<sup>\</sup>label{eq:continuous} \mbox{[e] Additional fees apply for Engineering review. See Engineering fee schedule.}$ 

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

#	<b>Description</b> Annexation Processing	Proposed Fee Structure Deposit	Current Fee \$5,789	Cost of Service (Max. Fee) \$17,280	Proposed Fee / Deposit \$17,000	Current Cost Recovery 34%	Proposed Cost Recovery 100%	Note [a]
2	Appeal							
	Appeal of Staff Decision	Fixed Fee	\$258	\$4,320	\$2,500	6%	58%	[b]
	Appeal of Commission Decision	Fixed Fee	\$522	\$6,048	\$4,200	9%	69%	[b]
3	Code Amendment	Fixed Fee	\$2,297	\$8,640	\$8,500	27%	98%	
4	Conditional Use Permit (CUP)							
	a) CUP Review (Major)	Fixed Fee	\$5,950	\$5,184	\$5,100	115%	98%	
	b) CUP Review (Minor)	Fixed Fee	\$2,821	\$2,592	\$2,500	109%	96%	
	c) CUP Modification	Fixed Fee	\$1,647	\$2,592	\$2,500	64%	96%	
5	Condominium Conversion Fee	Fixed Fee	\$11,709	\$17,280	\$17,000	68%	98%	
6	Design Review/Architectural Review							
	a) New Multi-Family/Commercial Structure/Single-Family Subdivision	Fixed Fee	\$2,210	\$5,184	\$5,100	43%	98%	
	b) Existing Multi-Family/Commercial Structure	Fixed Fee	\$2,210	\$2,592	\$2,210	85%	85%	
	c) New Single and Two Family Dwelling	Fixed Fee	\$63	\$1,296	\$800	5%	62%	
	d) Existing Single and Two Family Dwelling/Accessory Structure/Non- Exempted ADU	Fixed Fee	\$63	\$648	\$400	10%	62%	
	e) New Historic District Multi-Family/Commercial Structure	Fixed Fee	\$2,210	\$5,184	\$5,100	43%	98%	
	f) Existing Historic District Multi-Family/Commercial Structure	Fixed Fee	\$2,210	\$3,456	\$2,210	64%	64%	
	g) New Historic District Single Family, Two-Family Dwelling and Non- Exempted ADU	Fixed Fee	\$63	\$3,456	\$800	2%	23%	
	h) Existing Historic District Single and Two Family Dwelling/Accessory Structure/Demolition	Fixed Fee	\$63	\$2,592	\$400	2%	15%	
7	Development Agreement Processing	Deposit	\$5,405	\$10,368	\$10,000	52%	100%	[a]
8	Entertainment Permit	Fixed Fee	\$46	\$432	\$200	11%	46%	
9	Environmental Review							
	a) Environmental Impact Review & Report	Deposit	\$8,748	\$10,368	\$10,000	84%	100%	[a],[c]
	b) Environmental Mitigation Program Monitoring	Deposit	\$6,449	\$7,776	\$7,000	83%	100%	[a],[c]
	c) Initial Environmental Study/Assessment	Deposit	\$6,512	\$7,776	\$7,000	84%	100%	[a],[c]
	d) Notice of CEQA Determination	Fixed Fee	\$304	\$324	\$300	94%	93%	

