

Report on the Planning Department Cost of Services (User Fee) Study

MAUI COUNTY, HAWAII



March 2020

Table of Contents

1. Introduction and Executive Summary	1
2. Legal Framework and Policy Considerations	4
3. User Fee Study Methodology	7
4. Results Overview	9
5. Public Hearing Required	10
6. No Public Hearing Required	13
7. Bed and Breakfast and Short Term Rental Home	15
8. Other Permits and Approvals	17
9. Other Fees (Not Subject to Exceptions)	19
10. Annual Cost Recovery	20
11. Cost Recovery	22

Attachment A – Total Cost Per Unit Detail

Attachment B – Five Year Phased Schedule – Full Cost

Attachment C – Five Year Phased Schedule – All Departmental Cost

Attachment D – Five Year Phased Schedule – Departmental Overhead

Attachment E – Five Year Phased Schedule – Staff Cost Only

1. Introduction and Executive Summary

The report, which follows, presents the results of the Planning Department Cost of Services (User Fee) Study conducted by the Matrix Consulting Group for Maui County, Hawaii.

1 PROJECT BACKGROUND AND SCOPE OF WORK

In 2009 the Matrix Consulting Group conducted a Fee Study and Cost Recovery analysis for the Planning Department. This analysis looked at streamlining the Department's fee structure and determining the estimated total cost of providing Planning related services.

The following study is an update to the 2009 analysis, and looks to further streamline the Department's fee structure, and determine the current cost of services based on updated staffing, budget, and time estimate information. The results of this Study provide a tool for understanding current service levels, the cost for those services, and what fees for service can and should be charged.

2 GENERAL PROJECT APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed by the Matrix Consulting Group is a widely accepted "bottom up" approach to cost analysis, where time spent per unit of fee activity is determined for each position within a Department or Program. 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. The following table provides an overview of types of costs applied in establishing the "full" cost of services provided by the Planning Department:

Table 1: Cost Components Overview

Cost Component	Description
Direct	Fiscal Year 2019/20 Budgeted salaries, benefits and allowable expenditures.
Indirect	Division, departmental and countywide administration / management and clerical support (i.e. Finance, Human Resources, and Information Technology).

Together, the cost components in the table above comprise the calculation of the total "full" cost of providing any particular service, regardless of whether a fee for that service is currently charged.

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

- **Staff Interviews:** The project team interviewed Planning Department staff regarding their needs for clarification to the structure of existing fee items, or for the addition of new fee items.
- **Data Collection:** Data was collected for each permit / service, including time estimates. In addition, all budgeted costs and staffing levels for Fiscal Year 19/20 were entered into the Matrix Consulting Group's analytical software model.
- **Cost Analysis:** The full cost of providing each service included in the analysis was established. Cross-checks including allocation of not more than 100% of staff resources to both fee and non-fee related activities assured the validity of the data used in the Study.
- **Review and Approval of Results with Staff:** Department management has reviewed and approved these documented results.

A more detailed description of user fee methodology, as well as legal and policy considerations are provided in subsequent chapters of this report.

3 SUMMARY OF RESULTS

When comparing Fiscal Year 19/20 fee-related budgeted expenditures with a four-year average projected revenue for the services included within this study, the Planning Department is under-recovering its costs by approximately \$1 million annually. The following table outlines these results:

Table 2: Annual Cost Recovery Analysis

Fee Name	Annual Revenue at Current Fee	Total Annual Cost	Annual Surplus / (Deficit)	Cost Recovery %
Planning Services	\$195,597	\$1,159,615	(\$964,019)	17%

As shown in the table above, the Planning Department is only recovering 17% of its annual costs. It should be noted that a portion of the revenue for Planning is derived from services not reviewed in this study, whereas, the revenue shown in the above table is only reflective of applications and permits reviewed through this study, and does not include revenue from applications or permits which were not reviewed.

While the detailed documentation of the Study will show an over-collection for few fees (on a per unit basis), and an undercharge for most others, overall, the County is providing an annual subsidy to fee payers for all services included in the analysis.

The display of the cost recovery figures shown in this report are meant to provide a basis for policy development discussions among Council members and Administration staff, and do not represent a recommendation for where or how the Council should act. The setting of the “rate” or “price” for services, whether at 100 percent full cost recovery or lower, is a policy decision to be made only by the Council, with input from Administration staff and the community.

4 CONSIDERATIONS FOR COST RECOVERY POLICY AND UPDATES

The Matrix Consulting Group recommends that the County use the information contained in this report to discuss, adopt, and implement a formal Cost Recovery Policy, and a mechanism for the annual update of Planning fees for service.

1 Adopt a Formal Cost Recovery Policy

The Matrix Consulting Group strongly recommends that the County adopt a formalized, individual cost recovery policy for each service area included in this Study. Whenever a cost recovery policy is established at less than 100% of the full cost of providing services, a known gap in funding is recognized and may then potentially be recovered through other revenue sources. The Matrix Consulting Group considers a formalized cost recovery policy for various fees for service an industry Best Management Practice.

2 Adopt an Annual Fee Update / Increase Mechanism

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. The Matrix Consulting Group believes it is a best management practice to perform a complete update of a Fee Assessment every three to five years.

In between comprehensive updates, the County could utilize published industry economic factors such as Consumer Price Index (CPI) or other regional factors to update the cost calculations established in the Study on an annual basis. Alternatively, the County could continue the use of its own anticipated labor cost increases such as step increases, benefit enhancements, or cost of living raises. Documenting and utilizing an annual increase mechanism would ensure that the County is consistent in calculating annual updates, and that fee and revenue increases are appropriate and reflect growth in costs.

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:

Table 3: Services in Relation to Benefit Received

“Global” Community Benefit	“Global” Benefit and an Individual or Group Benefit	Individual or Group Benefit
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Police • Park Maintenance • Fire Suppression 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Recreation / Community Services • Fire Prevention / EMS 	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Building Permits • Planning and Zoning Approval • Site Plan Review • Facility Rentals

Funding for local government is obtained from a myriad of 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 Table 2, 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 fees, 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 almost entirely 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, California laws require that the charges for service be in direct proportion to the costs associated with providing those services. Once a charge for service is assessed at a level higher than the actual cost of providing a service, the term “user fee” no longer applies. The charge then becomes a tax subject to voter approval.

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.

2 GENERAL POLICY CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING USER FEES

Undoubtedly, there are programs, circumstances, and services that justify a subsidy from a tax base or alternative revenue source. However, it is essential that jurisdictions prioritize the use of revenue sources for the provision of services based on the continuum of benefit received.

Within the services that are typically funded by user fees, the Matrix Consulting Group recognizes several reasons why Planning staff or the County may not advocate the full cost recovery of services. The following factors are key policy considerations in setting fees at less than 100 percent of cost recovery:

- **Limitations posed by an external agency.** The State or an outside agency will occasionally set a maximum, minimum, or limit the jurisdiction’s ability to charge a fee at all. An example includes time spent copying and retrieving public documents.

- **Encouragement of desired behaviors.** Keeping fees for certain services below full cost recovery may provide better compliance from the community. For example, if the cost of a permit for charging a water heater in a residential home is higher than the cost of the water heater itself, many citizens will avoid pulling the permit.
- **Effect on demand for a particular service.** Sometimes raising the “price” charged for services might reduce the number of participants in a program. This is largely the case in Recreation programs such as camps or enrichment classes, where participants may compare a jurisdiction’s fees to surrounding jurisdictions or other options for support activities.
- **Benefit received by user of the service and the community at large is mutual.** Many services that directly benefit a group or individual equally benefit the community as a whole. Examples include Recreation programs, Planning Design Review, historical dedications and certain types of special events.

