

**Final Report on the Fee Study and Cost  
Recovery Plan for the Department of Planning**

**COUNTY OF MAUI, HAWAII**

**matrix** #  
consulting group

721 Colorado Avenue, Suite 101  
Palo Alto, CA 94303  
v.650.858.0507 f.650.858.0509

**December 2, 2009**

RECEIVED AT EDB MEETING ON 04/09/19  
Councilmember Sinenesi

# TABLE OF CONTENTS

December 2, 2009

	Page
1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
2. LEGAL AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS	5
3. USER FEE STUDY METHODOLOGY	8
4. DETAILED RESULTS FOR PLANNING FEES	11
5. MARKET SURVEY: COST RECOVERY PRACTICES	19
6. MARKET SURVEY: FEES	26
<b>ATTACHMENTS</b>	
A: Cost Recovery Report Table – Total for All Fee Related Services	
B: Recommended Prices for Services – 4 Year Phase-In	

## **1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY**

The report, which follows, presents the results of the Fee Study and Cost Recovery Plan conducted by the Matrix Consulting Group for Maui County's Department of Planning. This report provides the County with the findings and conclusions resulting from analysis of the Department's charges for services.

### **1. PROJECT BACKGROUND, SCOPE OF WORK, AND OBJECTIVES**

The Department of Planning contracted with the Matrix Consulting Group to analyze its current schedule of planning fees as related to the estimated total costs of providing the wide variety of planning services offered by the Department. The project team reviewed the existing fee structure with the Department of Planning's staff to update, consolidate, streamline, and improve the structure while including new and revised fee categories.

Through this study, the Matrix Consulting Group determined the estimated total cost of services provided by the Department of Planning, with a comprehensive look at all planning functions (both fee and non-fee related), keeping in mind the need for a fee structure that is straightforward, easy to understand, defensible, and clear in terms of presentation to the development community and the general public. The results of this analysis provide a tool for understanding current service levels, the cost and demand for those services, and what fees for service can and should be charged.

### **2. SUMMARY OF RESULTS**

The cumulative results of this Fee Study identified an overall subsidy provided to the fee payer, where the annual revenue collected for all fee related services is, on

**MAUI COUNTY, HAWAII**  
**Final Report on the Fee Study and Cost Recovery Plan for the Department of Planning**

---

average, less than the estimated true cost of providing those services. From a detailed, fee-by-fee perspective, the results demonstrate that almost all fees are set at levels lower than the true costs of providing services. As shown in the following table, the net result of the Study found an overall undercharge for services provided by the Department of Planning:

<b>Projected Annual Revenue at Current Fee / Deposit</b>	<b>Projected Annual Revenue at Full Cost per Unit</b>	<b>Annual Revenue Surplus / (Subsidy)</b>	<b>Full Cost Recovery Rate</b>
<b>\$ 392,000</b>	<b>\$2,115,000</b>	<b>\$(1,723,000)</b>	<b>19%</b>

The table above is comprised of the Department of Planning's estimated annual current revenue versus estimated total costs of providing the majority of the Department's fee-related services. These fees for service are mostly administered on a flat (per unit / per project) basis. The Department is currently recovering approximately 19% of the estimated full cost of providing fee related services. At full cost recovery, the potential additional revenue obtained from implementing these revised and/or additional fees for services is approximately \$1,723,000 million above what is currently collected for these services.

It should be noted that the summary cost recovery results shown in the table above and throughout the following report are not a precise measurement. Changes to the structure of fee names and application type names, interpretation of data contained in the Department's permit software, as well as the use of time estimates allow for only a reasonable projection of existing revenue, subsidies and/or surpluses associated with provision of services. Detailed cost calculation results are discussed further in Chapter 4 of this report.

### **3. GENERAL PROJECT APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY**

The Matrix Consulting Group utilized a cost-based analytical approach in calculating the full cost of providing planning services. By implementing a cost-based planning fee structure, Maui County follows a best management practice in the adoption of planning application fees that are fair, equitable, and in accordance with parameters set by the Hawaii Revised Statutes.

For this Study, the methodology employed in establishing the full cost of providing services is a widely known and accepted “bottom up” approach to cost analysis, where time spent per unit of fee activity is determined for each position within a department. Once time spent for a fee activity is determined, all applicable County costs are then considered in the calculation of the full cost of providing each service. Typical costs included in a “full” cost calculation include: direct salaries and benefits, operating services and supplies, divisional and departmental overhead, and Countywide overhead costs. A comprehensive discussion of all costs considered for the Department of Planning is included in Chapters 3 and 4 of this report.

The work accomplished by the Matrix Consulting Group in the analysis of the proposed fees for service involved the following steps:

- **Initial Interviews:** Key project management staff for Maui County were interviewed to solidify the mutual understanding of the objectives of this study and potential issues with the implementation of user fees.
- **Department of Planning Staff Interviews:** The project team interviewed staff at all levels of the Department regarding their needs for clarification to the structure of existing fee items, or for addition of new fee items.
- **Data Collection:** All essential data components were entered into the Matrix Consulting Group’s user fee analytical software model, including all budgetary, staffing level, time estimate, and volume of activity assumptions.

- **Cost Analysis:** The project team applied all applicable County costs toward the calculation of the full costs of providing each service included in the model. Resulting costs were presented on a unit and annual level, compared to revenue reports, and provided information about cost recovery surpluses and deficits.
- **Review and Approval of Results with County Staff:** Since the analysis of fees for service is based on estimates and information provided by County staff, it is extremely important that all participants are comfortable with our methodology and with the data they provided. Department management reviewed and approved these documented results.

In the detailed report, which follows, the full cost of services for items included in the Study are presented from both a unit and annual cost perspective. A more detailed description of user fee policy and methodology considerations are provided in Chapters 2 and 3 of this report.

#### **4. POLICY RECOMMENDATION HIGHLIGHTS**

The Matrix Consulting Group recommends the following policies be carefully considered when adopting the results of this Study:

- Formal cost recovery policy for the Department
- Cost of providing services vs. price charged for services
- Additional exceptions to fees for service
- Methods for updating the fee study
- Annual adjustments to keep up with inflation and costs

Each of the above policy considerations is discussed in more detail under Chapter 4 of this report.

## **2. LEGAL FRAMEWORK AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

A “user fee” is a charge for services provided by a governmental agency to a public citizen or group. In Hawaii, there are a variety of laws and case precedents that shape the design of fees for service. HRS Section 25-1.5(8) sets the parameters under which the user fees typically administered by local government are established and administered, whereas “Each county shall have the power to fix the fees and charges for all official service not otherwise provided for”.

Additionally, a “user fee”, as opposed to a “regulatory fee”, is based on the rights of the government entity as a proprietor of the instrumentalities used. Regulatory fees are based on the State’s Police Power to regulate certain businesses or activities. In other words, user fees involve the government providing a specific service to persons that pay to cover the costs of providing the service.

Finally, for a charge to qualify as a “fee” rather than a “tax”, the charge should meet three criteria: (1) applies to the direct beneficiary of a particular service, (2) is allocated directly to defraying the costs of providing the service, (3) is reasonably proportionate to the benefit received for that service.

### **1. GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND PHILOSOPHIES REGARDING USER FEES**

Local governments are providers of many types of general services to their communities. While all services provided by local government are beneficial to constituents, some services can be classified as globally beneficial to all citizens, while others provide more of a direct benefit to a specific group or individual. The following

table provides examples of services provided by local government within a continuum of the degree of community benefit received:

<b>Services that Provide General "Global" Community Benefit</b>	<b>Services that Provide Both "Global" Benefit and also a Specific Group or Individual Benefit</b>	<b>Services that Provide a Primary Benefit to an Individual or Group, with less "Global" Community Benefit</b>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Police</li> <li>• Park Maintenance</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Recreation / Community Services</li> <li>• Fire Suppression, Fire Prevention</li> </ul>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Building Permits</li> <li>• Planning and Zoning Approval</li> <li>• Site Plan Review</li> <li>• Engineering Development Review</li> </ul>

Funding for local government is obtained from many revenue sources such as taxes, fines, grants, special charges, user fees, etc. In recent years, alternative tax revenues, which typically offset subsidies for services provided to the community, have become increasingly limited. These limitations have caused increased attention on user fee activities as a revenue source that can offset costs otherwise subsidized (usually) by the general fund. In the table on the previous page, services in the "global benefit" section tend to be funded primarily through voter approved tax revenues. In the middle of the table, one typically finds a mixture of taxes, user fee, and other funding sources. Finally, in the "individual / group benefit" section of the table, lie the services provided by local government that are typically funded by user fee revenue.

The following are two central concepts regarding the establishment of user fees:

- **Fees should be assessed according to the degree of individual or private benefit gained from services.** For example, the processing and approval of a land use or building permit will generally result in monetary gain to the applicant, whereas Police services and Fire Suppression are examples of services that are essential to the safety of the community at large.
- **A profit making objective should not be included in the assessment of user fees.** In fact, case precedent in Hawaii requires that charges for service be reasonably proportionate to the benefit received for each service. Therefore,

once a charge for service is assessed at a level higher than the cost of providing a service, the term “user fee” no longer applies. The charge then becomes a tax.

Therefore, it is commonly accepted that user fees are established at a level that will recover up to, and not more than, the cost of providing a particular service.

### **3. USER FEE STUDY METHODOLOGY**

The Matrix Consulting Group utilizes a cost allocation methodology, commonly known and accepted as the “bottom-up” approach to establishing User Fees. The term means that several cost components are calculated for each fee or service. These components then build upon each other to comprise the total cost for providing the service. The components of “full cost” considered for Maui County’s Department of Planning are shown in the table below:

<b>Cost Component</b>	<b>Description</b>
<b>Direct</b>	Fiscal Year 2009/10 budgeted salaries, benefits and allowable departmental expenditures.
<b>Departmental Overhead</b>	Planning Department administration / management and clerical support.
<b>Countywide Overhead</b>	County costs associated with central service costs such as payroll, human resources, budgeting, County management, etc. These costs were established through the County’s detailed Cost Allocation Plan.

