# REPORT TO COUNCIL
# City of Sacramento

**915 I Street, Sacramento, CA 95814-2604**
**www. CityofSacramento.org**

**PUBLIC HEARING**
**March 25, 2007**

**Honorable Mayor and**
**Members of the City Council**

**Title: Citywide Fees and Charges Update**

**Location/Council District:** All

**Recommendation:** Conduct a public hearing and upon conclusion adopt a **Resolution** approving proposed new fees and fee increases.

**Contact:** Leyne Milstein, Budget Manager, 808-8491; Jason Bader, Management Analyst, 808-5817

**Presenter:** Leyne Milstein, Budget Manager, 808-8491

**Department:** Finance

**Division:** Budget

**Organization No: 1140**

## Description/Analysis

**Issue:** With the FY2005/06 Midyear Report (Resolution 2006-106), the City Council formally adopted a citywide Fees and Charges Policy (Attachment 1). This policy provides the mechanism to ensure that fees and charges reflect the Council's direction related to recovery of costs to provide programs and services.

Consistent with the Fees and Charges Policy, proposed new fees or fee increases requiring Council approval are included as Exhibit A, which reflects changes in fees in the following departments: Code Enforcement, Convention, Culture and Leisure, Development Services, Parks and Recreation, Planning, Transportation and Utilities. A number of those proposals are part of department efforts to reduce General Fund net costs in the FY2008/09 budget development process.

At this time, the Police Department and the Department of Parks and Recreation are updating fees that are not included in this report. For example, Burglar Alarms Permits and False Alarm Fees will be addressed at a later date when the Police Department brings a revised ordinance to Council for approval. In addition, the Police Department is proposing to modify other fees, but will wait until the user fee study described below has been completed. These fees

include the Vehicle Release Fee, DUI Fee, and Jail Booking Recovery Fee. Some of these fees haven't been updated in the last ten years.

The Department of Parks and Recreation will return to Council in late April or early May to propose additional new fees and increased fees related to the use of park picnic areas, sports fields and swimming pools. The proposals will address Council direction to increase Park Safety Services, and reductions in the General Fund. Additional time is needed to allow for public outreach, particularly for sports leagues and teams that have reserved fields through calendar year 2008.

In considering the appropriate level of cost recovery, it is important to determine the actual cost of providing programs and services. This is being done for program and service costs of four of our larger departments, specifically Police, Fire, Code Enforcement and Parks and Recreation. This may lead to additional opportunities for cost recovery for future Council consideration. As part of this effort we will identify the full cost of each fee-related service (direct and indirect costs) and benchmark the City's current fees against best practice and fees of other local and comparable cities. As work is completed, we will return to Council possibly as soon as FY2008/09 budget hearings, with recommendations for new fees, adjustments to existing fees and the impacts of proposed fee additions or adjustments.

An online database and website has been developed to provide a single place to store information for all City fees and charges and provides the residents with easy access to information about departmental fees and charges. The database can be found on the City of Sacramento Finance Department website: www.cityofsacramento.org/finance/fees/

**Policy Considerations:** Maintaining the objectives outlined in the citywide Fees and Charges Policy is consistent with the Council's adopted budget principle, to maintain a fiscally sustainable, balanced budget.

**Committee/Commission Action:** None.

**Environmental Considerations:** Approval of fees and the development of a website does not constitute a "project" and is therefore exempt from the California Environmental Quality Act (CEQA) according to Section 15601(b)(3) of the CEQA guidelines.

**Rationale for Recommendation:** The annual review of citywide fees and charges helps to ensure that the City's fees and charges keep pace with changes in the cost-of-living index, as well as changes in methods or levels of service delivery.

**Financial Considerations:** The City is faced with significant budget challenges in FY2008/09. The continued economic downturn in the local economy, coupled with multi-year commitments has created a growing gap between revenues and expenses. Consistent with the City Council's adopted Fees and Charges Policy, the review, and adjustment of and addition to citywide cost recovery through fees and charges is an appropriate mechanism to reduce General Fund expenditures. The approval of fees and charges outlined in this report will provide the means to recover costs and continue delivery of existing City services and programs.

**Emerging Small Business Development (ESBD):** There are no ESBD considerations with this report.

Respectfully Submitted by: _____
LEYNE MILSTEIN
Budget Manager

Approved by: _____
RUSSELL FEHR
Finance Director

Recommendation Approved:

_____
for RAY KERRIDGE
City Manager

**Table of Contents:**

Pg 1 Report
**Attachments**
**1** Pg 4 Fees and Charges Policy
**2** Pg 10 Resolution
**3** Pg 11 Exhibit A
**4** Pg 19 Exhibit B

**ATTACHMENT 1**

## CITY OF SACRAMENTO FEES AND CHARGES POLICY

The City of Sacramento has the ability to determine the extent to which fees should be used to fund City facilities, infrastructure and services.