The Matrix Consulting Group recognizes the need for policies in which the general fund intentionally subsidizes certain activities. The primary goals of a User Fee Study are to provide a fair and equitable basis for determining the costs of providing services and assure that the County complies with State law.

Once the full cost of providing services is known, the next step is to determine the “rate” or “price” for services at a level which is up to, and not more than the full cost amount. The County Council is responsible for this decision, which often becomes a question of balancing service levels and funding sources. The placement of a service or activity within the continuum of benefit received may require extensive discussion and at times fall into a “grey area”. However, with the resulting cost of services information from a User Fee Study, the Council can be assured that the adopted fee for service is reasonable, fair, and legal.

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 following chart describes the components of a full cost calculation:



The general steps utilized by the project team to determine allocations of cost components to a particular fee or service are:

- Calculate fully burdened hourly rates by position, including direct and indirect costs;
- Develop time estimates for each service included in the study;
- Distribute the appropriate amount of other cost components to each fee or service based on the staff time allocation basis, or another reasonable basis.

The results of these allocations provide detailed documentation for the reasonable estimate of the actual cost of providing each 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 the County developed these estimates.

The project team worked closely with Planning staff in developing time estimates with the following criteria:

- Estimates are representative of average times for providing services. Estimates for extremely difficult or abnormally simple projects are not factored into this analysis.
- Estimates reflect the time associated with the position or positions that typically perform a service.

- Estimates provided by staff are reviewed and approved by the division / 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.
- Estimates were not based on time in motion studies, as they are not practical for the scope of services and time frame for this project.

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

The alternative to time estimating is actual time tracking, often referred to billing on a “time and materials” basis. The Matrix Consulting Group believes this approach to not be 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 request assignment of less expensive personnel to their project.
- Departments can better predict revenue streams and staff needs using standardized time estimates and anticipated permit volumes.

A time tracking approach should only be used in the case of anomalous or very large and complex projects.

4. Results Overview

The motivation behind a cost of services (User Fee) analysis is for the County Council and Departmental 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.

It should be noted that the results presented in this report are not a precise measurement. In general, a cost of service analysis takes a “snapshot in time”, where a fiscal year of adopted budgeted cost information is compared to the same fiscal year of revenue. Changes to the structure of fee names, along with the use of time estimates allow only for a reasonable projection of subsidies. Consequently, the Council and Department staff should rely conservatively upon these estimates to gauge the impact of implementation going forward.

Discussion of results in the following chapters is intended as a summary of extensive and voluminous cost allocation documentation produced during the Study. Each chapter will include detailed cost calculation results for each major permit category including the following:

- **Modifications or Issues:** discussions regarding any revisions to the current fee schedule, including elimination or addition of fees.
- **“Per Unit” Results:** comparison of the full cost of providing each unit of service to the current fee for each unit of service (where applicable).

Cost recovery and annual revenue results are discussed in Chapter 10 – Annual Cost Recovery, with a detailed breakout of the Total Cost Per Unit outlined in Attachment A at the end of this report.

5. Public Hearing Required

The Planning Department is responsible for the review and approval of a variety of fees which require a public hearing process, and be approved by a Commission or Council. Fees which require a public hearing include: Change of Zoning, Conditional Use Permit, Community Plan Amendment, State Land Use District Boundary Amendment, Shoreline Setback Variances, and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits. The following subsections provide an overview of modifications made to the Public Hearing Required fee structure and a detailed per unit analysis.

1 FEE SCHEDULE MODIFICATIONS

Applications that require a public hearing are currently assessed fees based on the project's valuation. The current tiered fee structure is outlined in the following table:

Table 4: Current Fee Structure – Public Hearing Required

Fee Name	Current Fee
\$0 to \$125,000	\$687.50
\$125,001 to \$500,000	\$687.50
Each additional \$5,000	\$13.75
Additional review required by changes, additions, revisions, time extensions or renewals	\$206.25
\$500,001 to \$1,000,000	\$1,712.50
Each additional \$5,000	\$13.25
Additional review required by changes, additions, revisions, time extensions or renewals	\$343.75
\$1,000,001 and Up	\$3,093.75
Each additional \$5,000	\$13.75
Additional review required by changes, additions, revisions, time extensions or renewals	\$687.50
Additional public hearing notice	\$687.50

The County's current practice is to review an application and determine if a public hearing is required. If so, the project's proposed valuation is used in conjunction with the above table to determine a fee for service. The lowest fee an applicant would pay would be \$687.50 for a project valued up to \$125,000, while the highest fee an applicant would pay would be \$4,950 for a project valued at over \$1 million.

When reviewing the current structure and fee calculation methodology, along with process steps and time estimates, it was determined that a more simplistic approach could be taken, whereby flat fees could be calculated based on the type of application, rather than the value of the project. Furthermore, subcategories for Shoreline Setback Variances and Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits were modified to address

the type of decision or approval being requested, rather than the location (Maui, Molokai, or Lanai) of the project.

These structural changes will allow for greater clarity on the applicant's part in understanding the fees required at application submittal, and ensure that costs associated with various application review are reflective of the services provided by Planning staff.

2 DETAILED RESULTS

The total cost calculated for each Public Hearing Required permit includes direct staff costs, Departmental overhead, Departmental support, and Countywide overhead. The following table details the title / name, current fee, total cost, and surplus or deficit associated with each application.

Table 5: Total Cost Per Unit Results – Public Hearing Required

Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit ¹	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit
Geothermal Development Permit	\$688	Not Studied	
Change of Zoning	\$688	\$8,561	(\$7,873)
Conditional Use Permit	\$688	\$5,915	(\$5,227)
Community Plan Amendment	\$688	\$8,561	(\$7,873)
State Land Use District Boundary Amendment	\$688	\$8,511	(\$7,823)
Project District Zoning	\$688	\$9,702	(\$9,014)
BVA Variance	\$688	\$8,089	(\$7,401)
BVA Appeals	\$688	\$7,328	(\$6,640)
County Special Use Permit	\$688	\$6,258	(\$5,570)
Special Permit within State Land Use Agricultural and Rural Districts	\$688	\$6,258	(\$5,570)
<u>Shoreline Setback Variance</u>			
Shoreline Setback Variance - Removals of Demolitions	\$688	\$7,245	(\$6,557)
Shoreline Setback Variance - All Others	\$688	\$8,434	(\$7,746)
Environmental Assessments (non-exempt)	\$688	\$2,831	(\$2,143)
<u>Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits (non-exempt)</u>			
Major - Subdivision	\$688	\$6,971	(\$6,283)
Major - Multifamily	\$688	\$6,971	(\$6,283)
Major - Commercial / Industrial - < 49,999 GROSS S.F. Building	\$688	\$6,971	(\$6,283)
Major - Commercial / Industrial - > 50,000 GROSS S.F. Building	\$688	\$8,602	(\$7,914)
Major - Hotel - ALL NEW- < 100 ROOMS	\$688	\$6,971	(\$6,283)
Major - Hotel - ALL NEW - 100+ ROOMS	\$688	\$10,235	(\$9,547)
Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - <49,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$6,971	(\$6,283)
Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - 50,000-99,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$8,602	(\$7,914)

¹ All of these permits are currently assessed based on project valuation, with fees ranging from \$688 to \$4,950. For purposes of this assessment, the lowest fee was assumed.

Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit ¹	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit
Major - Hotel - RENOVATION > 100,000 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$10,642	(\$9,954)
Major - Mixed Use (<15 ACRES)	\$688	\$6,971	(\$6,283)
MAJOR - MIXED USE (>15.01 acres)	\$688	\$8,602	(\$7,914)
Major - SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING(S) ON ONE LOT	\$688	\$4,771	(\$4,083)
Boundary Amendment	\$688	\$1,122	(\$434)
Non-decennial General Plan Amendment	\$688	Not Studied	

All of the Public Hearing Required application types reviewed show a subsidy based on the lowest possible fee, ranging from \$20 to \$5,765. Due to the rarity of Geothermal Development and Non-decennial General Plan Amendment applications, these services were not reviewed through this study.

6. No Public Hearing Required

The Planning Department is responsible for the review and approval of a variety of fees which do not require a public hearing or approval by a Commission or Council. Permits which fall into this category include: Business – Country Town Design Appeal, Additional Reviews, certain Shoreline Setback approvals, and Emergency Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits, and All Other permits or reviews. The following subsections provide an overview of Modifications made to the No Public Hearing Required fee structure and a detailed per unit analysis.

1 FEE SCHEDULE MODIFICATIONS

The fees assessed for Shoreline Setback approvals and Emergency Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits are calculated in the same manner as Public Hearing Required permits, based on the value of the project. The lowest fee an applicant would pay would be \$687.50 for a project valued up to \$125,000, while the highest fee an applicant would pay would be \$4,950 for a project valued at over \$1 million. Upon review of process steps and time estimates, and in order to be consistent with Public Hearing Required permits, it was determined that a more simplistic approach could be taken, whereby flat fees could be calculated based on the type of application.

2 DETAILED RESULTS

The total cost calculated for each No Public Hearing Required permit includes direct staff costs, Departmental overhead, Departmental support, and Countywide overhead. The following table details the title / name, current fee, total cost, and surplus or deficit associated with each application.

Table 6: Current Fee Structure – No Public Hearing Required

Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit ²	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit
Shoreline Setback Variance			
Shoreline Setback Approval	\$688	\$899	(\$211)
Shoreline Setback Determination	\$688	\$692	(\$4)
Shoreline - Annual Erosion Hazard Rate Amendment	\$688	\$1,167	(\$479)
Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits (non-exempt)			
Emergency Permit	\$688	\$939	(\$251)
All other permits or reviews for which no public hearing is required, unless otherwise specified herein	\$206	Not Studied	

² All of these permits are currently assessed based on project valuation, with fees ranging from \$688 to \$4,950. For purposes of this assessment, the lowest fee was assumed.

Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit ²	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit
Business - Country Town Design Appeal	\$206	Not Studied	
Additional review required by changes, additions, revisions, time extensions or renewals	\$206	Not Studied	

The table above details the calculated subsidy associated with Shoreline Setback Approvals, Determination, and Annual Erosion Hazard Rate Amendment, as well as Emergency Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits based on the lowest possible range. The subsidies range from a low of \$4 to a high of \$479.

During discussions with Planning staff, it was determined that there was not a current need to review the fees or processes associated with All Other Permits, Business – Country Town Design Appeal, or Additional Review Required permits, and as such, these fees were not studied, nor was a full cost calculated.

7. Bed and Breakfast and Short Term Rental Home

The Planning Department is responsible for the review and approval of Bed and Breakfast permits as well as Short Term Rental Home permits, including ensuring appropriate zoning designations. Both permit types have current fees which are assessed depending on if an application is new or a renewal, as well as if the permit can be approved administratively or through a public hearing process. The following subsections provide an overview of modifications made to the Bed and Breakfast and Short Term Rental Home permit fee structure and a detailed per unit analysis.

1 FEE SCHEDULE MODIFICATIONS

The current structure for Bed and Breakfast and Short Term Rental Home permits has fees for administrative and public hearing review, an application fee for renewals, and fees based on the length of application approval. The following table details the current structure and fees for Bed and Breakfast permits.

Table 7: Current Fee Structure – Bed and Breakfast and Short Term Rental Home Permits

Fee Name	Current Fee
BED AND BREAKFAST	
New Permit	
Administrative	\$500
If Public Hearing Required	\$687
If B&B Permit approval for:	
1 year	\$0
2 years	\$250
3 years	\$500
Renewal	
Application Fee	\$375
If B&B Extension approval for:	
1 year	\$0
2 years	\$250
3 years	\$500
4 years	\$750
5 years	\$1,000
SHORT TERM RENTAL HOME	
New Permit	
Application Fee	\$812.50
If Public Hearing Required	\$687.50
If Permit approval for:	
1 year	\$0
2 years	\$250
3 years	\$500

Fee Name	Current Fee
Renewal	
Application Fee	\$375
If Extension approval for:	
1 year	\$0
2 years	\$250
3 years	\$500
4 years	\$750
5 years	\$1,000

In discussions with Planning staff, it was determined that the above structures should be modified to remove the approval for years greater than one, as each application (Bed and Breakfast or Short Term Rental Home) should be looked at annually. This change streamlines the fee structure and more accurately reflects how application review should be conducted, and the associated services.

2 DETAILED RESULTS

The total cost calculated for Bed and Breakfast and Short Term Rental Home permits includes direct staff costs, Departmental overhead, Departmental support, and Countywide overhead. The following table details the title / name, current fee, total cost, and surplus or deficit associated with each application.

Table 8: Total Cost Per Unit Results – Bed and Breakfast and Short Term Rental Home Permits

Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit
BED AND BREAKFAST			
New Permit			
Administrative	\$500	\$2,857	(\$2,357)
If Public Hearing Required	\$688	\$6,258	(\$5,570)
Renewal			
Application Fee	\$375	\$2,334	(\$1,959)
SHORT TERM RENTAL HOME			
New Permit			
Administrative	\$813	\$2,857	(\$2,044)
If Public Hearing Required	\$688	\$6,258	(\$5,571)
Renewal			
Application Fee	\$375	\$2,334	(\$1,959)

Bed and Breakfast permits show a subsidy of \$2,357 for Administrative permits, and \$5,570 for Public Hearing Required permits, while Short Term Rental Home permits show a subsidy of \$2,044 for Administrative review, and \$5,571 for Public Hearing Required reviews. The renewal process is proposed to only have an application fee, with both Bed and Breakfast and Short Term Rental Home permits showing a subsidy of \$1,959.

8. Other Permits and Approvals

The Planning Department is responsible for the review and approval of various permits relating to Signs, Parking Reductions, Historic District designations, Use Determinations, Landscape Planning, and Parking Analysis. The following subsections provide an overview of modifications made to the Other Permits and Approvals fee structure and a detailed per unit analysis.

1 FEE SCHEDULE MODIFICATIONS

During review of the fees that are categorized under Other Permits and Approvals, there were only two modifications that staff noted:

- **Addition of a Parking Analysis application:** This review is currently being provided, but no fee is being charged. The addition of this permit to the fee schedule will help the County recover costs associated with this service.
- **Removal of Existing Permit Review, Time Extension, etc.:** The services associated with time extensions or additional reviews are already accounted for within permit fees. Therefore, this fee is no longer needed in the fee structure.

While only two modifications were made to this section of the Planning fee schedule, the end result is a more accurate reflection of the services provided.

2 DETAILED RESULTS

The total cost calculated for Other Permits and Approvals includes direct staff costs, Departmental overhead, Departmental support, and Countywide overhead. The following table details the title / name, current fee, total cost, and surplus or deficit associated with each application.