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

# 10	Description General Plan	Proposed Fee Structure	Current Fee	Cost of Service (Max. Fee)	Proposed Fee / Deposit	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Cost Recovery	Note
	a) General Plan Amendment < 5 acres	Fixed Fee	\$4,384	\$10,368	\$10,000	42%	96%	
	b) General Plan Amendment 5 or more acres	Fixed Fee	\$8,768	\$13,824	\$13,000	63%	94%	
11	Home Occupation Permit Fee	Fixed Fee	\$31	\$65	\$60	48%	93%	
12	Indoor Marijuana Cultivation Permit	Fixed Fee	\$253	\$540	\$500	47%	93%	
13	Landmark Tree Classification	Fixed Fee	\$295	\$1,404	\$350	21%	25%	
14	Landmark Tree Declassification	Fixed Fee	\$295	\$1,836	\$1,800	16%	98%	[d]
15	Large Family Day Care Home	Fixed Fee	\$26	\$108	\$100	24%	93%	
16	Lot Line Adjustment/Parcel Merger - Planning	Fixed Fee	\$1,015	\$1,080	\$1,000	94%	93%	[e]
17	Minor Administrative Modification	Fixed Fee	\$0	\$432	\$400	0%	93%	
18	Non-Residential Plan Check Fee	Fixed Fee	10% of building permit fee	10%	10% of building permit fee	100%	100%	
19	Opinion on a Planning Matter	Fixed Fee	\$258	\$432	\$200	60%	46%	
20	Preliminary Project Review	Fixed Fee	\$656	\$2,592	\$1,000	25%	39%	
21	Planned Development							
	a) Planned Development Review							
	i) Base Fee	Fixed Fee	\$9,175	\$10,368	\$10,000	88%	96%	
	ii) Plus, Per Acre Fee	Fixed Fee	\$458	\$540	\$500	85%	93%	
	b) Planned Development Extension Review	Fixed Fee	\$3,217	\$3,456	\$3,000	93%	87%	
	c) Planned Development Modification Review	Fixed Fee	\$9,162	\$5,184	\$5,000	177%	96%	
22	Rezoning Request							
	a) Rezoning Request Review – 5 acres or less	Fixed Fee	\$3,005	\$10,368	\$10,000	29%	96%	
	b) Rezoning Request Review – 5+ acres	Fixed Fee	\$6,000	\$13,824	\$13,000	43%	94%	
23	Sidewalk Vendor Permit	Fixed Fee	\$50	\$432	\$50	12%	12%	

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

#	Description	Proposed Fee Structure	Current Fee	Cost of Service (Max. Fee)	Proposed Fee / Deposit	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Cost Recovery	Note
24	Signs							
	a) Sign Permit - Staff	Fixed Fee	\$129	\$151	\$150	85%	99%	
	b) Sign Permit Extension	Fixed Fee	\$60	\$108	\$100	56%	93%	
	c) Special Event Sign Permit	Fixed Fee	\$63	\$108	\$100	58%	93%	
	d) Historic District Sign Review (Staff Level)	Fixed Fee	\$63	\$151	\$150	42%	99%	
	e) Historic District Sign Review (Commission Level)	Fixed Fee	\$63	\$864	\$800	7%	93%	
	f) Planned Development Sign Permit	Fixed Fee	\$1,286	\$2,592	\$2,500	50%	96%	
	g) Temporary Sign Permit	Fixed Fee	\$10	\$43	\$40	23%	93%	
	h) On-Site Subdivision Signs	Fixed Fee	\$126	\$216	\$200	58%	93%	
	i) Off-Site Subdivision Signs							
	i) base fee	Fixed Fee	\$171	\$324	\$300	53%	93%	
	ii) refundable deposit - per sign	Deposit	\$500		\$500			
	j) Off-Site Weekend Directional Signs							
	i) base fee	Fixed Fee	\$175	\$324	\$300	54%	93%	
	ii) refundable deposit	Deposit	\$200		\$200			
	k) Uniform Sign Program	Fixed Fee	\$295	\$432	\$400	68%	93%	
25	Site Design Review							
	a) Site Design Review	Fixed Fee	\$302	\$432	\$400	70%	93%	
	b) Site Design Review – Planning Commission	Fixed Fee	\$4,794	\$5,184	\$5,100	92%	98%	
26	Specific Plan							
	a) Specific Plan Review	Deposit	\$6,432	\$15,552	\$15,500	41%	100%	
	b) Specific Plan Amendment Review	Deposit	\$7,076	\$10,368	\$10,300	68%	99%	
27	Street Name Review/Change	Fixed Fee	\$1,256	\$864	\$800	145%	93%	
28	Temporary Outdoor Dining							
	a) Initial Permit (Additional Revocable Permit Fees Apply)	Fixed Fee	\$302	\$864	\$400	35%	46%	
	b) Renewal	Fixed Fee	\$302	\$432	\$200	70%	46%	
29	Temporary Use Permit	Fixed Fee	\$65	\$432	\$300	15%	69%	