There are five main categories of fees that the City currently implements[1]:

- ✓ **Impact/development fees** are typically one-time charges levied by the City against new development to generate revenue for the construction of infrastructure and capital facilities needed to offset the impacts of the new development.
- ✓ **Service fees** are charges imposed on persons or property that are designed to offset the cost of providing a government service. Sometimes these services are elective, such as fees for processing voluntary development permit applications, or providing service/recreation programs, while other service fees are not, such as mandatory service fees for trash or utility services. Such fees are typically reasonably related to the cost of providing the service for which the fee is imposed. Otherwise, the fee may constitute a special tax for which voter approval is required by Propositions 13, 62, and 218.
- ✓ **Regulatory fees** are imposed to offset the cost of a regulatory program, such as business regulatory fees, or to mitigate the past, present or future adverse impact of a fee payer's operations. While payment of a regulatory fee does not necessarily provide any direct benefit from payment of the fee, there must be a "nexus" between the activity and the adverse consequences addressed by the fee. Common examples of regulatory fees include inspection fees and business license fees designed to reimburse a local agency for the cost of monitoring the business and enforcing compliance with City code.
- ✓ **Rental fees** are charged for the rental of public property and include the rental of real property, parking spaces in a public parking lot, or the rental of community facilities such as a recreation or community room or picnic area. Rental fees are not subject to the general rule that the fee must bear a direct relationship to the reasonable cost of providing the service for which the fee is charged, however, rental fees must be fair and reasonable.
- ✓ **Penalties/Fines** payment required for non-compliance or failure to adhere to specific rules and/or requirements.

This document sets forth guidelines for:

---

1 League of California Cities Website: Spring Meeting May 13-15, 1998Laurence S. Wiener, Esq.City Attorney of Beverly Hillsand Westlake Village ***THE CITY ATTORNEY'S ROLE IN EVALUATING FEE STUDIES.***

- Establishing cost recovery goals;
- Determining the categories of cost recovery levels in which to categorize/organize fees;
- Methods for determining which category a fee falls under; and
- Establishment and modification of fees and changes.

## A. Cost Recovery Goals

In setting user fees and cost recovery levels, the following factors will be considered[2]:

1) The amount of a fee should not exceed the overall cost of providing the facility, infrastructure or service for which the fee is imposed. In calculating that cost, direct and indirect costs may be included. That is:
   - Costs which are directly related to the provision of the service; and,
   - Support costs which are more general in nature but provide support for the provision of the service. For example, service fees can include reimbursement for the administrative costs of providing the service. Development fees can include the cost of administering the program to construct public facilities that are necessary to serve new development.

2) The method of assessing and collecting fees should be as simple as possible in order to reduce the administrative cost of collection.

3) Fees should be sensitive to the "market" for similar services.

In addition, in setting enterprise fund fees and cost recovery levels, the following factors will be considered:

4) The City will set fees and rates at levels which fully cover the total direct and indirect costs, including operations, capital outlay and debt service of the enterprise programs.

5) The City will review and adjust enterprise fees and rate structures as required to ensure that they remain appropriate and equitable.

## B. Categories of Cost Recovery Levels in Which to Categorize/Organize Fees

There are five categories of cost recovery levels in which to classify fees:

---

2 Government Finance Officers Association Website, Best Practices in Public Budgeting, Ci9ty of San Luis Obispo: User Fee Cost Recovery Goals, 2005.

1. **Enterprise**: Full direct and indirect cost recovery (100% of total costs) for enterprise services such as water, sewer and solid waste, as well as impact/development fees.

2. **High**: Full direct cost recovery (81-100% of total costs).

3. **Medium**: Recovery between 41-80% of direct costs.

4. **Low**: Recovery between 0-40% of direct costs.

5. **Other**: Fees based on market, geography, assessment, project specific, legal limits or specific Council policy.

The City may choose, for policy reasons, to set fees at less than full recovery. For example, fees based on market, geography, assessment, project specific, statutory/legal limits or specific Council policy. In some cases, the City will acknowledge that a subsidy is acceptable, or even necessary to ensure program access and viability.

## C. Methods for Determining Which Category a Fee Falls Under

Implementation of higher cost recovery levels is appropriate under the following conditions (up to 100% of the cost of the service or program):

- The service is regulatory in nature (i.e. building permits, plan check fees);
- The service is similar to services provided through the private sector;
- Other private or public sector alternatives could or do exist for the delivery of the service; and
- The use of the service is specifically discouraged (i.e., police responses to disturbances or false alarms might fall into this category).
- The service or facility is a specialized use that could be provided at a lower cost if not for specific nature or service (i.e. lighted fields).

Lower cost recovery levels are appropriate under the following conditions:

- There is no intended relationship between the amount paid and the benefit received. (It is likely that some recreation and human service programs fall into this category as it is expected that these programs will be subsidized by funds);
- Collecting fees is not cost-effective or will significantly impact the accessibility to the service;
- The service is non-recurring, generally delivered on a peak demand or emergency basis, cannot be planned for and is not readily available from a private sector source (i.e. public safety services);
- Collecting fees would discourage compliance with regulatory requirements and adherence is primarily self-identified, and as such, failure to comply would not be readily detected by the City.