Table 9: Total Cost Per Unit Results – Other Permits and Approvals

Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit
Building Permit Review Fees			
Initial Review	\$0	Not Studied	
Review of First Resubmittal	\$313	Not Studied	
Review of Second Resubmittal	\$625	Not Studied	
Review of Additional Resubmittal	\$1,250	Not Studied	
Sign Variances	\$688	\$6,037	(\$5,349)
Other Sign Permits	\$69	\$171	(\$102)

Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit
Other Promotional Signs	\$31	Not Studied	
Parking Reduction	\$138	\$956	(\$819)
Parking Reduction (Molokai PC)	\$69	\$1,410	(\$1,342)
Historic District Commission Applications	\$138	\$2,549	(\$2,412)
Historic District Administrative Applications	\$69	\$1,122	(\$1,054)
Historic District Signs	\$69	\$528	(\$459)
Historic District Banners	\$31	\$290	(\$259)
Planned Development	\$138	\$6,079	(\$5,942)
Maui Redevelopment Agency Approval	\$138	\$1,191	(\$1,054)
Use determination (Non-Administrative)	\$0	\$6,258	(\$6,258)
Use determination (Administrative)	\$0	\$446	(\$446)
Flood Development Permit	\$0	\$865	(\$865)
Landscape Planting Approval for Parking	\$0	\$505	(\$505)
Parking Analysis	\$0	\$821	(\$821)

All of the Other Permits and Approvals application types reviewed show a subsidy ranging from \$102 to \$6,258.

Building Permit Review fees were not part of this study, and therefore no analysis was conducted to determine cost of service. Due to the rarity of Other Promotional Sign applications, these services were also not reviewed through this study.

9. Other Fees (Not Subject to Exceptions)

The Planning Department is responsible for the review and approval of applications and permits which are not subject to exceptions. Services that fall into this category include: Special Management Area Appeal of Director's Decision, Shoreline Setback Appeal, Adoption, Amendment or Repeal of Planning Commission Rules and Regulations; and Petition to Intervene. The following subsections provide an overview of modifications made to the Other Fees fee structure and a detailed per unit analysis.

1 FEE SCHEDULE MODIFICATIONS

During discussions with Planning staff, it was determined that no modifications were needed to this section of the fee schedule.

2 DETAILED RESULTS

The total cost calculated for Other Fees includes direct staff costs, Departmental overhead, Departmental support, and Countywide overhead. The following table details the title / name, current fee, total cost, and surplus or deficit associated with each application.

Table 10: Total Cost Per Unit Results – Other Fees

Fee Name	Current Fee / Deposit	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit
Special Management Area Appeal of Director's Decision	\$688	\$5,160	(\$4,473)
Shoreline Setback Appeal	\$313	\$5,160	(\$4,848)
Adoption, Amendment or Repeal of Planning Commission Rules and Regulations	\$313	\$6,208	(\$5,895)
Petition to Intervene	\$313	\$1,971	(\$1,659)

All services in this section of the fee schedule show a subsidy. Petition to Intervene has the lowest subsidy at \$1,659, while the largest subsidy relates to Adoption, Amendment or Repeal of Planning Commission Rules and Regulations at \$5,895.

10. Annual Cost Recovery

The previous chapters in this report have outlined the various Planning services provided by the County, the current fees being charged for those services, the full cost of providing those services, and the associated differences in cost. In order to calculate projected revenue impacts, the Planning Department provided permit workload information for Fiscal Years 2016, 2017, 2018, and 2019. Application and permit workload can vary from year to year, therefore an average of the four years was used to calculate projected annual revenue impacts.

Based on the four-year workload average and current fees, the Planning Department is showing a deficit of approximately \$1 million for services outlined in this report. The following table shows by fee name, the number of permits, the revenue at current fee, the total annual cost, and the resulting surplus / (deficit):

Table 11: Annual Revenue Impacts

Fee Name	Annual Recoverable Volume	Revenue at Current Fee - Annual	Total Cost - Annual	Surplus / (Deficit) - Annual
TABLE A - PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED				
Change of Zoning	8	\$5,504	\$68,490	(\$62,986)
Conditional Use Permit	5	\$3,440	\$29,576	(\$26,136)
Community Plan Amendment	4	\$2,752	\$34,245	(\$31,493)
State Land Use District Boundary Amendment	4	\$2,752	\$34,045	(\$31,293)
Project District Zoning	9	\$6,192	\$87,319	(\$81,127)
County Special Use Permit	6	\$4,128	\$37,545	(\$33,417)
Special Permit within State Land Use Agricultural and Rural Districts	19	\$13,072	\$118,893	(\$105,821)
Shoreline Setback Variance				
Shoreline Setback Variance - Removals of Demolitions	1	\$688	\$7,245	(\$6,557)
Environmental Assessments (non-exempt)	1	\$688	\$2,831	(\$2,143)
Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits (non-exempt)				
SMA - Major - Subdivision	10	\$6,880	\$69,714	(\$62,834)
TABLE B - NO PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED				
Shoreline Setback Variance				
Shoreline Setback Approval	65	\$44,720	\$58,421	(\$13,701)
Shoreline Setback Determination	2	\$1,376	\$1,383	(\$7)
Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits (non-exempt)				
SMA - Emergency Permit	9	\$6,192	\$8,454	(\$2,262)
BED AND BREAKFAST PERMITS				
1. New Permit				
Administrative	25	\$12,500	\$71,425	(\$58,925)
2. Renewal				
Application Fee	27	\$10,125	\$63,029	(\$52,904)

Fee Name	Annual Recoverable Volume	Revenue at Current Fee - Annual	Total Cost - Annual	Surplus / (Deficit) - Annual
SHORT TERM RENTAL HOME PERMIT				
1. New Permit				
Application Fee	58	\$47,125	\$165,691	(\$118,566)
2. Renewal				
Application Fee	45	\$16,875	\$105,048	(\$88,173)
OTHER PERMITS AND APPROVALS				
Other Sign Permits	73	\$5,019	\$12,456	(\$7,438)
Historic District Administrative Applications	33	\$2,269	\$37,040	(\$34,772)
Historic District Signs	20	\$1,375	\$10,557	(\$9,182)
Planned Development	6	\$825	\$36,475	(\$35,650)
Maui Redevelopment Agency Approval	3	\$413	\$3,574	(\$3,162)
Use determination (Administrative)	1	\$0	\$446	(\$446)
Flood Development Permit	98	\$0	\$84,807	(\$84,807)
Parking Analysis	7	\$0	\$5,748	(\$5,748)
OTHER FEES (NOT SUBJECT TO EXCEPTIONS)				
1. Special Management Area Appeal of Director's Decision	1	\$688	\$5,160	(\$4,473)
TOTAL		\$195,597	\$1,159,615	(\$964,019)

Overall, the Planning Department is recovering approximately 17% of the fee-related services assessed through this study. The two largest areas of subsidy relate to Short Term Rental Home Permit Applications and Special Permits within State Land Use Agricultural and Rural Districts.

It should be noted that the revenue projection in the table above does not account for all of the revenue the Planning Department receives, as there are other services provided which were not assessed through this study for which the Department assesses fees.

11. Cost Recovery

The following sections provide guidance regarding how and where to increase fees, determining annual update factors, and developing cost recovery policies and procedures.

1 FEE ADJUSTMENTS

This study has documented and outlined on a fee-by-fee basis where the County is under and over collecting for its fee-related services. Department and County management will now need to review the results of the study and adjust fees in accordance with Departmental and County philosophies and policies. The following dot points outline the major options the County has in adjusting its fees.

- **Overages:** Upon review of the fees in which the cost of service has decreased, the County should reduce the current fee to be in line with the full cost of providing the service.
- **Full Cost Recovery:** For fees that show an under-collection for costs of services provided, the County may decide to increase the fee to full cost recovery immediately.
- **Phased Increase:** For fees with significantly low-cost recovery levels, or which would have a significant impact on the community, the County could choose to increase fees gradually over a set period of time.

The County will need to review the results of the fee study and associated cost recovery levels and determine how best to adjust fees. While decisions regarding fees that currently show an over-recovery due to service cost decreases are fairly straight forward, the following subsections, provide further detail on why and how the County should consider either implementing Full Cost Recovery or a Phased Increase approach to adjusting its fees.