For the Department of Planning, the general steps utilized by the project team to determine allocations of the above cost components to a particular fee or service were:

- Create a list of planning application and permitting fees;
- Identify average time to process, plan check, and review each project item; and,
- Calculate the full cost of providing services to include all direct and indirect cost components.

The result of these allocations provides detailed documentation for the reasonable estimate of the actual cost of providing each service. The following are critical points about the use of time estimates and the validity of our cost allocation models.

**1. TIME ESTIMATES ARE A MEASURE OF SERVICE LEVELS REQUIRED TO PERFORM A PARTICULAR SERVICE**

One of the key study assumptions utilized in the “bottom up” approach is the use of time estimates for the provision of each fee related service. Utilization of time estimates is a reasonable and defensible approach, especially since experienced staff members who understand service levels and processes unique to Maui County developed these estimates.

The project team worked closely with the County’s staff in developing time estimates with the following criteria:

- Estimates are representative of average times for providing service. Extremely difficult or abnormally simple projects are excluded from the analysis.
- Estimates provided by staff are reviewed and approved by the Department, and often involve multiple iterations before a study is finalized.
- Estimates are reviewed by the project team for “reasonableness” against their experience with other agencies.

The Matrix Consulting Group agrees that while the use of time estimates is not a perfect approach, it is the best alternative available for setting a standard level of service for which to base a jurisdiction’s fees for service, and it meets the requirements of Hawaii law.

The alternative to time estimating is actual time tracking, often referred to billing on a “time and materials” basis. Except for in the case of anomalous or sometimes very large and complex projects, the Matrix Consulting Group believes this approach is not cost effective or reasonable for the following reasons:

- Accuracy in time tracking is compromised by the additional administrative burden required to track, bill, and collect for services in this manner.
- Additional costs are associated with administrative staff’s billing, refunding, and

monitoring deposit accounts.

- Customers often prefer to know the fees for services in advance of applying for permits or participating in programs.
- Applicants may begin to request assignment of faster or less expensive personnel to their project.
- Departments can better predict revenue streams and staff needs using standardized time estimates and anticipated permit volumes.

Situations arise where the size and complexity of a given project warrants time tracking and billing on a “time and materials” basis. However, the Matrix Consulting Group discourages this practice whenever possible.

## **2. CROSS CHECKS ENSURE THE VALIDITY OF OUR ANALYTICAL MODEL**

In addition to the collection of time estimate data for each fee or service included in the User Fee Study, annual volume of activity data assumptions are also a critical component. By collecting data on the estimated volume of activity for each fee or service, a number of analyses are performed which not only provide useful information to departments regarding allocation of staff resources, but also provide valuable cross checks that ensure the validity of each cost allocation model. This includes assurance that 100% of staff resources are accounted for and allocated to a fee for service, or “other non fee” related category. Since there are no objectives to make a profit in establishing user fees, it is very important to ensure that services are not estimated at a level that exceeds budgeted resource capacity. If at least and not significantly more than 100% of staff resources are accounted for, then no more than 100% of costs associated with providing services will be allocated to individual services in the study.

## **4. DETAILED RESULTS FOR PLANNING FEES**

The motivation behind a cost of services (User Fee) analysis is for the Mayor, County Council and County staff to maintain services at a level that is both accepted and effective for the community, and also to maintain control over the policy and management of these services.

### **1. OVERVIEW OF TOTAL COST RESULTS**

The Department of Planning offers technical advice to the Mayor, County Council and commissions; proposes zoning legislation; drafts updates to the General Plan, Maui Island Plan and Community Plans; presents reports & recommendations on development proposals; and oversees programs on cultural resources, census and geographic information, flood plain permits and other special projects and permits. The County of Maui wished to consider updating and improving its Fee Schedule, for many of the reasons previously discussed in Chapter 2. Therefore, the Matrix Consulting Group worked with County staff to undergo a thorough analysis that connects staff hours and costs by various project types to fees for service. The presentation of results in this chapter are intended as summaries of extensive and voluminous cost allocation documentation for the Department's analytical model. The full analytical results were provided to the County staff under separate cover from this summary report.

The total cost of the Department, as factored into this Study, is approximately \$6,576,000. This cost is comprised of the following components:

**MAUI COUNTY, HAWAII**  
**Final Report on the Fee Study and Cost Recovery Plan for the Department of Planning**

<b>FY 09/10 EXPENSE</b>	<b>AMOUNT</b>	<b>NOTES / SOURCE</b>
<b>Personnel Salaries &amp; Benefits</b>		
Salaries and Wages	\$3,009,456	Includes Current Planning, ZAED, Long Range Planning, & GIS
College Student Interns	\$24,280	General intern use
Others (Recruitment Incentives)	\$20,000	On-going costs
Premium Pay	\$143,700	Overtime, general for all employees
Benefits	\$1,572,140	52.24% per Finance Department
CZM Staff (4.0 FTE)	\$338,350	Salaries and Benefits for CZM grant funded employees
<b>Subtotal Personnel Cost</b>	<b>\$5,107,926</b>	
<b>Operating Services &amp; Supplies</b>		
Materials & Supplies	\$46,000	General materials and operating office supplies
Services	\$51,500	General advertising, printing and binding, copier maintenance
Professional Services	\$330,000	Special Long Range projects, court reporting, legal services, and contract execution services
Utilities	\$16,500	Cell-phone, telephone, water
Travel	\$199,265	On-going airfare expense, mileage and per diem
Other Costs	\$62,220	Meal allowance, general operating supplies, subscriptions, training fees, awards
Rentals	\$310,000	Building lease
Computer Software	\$37,000	Ongoing GIS software license
Expansion Office Furniture	\$12,000	One-time expense/special project
Leased Equipment	\$32,760	Ongoing copier lease
Noticing / Advertising	\$25,628	Two year average of debits from 717504
<b>Subtotal Operating Cost</b>	<b>\$1,122,873</b>	
<b>Excluded Costs</b>		
Expansion Office Furniture	\$(12,000)	One-time expense/special project
Professional Services	\$(330,000)	Special Long Range projects, court reporting, legal services, and contract execution services
<b>Subtotal Excluded Cost</b>	<b>\$(342,000)</b>	
<b>Overhead</b>		
Office of the Director - Salaries & Wages	\$437,948	Salaries and Benefits
Office of the Director - Benefits	\$228,784	52.24% per Finance Department
County Wide Overhead	\$348,983	Countywide Cost Allocation Plan
<b>Subtotal Overhead Cost</b>	<b>\$1,015,715</b>	
<b>Other</b>		
Cost Adjustment - CZM Grant	\$(327,994)	Current CZM contract
<b>Subtotal Other</b>	<b>\$(327,994)</b>	
<b>TOTAL COSTS</b>	<b>\$6,576,520</b>	

The results of this Fee Study determined that approximately 33% of the Planning Department's total costs are associated with services for which user fees are charged. The remaining costs of the Department are associated with services funded by other revenue sources including general fund or regulatory fees, such as code enforcement

inspection, long range planning, public information, responses to interagency requests for information, etc.

As shown in the table below, the County currently collects, on average, approximately \$392,000 in planning application user fee revenue per year. When compared to the total costs of providing these fee-related services, the County recovers approximately 19% of the costs of providing these services.

<b>Projected Annual Revenue at Current Fee / Deposit</b>	<b>Projected Annual Revenue at Full Cost per Unit</b>	<b>Annual Revenue Surplus / (Subsidy)</b>	<b>Full Cost Recovery Rate</b>
<b>\$ 392,000</b>	<b>\$2,115,000</b>	<b>\$(1,723,000)</b>	<b>19%</b>

The total cost of fee related services included in the analysis is approximately \$2,115,000. If fees were set to recover 100% of their cost, additional revenue of approximately \$1,723,000 could be achieved.

## **2. ATTACHMENT A: DETAILED COST RECOVERY RESULTS**

Attachment A to this report displays the resulting cost of services calculations from two perspectives:

- **First, on a “Fee Per Unit” Basis:** comparing the full cost of providing each unit of service to the current fee for each unit of service (where applicable). The attachment shows the per unit costs broken down by the functional division / unit providing these services, with a resulting “total cost per unit” for each item included in the study. Note: If a current fee for service is not noted, this does not mean a current fee does not exist. Rather, for purposes of analysis, current fees were identified for projects that were performed in the last fiscal year.
- **Second, on an annualized basis:** the project team utilized volume of activity estimates taken from the Department’s permit software database, and used this information to project annual subsidies and revenue impacts associated with the implementation of each fee for service at full cost recovery levels.

It should be noted that the results are not a precise measurement. Changes to the structure of fee names, interpretation of data contained in the Department’s permit

software, along with the use of time estimates allow only for a reasonable projection of subsidies and revenue. Consequently, the Mayor, County Council, and County staff should rely conservatively upon these estimates to gauge the impact of implementation going forward.

### **3. SIGNIFICANT CHANGES WERE MADE TO THE DEPARTMENT'S FEE STRUCTURE**

It should be noted that this Study of Maui County's Planning Department fees propose significant changes to the existing fee structure in order to enhance fairness and equitability to the end receiver of charges for service. In addition, the Study identifies a number of services for which the department is eligible to, but not charging fees for at all.