Other:

- Market pricing requires that there be a direct relationship between the amount paid and the level and cost of the service received or a direct relationship to actual prices being charged for the service in the current market.
- Legal specifications and/or limitations to the amount that is charged.
- Adopted Council Policy setting specific fee.

**Factors to Consider**

The extent to which the total cost of service should be recovered through fees depends upon the following factors:

- ✓ The nature of the facilities, infrastructure or services;
- ✓ The nature and extent of the benefit to the fee payer;
- ✓ The effect of pricing on the demand for services; and
- ✓ The feasibility of collection and recovery.

The chart below reflects these factors and the potential options for higher or lower cost recovery[3]:

3 Government Finance Officers Association Website, Best Practices in Public Budgeting, City of Fort Collins, CO: User Fee Policies, 2005.

| | The Nature of the Facilities, Infrastructure or Services | The Nature and Extent of the Benefit to The Fee Payers | Effect of Pricing on the Demand for Services | Feasibility of Collection and Recovery |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Higher Cost Recovery | In the case of fees for facilities, infrastructure and proprietary services[4], total cost recovery may be warranted. | When a particular facility or service results in substantial, immediate and direct benefit to fee payers, a higher percentage of the cost of providing the facility or service should be recovered by the fee. | Because the pricing of services can significantly affect demand, full cost recovery for services is more appropriate when the market for the services is strong and will support a high level of cost recovery. | In the case of impact fees, which can be collected at the time of issuance of a building permit, ease of collection is generally not a factor. |
| Lower Cost Recovery | In the case of governmental services[5], it may be appropriate for a substantial portion of the cost of such services to be borne by the City's taxpayers, rather than the individual users of such services. | When a particular facility or service benefits not only the fee payer but also a substantial segment of the community, lower cost recovery is warranted. | If high levels of cost recovery affect accessibility to or negatively impact the delivery of services to lower income groups, this should be considered based on the overall goals of the program being implemented. | Some fees may prove to be impractical for the City to utilize if they are too costly to administer. |

## D. Establishment and Modification of Fees and Charges

Fees will be reviewed and updated on an ongoing basis as part of the annual budget process to ensure that they keep pace with changes in the cost-of-living as well as changes in methods or levels of service delivery. At the beginning of

4 Proprietary services are those which are provided for the benefit and enjoyment of the residents of the City

5 Governmental services are those which are provided by the City for the public good such as regulating land use, maintaining streets, and providing police and fire protection.

the budget process each department will submit a list of proposed adjustments to their section of the master fee schedule. Each service must be assigned a target cost recovery level as defined above.

Maintaining competitive status and comparability with other cities should be considered when determining new fee levels. Those fees that are proposed for adjustment should be benchmarked against neighboring jurisdiction fee schedules or appropriate service markets. The benchmark analysis should be taken into consideration when making final pricing decisions.

However, the City may choose, for policy reasons, to set fees at less than full recovery. For example, fees based on market, geography, assessment, project specific, statutory/legal limits or specific Council policy. As stated above, in some cases, the City will acknowledge that a subsidy is acceptable, or even necessary to ensure program access and viability. Where appropriate, fees that have not been increased in some time should have increases phased in over several years to avoid 'sticker shock' increases.

If a particular fee is not adjusted in the budget process, to the extent feasible and/or appropriate, it should be increased bi-annually by a CPI factor to keep pace with inflation. For CPI adjustments the City will use the Employee Cost Index for State and Local Government Employees, Total Compensation as published by the Bureau of Labor Statistics. Bi-annually, the Finance Department shall determine the percentage change in this index and apply the increase or decrease to the master fee schedule, rounding up to the nearest whole dollar. Certain fees are exempt from an index adjustment, such as fees set by the State of California, percentage based fees or those that have been identified as inappropriate for indexed fee increases (i.e. feasibility or fees that are based on market for services). Exempt fees are noted in the master fee schedule. Council may consider fee issues outside of the annual budget process on a case by case basis.

Every five to seven years the City should conduct a comprehensive cost of service analysis to ensure fees and charges are set appropriately. Generally, fees may be adjusted based on supplemental analysis whenever there have been significant changes in the method, level or cost of service delivery. For example, changes in processes and technology change the staff time required to provide services to the public. A cost of service study will identify and quantify these changes.

# RESOLUTION NO. 2008-XXX

Adopted by the Sacramento City Council

March 25, 2008

## NEW CITYWIDE FEES AND FEE INCREASES

**BACKGROUND:**

A. On February 7, 2006, the City Council adopted the Citywide Fees and Charges policy (Resolution No. 2006-106).

B. Implementation of the policy requires a necessary mechanism to ensure that the City's fees and charges reflect the City's current costs and that those fees and charges are reviewed on an annual basis by City Council. Staff has conducted the required annual review and recommends certain new fees and fee increases.

C. Proposed new fees and fee increases are set forth in Exhibits A and B.

**BASED ON THE FACTS SET FORTH IN THE BACKGROUND, THE CITY COUNCIL RESOLVES AS FOLLOWS:**

Section 1. Proposed new fees and fee increases are hereby approved, as set forth in Exhibits A and B.