1 Full Cost Recovery

Based on the permit or review type, the County may wish to increase the fee to cover the full cost of providing services. Certain permits may be close to cost recovery already, and an increase to full cost may not be significant. Other permits may have a more significant increase associated with full cost recovery.

Increasing fees associated with permits and services that are already close to full cost recovery can potentially bring a Department's overall cost recovery level higher. Often,

these minimal increases can provide necessary revenue to counterbalance fees which are unable to be increased.

The County should consider increasing fees for permits for which services are rarely engaged to full cost recovery. These services often require specific expertise and can involve more complex research and review due to their infrequent nature. As such, setting these fees at full cost recovery will ensure that when the permit or review is requested, the County is recovering the full cost of its services.

2 Phased Increases

Depending on current cost recovery levels some current fees may need to be increased significantly in order to comply with established or proposed cost recovery policies. Due to the type of permit or review, or the amount by which a fee needs to be increased, it may be best for the County to use a phased approach to reach its cost recovery goals.

As an example, you may have a current fee of \$200 with a full cost of \$1,000, representing 20% cost recovery. If the current policy is 80% cost recovery, the current fee would need to increase by \$600, bringing the fee to \$800, in order to be in compliance. Assuming this particular service is something the County provides quite often, and affects various members of the community, an instant increase of \$600 may not be feasible. Therefore, the County could take a phased approach, whereby it increases the fee annually over a set period until cost recovery is achieved.

Raising fees over a set period of time not only allows the County to monitor and control the impact to applicants, but also ensure that applicants have time to adjust to significant increases. Continuing with the example laid out above, the County could increase the fee by \$150 for the next four years, spreading out the increase. Depending on the desired overall increase, and the impact to applicants, the County could choose to vary the number of years by which it chooses to increase fees. ***However, the project team recommends that the County not phase increases for periods greater than five years, as that is the maximum window for which a comprehensive fee assessment should be completed.***

2 ANNUAL ADJUSTMENTS

Conducting a comprehensive analysis of fee-related services and costs annually would be quite cumbersome and costly. The general rule of thumb for comprehensive fee analyses is between three and five years. This allows for jurisdictions to ensure they account for organizational changes such as staffing levels and merit increases, as well as process efficiencies, code or rule changes, or technology improvements.

Developing annual update mechanisms allow jurisdictions to maintain current levels of cost recovery, while accounting for increases in staffing or expenditures related to permit services. The two most common types of update mechanisms are Consumer Price Index (CPI) and Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) factors. The following points provide further detail on each of these mechanisms.

- **COLA / Personnel Cost Factor:** Jurisdictions often provide their staff with annual salary adjustments to account for increases in local cost of living. These increases are not tied to merit or seniority, but rather meant to offset rising costs associated with housing, gas, and other livability factors. Sometimes these factors vary depending on the bargaining group of a specific employee. Generally, these factors are around two or three percent annually.
- **CPI Factor:** A common method of increasing fees or cost is to look at regional cost indicators, such as the Consumer Price Index. These factors are calculated by the Bureau of Labor Statistics, put out at various intervals within a year, and are specific to states and regions.

The County should review its current options internally (COLA) as well as externally (CPI) to determine which option better reflects the goals of the Department and the County. If choosing a CPI factor, the County should outline which particular CPI should be used, including specific region, and adoption date. If choosing an internal factor, again, the County should be sure to specify which factor if multiple exist.

3 POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

This study has identified the permit areas where the County is under-collecting the cost associated with providing services. This known funding gap is therefore being subsidized by other County revenue sources. Based on the information provided in this report, at a global or per unit level, the County may not have any issues with using non-fee related revenue to account for the current deficit.

Development of cost recovery policies and procedures will serve to ensure that current and future decision makers understand how and why fees were determined and set, as well as provide a road map for ensuring consistency when moving forward. The following subsections outline typical cost recovery levels and discuss the benefits associated with developing target cost recovery goals and procedures for achieving and increasing cost recovery.

1 Typical Cost Recovery

The Matrix Consulting Group has extensive experience in analyzing local government operations across the United States and has calculated typical cost recovery levels.

Based on the Matrix Consulting Group's experience in analyzing local government's operations across the United States and in California, the *typical* cost recovery level observed by local adopting authorities for Planning services is between 50% - 70%.

The analysis within this report shows that the County is well below the average as compared to national averages.

2 Development of Cost Recovery Policies and Procedures

The County should review the current cost recovery levels and adopt a formal policy regarding cost recovery. This policy can be general in nature and can apply broadly to the County as a whole, or to individual departments. A department-specific cost recovery policy would allow the County to better control the cost recovery associated with the different types of services being provided and the benefit being received by the community.

Attachment A – Total Cost Per Unit Detail

The previous chapters of this report provided a comparison of the current fee being charged by the County to the calculated Total Cost Per Unit. The full cost of providing services includes the following cost components:

- **Direct Staff:** These costs account for salary and benefits associated with staff who work directly on an application or permit.
- **Departmental Overhead:** These costs account for the services and supplies associated with the Planning Department, including office supplies, telephone, training, and office rent.
- **Admin Support:** These costs are reflective of management and support staff who do not directly work on permits, but who manage or support the staff who do, including Secretaries, Assistants, and the Deputy Director.
- **County Overhead:** This cost component accounts for support provided by County staff, such as Finance, Human Resources, and County Management.

The following table provides a breakout of the Total Cost Per Unit by each of the above cost components.

Fee Name	Current Fee	Direct Staff	Departmental Overhead	Admin Support	County Overhead	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit
TABLE A - PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED							
Geothermal Development Permit	\$688	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Not Studied	
Change of Zoning	\$688	\$4,646	\$681	\$1,862	\$1,372	\$8,561	(\$7,873)
Conditional Use Permit	\$688	\$3,198	\$473	\$1,291	\$953	\$5,915	(\$5,227)
Community Plan Amendment	\$688	\$4,646	\$681	\$1,862	\$1,372	\$8,561	(\$7,873)
State Land Use District Boundary Amendment	\$688	\$4,624	\$676	\$1,851	\$1,361	\$8,511	(\$7,823)
Project District Zoning	\$688	\$5,275	\$770	\$2,107	\$1,550	\$9,702	(\$9,014)
BVA Variance	\$688	\$4,306	\$739	\$1,555	\$1,489	\$8,089	(\$7,401)
BVA Appeals	\$688	\$3,725	\$704	\$1,481	\$1,418	\$7,328	(\$6,640)
County Special Use Permit	\$688	\$3,406	\$496	\$1,356	\$1,000	\$6,258	(\$5,570)
Special Permit within State Land Use Agricultural and Rural Districts	\$688	\$3,406	\$496	\$1,356	\$1,000	\$6,258	(\$5,570)
Shoreline Setback Variance							
Shoreline Setback Variance - Removals of Demolitions	\$688	\$3,925	\$578	\$1,578	\$1,164	\$7,245	(\$6,557)