Historically, many types of planning application fees assessed by the Department were based on the total valuation of the project. The Matrix Consulting Group notes a number of issues with this methodology:

- Valuation of a project is an economic factor and does not closely correlate to the level of effort required by County staff to review, process, and approve an application.
- Often the valuation of a project is unknown at the time of application, especially if there is no proposed structure with the entitlement.
- As costs of industry, materials, etc. rise and fall with economic cycles, a jurisdiction's costs do not necessarily rise and fall at the same rate.

For these reasons, the Matrix Consulting Group recommended that the Department consider an alternate structure to project valuation, based on the type and scope of a particular project that results in a flat fee for service. The recommendations and proposed fee structures in this report are legally defensible and establish a nexus between costs of providing services to each specific user fee that is charged.

#### **4. IMPORTANT IMPLEMENTATION POLICY CONSIDERATIONS**

The following are important policy considerations and recommendations related to adoption of the Study's results:

##### **(1) Formal Cost Recovery Policy for the Department**

The Matrix Consulting Group strongly recommends that the County use the information contained in this report to discuss, adopt, and implement policies regarding a formal cost recovery policy related to the Department of Planning's fees for service. In many Planning Departments across the United States, it is not uncommon for planning application review services to be subsidized to some degree. Maui County's Department of Planning currently recovers approximately 18% of the costs of providing fee related services. According to the Matrix Consulting Group's experience in hundreds of similar studies across the United States, typical cost recovery for Planning Departments range from 40% to 60%. A cost recovery level of 80% would constitute a Best Management Practice.

##### **(2) Cost of Providing Services vs. Price Charged for Services**

The project team recommends the County try to recover as much of the service costs as feasible. For most fee related services, the Matrix Consulting Group recommends setting fees at a level up to and not more than 100% cost recovery. However, as discussed in Chapter 2 of this report, there are several political and economic policy factors that often warrant adoption of fee levels at less than 100%.

The project team worked together with Planning Department staff to establish recommendations on "prices" for services that in many instances do not reflect the full cost of providing services as shown in Attachment A of this report. These

recommendations are presented in Attachment B of this report, and reflect the following policy for consideration by the Council:

- Adopt a 4-year phase-in approach of the Study's results to eventually achieve cost recovery between 60 - 70% of the total County cost of providing services in year 4.
- In Year One of the phase in, most fees would be priced to recover approximately 40% of their total cost. In Year Two, 50%, and Year 3, 60%.
- Several fee line items shown in Attachment A should be given special consideration and implemented at lower cost recovery percentages than mentioned above, including:
  - **Variiances and appeals:** a lower recovery price is set to support the general right to challenge a decision through due process, such as Interventions and Appeal of a Director's Decision in the Special Management Area
  - **Particular Incentives:** applications for which the County should provide an incentive that encourages the application for a permit, such as Shoreline Setback Variances for Removals or Demolitions.

It should be noted that the Projected Annual Revenue and resulting Cost Recovery Percentages shown in Attachment B are slightly lower than the targets mentioned above. This is a result of the lower recovery prices provided for variiances and appeals as well as particular incentives.

### **(3) Additional Exceptions to Fees for Service**

Department staff also recommends the following policy considerations for fee exceptions be considered:

- **Concurrent Processing:** Permit or development applications which are being processed concurrently with other permit or development applications processed by the Department of Planning are charged the full fee for the first application and 50% of the fee for each additional application to the extent processed at the same time as the first application.

- **“After the Fact” Fees:** for applications required as a result of a zoning code enforcement action would be required to pay 100% of the total cost shown in Attachment A, with no phase-in relief nor discounts.
- **Government Fees:** Reduced fees for development or permit applications filed by or on behalf of any Federal, State, or County agency.
- **Affordable Housing:** Projects built and offered for sale or rental in accordance with Chapter 2.96, Maui County Code, shall be exempt from the fees set forth in the adopted fee table, by the percentage of fee waived per the percentage of affordable housing units above those required by Chapter 2.96.
- **Applicant Initiated Re-submissions:** After an application has been accepted by the Planning Department as “complete and in process”, any changes initiated by the applicant to the project’s scope or size that require additional Department staff time and effort will incur an additional 50% of the original project fee.

A number of these policies are currently in-place within the Planning Department’s existing fee structure. With the exception of the After the Fact Fees and the Applicant Initiated Resubmission policy, the others remain unchanged.

#### **(4) Alternative Cost Recovery Policy Option**

An alternative to the policy consideration discussed in Subsection 2 above would be to set most fees at 100% of their total cost, but provide discounts to a broader range of groups to include the examples noted above, small family subdivisions, small businesses, lower income applicants, and/or owner-occupied single family residences outside the shoreline requesting permits. Staff and the project team estimate that this type of implementation policy would still lead to an overall recovery of approximately 60% of total costs. Matrix Consulting Group, however, recommends the first option presented above to avoid establishment of an elaborate application process for fee discounts.

**(5) Updates to the Fee Study**

The County should perform a complete update of its User Fee Study on a periodic basis. The County's costs of providing planning application review services have not been studied in over 10 years. In general, 3 to 5 years for fee and rate studies is considered a Best Management Practice. The purpose of a comprehensive update is to completely revisit the analytical structure, service level estimates and assumptions applied in the previous study, and to account for any major shifts in cost components or organizational structures.

**(6) Annual Adjustments Keep Up with Inflation and Costs**

In between comprehensive updates, the County could utilize published industry economic factors such as CPI or other regional factors to update the cost calculations established in the Study on an annual basis. Alternatively, the County could also consider the use of its own anticipated labor cost increases such as step increases, benefit enhancements, or cost of living raises. The latter example provides a more realistic reflection than a CPI, given the fact that labor costs generally comprise the majority of cost calculations for a jurisdiction. Use of an automatic increase mechanism based on the County's own labor costs also provides a factor that is specific to it and its operations, rather than one that is specific to a region or industry as a whole. Utilizing an annual increase mechanism would ensure that the County receives appropriate fee and revenue increases that reflect growth in costs.

## **5. MARKET SURVEY OF COST RECOVERY PRACTICES IN COMPARABLE JURISDICITONS**

As part of the User Fee Study for the Planning Department, Matrix Consulting Group developed a comparative survey in order to develop quantitative and qualitative data identifying similarities and differences between cost recovery policy and procedure for the Maui County Planning Department versus other comparable communities. This chapter contains the responses to the procedural questions of the market survey for the planning department of the County of Maui. The comparative survey consisted of questions in six categories: cost recovery policy and impact, cost adjustment and analysis, overhead costs, productivity, discounts, and cost sharing. Each of the categories contained specific questions to ensure clear and direct answers were reached.

The comparative survey was distributed to three local, and five mainland jurisdictions: City and County of Honolulu, HI; County of Hawaii, HI; County of Kauai, HI; County of Monterey, CA; County of Santa Barbara, CA; County of Wake, NC; County of Dukes, MA (Martha's Vineyard); and County of Monroe, FL (Florida Keys). The five Mainland jurisdictions were chosen based on the following criteria: 1) the jurisdiction has a stable residential population, 2) the jurisdiction contains a variety of tourist destinations, 3) the jurisdiction has a mix of high income as well as low income affordability issues.

Contact was made with someone in each of the eight selected jurisdictions, however, Monroe and Dukes did not respond. The answers provided by responding

jurisdictions are provided with as little editing and modification as possible to ensure the clarity of their responses.

The sections below summarize the responses of the comparative survey.

## **1. COST RECOVERY POLICY AND IMPACT**

Respondents were presented with a series of questions regarding their department's cost recovery policies, including the percentage of their budget recovered by fees, and other funding sources.

- **Kauai:** The County's planning department does not have a formal cost recovery policy, however, they have discussed establishing a recovery fund. The Department tries to pass on noticing costs to developers as much as possible. 100% of the Department's budget is covered by the general fund.
- **Honolulu:** The County's planning department does not have a formal cost recovery policy, however, they do try to recover a significant portion of their costs tempered with market considerations. The planning department's budget is covered solely by the general fund.
- **Hawaii:** The County's planning department does not have a formal cost recovery policy, and is primarily funded by the general fund.
- **Wake:** The County's planning department does not have a formal cost recovery policy, however, 80% of its funding comes from planning fees, with the other 20% coming from the general fund.
- **Santa Barbara:** The County's planning department has a formal cost recovery policy that currently funds about 85% of the department's budget needs.
- **Monterey:** The County's planning department does not have a formal cost recovery policy, and only 30% of their budget is covered by fees, with the remaining 70% funded by the general fund.
- **Maui:** The County's Planning Department does not have a formal cost recovery policy. The Department recovers approximately 6% of their total budget via fee revenue, and approximately 18% of the costs associated with providing fee related services. The majority of the Planning Department's budget is funded by the general fund.

## **2. COST ADJUSTMENT AND ANALYSIS**

Respondents were presented with a series of questions regarding how often their department analyzes the cost of providing services, including conducting comprehensive fee studies, as well as what index is used to calculate fee updates in years when there is not a comprehensive study.

- **Kauai:** The County's planning department has never done a consultant study, and have not changed their fees since 1972, however, they have made recommendations to raise zoning ordinance fees.
- **Honolulu:** The County's planning department just finished an in-house analysis of their costs to provide services, and is currently in the approval process. The County has not used an outside source, or consultant to analyze their fees in over 20 years, and does not use any kind of index or percentage to annually update their fees.
- **Hawaii:** The County does not typically analyze its costs of providing services, and hasn't conducted a comprehensive study in over 40 years. While the County does not use an index to annually calculate fee updates, it does have a method for updating its impact fees.
- **Wake:** The County analyzes its costs of providing services annually through its budget process. The last comprehensive fee study they had was done in-house roughly four years ago, and uses a CPI to calculate fee updates.
- **Santa Barbara:** The County's planning department analyzes its cost of providing services annually, and conducts a comprehensive fee study as needed, with the last one being conducted four years ago. When a comprehensive study is not done, a CPI is used to update fees.
- **Monterey:** The County does not have a set cycle for analyzing their cost of providing services, and conducts a comprehensive fee study about every five years. A CPI is used annually to update fees.
- **Maui:** The County does not have a set cycle for analyzing their cost of providing services, and has not conducted a comprehensive study in more than 15 years. The County does not have a method for updating its fees annually via CPI or any other factor.