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

#	Description	Proposed Fee Structure	Current Fee	Cost of Service (Max. Fee)	Proposed Fee / Deposit	Current Cost Recovery	Proposed Cost Recovery	Note
30	Tentative Map/Parcel/Subdivision Map						·	
	a) Tentative Parcel Map Review	Fixed Fee	\$5,710	\$7,776	\$7,700	73%	99%	
	b) Tentative Map Amendment Review	Fixed Fee	\$9,515	\$5,184	\$5,100	184%	98%	
	c) Tentative Map Extension Review	Fixed Fee	\$4,087	\$4,320	\$4,300	95%	100%	
	d) Tentative Subdivision Map Review							
	i) Base Fee	Fixed Fee	\$6,718	\$8,640	\$8,600	78%	100%	
	ii) Plus, Per Lot Fee	Fixed Fee	\$34	\$54	\$50	63%	93%	
31	Unattended Donation Box							
	a) Initial Permit	Fixed Fee	\$201	\$324	\$300	62%	93%	
	b) Renewal	Fixed Fee	\$49	\$108	\$100	45%	93%	
32	Variance							
	a) Variance Review – Single Family Dwelling	Fixed Fee	\$1,686	\$5,184	\$2,500	33%	48%	
	b) Variance Review - Other	Fixed Fee	\$1,686	\$5,184	\$5,100	33%	98%	
33	Zoning Verification Review	Fixed Fee	\$310	\$432	\$400	72%	93%	
34	For Services Requested of City Staff which have no fee listed in this Master Fee Schedule, the City Manager or the City Manager's designee shall determine the appropriate fee based on the following hourly rates for staff time involved in the service or activity (per hour)	Per Hour	\$101	\$216	\$200	47%	93%	

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>[</sup>e] Additional fees apply for Engineering review. See Engineering fee schedule.

### **User and Regulatory Fees**

Cost of Service Calculations
Allocation of Citywide Overhead

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	

<sup>\*</sup> 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.

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

 $<sup>[</sup>b] \ Indirect \ cost \ allocation \ basis \ is \ staffing \ levels \ of \ direct \ service \ departments.$ 

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

# **APPENDIX C**

### **PROPOSED FEES**

#	Description	Fee	Fee Structure	Note
1	Annexation Processing	\$17,000	Deposit	[a]
2	Appeal			
	a) Appeal of Staff Decision	\$2,500	Fixed Fee	[b]
	b) Appeal of Commission Decision	\$4,200	Fixed Fee	[b]
3	Code Amendment	\$8,500	Fixed Fee	
4	Conditional Use Permit (CUP)			
	a) CUP Review (Major)	\$5,100	Fixed Fee	
	b) CUP Review (Minor)	\$2,500	Fixed Fee	
	c) CUP Modification	\$2,500	Fixed Fee	
5	Condominium Conversion Fee	\$17,000	Fixed Fee	
6	Design Review/Architectural Review			
	a) New Multi-Family/Commercial Structure/Single-Family Subdivision	\$5,100	Fixed Fee	
	b) Existing Multi-Family/Commercial Structure	\$2,210	Fixed Fee	
	c) New Single and Two Family Dwelling	\$800	Fixed Fee	
	d) Existing Single and Two Family Dwelling/Accessory Structure/Non-Exempted ADU	\$400	Fixed Fee	
	e) New Historic District Multi-Family/Commercial Structure	\$5,100	Fixed Fee	
	f) Existing Historic District Multi-Family/Commercial Structure	\$2,210	Fixed Fee	
	g) New Historic District Single Family, Two-Family Dwelling and Non-Exempted ADU	\$800	Fixed Fee	
	h) Existing Historic District Single and Two Family Dwelling/Accessory Structure/Demolition	\$400	Fixed Fee	
7	Development Agreement Processing	\$10,000	Deposit	[a]
8	Entertainment Permit	\$200	Fixed Fee	
9	Environmental Review			
	a) Environmental Impact Review & Report	\$10,000	Deposit	[a],[c]
	b) Environmental Mitigation Program Monitoring	\$7,000	Deposit	[a],[c]
	c) Initial Environmental Study/Assessment	\$7,000	Deposit	[a],[c]
	d) Notice of CEQA Determination	\$300	Fixed Fee	