Exhibits:
Exhibit A - Proposed New Fees and Fee Increases
Exhibit B – Development Services New Fees and Fee Increases

**EXHIBIT A**

## CODE ENFORCEMENT

**Fee Name:** Pedicab Appeal Fee
**Current Fee:** $370.00
**Proposed Fee:** $400.00
**Justification:** The last fee increase for CPI identified fees occurred 2/27/07 under reso 2007-120. All code enforcement appeal fees were increased from $370 to $400 at that time. However, the pedicab ordinance was adopted and appeal fee was established under reso 2007-153 on 3/13/07. Due to the overlapping timeframe of the reports, the pedicab fee was set at the old rate of $370. This increase would bring the pedicab appeal fee in line with the other Code Enforcement appeal fees.

## CONVENTION, CULTURE & LEISURE

**Fee Name:** Boat Dock – Day Use Power Fee
**Current Fee:** None (currently we charge for overnight docking only)
**Proposed Fee:** $15
**Justification:** Re-coup costs for City provided electricity during day-time hours at Old Sacramento public boat dock

**Fee Name:** Carriage Driver's Permit
**Current Fee:** $20/year
**Proposed Fee:** $30/year
**Justification:** Fee has not been increased since at least 1990.

**Fee Name:** Carriage Operator's Permit
**Current Fee:** $20/year
**Proposed Fee:** $50/year
**Justification:** Fee has not been increased since at least 1990.

**Fee Name:** Carriage Vehicle Fee
**Current Fee:** $20/year
**Proposed Fee:** $30/year
**Justification:** Fee has not been increased since at least 1990.

**Fee Name:** Photocopy, Oversize (Maps & Plans) – Service Fee
**Current Fee:** $13.00 per half hour
**Proposed Fee:** 1 hour minimum charge ($26)
**Justification:** Archives staff has to take oversized documents to a reproduction firm to get copies, and it takes a minimum of one hour for staff to get them there, copied, etc.

**Fee Name:** Digital Reproduction – Scan to CD/DVD
**Current Fee:** $50 per image
**Proposed Fee:** $25 service fee for every 10 images
**Justification:** While it seems this fee is being reduced, it is expected that by lowering the cost, there will be a greater use of this service. Staff and trained volunteers will be able to scan instead of sending out unique and irreplaceable material out to vendors, thereby reducing cost, and offering the customer a better service.

**Fee Name:** DVD/VHS/Cassette Reproduction (Storage medium)
**Current Fee:** $3
**Proposed Fee:** $25 service fee per order
**Justification:** There have been several requests for copies of public meetings recorded on VHS – this would be a service fee for copying them.

## DEVELOPMENT SERVICES DEPARTMENT

**Fee Name:** Current Planning
**Current Fee:** See Exhibit B
**Proposed Fee:** See Exhibit B
**Justification:** The proposed fee increases address Current Planning fees. Proposed fee increases primarily impact Commercial Development keeping existing fees for Residential Development left largely intact.
The most recent Current Planning fee increase occurred in September 2004 and involved a few select fees. The last large-scale increase to Current Planning fees took place in June of 1998 and reflected a 48% General Fund subsidy. Current fees collected reflect a budget requiring a significantly larger General Fund subsidy. With the help and advice of a Development Oversight Commission (DOC) sub-committee and industry stakeholders charged with reviewing DSD costs and recommending adjustments of fees, existing Current Planning fees are increased to reflect a fee structure that more closely approximates the fees of neighboring jurisdictions, and considers the value added to a developed property, the scope of services provided, and costs associated with the timely processing of an application.

**Fee Name:** Technology Fee
**Current Fee:** 4% of Planning Entitlement Fee and 4% of Building & Plan Review Fees.
**Proposed Fee:** 8% of Planning Entitlement Fee and 8% of Building & Plan Review Fees.
**Justification:** A technology fee is related to cost efficiencies gained by technology improvement. To achieve an important goal of the Department is to implement "Tools of Transparency", DSD has implemented significant modifications and improvements to the department's web-based permitting system. In October 2006, DSD implemented a comprehensive web-based interactive permit system accessible by the public and staff, as well as a variety of other software applications and technologies. Adding to these improvements, the Building Division's wireless inspection program was recently implemented, allowing inspectors to approve

inspections immediately from the field. Implementing these programs have saved staff time and developed a more efficient way of processing applications, but at the same time these improvements have required the need for new equipment, on-going program maintenance; and equipment replacement costs. To recapture these costs, staff recommends the Technology Fee for Building and Planning be raised from 4% to 8% of the corresponding permit fees. The original Technology Fee was established for plan check and building permits in 1992; and for planning entitlement applications in 2004.

**Fee Name:** Hourly Rate: Development Services Department
**Current Fee:** Varies from $65/hr - $135/hr
**Proposed Fee:** $140/hr
**Justification:** This fee is adjusted to more closely represent the actual hourly staff cost. Adopting a uniform hourly rate for the Development Services Department is more consistent with the Department goals of Predictable, Clear and Seamless.