### **3. OVERHEAD COSTS**

Respondents were presented with a series of questions about what types of cost recovery were included in their case processing fees, such as technology updates, general plan and specific plan maintenance, and records management.

- **Kauai:** The County does not recover for any overhead costs in their fees.
- **Honolulu:** The County does not include overhead or surcharges in their fees.
- **Hawaii:** The County does not recover for any overhead costs in their fees.
- **Wake:** The County does not recover for any overhead costs in their fees, however, they do recover technology update costs through their CIP.
- **Santa Barbara:** The County recovers for overhead, technology updates, general and specific plan maintenance, and records management costs in their fees.
- **Monterey:** The County includes overhead cost recovery in their hourly rates, as well as a 1% fee that is applied to all land use permits.
- **Maui:** The County does not currently recover for County administrative or other types of aforementioned overhead costs in their case processing fees.

### **4. PRODUCTIVITY**

Respondents were presented with questions regarding their department's productivity, including how many cases were processed in the last year, how many staff were on hand to process cases, and if staffing levels are adjusted for case load.

- **Kauai:** Last year the Planning department processed roughly 1,153 permits with about 10 full time staff. Currently there is only a slight decrease in permit volume compared to the previous year. Staffing levels are not adjusted for case loads.
- **Honolulu:** In FY 08, the Planning department processed roughly 1,000 permits with a staff of around 40 (20 land use, 20 planning). Overall, the number of permits processed and the staff processing them does not fluctuate dramatically from year to year.

- **Hawaii:** The Planning department has seen a slight change in the number of cases they've processed over the last fiscal year, however they keep their staffing levels consistent regardless.
- **Wake:** Last year the Planning department processed about 620 cases with 9 staff. Current trends show case levels down, and the Department is down two staff due to budget constraints. Overall, staffing levels are not adjusted for caseloads.
- **Santa Barbara:** In the last fiscal year, the Planning department processed roughly 2,920 cases with 80 staff. Current case loads are lower than last year, and the Department does adjust staffing levels to reflect case loads.
- **Monterey:** The Planning department processed roughly 500 permits last year with 30 staff. While they have experienced a drop in major permit volume, minor permits seem to be holding steady. The Department does not adjust staffing levels for case load, but rather tries to maintain staffing levels.
- **Maui:** The Planning Department processes between 1450 and 1600 permits per year with approximately 65 staff. Out of the total staff in the Planning budget, approximately 38 are most closely associated with the processing of planning applications.

## **5. DISCOUNTS**

Respondents were provided with questions regarding fee reductions and discounts given, including what and whom the discount was for, and how the discount was applied.

- **Kauai:** The County's Planning Department has an affordable housing provision that allows for a waiver of impact fees.
- **Honolulu:** The County's Planning department applies affordable housing discounts through State 201 H. Specific qualifications can be met by business for various exemptions, however, these do not apply to zoning permits.
- **Hawaii:** The County's Planning department does not apply any fee reductions or discounts for applications.
- **Wake:** The County's Planning department does not apply any fee reductions or discounts for applications.

- **Santa Barbara:** The County's Planning department does not apply fee reductions or discounts for applications, however, the County Board does have authority to allow discounts.
- **Monterey:** Fee waivers are given to certain groups within the community, such as non-profits, elderly, and county agencies as long as they meet specified requirements. All discounts are built in to the fee from the start.
- **Maui:** The County provides discounts for multiple permits processed concurrently, government applications for services, and affordable housing projects.

## **6. COST SHARING**

Respondents were presented with a series of questions regarding their cost sharing policies, including whether they collect fees for other departments, how long other departments have to review planning cases, or if those departments assign overtime hours for staff to review these cases.

- **Kauai:** The County's Planning Department does not collect fees for other departments. However, the County is just beginning a one-stop ombudsman program. The Department aims for a 30 day turn-around time for plan review, and does not use other department's staff to help review cases.
- **Honolulu:** The County's Planning department has one counter that collects fees for all departments. While the Department does not actively monitor processing times, it does adhere to state statutes. When workloads dictate more staff time, an overtime budget is used to pay for extra planner review.
- **Hawaii:** The Planning department does not collect fees for other departments, and generally tries to keep its overtime and comp pay to a minimum. The department is currently trying to track their review turn-around times, but currently just follows state and county guidelines.
- **Wake:** The Planning department does collect fees to cover the cost of reviewing planning cases, but does not use other department or division staff to help review planning cases. The turn-around time for case reviews varies, with minor cases ranging from 15 to 20 days, and major cases taking around 45 days.
- **Santa Barbara:** The Planning department does collect fees to cover the cost of reviewing planning cases, but does not use other department or division staff to help review planning cases. The Department does not have set review times for case types, nor do they track that information.

**MAUI COUNTY, HAWAII**

***Final Report on the Fee Study and Cost Recovery Plan for the Department of Planning***

---

- **Monterey:** The Planning department collects fees to cover the cost of reviewing planning cases from all departments except fire. Turn around times for case review can be from anywhere between 45 days for an exempt CEQA permit to four to five months for cases involving coastal zones.
- **Maui:** The Planning Department does not collect fees to cover the cost of reviewing planning applications for departments other than Planning.

## **6. MARKET SURVEY OF FEES IN COMPARABLE JURISDICITONS**

As part of this Cost of Services (User Fee) Study for the Maui County's Planning Department, the Matrix Consulting Group conducted a comparative survey of fees. The comparative survey was conducted across three local, and five mainland jurisdictions: City and County of Honolulu, HI; County of Hawaii, HI; County of Kauai, HI; County of Monterey, CA; County of Santa Barbara, CA; County of Wake, NC; County of Dukes, MA; and County of Monroe, FL. The five Mainland jurisdictions were chosen based on the following criteria: 1) the jurisdiction has a stable residential population, 2) the jurisdiction contains a variety of tourist destinations, 3) the jurisdiction has a mix of high income as well as low income affordability issues. Information from the County of Dukes, MA was not attainable.

The following issues should be noted regarding the use of market surveys in the setting of fees for service:

- A market survey does not provide adequate or objective information on the relationship of a jurisdiction's costs to its fees. Therefore, comparative surveys do not help the Mayor or Council make cost-based decisions.
- Each jurisdiction and its fees are different, and many are not based on actual cost of providing services.
- The same "fee" with the same name may include more or less steps or sub-activities. In addition, jurisdictions provide varying levels of service and have varying levels of costs associated with providing services such as staffing levels, salary levels, indirect overhead costs, etc.

Because each jurisdiction is different, the Matrix Consulting Group recommends that the information contained in the market comparison of fees be used as a secondary

decision-making tool, rather than a tool for establishing an acceptable price point for services.

The Matrix Consulting Group also recommends that the number of fees and jurisdictions involved in a comparative survey be limited to the vital few necessary to assess the market and make decisions. Using an excessive number of components to such a survey can risk creating a confusing excess of data that will obscure rather than clarify policy issues.

The project team compared fee items that were most comparable across all jurisdictions in order to help keep the focus on the vital fee items with the most significant impact to the community. The following provides several important points regarding the results of the survey:

- In general, Hawaii jurisdictions do not charge for user fee services as much as they could. Maui County is the most progressive in this area, and their fees are higher, on average, than other Hawaii jurisdictions.
- As compared to mainland jurisdictions, Maui County's existing fees are much lower than average.

The following pages present the results of the market survey of fees for Maui County.

**1. HAWAII PLANNING FEE COMPARISON**

<b>Fee Type</b>	<b>County of Maui – Current Fee</b>	<b>County of Hawaii</b>	<b>County of Honolulu</b>	<b>County of Kauai</b>
Change of Zone	Valuation based Minimum \$550 Maximum \$4,950	Application \$500 + \$25 per lot / unit	\$600 + \$225 per acre or major fraction; max. \$12,000	Class III Zoning Permit \$35 Class IV Zoning Permit \$150
State Land Use Boundary Amendment	No Charge	\$200 filing fee	NA	\$100

**MAUI COUNTY, HAWAII**

**Final Report on the Fee Study and Cost Recovery Plan for the Department of Planning**

Fee Type	County of Maui – Current Fee	County of Hawaii	County of Honolulu	County of Kauai
Project District Zoning	\$165	Project District Application \$5,000	NA	NA
Use Permit	County Special Use  Valuation based  Minimum \$550 Maximum \$4,950	Special Permit <15 acres \$100  Use Permit \$250	(Minor) \$300  (Major) \$600 + \$300 per acre or major fraction; max \$10,000	\$50
Shoreline Setback Variance	\$117	\$200	NA	\$100
SMA	Valuation based  Minimum \$550 Maximum \$4,950	SMA Assessment - No Charge  Major \$250	Use permit appl. for agriculture, aquaculture or outdoor recreation developments \$300  Use Permit – All other \$600 + \$300 per acre or fraction thereof up to a maximum of \$10,000  Minor permit - \$100  After the Fact – double the application fee	\$100
Sign Permit	\$57	NA	≤\$500 \$18 \$500.01 - \$1,000 \$35 ≥\$1,000.01 \$70	NA
Agricultural Assessment	No Charge	No Charge	Exclusive Agriculture Site Approval \$300	NA
Planned Development	Valuation based  Minimum \$550 Maximum \$4,950	Planned Unit Development Application \$500	\$600 + \$300 per acre or major fraction; max \$10,000	NA