Attachment A – Total Cost Per Unit Detail

Fee Name	Current Fee	Direct Staff	Departmental Overhead	Admin Support	County Overhead	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit
Shoreline Setback Variance - All Others	\$688	\$4,575	\$671	\$1,835	\$1,352	\$8,434	(\$7,746)
Environmental Assessments (non-exempt)	\$688	\$1,514	\$229	\$625	\$462	\$2,831	(\$2,143)
Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits (non-exempt)							
SMA - Major - Subdivision	\$688	\$3,796	\$553	\$1,509	\$1,113	\$6,971	(\$6,283)
SMA - Major - Multifamily	\$688	\$3,796	\$553	\$1,509	\$1,113	\$6,971	(\$6,283)
SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - < 49,999 GROSS S.F. Building	\$688	\$3,796	\$553	\$1,509	\$1,113	\$6,971	(\$6,283)
SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - > 50,000 GROSS S.F. Building	\$688	\$4,693	\$680	\$1,859	\$1,370	\$8,602	(\$7,914)
SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW- < 100 ROOMS	\$688	\$3,796	\$553	\$1,509	\$1,113	\$6,971	(\$6,283)
SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW - 100+ ROOMS	\$688	\$5,592	\$808	\$2,208	\$1,627	\$10,235	(\$9,547)
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - <49,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$3,796	\$553	\$1,509	\$1,113	\$6,971	(\$6,283)
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - 50,000-99,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$4,693	\$680	\$1,859	\$1,370	\$8,602	(\$7,914)
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION > 100,000 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$5,816	\$840	\$2,295	\$1,691	\$10,642	(\$9,954)
SMA - Major - Mixed Use (<15 ACRES)	\$688	\$3,796	\$553	\$1,509	\$1,113	\$6,971	(\$6,283)
SMA - MAJOR - MIXED USE (>15.01 acres)	\$688	\$4,693	\$680	\$1,859	\$1,370	\$8,602	(\$7,914)
SMA - Major - SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING(S) ON ONE LOT	\$688	\$2,593	\$379	\$1,035	\$764	\$4,771	(\$4,083)
SMA - Boundary Amendment	\$688	\$596	\$92	\$249	\$185	\$1,122	(\$434)
Non-decennial General Plan Amendment	\$688	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Not Studied	
TABLE B - NO PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED							
Shoreline Setback Variance							
Shoreline Setback Approval	\$688	\$476	\$74	\$199	\$149	\$899	(\$211)
Shoreline Setback Determination	\$688	\$368	\$57	\$152	\$115	\$692	(\$4)
Shoreline - Annual Erosion Hazard Rate Amendment	\$688	\$628	\$94	\$255	\$190	\$1,167	(\$479)
Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits (non-exempt)							
SMA - Emergency Permit	\$688	\$508	\$75	\$205	\$151	\$939	(\$251)
All other permits or reviews for which no public hearing is required, unless otherwise specified herein	\$206	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Not Studied	
Business - Country Town Design Appeal	\$206	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Not Studied	
Additional review required by changes, additions, revisions, time extensions or renewals	\$206	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Not Studied	

Attachment A – Total Cost Per Unit Detail

Fee Name	Current Fee	Direct Staff	Departmental Overhead	Admin Support	County Overhead	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit
BED AND BREAKFAST PERMITS							
1. New Permit							
Administrative	\$500	\$1,542	\$229	\$624	\$462	\$2,857	(\$2,357)
If Public Hearing Required	\$688	\$3,406	\$496	\$1,356	\$1,000	\$6,258	(\$5,570)
2. Renewal							
Application Fee	\$375	\$1,257	\$187	\$513	\$377	\$2,334	(\$1,959)
SHORT TERM RENTAL HOME PERMIT							
1. New Permit							
Application Fee	\$813	\$1,541	\$229	\$624	\$462	\$2,857	(\$2,044)
If Public Hearing Required	\$688	\$3,406	\$496	\$1,356	\$1,000	\$6,258	(\$5,571)
2. Renewal							
Application Fee	\$375	\$1,257	\$187	\$513	\$377	\$2,334	(\$1,959)
OTHER PERMITS AND APPROVALS							
Building Permit Review Fees							
Initial Review	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Not Studied	
Review of First Resubmittal	\$313	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Not Studied	
Review of Second Resubmittal	\$625	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Not Studied	
Review of Additional Resubmittal	\$1,250	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Not Studied	
Sign Variances	\$688	\$3,265	\$540	\$1,144	\$1,088	\$6,037	(\$5,349)
Other Sign Permits	\$69	\$79	\$18	\$38	\$36	\$171	(\$102)
Other Promotional Signs	\$31	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	Not Studied	
Parking Reduction	\$138	\$561	\$77	\$163	\$156	\$956	(\$819)
Parking Reduction (Molokai PC)	\$69	\$811	\$115	\$253	\$231	\$1,410	(\$1,342)
Historic District Commission Applications	\$138	\$1,377	\$204	\$556	\$412	\$2,549	(\$2,412)
Historic District Administrative Applications	\$69	\$596	\$92	\$249	\$185	\$1,122	(\$1,054)
Historic District Signs	\$69	\$271	\$45	\$120	\$91	\$528	(\$459)
Historic District Banners	\$31	\$141	\$27	\$69	\$53	\$290	(\$259)
Planned Development	\$138	\$3,308	\$482	\$1,317	\$971	\$6,079	(\$5,942)
Maui Redevelopment Agency Approval	\$138	\$639	\$96	\$263	\$193	\$1,191	(\$1,054)
Use determination (Non-Administrative)	\$0	\$3,406	\$496	\$1,356	\$1,000	\$6,258	(\$6,258)
Use determination (Administrative)	\$0	\$254	\$37	\$79	\$75	\$446	(\$446)
Flood Development Permit	\$0	\$470	\$77	\$163	\$156	\$865	(\$865)
Landscape Planting Approval for Parking	\$0	\$253	\$49	\$103	\$99	\$505	(\$505)
Parking Analysis	\$0	\$438	\$75	\$158	\$151	\$821	(\$821)

Attachment A – Total Cost Per Unit Detail

Fee Name	Current Fee	Direct Staff	Departmental Overhead	Admin Support	County Overhead	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit
OTHER FEES (NOT SUBJECT TO EXCEPTIONS)							
1. Special Management Area Appeal of Director's Decision	\$688	\$2,790	\$412	\$1,128	\$830	\$5,160	(\$4,473)
2. Shoreline Setback Appeal	\$313	\$2,790	\$412	\$1,128	\$830	\$5,160	(\$4,848)
3. Adoption, Amendment or Repeal of Planning Commission Rules and Regulations	\$313	\$3,384	\$491	\$1,344	\$989	\$6,208	(\$5,895)
4. Petition to Intervene	\$313	\$1,069	\$157	\$430	\$316	\$1,971	(\$1,659)

Attachment B – Five Year Phased Schedule – Full Cost

The County is looking to increase their fees over the course of the next five years, with a plan of achieving 70% cost recovery. The following table outlines the proposed fee schedule, assuming the County is looking to recover the Full Cost (direct staff, departmental overhead, admin support, and county overhead) of providing services, as outlined in the previous report.