#	Description	Fee	Fee Structure	Note
10	General Plan			
	a) General Plan Amendment < 5 acres	\$10,000	Fixed Fee	
	b) General Plan Amendment 5 or more acres	\$13,000	Fixed Fee	
11	Home Occupation Permit Fee	\$60	Fixed Fee	
12	Indoor Marijuana Cultivation Permit	\$500	Fixed Fee	
13	Landmark Tree Classification	\$350	Fixed Fee	
14	Landmark Tree Declassification	\$1,800	Fixed Fee	[d]
15	Large Family Day Care Home	\$100	Fixed Fee	
16	Lot Line Adjustment/Parcel Merger - Planning	\$1,000	Fixed Fee	[e]
17	Minor Administrative Modification	\$400	Fixed Fee	
18	Non-Residential Plan Check Fee	10% of building permit fee	Fixed Fee	
19	Opinion on a Planning Matter	\$200	Fixed Fee	
20	Preliminary Project Review	\$1,000	Fixed Fee	
21	Planned Development			
	a) Planned Development Review			
	i) Base Fee	\$10,000	Fixed Fee	
	ii) Plus, Per Acre Fee	\$500	Fixed Fee	
	b) Planned Development Extension Review	\$3,000	Fixed Fee	
	c) Planned Development Modification Review	\$5,000	Fixed Fee	
22	Rezoning Request			
	a) Rezoning Request Review – 5 acres or less	\$10,000	Fixed Fee	
	b) Rezoning Request Review – 5+ acres	\$13,000	Fixed Fee	
23	Sidewalk Vendor Permit	\$50	Fixed Fee	

#	Description	Fee	Fee Structure	Note
24	Signs			
	a) Sign Permit - Staff	\$150	Fixed Fee	
	b) Sign Permit Extension	\$100	Fixed Fee	
	c) Special Event Sign Permit	\$100	Fixed Fee	
	d) Historic District Sign Review (Staff Level)	\$150	Fixed Fee	
	e) Historic District Sign Review (Commission Level)	\$800	Fixed Fee	
	f) Planned Development Sign Permit	\$2,500	Fixed Fee	
	g) Temporary Sign Permit	\$40	Fixed Fee	
	h) On-Site Subdivision Signs	\$200	Fixed Fee	
	i) Off-Site Subdivision Signs			
	i) base fee	\$300	Fixed Fee	
	ii) refundable deposit - per sign	\$500	Deposit	
	j) Off-Site Weekend Directional Signs			
	i) base fee	\$300	Fixed Fee	
	ii) refundable deposit	\$200	Deposit	
	k) Uniform Sign Program	\$400	Fixed Fee	
25	Site Design Review			
	a) Site Design Review	\$400	Fixed Fee	
	b) Site Design Review – Planning Commission	\$5,100	Fixed Fee	
26	Specific Plan			
	a) Specific Plan Review	\$15,500	Deposit	
	b) Specific Plan Amendment Review	\$10,300	Deposit	

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

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

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

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

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

<sup>[</sup>d] For non-development related declassifications, the fee will be waived if the urban forester finds/agrees the tree is dead/dying with no reasonable expectation of recovery and poses a risk to persons/property. For development-related declassifications, fee is amount shown. [e] Additional fees apply for Engineering review. See Engineering fee schedule.