**MAUI COUNTY, HAWAII**

**Final Report on the Fee Study and Cost Recovery Plan for the Department of Planning**

Fee Type	County of Maui – Current Fee	County of Hawaii	County of Honolulu	County of Kauai
General Plan Amendment	NA	NA	\$600	\$100
Accessory Dwelling Permit	NA	Ohana Dwelling Permit \$25	NA	NA
Variance	Valuation based Minimum \$550 Maximum \$4,950	Subdivision Variance \$100 BOA Variance \$200 Zoning Variance \$250	Zoning Variance \$600	NA
Appeals	Valuation based Minimum \$550 Maximum \$4,950	BOA DPW Director BOA Planning Director BOA Denial of Use of Alternative Methods \$250	Zoning BOA or contested case hearings \$200	NA
Subdivision Application	NA	\$250 + \$25 per lot/unit	NA	\$3 per lot
Cluster Housing	NA	\$15 + \$3 per lot	\$600 + \$300 per acre or major fraction; max \$10,000	NA
Special District Projects	Valuation based Minimum \$550 Maximum \$4,950	NA	Exempt – No Charge Minor - \$100	NA
Zoning Confirmation Letter	NA	NA	\$50 per request or for each map key when multiple parcels are involved	NA
Environmental Review	NA	NA	NA	No Charge

**MAUI COUNTY, HAWAII****Final Report on the Fee Study and Cost Recovery Plan for the Department of Planning****2. MAINLAND PLANNING FEE COMPARISON**

Fee Type	County of Maui – Current Fee	County of Monroe, FL	County of Santa Barbara, CA	County of Monterey, CA	County of Wake County, NC
Conditional Permit	Valuation based  Minimum \$550 Maximum \$4,950	Application  Minor \$8,484 Major \$10,014	Major \$5,000 Minor \$1,500  Amendment \$3,000	General \$3,780	General Use Commercial \$800 for general review \$100 for Minor site plan
Land Use Amendments	No Charge	Nonresidential \$4,929  Residential \$4,131	Nonresidential \$528  Residential Depends on structure type  Minimum \$375 Maximum \$756	NA	Change of use \$800  Same Use \$50
Parking Approval	\$228	Parking Agreement \$1,013	NA	NA	NA
Sign Variance	\$330	\$1,076	NA	NA	NA
Variance	Valuation based  Minimum \$550 Maximum \$4,950	Planning Commission \$1,608  Planning Director \$1,248	\$1,500 deposit	\$3,024	Hardship Variance Review  \$200
Landscape	Planting Approval \$40	NA	Review Minor \$528 Other \$833	NA	NA
Coastal Permits	Valuation based  Minimum \$550 Maximum \$4,950	NA	Development Permit w/hearing \$1,500 deposit	Administrative \$2,016  Development \$4,536	NA

**MAUI COUNTY, HAWAII**

**Final Report on the Fee Study and Cost Recovery Plan for the Department of Planning**

Fee Type	County of Maui – Current Fee	County of Monroe, FL	County of Santa Barbara, CA	County of Monterey, CA	County of Wake County, NC
Zoning	Change in Zone  Valuation based  Minimum \$550 Maximum \$4,950	NA	Rezone \$8,000 deposit	Rezoning – Extraordinary Project  \$15,120	Verification \$50  Rezone – depends on classification change Minimum \$300 Maximum \$1,000 + \$50 per acre
Design Review	\$55	NA	NA	Approvals  Public Hearing \$756 Director's Approval \$453.60	NA
Environmental Review	No Charge	NA	NA	\$15,120	NA

## **ATTACHMENT A**

**Cost Recovery Report Table – Total for All Fee Related Services**

Cost Recovery Report Table - Fee Related Services Only

FEE NO.	Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit (\$)	Total Cost Per Unit (\$)	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit (\$)	Annual Recoverable Volume	Revenue at Current Fee - Annual (\$)	Total Cost - Annual (\$)	Surplus / (Deficit) - Annual (\$)
<b>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</b>								
1	Change of Zone (<5 acres)	550	10,185	(9,635)	2	1,100	20,371	(19,271)
2	Change of Zone (5.01-10 acres)	-	11,276	(11,276)	-	-	-	-
3	Change of Zone (>10.01 acres, each add'l 10 acres)	-	1,972	(1,972)	-	-	-	-
4	Conditional Permit	1,008	6,949	(5,941)	7	7,056	48,641	(41,585)
5	Community Plan Amendment (<5 acres)	550	10,185	(9,635)	1	550	10,185	(9,635)
6	Community Plan Amendment (5.01-10 acres)	-	11,276	(11,276)	-	-	-	-
7	Community Plan Amendment (>10.01 acres, each add'l 10 acres)	-	1,972	(1,972)	-	-	-	-
8	State Land Use District Boundary Amendment (<15 acres)	-	10,140	(10,140)	-	-	-	-
9	State Land Use District Boundary Amendment (>15 acres)	-	14,640	(14,640)	-	-	-	-
10	Project District Zoning - Phase I (<10 acres)	-	11,674	(11,674)	-	-	-	-
11	Project District Zoning - Phase I (>10.01 acres, each add'l 10 acres)	-	1,570	(1,570)	-	-	-	-
12	Project District Zoning - Phase II (<2 acres)	-	7,871	(7,871)	-	-	-	-
13	Project District Zoning - Phase II (2.01-5 acres)	-	9,322	(9,322)	-	-	-	-
14	Project District Zoning - Phase II (5.01-10 acres)	-	10,776	(10,776)	-	-	-	-
15	Project District Zoning - Phase II (>10.01 acres, each add'l 10 acres)	-	1,422	(1,422)	-	-	-	-
16	Proj District Zoning - Phase III (<2 acres)	165	1,108	(943)	2	330	2,215	(1,885)
17	Proj District Zoning - Phase III (2.01-5 acres)	-	1,322	(1,322)	-	-	-	-
18	Proj District Zoning - Phase III (5.01-10 acres)	-	1,750	(1,750)	-	-	-	-
19	Proj District Zoning - Phase III (>10.01 acres, each add'l 10 acres)	-	164	(164)	-	-	-	-
20	BVA Variance (1 variance)	550	10,234	(9,684)	14	7,700	143,277	(135,577)
21	BVA Variance (2 or more variances)	-	13,991	(13,991)	-	-	-	-
22	BVA Appeal	550	9,104	(8,554)	4	2,200	36,414	(34,214)
23	County Special Use Permit	550	7,480	(6,930)	4	2,200	29,919	(27,719)
24	State SUP (<15 acres)	718	7,480	(6,762)	19	13,642	142,114	(128,472)
25	State SUP (>15 acres)	-	9,477	(9,477)	-	-	-	-
26	Shoreline Setback Approval	117	760	(643)	5	585	3,801	(3,216)
27	Shoreline Setback Determination	-	572	(572)	-	-	-	-
28	Shoreline Setback Variance - All Other	-	10,150	(10,150)	-	-	-	-
29	Shoreline Setback Variance - Minor Structures, or Minor Repairs*	-	9,423	(9,423)	-	-	-	-
30	Shoreline Setback Variance - Removals or Demolitions*	-	6,398	(6,398)	-	-	-	-
31	Shoreline - Annual Erosion Hazard Rate Amendment	-	1,001	(1,001)	-	-	-	-
32	Environmental Assessments	3,262	3,301	(39)	5	16,310	16,503	(193)
33	EIS - Prep Notice Review	-	768	(768)	-	-	-	-
34	EIS - Review	-	4,587	(4,587)	-	-	-	-
35	Special Management Area Assessment - Initial Review(SMX) Minor / Exemption	104	864	(760)	488	50,752	421,697	(370,945)
36	SMA - Major - Subdivision	-	8,353	(8,353)	-	-	-	-
37	SMA - Major - Multifamily	1,925	8,353	(6,428)	3	5,775	25,058	(19,283)
38	SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - < 49,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING	1,945	8,352	(6,407)	19	36,955	158,697	(121,742)