**Fee Name:** Development Engineering Deposit
**Current Fee:** Cost Recovery Deposit
**Proposed Fee:** Cost Recovery Deposit Increase
**Justification:** The proposed increase in deposits for Development Engineering applications will reduce the General Fund contribution at the beginning of a development project. Current methodology leaves the General Fund to finance the costs of the application until the application is completed. When applications are accepted by Development Engineering, an estimated fee is calculated and a deposit is taken. When the application is completed, the actual cost of processing the application is billed. Increasing the deposit will not increase the fee but will reduce carrying costs that would be incurred by the General Fund.

**Note:** All Development Services fees are recommended to go into effect 60 days after the approval by City Council. All proposed fee changes were presented and recommended to go forward by the DOC on Monday, March 3, 2008.

## PLANNING

**Fee Name:** Annexation Fee
**Current Fee:** None
**Proposed Fee:** Tied to Existing Planning Entitlement Fees for Prezone/Rezone:

- Residential Project up to 2 acres: $1,000
- Residential Project >2 acres $8,000
- Commercial /Mixed Use Project: $20,000
- $1013 Hearing/Noticing fee;
- Additional Charges: Applications requiring more staff time than has been allocated by the fees charged per this schedule will be assessed for the additional staff time at $140 per staff hour.

**Justification**: Staff time: project review and analysis, prepare documents, research, site visits, neighborhood outreach, attend hearings. The annexation activity involves tasks supplemental to those conducted for a prezone; specifically, these supplemental tasks include review of a "plan for services", coordination with outside agencies proposed for detachment or reorganization, preparation of a "tax share agreement", and preparation for LAFCo hearings.

## TRANSPORTATION

**Fee Name:** Parking violation - Meter Expired
**Current Fee:** $25.00
**Proposed Fee:** $30.00
**Justification:** Last increase was 2004. Based on a study of seven similar and larger west coast cities, Sacramento's fee is less than the seven-city average.

**Fee Name:** Parking violation - No Parking Certain Hours
**Current Fee:** $35.00
**Proposed Fee:** $40.00
**Justification:** Last increase was 2004. Based on a study of seven similar and larger west coast cities, Sacramento's fee is less than the seven-city average.

**Fee Name:** Parking violation - Parking In Alleys
**Current Fee:** $35.00
**Proposed Fee:** $40.00
**Justification:** Last increase was 2004. Based on a study of seven similar and larger west coast cities, Sacramento's fee is less than the seven-city average.

**Fee Name:** Parking violation - Parking On Sidewalk
**Current Fee:** $35.00
**Proposed Fee:** $40.00
**Justification:** Last increase was 2004. Based on a study of seven similar and larger west coast cities, Sacramento's fee is less than the seven-city average.

**Fee Name:** Parking violation - Passenger Loading Zone (White Zone)
**Current Fee:** $35.00
**Proposed Fee:** $40.00
**Justification:** Last increase was 2004. Based on a study of seven similar and larger west coast cities, Sacramento's fee is less than the seven-city average.

**Fee Name:** Parking violation - Posted No Parking
**Current Fee:** $35.00
**Proposed Fee:** $40.00
**Justification:** Last increase was 2004. Based on a study of seven similar and larger west coast cities, Sacramento's fee is less than the seven-city average.

**Fee Name:** Parking violation - Red Curb or Bus Zone
**Current Fee:** $35.00
**Proposed Fee:** $40.00
**Justification:** Last increase was 2004. Based on a study of seven similar and larger west coast cities, Sacramento's fee is less than the seven-city average.

**Fee Name:** Parking violation - Residential Permit Parking
**Current Fee:** $35.00
**Proposed Fee:** $40.00
**Justification:** Last increase was 2004. Based on a study of seven similar and larger west coast cities, Sacramento's fee is less than the seven-city average.

**Fee Name:** Parking violation - Yellow Zone
**Current Fee:** $35.00
**Proposed Fee:** $40.00
**Justification:** Last increase was 2004. Based on a study of seven similar and larger west coast cities, Sacramento's fee is less than the seven-city average.

**Fee Name:** Parking Meter Fees
**Current Fee:** $1.00 per hour**
**Proposed Fee:** $1.25 per hour**
**Justification:** Last increase was 2004. Based on a study of seven similar and larger west coast cities, Sacramento's fee is less than the seven-city average.
***Rate may vary depending on location in city. Rate indicated may be average in downtown core areas*

**Fee Name:** Residential Parking Permit Replacement Fee
**Current Fee:** $5.00; not previously in the schedule
**Proposed Fee:** $5.00
**Justification:** Fee covers cost of issuing a replacement permit for lost or damaged permits.

**Fee Name:** Parking Meter Debit Card or Parking Permit Card Administrative Fee
**Current Fee:** $10.00; not previously in the schedule
**Proposed Fee:** $10.00 for each card issued or replaced
**Justification:** Fee covers cost of issuing a new or replacement permit card.