Fee Name	Cost Per Unit Results			Recommended Fees				
	Current Fee	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
TABLE A - PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED								
Geothermal Development Permit	\$688	Not Studied		\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Change of Zoning	\$688	\$8,561	(\$7,873)	\$2,568	\$3,424	\$4,281	\$5,137	\$5,993
Conditional Use Permit	\$688	\$5,915	(\$5,227)	\$1,775	\$2,366	\$2,958	\$3,549	\$4,141
Community Plan Amendment	\$688	\$8,561	(\$7,873)	\$2,568	\$3,424	\$4,281	\$5,137	\$5,993
State Land Use District Boundary Amendment	\$688	\$8,511	(\$7,823)	\$2,553	\$3,405	\$4,256	\$5,107	\$5,958
Project District Zoning	\$688	\$9,702	(\$9,014)	\$2,911	\$3,881	\$4,851	\$5,821	\$6,791
BVA Variance	\$688	\$8,089	(\$7,401)	\$2,427	\$3,236	\$4,045	\$4,854	\$5,662
BVA Appeals	\$688	\$7,328	(\$6,640)	\$2,198	\$2,931	\$3,664	\$4,397	\$5,130
County Special Use Permit	\$688	\$6,258	(\$5,570)	\$1,877	\$2,503	\$3,129	\$3,755	\$4,380
Special Permit within State Land Use Agricultural and Rural Districts	\$688	\$6,258	(\$5,570)	\$1,877	\$2,503	\$3,129	\$3,755	\$4,380
Shoreline Setback Variance								
Shoreline Setback Variance - Removals of Demolitions	\$688	\$7,245	(\$6,557)	\$2,173	\$2,898	\$3,622	\$4,347	\$5,071
Shoreline Setback Variance - All Others	\$688	\$8,434	(\$7,746)	\$2,530	\$3,374	\$4,217	\$5,060	\$5,904
Environmental Assessments (non-exempt)	\$688	\$2,831	(\$2,143)	\$849	\$1,132	\$1,415	\$1,698	\$1,982
Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits (non-exempt)								
SMA - Major - Subdivision	\$688	\$6,971	(\$6,283)	\$2,091	\$2,789	\$3,486	\$4,183	\$4,880
SMA - Major - Multifamily	\$688	\$6,971	(\$6,283)	\$2,091	\$2,789	\$3,486	\$4,183	\$4,880
SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - < 49,999 GROSS S.F. Building	\$688	\$6,971	(\$6,283)	\$2,091	\$2,789	\$3,486	\$4,183	\$4,880
SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - > 50,000 GROSS S.F. Building	\$688	\$8,602	(\$7,914)	\$2,581	\$3,441	\$4,301	\$5,161	\$6,022
SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW- < 100 ROOMS	\$688	\$6,971	(\$6,283)	\$2,091	\$2,789	\$3,486	\$4,183	\$4,880
SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW - 100+ ROOMS	\$688	\$10,235	(\$9,547)	\$3,070	\$4,094	\$5,117	\$6,141	\$7,164
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - <49,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$6,971	(\$6,283)	\$2,091	\$2,789	\$3,486	\$4,183	\$4,880

Attachment B – Five Year Phased Schedule – Full Cost

Fee Name	Cost Per Unit Results			Recommended Fees				
	Current Fee	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - 50,000-99,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$8,602	(\$7,914)	\$2,581	\$3,441	\$4,301	\$5,161	\$6,022
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION > 100,000 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$10,642	(\$9,954)	\$3,193	\$4,257	\$5,321	\$6,385	\$7,450
SMA - Major - Mixed Use (<15 ACRES)	\$688	\$6,971	(\$6,283)	\$2,091	\$2,789	\$3,486	\$4,183	\$4,880
SMA - MAJOR - MIXED USE (>15.01 acres)	\$688	\$8,602	(\$7,914)	\$2,581	\$3,441	\$4,301	\$5,161	\$6,022
SMA - Major - SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING(S) ON ONE LOT	\$688	\$4,771	(\$4,083)	\$1,431	\$1,909	\$2,386	\$2,863	\$3,340
SMA - Boundary Amendment	\$688	\$1,122	(\$434)	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$786
Non-decennial General Plan Amendment	\$688	Not Studied		\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
TABLE B - NO PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED								
Shoreline Setback Variance								
Shoreline Setback Approval	\$688	\$899	(\$211)	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Shoreline Setback Determination	\$688	\$692	(\$4)	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Shoreline - Annual Erosion Hazard Rate Amendment	\$688	\$1,167	(\$479)	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$700	\$817
Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits (non-exempt)								
SMA - Emergency Permit	\$688	\$939	(\$251)	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
All other permits or reviews for which no public hearing is required, unless otherwise specified herein	\$206	Not Studied		\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
Business - Country Town Design Appeal	\$206	Not Studied		\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
Additional review required by changes, additions, revisions, time extensions or renewals	\$206	Not Studied		\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
BED AND BREAKFAST PERMITS								
1. New Permit								
Administrative	\$500	\$2,857	(\$2,357)	\$857	\$1,143	\$1,429	\$1,714	\$2,000
If Public Hearing Required	\$688	\$6,258	(\$5,570)	\$1,877	\$2,503	\$3,129	\$3,755	\$4,380
2. Renewal								
Application Fee	\$375	\$2,334	(\$1,959)	\$700	\$934	\$1,167	\$1,401	\$1,634
SHORT TERM RENTAL HOME PERMIT								
1. New Permit								
Application Fee	\$813	\$2,857	(\$2,044)	\$857	\$1,143	\$1,428	\$1,714	\$2,000
If Public Hearing Required	\$688	\$6,258	(\$5,571)	\$1,877	\$2,503	\$3,129	\$3,755	\$4,381

Attachment B – Five Year Phased Schedule – Full Cost

Fee Name	Cost Per Unit Results			Recommended Fees				
	Current Fee	Total Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
2. Renewal								
Application Fee	\$375	\$2,334	(\$1,959)	\$700	\$934	\$1,167	\$1,401	\$1,634
OTHER PERMITS AND APPROVALS								
Building Permit Review Fees								
Initial Review	\$0	Not Studied		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Review of First Resubmittal	\$313	Not Studied		\$313	\$313	\$313	\$313	\$313
Review of Second Resubmittal	\$625	Not Studied		\$625	\$625	\$625	\$625	\$625
Review of Additional Resubmittal	\$1,250	Not Studied		\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250
Sign Variances	\$688	\$6,037	(\$5,349)	\$1,811	\$2,415	\$3,018	\$3,622	\$4,226
Other Sign Permits	\$69	\$171	(\$102)	\$69	\$69	\$85	\$102	\$119
Other Promotional Signs	\$31	Not Studied		\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31
Parking Reduction	\$138	\$956	(\$819)	\$287	\$382	\$478	\$574	\$669
Parking Reduction (Molokai PC)	\$69	\$1,410	(\$1,342)	\$423	\$564	\$705	\$846	\$987
Historic District Commission Applications	\$138	\$2,549	(\$2,412)	\$765	\$1,020	\$1,275	\$1,530	\$1,785
Historic District Administrative Applications	\$69	\$1,122	(\$1,054)	\$337	\$449	\$561	\$673	\$786
Historic District Signs	\$69	\$528	(\$459)	\$158	\$211	\$264	\$317	\$369
Historic District Banners	\$31	\$290	(\$259)	\$87	\$116	\$145	\$174	\$203
Planned Development	\$138	\$6,079	(\$5,942)	\$1,824	\$2,432	\$3,040	\$3,647	\$4,255
Maui Redevelopment Agency Approval	\$138	\$1,191	(\$1,054)	\$357	\$477	\$596	\$715	\$834
Use determination (Non-Administrative)	\$0	\$6,258	(\$6,258)	\$1,877	\$2,503	\$3,129	\$3,755	\$4,380
Use determination (Administrative)	\$0	\$446	(\$446)	\$134	\$178	\$223	\$268	\$312
Flood Development Permit	\$0	\$865	(\$865)	\$260	\$346	\$433	\$519	\$606
Landscape Planting Approval for Parking	\$0	\$505	(\$505)	\$151	\$202	\$252	\$303	\$353
Parking Analysis	\$0	\$821	(\$821)	\$246	\$328	\$411	\$493	\$575
OTHER FEES (NOT SUBJECT TO EXCEPTIONS)								
1. Special Management Area Appeal of Director's Decision	\$688	\$5,160	(\$4,473)	\$1,548	\$2,064	\$2,580	\$3,096	\$3,612
2. Shoreline Setback Appeal	\$313	\$5,160	(\$4,848)	\$1,548	\$2,064	\$2,580	\$3,096	\$3,612
3. Adoption, Amendment or Repeal of Planning Commission Rules and Regulations	\$313	\$6,208	(\$5,895)	\$1,862	\$2,483	\$3,104	\$3,725	\$4,345
4. Petition to Intervene	\$313	\$1,971	(\$1,659)	\$591	\$789	\$986	\$1,183	\$1,380

Attachment C – Five Year Phased Schedule – All Departmental Cost

The County is looking to increase their fees over the course of the next five years, with a plan of achieving 70% cost recovery. The following table outlines the proposed fee schedule, assuming the County is looking to recover the Full Departmental Cost (direct staff, departmental overhead, and admin support) of providing services, as outlined in the previous report.