**Cost Recovery Report Table - Fee Related Services Only**

FEE NO.	Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit (\$)	Total Cost Per Unit (\$)	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit (\$)	Annual Recoverable Volume	Revenue at Current Fee - Annual (\$)	Total Cost - Annual (\$)	Surplus / (Deficit) - Annual (\$)
38A	SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - >50,000 GROSS S.F. BUILDING	-	10,346	(10,346)	-	-	-	-
39	SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW - <100 ROOMS	-	8,353	(8,353)	-	-	-	-
39A	SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW - 100+ ROOMS	-	12,340	(12,340)	-	-	-	-
40	SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - <49,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	-	8,353	(8,353)	-	-	-	-
40A	SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - 50,000-99,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	4,950	10,346	(5,396)	1	4,950	10,346	(5,396)
40B	SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION > 100,000 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	-	12,838	(12,838)	-	-	-	-
41	SMA - Major - Mixed Use (>15 ACRES)	-	8,353	(8,353)	-	-	-	-
42	SMA - MAJOR - MIXED USE (>15.01 acres)	-	10,346	(10,346)	-	-	-	-
43	SMA - Major - SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING(S) ON ONE LOT	-	5,661	(5,661)	-	-	-	-
44	SMA - Emergency Permit	-	614	(614)	-	-	-	-
45	SMA - Boundary Amendment	-	962	(962)	-	-	-	-
46	Accessory Use Permit	297	3,069	(2,772)	5	1,485	15,343	(13,858)
47	Flood Development Permit	543	926	(383)	17	9,231	15,737	(6,506)
48	Comprehensive Sign Program Application	267	987	(720)	14	3,738	13,813	(10,075)
49	Sign Permit (per permit)	55	134	(79)	76	4,180	10,192	(6,012)
50	Banner Permit	25	53	(28)	126	3,150	6,649	(3,499)
51	Sign Variance	330	7,283	(6,953)	2	660	14,566	(13,906)
52	Parking Approval (Administrative)	55	559	(504)	7	385	3,910	(3,525)
53	Parking Approval (Non-Administrative)	110	4,171	(4,061)	-	-	-	-
54	Landscape Planting Approval (Off-Street/Commercial/Industrial)	40	525	(485)	5	200	2,626	(2,426)
55	Landscape Planting Approval (Subdivision - <10 lots)	-	632	(632)	-	-	-	-
56	Landscape Planting Approval (Subdivision - >10 lots)	-	710	(710)	-	-	-	-
57	Farm Plan Review - Update	-	899	(899)	-	-	-	-
58	Farm Plan Review - w/o Site Inspection	55	120	(65)	115	6,325	13,785	(7,460)
59	Farm Plan Review - w/ Site Inspection	55	321	(266)	7	385	2,245	(1,860)
60	Agricultural Assessment	-	378	(378)	21	-	7,945	(7,945)
61	Zoning and Flood Confirmation Form (Stand-Alone)	-	33	(33)	-	-	-	-
62	Subordination Agreement	-	66	(66)	58	-	3,810	(3,810)
63	Design Review for Special Districts (Historic / MRA / CTB)	55	525	(470)	19	1,045	9,981	(8,936)
64	Historic District Application - Administrative	-	962	(962)	-	-	-	-
65	Historic District Application - Commission	-	2,246	(2,246)	-	-	-	-
66	Historic District Sign	-	427	(427)	-	-	-	-
67	Historic District Banner	-	213	(213)	-	-	-	-
68	Historic District Event - NEW	-	1,526	(1,526)	-	-	-	-
69	Historic District Event - Recurring Annual Events	-	213	(213)	-	-	-	-
70	MRA Approval (w/o variance)	229	1,036	(807)	7	1,603	7,250	(5,647)
71	MRA Conceptual Design Approval - DELETE	-	-	-	-	-	-	-
72	MRA Variance (1 Variance)	-	1,771	(1,771)	-	-	-	-

**Cost Recovery Report Table - Fee Related Services Only**

FEE NO.	Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit (\$)	Total Cost Per Unit (\$)	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit (\$)	Annual Recoverable Volume	Revenue at Current Fee - Annual (\$)	Total Cost - Annual (\$)	Surplus / (Deficit) - Annual (\$)
73	MRA Variance (2 or more Variances)	-	2,935	(2,935)	-	-	-	-
74	B&B Permit - New - Administrative Decision	330	2,506	(2,176)	51	16,830	127,818	(110,988)
75	B&B Permit - New - Public Hearing Required (Add on to Admin Fee)	-	2,977	(2,977)	-	-	-	-
76	Any Permit Amendment - Time Extensions, Transfers, Modifications, Additions to Terms, Change of Scope, Other Amendments - Administrative	-	525	(525)	-	-	-	-
77	Any Permit Amendment - Time Extensions, Transfers, Modifications, Additions to Terms, Change of Scope, Other Amendments - Commission Action	-	4,707	(4,707)	-	-	-	-
78	Any Permit Amendment - Time Extensions, Transfers, Modifications, Additions to Terms, Change of Scope, Other Amendments - Council Actions	-	6,040	(6,040)	-	-	-	-
79	Special Management Area - Appeal of Director's Decision	-	6,161	(6,161)	-	-	-	-
80	Shoreline Setback Appeal	-	6,161	(6,161)	-	-	-	-
81	Adoption / Amendment / Repeal of PC Rules & Regs	-	5,470	(5,470)	-	-	-	-
82	Petition to Intervene	-	2,251	(2,251)	-	-	-	-
83	Granted Intervention	-	10,491	(10,491)	-	-	-	-
84	Preliminary Compliance Report	-	632	(632)	-	-	-	-
85	Final Compliance Report	-	774	(774)	-	-	-	-
86	Cluster Preliminary	-	773	(773)	-	-	-	-
87	Cluster Final	-	1,308	(1,308)	-	-	-	-
88	RO Overlay	-	1,308	(1,308)	-	-	-	-
89	Plan Development Step 1	70	7,262	(7,192)	4	280	29,046	(28,766)
90	Plan Development Step 2	-	7,216	(7,216)	-	-	-	-
91	Plan Development Step 3	110	7,216	(7,106)	1	110	7,216	(7,106)
99	Determination of Eligibility (DOE)	-	1,284	(1,284)	12	-	15,412	(15,412)
100	HABS / HAER Review	-	428	(428)	10	-	4,281	(4,281)
101	HABS / HAER Document Preparation	-	8,562	(8,562)	5	-	42,811	(42,811)
<b>SUPPORT TO DSA / PW</b>								
105	Subdivision Review (<10 lots)	-	974	(974)	12	-	11,683	(11,683)
106	Subdivision Review (>10 lots)	-	1,299	(1,299)	26	-	33,769	(33,769)
107	Ag Subdivision Agreement	-	380	(380)	21	-	7,974	(7,974)
108	Condominium Property Regime Review / Zoning Determination	-	540	(540)	156	-	84,317	(84,317)
109	Bldg PC - ≤ \$500	-	144	(144)	125	-	18,043	(18,043)
110	Bldg PC - \$501 - \$2,000	-	144	(144)	120	-	17,322	(17,322)
111	Bldg PC - \$2,001 - \$25,000	-	144	(144)	583	-	84,153	(84,153)
112	BLDG PC - \$25,001 - \$50,000	-	144	(144)	301	-	43,448	(43,448)
113	BLDG PC - \$50,001 - \$100,000	-	259	(259)	267	-	69,234	(69,234)
114	BLDG PC - \$100,001 - \$500,000	-	259	(259)	443	-	114,871	(114,871)
115	BLDG PC - \$500,001 - \$1,000,000	-	432	(432)	145	-	62,665	(62,665)
116	BLDG PC - ≥ \$1,000,001	-	432	(432)	145	-	62,665	(62,665)
<b>FEE SUPPORTING AND OTHER NON-FEE RELATED ACTIVITIES</b>								

**Cost Recovery Report Table - Fee Related Services Only**

FEE NO.	Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit (\$)	Total Cost Per Unit (\$)	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit (\$)	Annual Recoverable Volume	Revenue at Current Fee - Annual (\$)	Total Cost - Annual (\$)	Surplus / (Deficit) - Annual (\$)
127	Public Information / Planner on Call	-	359,052	(359,052)	-	-	-	-
134	EAC**	-	669	(669)	-	-	-	-
135	Small Town Design Guidelines / Code Revisions	-	22,262	(22,262)	-	-	-	-
136	Small Town Public Information / Liasion	-	66,786	(66,786)	-	-	-	-
137	General Agency Request for Comments	-	669	(669)	-	-	-	-
<b>HOURLY RATES</b>								
152	Program Admin	-	153	(153)	-	-	-	-
153	Planner VI / V / IV / III	-	106	(106)	-	-	-	-
154	Clerical (Sup. Clerk/OOA II/ Clerk III)	-	57	(57)	-	-	-	-
155	Secretary to Boards / Commissions II / I	-	82	(82)	-	-	-	-
156	Land Use & Bldg Plans Examiner / Tech	-	86	(86)	-	-	-	-
157	Land Use Permit Clerk	-	57	(57)	-	-	-	-
158	ZAED Inspector III	-	104	(104)	-	-	-	-
159	ZAED Inspector II / Trainee	-	81	(81)	-	-	-	-
160	GIS Blended	-	103	(103)	-	-	-	-
<b>AFTER THE FACT PERMITS</b>								
166	AF - Special Management Area Assessment - Initial Review(SMX) Minor / Exemption	3,084	864	2,220	61	188,124	52,712	135,412
167	AF - SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - < 49,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING	55	8,353	(8,298)	1	55	8,353	(8,298)
168	AF - Accessory Use Permit	1,475	4,353	(2,878)	2	2,950	8,705	(5,755)
170	AF - MRA Approval (w/o variance)	1,000	1,036	(36)	1	1,000	1,036	(36)
NF	NON-USER FEE ACTIVITIES	-	3,019,699	(3,019,699)	-	-	-	-
<b>TOTAL</b>						391,841	2,114,690	(1,722,849)