## UTILITIES – WATER FUND

**Fee Name:** Installation Charges – Water Tap: Paved Streets/Alleys
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis

| Nom. Dia.: | Current Fee: | Proposed Fee: |
|---|---|---|
| 1" | $2,309 | $2,691 |
| 1½" | $2,449 | $2,784 |
| 2" | $2,586 | $2,915 |
| 4" | $4,621 | $5,524 |
| 6" | $4,769 | $5,744 |
| 8" | $5,076 | $6,170 |
| 10" | $7,893 | $9,589 |
| 12" | $8,372 | $9,889 |
| 12" (tie in) | $8,287 | $10,230 |

**Fee Name:** Installation Charges – Water Tap: Unpaved Easements
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis

| Nom. Dia.: | Current Fee: | Proposed Fee: |
|---|---|---|
| 1" | $1,293 | $1,359 |
| 1½" | $1,433 | $1,452 |
| 2" | $1,569 | $1,583 |
| 4" | $2,432 | $2,648 |
| 6" | $2,580 | $2,867 |
| 8" | $2,887 | $3,294 |
| 10" | $4,355 | $5,403 |
| 12" | $4,834 | $5,703 |
| 12" (tie in) | $5,219 | $5,730 |

**Fee Name:** Installation Charges – Meters: Charge for Meter Only
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis

| Size: | Current Fee: | Proposed Fee: |
|---|---|---|
| 3” | $1,236 | $1,321 |
| 4” | $1,957 | $2,095 |
| 6” | $2,728 | $2,910 |
| 8” | $3,749 | $4,001 |
| 10” | $2,857 | $3,057 |
| 12” | $3,517 | $3,763 |

**Fee Name:** Installation Charges – Meters: Charge for Meter and Installation by City
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis

| Size: | Current Fee: | Proposed Fee: |
|---|---|---|
| 1” | $462 | $538 |
| 1½” | $560 | $636 |
| 2” | $617 | $695 |
| 3” | $1,615 | $1,810 |
| 4” | $2,336 | $2,584 |
| 6” | $3,395 | $3,780 |
| 8” | $4,416 | $4,871 |
| 10” | $3,524 | $3,926 |
| 12” | $4,184 | $4,632 |

**Fee Name:** Water Service Fee: Restoration of service following discontinuance
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis
**Current Fee:** $140
**Proposed Fee:** $184

**Fee Name:** Water Service Fee: Vacancy credit service fee
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis
**Current Fee:** $115
**Proposed Fee:** $184

**Fee Name:** Replacement of Lost or Damaged Water Lock Box
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis

| Description | Current Fee: | Proposed Fee: |
|---|---|---|
| Water lock box removed | $75 | $99 |
| Water lock box removed, chain cut **OR** lock missing | $95 | $119 |
| Water lock box, chain, **AND** lock missing | $173 | $218 |

**Fee Name:** Fire Hydrant Installation and Use Fee: Limited Periodic Use - Service Charge
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis

| Description | Current Fee: | Proposed Fee: |
|---|---|---|
| 1 – 10 days | $35 | $37 |
| 11 – 30 days | $92 | $98 |
| 31 – 60 days | $178 | $189 |

**Fee Name:** Fire Hydrant Installation and Use Fee: Water Truck Use - Annual Fee
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis

| Truck Capacity | Current Fee: | Proposed Fee: |
|---|---|---|
| 1,000 gallons or less | $173 | $183 |
| 2,000 gallons | $351 | $372 |
| 3,000 gallons | $535 | $567 |

**Fee Name:** Fire Hydrant Installation and Use Fee: Installation - Standard Complete
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis
**Current Fee:** $7,002
**Proposed Fee:** $8,076

**Fee Name:** Fire Hydrant Installation and Use Fee: Backflow Prevention Assemblies
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis

| Description | Current Fee: | Proposed Fee: |
|---|---|---|
| Installation/Testing - 2” | $165 | $206 |
| Installation/Testing - 4” | $562 | $728 |

**Fee Name:** Water Supply for Fire Protection
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis

| Description | Current Fee: | Proposed Fee: |
|---|---|---|
| Engineering Analysis | $90 | $105 |
| Field Test | $493 | $624 |

**Fee Name:** Water Service Abandonment
**Justification:** Full cost recovery based on recent cost analysis

| Description | Current Fee: | Proposed Fee: |
|---|---|---|
| 1” – 3” Taps | $901 | $1,096 |
| 4” – 12” Taps | $1,666 | $2,130 |