cost recovery %

19%

## **ATTACHMENT B**

**Recommended Prices for Services – 4 Year Phase In**

Cost Recovery Report Table - Fee Related Services Only

FEE NO.	Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit (\$)	Total Cost Per Unit - 100% (\$)	Annual Recoverable Volume	YEAR 1 OF PHASE-IN				YEAR 2 OF PHASE-IN				YEAR 3 OF PHASE-IN				YEAR 4 OF PHASE-IN			
					% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)		
<b>PLANNING APPLICATIONS</b>																				
1	Change of Zone (<5 acres)	550	10,185	2	40%	4,074	50%	5,093	60%	6,111	70%	7,130	80%	8,149	90%	9,168	100%	10,185		
2	Change of Zone (5.01-10 acres)	-	11,276	-	40%	4,510	50%	5,638	60%	6,766	70%	7,893	80%	9,021	90%	10,149	100%	11,276		
3	Change of Zone (>10.01 acres, each add'l 10 acres)	-	1,972	-	40%	789	50%	986	60%	1,183	70%	1,380	80%	1,577	90%	1,774	100%	1,972		
4	Conditional Permit	1,008	6,949	7	40%	2,779	50%	3,474	60%	4,169	70%	4,864	80%	5,559	90%	6,254	100%	6,949		
5	Community Plan Amendment (<5 acres)	550	10,185	1	40%	4,074	50%	5,093	60%	6,111	70%	7,130	80%	8,149	90%	9,168	100%	10,185		
6	Community Plan Amendment (5.01-10 acres)	-	11,276	-	40%	4,510	50%	5,638	60%	6,766	70%	7,893	80%	9,021	90%	10,149	100%	11,276		
7	Community Plan Amendment (>10.01 acres, each add'l 10 acres)	-	1,972	-	40%	789	50%	986	60%	1,183	70%	1,380	80%	1,577	90%	1,774	100%	1,972		
8	State Land Use District Boundary Amendment (<15 acres)	-	10,140	-	40%	4,056	50%	5,070	60%	6,084	70%	7,098	80%	8,112	90%	9,126	100%	10,140		
9	State Land Use District Boundary Amendment (>15 acres)	-	14,640	-	40%	5,856	50%	7,320	60%	8,784	70%	10,248	80%	11,712	90%	13,176	100%	14,640		
10	Project District Zoning - Phase I (<10 acres)	-	11,674	-	40%	4,669	50%	5,837	60%	7,004	70%	8,172	80%	9,340	90%	10,508	100%	11,674		
11	Project District Zoning - Phase I (>10.01 acres, each add'l 10 acres)	-	1,570	-	40%	628	50%	785	60%	942	70%	1,099	80%	1,256	90%	1,413	100%	1,570		
12	Project District Zoning - Phase II (<2 acres)	-	7,871	-	40%	3,149	50%	3,936	60%	4,723	70%	5,510	80%	6,297	90%	7,084	100%	7,871		
13	Project District Zoning - Phase II (2.01-5 acres)	-	9,322	-	40%	3,729	50%	4,661	60%	5,593	70%	6,525	80%	7,457	90%	8,389	100%	9,322		
14	Project District Zoning - Phase II (5.01-10 acres)	-	10,776	-	40%	4,311	50%	5,388	60%	6,466	70%	7,543	80%	8,621	90%	9,698	100%	10,776		
15	Project District Zoning - Phase II (>10.01 acres, each add'l 10 acres)	-	1,422	-	40%	569	50%	711	60%	853	70%	996	80%	1,138	90%	1,280	100%	1,422		
16	Proj District Zoning - Phase III (<2 acres)	165	1,108	2	40%	443	50%	554	60%	665	70%	775	80%	886	90%	997	100%	1,108		
17	Proj District Zoning - Phase III (2.01-5 acres)	-	1,322	-	40%	529	50%	661	60%	793	70%	925	80%	1,057	90%	1,189	100%	1,322		
18	Proj District Zoning - Phase III (5.01-10 acres)	-	1,750	-	40%	700	50%	875	60%	1,050	70%	1,225	80%	1,400	90%	1,575	100%	1,750		
19	Proj District Zoning - Phase III (>10.01 acres, each add'l 10 acres)	-	164	-	40%	65	50%	82	60%	98	70%	114	80%	131	90%	147	100%	164		
20	BVA Variance (1 variance)	550	10,234	14	20%	2,047	27%	2,763	33%	3,377	40%	4,094	50%	4,810	60%	5,526	70%	6,242		
21	BVA Variance (2 or more variances)	-	13,991	-	20%	2,798	27%	3,778	33%	4,617	40%	5,596	50%	6,575	60%	7,554	70%	8,533		
22	BVA Appeal	550	9,104	4	10%	910	13%	1,211	17%	1,511	20%	1,821	30%	2,428	40%	3,035	50%	3,642		
23	County Special Use Permit	550	7,460	4	40%	2,992	50%	3,740	60%	4,488	70%	5,236	80%	5,984	90%	6,732	100%	7,460		
24	State SUP (<15 acres)	718	7,480	19	40%	2,992	50%	3,740	60%	4,488	70%	5,236	80%	5,984	90%	6,732	100%	7,480		
25	State SUP (>15 acres)	-	9,477	-	40%	3,791	50%	4,739	60%	5,686	70%	6,634	80%	7,582	90%	8,530	100%	9,477		
26	Shoreline Setback Approval	117	760	5	40%	304	50%	380	60%	456	70%	532	80%	608	90%	684	100%	760		
27	Shoreline Setback Determination	-	572	-	40%	229	50%	286	60%	343	70%	401	80%	458	90%	515	100%	572		
28	Shoreline Setback Variance - All Other	-	10,150	-	40%	4,060	50%	5,075	60%	6,090	70%	7,105	80%	8,120	90%	9,135	100%	10,150		
29	Shoreline Setback Variance - Minor Structures, or Minor Repairs*	-	9,423	-	40%	3,769	50%	4,711	60%	5,654	70%	6,596	80%	7,539	90%	8,481	100%	9,423		
30	Shoreline Setback Variance - Removals or Demolitions*	-	6,398	-	10%	640	10%	640	10%	640	10%	640	10%	640	10%	640	10%	640		
31	Shoreline - Annual Erosion Hazard Rate Amendment	-	1,001	-	40%	400	50%	500	60%	601	70%	701	80%	801	90%	901	100%	1,001		
32	Environmental Assessments	3,262	3,301	5	40%	1,320	50%	1,650	60%	1,980	70%	2,310	80%	2,640	90%	2,970	100%	3,301		
33	EIS - Prep Notice Review	-	768	-	40%	307	50%	384	60%	461	70%	537	80%	614	90%	691	100%	768		
34	EIS - Review	-	4,587	-	40%	1,835	50%	2,294	60%	2,752	70%	3,211	80%	3,669	90%	4,127	100%	4,587		
35	Special Management Area Assessment - Initial Review(SMX) Minor / Exemption	104	864	488	40%	346	50%	432	60%	518	70%	605	80%	691	90%	777	100%	864		
36	SMA - Major - Subdivision	-	8,353	-	40%	3,341	50%	4,176	60%	5,012	70%	5,847	80%	6,683	90%	7,518	100%	8,353		
37	SMA - Major - Multifamily	1,925	8,353	3	40%	3,341	50%	4,176	60%	5,012	70%	5,847	80%	6,683	90%	7,518	100%	8,353		
38	SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - < 49,999 GROSS S.F.	1,945	8,352	19	40%	3,341	50%	4,176	60%	5,011	70%	5,847	80%	6,682	90%	7,517	100%	8,352		
38A	SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - >50,000 GROSS S.F.	-	10,346	-	40%	4,138	50%	5,173	60%	6,207	70%	7,242	80%	8,277	90%	9,312	100%	10,346		
39	SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW - <100 ROOMS	-	8,353	-	40%	3,341	50%	4,176	60%	5,012	70%	5,847	80%	6,683	90%	7,518	100%	8,353		
39A	SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW - 100+ ROOMS	-	12,340	-	40%	4,936	50%	6,170	60%	7,404	70%	8,638	80%	9,872	90%	11,106	100%	12,340		
40	SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - <49,999 GROSS S.F.	-	8,353	-	40%	3,341	50%	4,176	60%	5,012	70%	5,847	80%	6,683	90%	7,518	100%	8,353		
40A	SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - 50,000-99,999 GROSS S.F.	-	10,346	-	40%	4,138	50%	5,173	60%	6,207	70%	7,242	80%	8,277	90%	9,312	100%	10,346		
40B	SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - 100,000 GROSS S.F.	4,950	10,346	1	40%	4,138	50%	5,173	60%	6,207	70%	7,242	80%	8,277	90%	9,312	100%	10,346		
40B	BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	-	12,838	-	40%	5,135	50%	6,419	60%	7,703	70%	8,987	80%	10,271	90%	11,555	100%	12,838		
41	SMA - Major - Mixed Use (>15 ACRES)	-	8,353	-	40%	3,341	50%	4,176	60%	5,012	70%	5,847	80%	6,683	90%	7,518	100%	8,353		
42	SMA - MAJOR - MIXED USE (>15.01 acres)	-	10,346	-	40%	4,138	50%	5,173	60%	6,207	70%	7,242	80%	8,277	90%	9,312	100%	10,346		
43	SMA - Major - SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING(S) ON ONE LOT	-	5,661	-	40%	2,264	50%	2,831	60%	3,397	70%	3,963	80%	4,529	90%	5,095	100%	5,661		
44	SMA - Emergency Permit	-	614	-	40%	245	50%	307	60%	368	70%	430	80%	491	90%	553	100%	614		
45	SMA - Boundary Amendment	-	962	-	40%	385	50%	481	60%	577	70%	673	80%	769	90%	865	100%	962		
46	Accessory Use Permit	297	3,069	5	40%	1,227	50%	1,534	60%	1,841	70%	2,148	80%	2,455	90%	2,762	100%	3,069		
47	Flood Development Permit	543	926	17	40%	370	50%	463	60%	555	70%	648	80%	741	90%	834	100%	926		
48	Comprehensive Sign Program Application	267	987	14	40%	395	50%	493	60%	592	70%	691	80%	789	90%	888	100%	987		
49	Sign Permit (per permit)	55	134	76	40%	54	50%	67	60%	80	70%	94	80%	107	90%	120	100%	134		

FEE NO.	Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit (\$)	Total Cost Per Unit - 100% (\$)	Annual Recoverable Volume	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)
50	Banner Permit	25	53	126	40%	21	50%	26	60%	32	70%	37
51	Sign Variance	330	7,283	2	20%	1,457	27%	1,937	33%	2,418	40%	2,913
52	Parking Approval (Administrative)	55	559	7	40%	223	50%	279	60%	335	70%	391
53	Parking Approval (Non-Administrative)	110	4,171	-	20%	834	27%	1,114	33%	1,385	40%	1,668
54	Landscape Planting Approval (Off-Street/Commercial/Industrial)	40	525	5	40%	210	50%	263	60%	315	70%	368
55	Landscape Planting Approval (Subdivision - <10 lots)	-	632	-	40%	253	50%	316	60%	379	70%	443
56	Landscape Planting Approval (Subdivision - >10 lots)	-	710	-	40%	284	50%	355	60%	426	70%	497
57	Farm Plan Review - Update	-	899	-	40%	360	50%	450	60%	540	70%	629
58	Farm Plan Review - w/o Site Inspection	55	120	115	40%	48	50%	60	60%	72	70%	84
59	Farm Plan Review - w/ Site Inspection	55	321	7	40%	128	50%	160	60%	192	70%	224
60	Agricultural Assessment	-	378	21	40%	151	50%	189	60%	227	70%	265
61	Zoning and Flood Confirmation Form (Stand-Alone)	-	33	-	20%	7	27%	9	33%	11	40%	13
62	Subordination Agreement	-	66	58	40%	26	50%	33	60%	39	70%	46
63	Design Review for Special Districts (Historic / MRA / CTB)	55	525	19	40%	210	50%	263	60%	315	70%	368
64	Historic District Application - Administrative	-	962	-	40%	385	50%	481	60%	577	70%	673
65	Historic District Application - Commission	-	2,246	-	40%	898	50%	1,123	60%	1,348	70%	1,572
66	Historic District Sign	-	427	-	40%	171	50%	213	60%	256	70%	299
67	Historic District Banner	-	213	-	40%	85	50%	106	60%	128	70%	149
68	Historic District Event - NEW	-	1,526	-	40%	610	50%	763	60%	916	70%	1,068
69	Historic District Event - Recurring Annual Events	-	213	-	40%	85	50%	106	60%	128	70%	149
70	MRA Approval (w/o variance)	229	1,036	7	40%	414	50%	518	60%	621	70%	725
72	MRA Variance (1 Variance)	-	1,771	-	40%	709	50%	886	60%	1,063	70%	1,240
73	MRA Variance (2 or more Variances)	-	2,935	-	40%	1,174	50%	1,467	60%	1,761	70%	2,054
74	B&B Permit - New - Administrative Decision	330	2,506	51	40%	1,002	50%	1,253	60%	1,504	70%	1,754
75	B&B Permit - New - Public Hearing Required (Add on to Admin Fee)	-	2,977	-	40%	1,191	50%	1,489	60%	1,786	70%	2,084
76	Any Permit Amendment - Time Extensions, Transfers, Modifications, Additions to Terms, Change of Scope, Other Amendments - Administrative	-	525	-	40%	210	50%	263	60%	315	70%	368
77	Any Permit Amendment - Time Extensions, Transfers, Modifications, Additions to Terms, Change of Scope, Other Amendments - Commission Action	-	4,707	-	40%	1,883	50%	2,354	60%	2,824	70%	3,295
78	Any Permit Amendment - Time Extensions, Transfers, Modifications, Additions to Terms, Change of Scope, Other Amendments - Council Actions	-	6,040	-	40%	2,416	50%	3,020	60%	3,624	70%	4,228
79	Special Management Area - Appeal of Director's Decision	-	6,161	-	10%	616	13%	819	17%	1,023	20%	1,232
80	Shoreline Setback Appeal	-	6,161	-	10%	616	13%	819	17%	1,023	20%	1,232
81	Adoption / Amendment / Repeal of PC Rules & Regs	-	5,470	-	40%	2,188	50%	2,735	60%	3,282	70%	3,829
82	Petition to Intervene	-	2,251	-	20%	450	27%	608	33%	743	40%	900
83	Granted Intervention	-	10,491	-	20%	2,098	27%	2,832	33%	3,462	40%	4,196
84	Preliminary Compliance Report	-	632	-	40%	253	50%	316	60%	379	70%	443
85	Final Compliance Report	-	774	-	40%	309	50%	386	60%	464	70%	541
86	Cluster Preliminary	-	773	-	40%	309	50%	386	60%	464	70%	541
87	Cluster Final	-	1,308	-	40%	523	50%	654	60%	785	70%	915
88	R0 Overlay	-	1,308	-	40%	523	50%	654	60%	785	70%	915
89	Plan Development Step 1	70	7,262	4	40%	2,905	50%	3,631	60%	4,357	70%	5,083
90	Plan Development Step 2	-	7,216	-	40%	2,886	50%	3,608	60%	4,330	70%	5,051
91	Plan Development Step 3	110	7,216	1	40%	2,886	50%	3,608	60%	4,330	70%	5,051
97	HRHP / NRHP Nomination	-	-	-	20%	-	27%	-	33%	-	40%	-
98	HPCA Tax Credit Project	-	-	-	15%	-	20%	-	25%	-	30%	-
99	Determination of Eligibility (DOE)	-	1,284	12	40%	514	50%	642	60%	771	70%	899
100	HABS / HAER Review	-	428	10	40%	171	50%	214	60%	257	70%	300
101	HABS / HAER Document Preparation	-	8,562	5	40%	3,425	50%	4,281	60%	5,137	70%	5,994
<b>SUPPORT TO DSA / PW</b>												
105	Subdivision Review (<10 lots)	-	974	12	40%	389	50%	487	60%	584	70%	682
106	Subdivision Review (>10 lots)	-	1,299	26	40%	520	50%	649	60%	779	70%	909
107	Ag Subdivision Agreement	-	380	21	40%	152	50%	190	60%	228	70%	266
108	Condominium Property Regime Review / Zoning Determination	-	540	156	40%	216	50%	270	60%	324	70%	378
109	Bldg PC - \$ \$500	-	144	125	40%	58	50%	72	60%	87	70%	101
110	Bldg PC - \$501 - \$2,000	-	144	120	40%	58	50%	72	60%	87	70%	101
111	Bldg PC - \$2,001 - \$25,000	-	144	583	40%	58	50%	72	60%	87	70%	101
112	Bldg PC - \$25,001 - \$50,000	-	144	301	40%	58	50%	72	60%	87	70%	101
113	Bldg PC - \$50,001 - \$100,000	-	259	267	40%	104	50%	130	60%	156	70%	182
114	Bldg PC - \$100,001 - \$500,000	-	259	443	40%	104	50%	130	60%	156	70%	182

FEE NO.	Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit (\$)	Total Cost Per Unit - 100% (\$)	Annual Recoverable Volume	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee	Base Fee (before any discounts) - (\$)	% of Total Cost Per Unit Charged for Base Fee
115	BLDG PC - \$500,001 - \$1,000,000	-	432	145	40%	173	50%	216	60%	259	70%	303	70%
116	BLDG PC - ≥ \$1,000,001	-	432	145	40%	173	50%	216	60%	259	70%	303	70%
<b>FEE SUPPORTING AND OTHER NON-FEE RELATED ACTIVITIES</b>													
127	Public Information / Planner on Call	-	359,052	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
134	EAC**	-	669	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
135	Small Town Design Guidelines / Code Revisions	-	22,262	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
136	Small Town Public Information / Liaison	-	66,786	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
137	General Agency Request for Comments	-	669	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
<b>HOURLY RATES</b>													
152	Program Admin	-	153	-	40%	61	50%	77	60%	92	70%	107	70%
153	Planner VI / V / IV / III	-	106	-	40%	42	50%	53	60%	64	70%	74	70%
154	Clerical (Sup. Clerk/OOA II/ Clerk III)	-	57	-	40%	23	50%	29	60%	34	70%	40	70%
155	Secretary to Boards / Commissions II / I	-	82	-	40%	33	50%	41	60%	49	70%	57	70%
156	Land Use & Bldg Plans Examiner / Tech	-	86	-	40%	34	50%	43	60%	52	70%	60	70%
157	Land Use Permit Clerk	-	57	-	40%	23	50%	29	60%	34	70%	40	70%
158	ZAED Inspector III	-	104	-	40%	42	50%	52	60%	63	70%	73	70%
159	ZAED Inspector II / Trainee	-	81	-	40%	32	50%	40	60%	49	70%	57	70%
160	GIS Blanded	-	103	-	40%	41	50%	51	60%	62	70%	72	70%
<b>AFTER THE FACT PERMITS</b>													
166	AF - Special Management Area Assessment - Initial Review(SMX) Minor / Exemption	3,084	864	61	100%	864	100%	864	100%	864	100%	864	100%
167	AF - SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial / < 49,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING	55	8,353	1	100%	8,353	100%	8,353	100%	8,353	100%	8,353	100%
168	AF - Accessory Use Permit	1,475	4,353	2	100%	4,353	100%	4,353	100%	4,353	100%	4,353	100%
170	AF - MRA Approval (w/o variance)	1,000	1,036	1	100%	1,036	100%	1,036	100%	1,036	100%	1,036	100%
171	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance)	1,000	1,036	1	100%	1,036	100%	1,036	100%	1,036	100%	1,036	100%
172	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
173	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
174	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
175	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
176	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
177	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
178	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
179	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
180	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
181	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
182	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
183	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
184	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
185	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
186	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
187	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
188	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
189	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
190	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
191	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
192	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
193	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
194	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
195	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
196	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
197	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
198	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
199	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
200	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
201	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
202	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
203	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
204	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
205	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
206	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
207	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
208	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
209	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
210	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
211	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
212	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
213	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
214	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
215	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
216	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
217	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
218	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
219	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
220	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
221	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
222	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
223	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
224	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
225	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
226	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
227	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
228	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
229	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
230	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
231	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
232	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
233	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
234	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
235	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
236	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
237	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
238	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
239	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
240	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
241	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
242	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
243	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
244	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
245	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
246	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
247	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
248	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
249	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
250	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
251	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
252	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
253	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
254	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%	-	0%
255	AF - MRA Approval (w/ variance) - Other	-	-	-	0%								