**Planning Fees Listing**
**Proposed Rates**

| | Current Fee | Proposed General | Proposed Residential | Proposed Commercial |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| **Planning Director** | | | | |
| Special Permits | | | | |
| Special Permit - Major Modification | 500 | 1,400 | | |
| Special Permit - Minor Modification | 459 | 500 | | |
| Planning Director's Plan Review | | | | |
| Planning Director's Plan Review | 3,500 | 3,750 | | |
| Planning Director's Plan Review - Major Mod | 954 | 1,400 | | |
| Planning Director's Plan Review - Minor Mod | 459 | 500 | | |
| Design Review | | | | |
| DR is required if plan review for multi-family is located in DR district (speparate design review application is not required) | 322 | 500 | | |
| DR Mod: DR is required if plan review for multi-family is located in a DR district. (Separate DR application is not required) | 143 | 350 | | |
| **Urban Special Permit or mod (Railyard Only)** | | 25,000 | | |
| **Planning Commission Fees** | | | | |
| Plan Amendments | | | | |
| General Plan Amendment | 11,400 | 20,000 | | |
| Community Plan Amendment | 8,600 | 10,000 | | |
| Plan Amendment (0-2 acre res'l project) | 2,143 | 1,500 | | |
| Rezoning/Prezoining | | | | |
| Rezone/Prezone | 9,536 | | 8,000 | 20,000 |
| Rezone (0-2 acre res'l project) | 2,143 | 1,000 | | |
| Tentative Maps/Lot Line Adjustment | | | | |
| Tentative Map 1-4 parcels | 3,576 | 500/lot | | |
| Tentative Map 5-50 parcels | 6,500 | " | | |
| Tentative Map 51-100 parcels | 7,500 | 25000+20/lot over 50 | | |
| Add'l Fee for each 100 parcels | 417 | delete | | |
| Subdivision Modification | 596 | 500 | | |
| Post Subdividion Modification | 2,384 | 1,500 | | |
| Lot Line Adjustment | 596 | 550 | | |
| Special Permits | | | | |
| Planning Commission | 5,500 | | 4,000 | 9,000 |
| Development w/in a PUD | 5,300 | | 4,000 | 9,000 |
| Condominium Conversion | 9,298 | 25,000 | | |
| Infill Development | 2,400 | | - | 2,500 |
| Major Project | 8,344 | | 5,000 | 12,500 |
| Temporary Parking Lot | 1,788 | | 3,500 | 3,500 |
| Time Extension | 2,384 | | 1,500 | 2,500 |
| Special Project Major Mod | 5,500 | | 4,000 | 9,000 |

| | Fee | General | Residential | Commercial |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Variances | | | | |
| Planning Commission | 3,000 | | 1,500 | 5,000 |
| Variance Time Extension | 3,000 | | 1,500 | 5,000 |
| Development Plan Review | | | | |
| Review | 5,300 | 7,500 | | |
| Plan Review Time Extension | 2,384 | 3,500 | | |
| Plan Review Major Modification | 2,384 | 3,500 | | |
| Planned Unit Development | | | | |
| PUD Establishment | 4,410 | | 4,500 | 6,200 |
| PUD Guideline Amendment | 3,218 | | 3,300 | 4,500 |
| PUD Schematic Plan Amendment | 2,861 | | 2,900 | 4,000 |
| Miscellaneous Entitlements | | | | |
| Development Agreement | 9,178 | 20,000 | | |
| Street/Alley Abandonment | 2,146 | 3,000 | | |
| Street Name Change | 2,146 | 2,100 | | |
| Inclusionary Housing Plan | 475 | 1,000 | | |
| Pre-App Staff Prliminary review | 1,907 | | 500 w/out rpt | 2600 w/rpt |
| Early Policy Review of Major Projects | 2,861 | 4,000 | | |
| Plan Consistency Review | 2,146 | | | |
| Staff Hourly Review | 113 | 140 | | |
| Development Engineering | | | | |
| Final Map/Parcel Map 1 - 4 | 1250 + 50/lot | | | |
| Final Map/Parcel Map 5 and more | 2250 + 10/lot | | | |
| Certificate of Compliance | | | | |
| Lot Splits | 1,000 | | | |
| Lot Mergers | 1,555 | | | |
| Lot Adjustments 2 to 3 lots | 1,805 | | | |
| Lot Adjustments 4 lots | 2,055 | | | |
| **Zoning** | | | | |
| Subdivision Maps | | | | |
| Tentative Map 1 - 4 Parcels | 2,500 | 2,500 | | |
| Subdivision Modificaton | 480 | 500 | | |
| Post Subdivision Modification | 480 | 500 | | |
| Lot Line Adjustment | 596 | 600 | | |

| | Fee | General | Residential | Commercial |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Special Permits | | | | |
| Fence/Wall | 596 | 600 | | |
| Driveway | 596 | 600 | | |
| Non-conforming Building | 596 | 600 | | |
| Sidewal Café | 596 | 750 | | |
| Office Percentage | 2,750 | 2,750 | | |
| Second Residential Unit | 2,750 | 2,750 | | |
| Parking Waiver or Reduction | 2,750 | 2,750 | | |
| Duplex | 2,750 | 2,750 | | |
| Bed & Breakfast Inn | 2,750 | 4,000 | | |
| Transportation Corridor Use | 2,750 | 2,750 | | |
| Other Special Permits | 2,750 | 2,750 | | |
| Deep Lot | 3,000 | 3,000 | | |
| Antennas (Cell) | 3,000 | 7,500 | | |
| Variances | | | | |
| Setback | 1,250 | 1,250 | | |
| height | 1,250 | 1,250 | | |
| Driveway | 1,250 | 1,250 | | |
| Garage | 1,250 | 1,250 | | |
| Lot Coverage | 1,650 | 3,000 | | |
| Fence/Wall | 1,650 | 1,650 | | |
| Other Variances | 1,650 | 1,650 | | |
| Plan Review | | | | |
| Plan Review | 1,371 | | 1,400 | 2,000 |
| Exception to Home Occupation Permit Regulations | | | | |
| Exception to Home Occ'n Permit Reg'ns | 834 | 1,200 | | |
| Modifications | | | | |
| Special Permit or Plan Review Minor Mod | 459 | | 50 | 700 |
| Special Permit or Plan Review Major Mod | 954 | | 1,000 | 2,000 |
| Time Extensions | | | | |
| Tentitive Map Time Extension | 1,200 | 2,000 | | |
| Extension of ZA Entitlements to ZA | 459 | 750 | | |
| Extension of CPC Entitlement to ZA | 954 | 1,500 | | |
| Miscellaneous Entitlements | | | | |
| Revocable Permit (without other entitlement) | 274 | 500 | | |
| Staff Hourly Fee | 113 | 140 | | |
| Appeals | | | | |
| Applicant Appeal | 596 | 1,000 | | |
| Third Party Appeal | 298 | 1,000 | | |
| **Design Review** | | | | |
| Designated Design Review Districts | | | | |
| New Construction | | | | |
| 1 & 2 Family Units (staff Review) | 270 | 325 | | |
| Multi-Family (director review) | 1,311 | 1,850 | | |
| Commercial Development (director or board review) | 1,311 | 4units & < = 2500<br>>4units = 5000 | | |

| | Fee | General | Residential | Commercial |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Exterior Rehabilitations/Additions | | | | |
| Projects w/<$10,000 of work to be reviewed (staff review) | 120 | 140 | | |
| Projects w/$10,000 to under $50,000 of work to be reviewed (staff review) | 235 | 300 | | |
| Projects w/$50,000 to under $100,000 of work to be reviewed (staff review) | 350 | 500 | | |
| Projects w/$100,000 and over of work to be reviewed (director or commission review) | 1,311 | 1,500 | | |
| Expanded North Area Design Review District | | | | |
| New Construction | | | | |
| 1 & 2 Family Units (With minimal staff review or modification required) | 60 | 140 | | |
| 1 & 2 Family Units (With some staff review or modification required) | 120 | 140 | | |
| 1 & 2 Family Units (With extensive staff review or modification required) | 235 | 280 | | |
| Multi-Family Units (3 or more) | 252 | 400 | | |
| Non-Residential Developments | 560 | 800 | | |
| Exterior Additions, Modifications and Rehabilitations | | | | |
| Residential and Non-Residential Projects (Exterior work valued up to $50,000) | 72 | 140 | | |
| Residential and Non-Residential Projects (Exterior work valued from $50,000 to $144,000) | 143 | 140 | | |
| Residential Projects (Exterior work valued over $100,000 | 280 | 325 | | |
| Non-Residential Projects (Exterior work valued over $100,000) | 417 | 800 | | |
| City wide Single Family & Two Family Design Review (Not located in a designated design review district) | | | | |
| New Construction | | | | |
| 1 & 2 Family Units (With minimal staff review or modification required) | 60 | 140 | | |
| 1 & 2 Family Units (With some staff review or modification required) | 120 | 140 | | |
| 1 & 2 Family Units (With extensive staff review or modification required) | 235 | 280 | | |
| Exterior Rehabilitations | N/A | | | |
| Staff Research - Staff hourly rate | 113 | 140 | | |
| **Preservation Fees** | | | | |
| New Construction | | | | |
| 1 & 2 Family Units (staff review) | 322 | 325 | | |
| Muti-Family (director review) | 1,311 | 1,800 | | |
| Commercial Develop't (director or commission review) | 1,311 | 3,500 | | |
| New Construction on Vacant Lot | 1,311 | | 1,000 | 3,500 |
| Rehabilitations and Additions | | | | |
| Projects with , $10,000 of work to be reviewed (staff review) | 143 | 140 | | |
| Projects with $10,000 - < $50,000 of work to be reviewed (staff review) | 280 | 280 | | |

| | Fee | General | Residential | Commercial |
|---|---|---|---|---|
| Projects with $50,000 - < $100,0000 of work to be reviewed (staff review) | 417 | 800 | | |
| Projects with $100,000 and more of work to be reviewed (director or commission review) | 1,311 | 1,800 | | |
| Miscellaneous | | | | |
| Demolition of listed structure or structure in a historic area (commission review)Registerd listed | 1,311 | 3,500 | | |
| " Potentially eligible | | 500 | | |
| Building move of a listed structure or structure in a historic area (commisssion review) | 1,311 | 2,500 | | |
| " Potentially eligible | | 500 | | |
| Parking lots with over $100,000 of improvements (staff review) | 322 | 1,500 | | |
| Parking lots with over $100,000 of improvements (commission review) | 1,311 | 3,500 | | |
| Staff Research - Staff hourly rate | 113 | 140 | | |
| **Environmental** | | | | |
| Standard | | | | |
| Exemption | 113 | 140 | | |
| Negative Declaration | 1,669 | 1,600 | | |
| Environmental Impact Report | Full Cost | | | |
| Staff Research - Staff hourly rate | 113 | 140 | | |