Fee Name	Cost Per Unit Results			Recommended Fees				
	Current Fee	Dept. Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
TABLE A - PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED								
Geothermal Development Permit	\$688	Not Studied		\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Change of Zoning	\$688	\$7,189	(\$6,501)	\$2,157	\$2,876	\$3,594	\$4,313	\$5,032
Conditional Use Permit	\$688	\$4,963	(\$4,275)	\$1,489	\$1,985	\$2,481	\$2,978	\$3,474
Community Plan Amendment	\$688	\$7,189	(\$6,501)	\$2,157	\$2,876	\$3,594	\$4,313	\$5,032
State Land Use District Boundary Amendment	\$688	\$7,150	(\$6,462)	\$2,145	\$2,860	\$3,575	\$4,290	\$5,005
Project District Zoning	\$688	\$8,152	(\$7,464)	\$2,446	\$3,261	\$4,076	\$4,891	\$5,706
BVA Variance	\$688	\$6,601	(\$5,913)	\$1,980	\$2,640	\$3,300	\$3,960	\$4,620
BVA Appeals	\$688	\$5,910	(\$5,222)	\$1,773	\$2,364	\$2,955	\$3,546	\$4,137
County Special Use Permit	\$688	\$5,258	(\$4,570)	\$1,577	\$2,103	\$2,629	\$3,155	\$3,680
Special Permit within State Land Use Agricultural and Rural Districts	\$688	\$5,258	(\$4,570)	\$1,577	\$2,103	\$2,629	\$3,155	\$3,680
Shoreline Setback Variance								
Shoreline Setback Variance - Removals of Demolitions	\$688	\$6,081	(\$5,393)	\$1,824	\$2,432	\$3,041	\$3,649	\$4,257
Shoreline Setback Variance - All Others	\$688	\$7,082	(\$6,394)	\$2,124	\$2,833	\$3,541	\$4,249	\$4,957
Environmental Assessments (non-exempt)	\$688	\$2,369	(\$1,681)	\$711	\$947	\$1,184	\$1,421	\$1,658
Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits (non-exempt)								
SMA - Major - Subdivision	\$688	\$5,858	(\$5,170)	\$1,758	\$2,343	\$2,929	\$3,515	\$4,101
SMA - Major - Multifamily	\$688	\$5,858	(\$5,170)	\$1,758	\$2,343	\$2,929	\$3,515	\$4,101
SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - < 49,999 GROSS S.F. Building	\$688	\$5,858	(\$5,170)	\$1,758	\$2,343	\$2,929	\$3,515	\$4,101
SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - > 50,000 GROSS S.F. Building	\$688	\$7,232	(\$6,544)	\$2,170	\$2,893	\$3,616	\$4,339	\$5,063
SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW- < 100 ROOMS	\$688	\$5,858	(\$5,170)	\$1,758	\$2,343	\$2,929	\$3,515	\$4,101
SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW - 100+ ROOMS	\$688	\$8,608	(\$7,920)	\$2,582	\$3,443	\$4,304	\$5,165	\$6,025
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - <49,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$5,858	(\$5,170)	\$1,758	\$2,343	\$2,929	\$3,515	\$4,101

Attachment C – Five Year Phased Schedule – All Departmental Cost

Fee Name	Cost Per Unit Results			Recommended Fees				
	Current Fee	Dept. Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - 50,000-99,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$7,232	(\$6,544)	\$2,170	\$2,893	\$3,616	\$4,339	\$5,063
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION > 100,000 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$8,951	(\$8,263)	\$2,685	\$3,580	\$4,476	\$5,371	\$6,266
SMA - Major - Mixed Use (<15 ACRES)	\$688	\$5,858	(\$5,170)	\$1,758	\$2,343	\$2,929	\$3,515	\$4,101
SMA - MAJOR - MIXED USE (>15.01 acres)	\$688	\$7,232	(\$6,544)	\$2,170	\$2,893	\$3,616	\$4,339	\$5,063
SMA - Major - SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING(S) ON ONE LOT	\$688	\$4,007	(\$3,319)	\$1,202	\$1,603	\$2,004	\$2,404	\$2,805
SMA - Boundary Amendment	\$688	\$937	(\$249)	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Non-decennial General Plan Amendment	\$688	Not Studied		\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
TABLE B - NO PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED								
Shoreline Setback Variance								
Shoreline Setback Approval	\$688	\$750	(\$62)	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Shoreline Setback Determination	\$688	\$577	\$111	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Shoreline - Annual Erosion Hazard Rate Amendment	\$688	\$977	(\$289)	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits (non-exempt)								
SMA - Emergency Permit	\$688	\$788	(\$100)	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
All other permits or reviews for which no public hearing is required, unless otherwise specified herein	\$206	Not Studied		\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
Business - Country Town Design Appeal	\$206	Not Studied		\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
Additional review required by changes, additions, revisions, time extensions or renewals	\$206	Not Studied		\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
BED AND BREAKFAST PERMITS								
1. New Permit								
Administrative	\$500	\$2,395	(\$1,895)	\$718	\$958	\$1,197	\$1,437	\$1,676
If Public Hearing Required	\$688	\$5,258	(\$4,570)	\$1,577	\$2,103	\$2,629	\$3,155	\$3,680
2. Renewal								
Application Fee	\$375	\$1,957	(\$1,582)	\$587	\$783	\$979	\$1,174	\$1,370
SHORT TERM RENTAL HOME PERMIT								
1. New Permit								
Application Fee	\$813	\$2,395	(\$1,582)	\$813	\$958	\$1,197	\$1,437	\$1,676
If Public Hearing Required	\$688	\$5,258	(\$4,571)	\$1,577	\$2,103	\$2,629	\$3,155	\$3,681

Attachment C – Five Year Phased Schedule – All Departmental Cost

Fee Name	Cost Per Unit Results			Recommended Fees				
	Current Fee	Dept. Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
2. Renewal								
Application Fee	\$375	\$1,957	(\$1,582)	\$587	\$783	\$979	\$1,174	\$1,370
OTHER PERMITS AND APPROVALS								
Building Permit Review Fees								
Initial Review	\$0	Not Studied		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Review of First Resubmittal	\$313	Not Studied		\$313	\$313	\$313	\$313	\$313
Review of Second Resubmittal	\$625	Not Studied		\$625	\$625	\$625	\$625	\$625
Review of Additional Resubmittal	\$1,250	Not Studied		\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250
Sign Variances	\$688	\$4,949	(\$4,261)	\$1,485	\$1,980	\$2,474	\$2,969	\$3,464
Other Sign Permits	\$69	\$134	(\$66)	\$69	\$69	\$69	\$81	\$94
Other Promotional Signs	\$31	Not Studied		\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31
Parking Reduction	\$138	\$800	(\$663)	\$240	\$320	\$400	\$480	\$560
Parking Reduction (Molokai PC)	\$69	\$1,179	(\$1,110)	\$354	\$472	\$590	\$708	\$825
Historic District Commission Applications	\$138	\$2,138	(\$2,000)	\$641	\$855	\$1,069	\$1,283	\$1,496
Historic District Administrative Applications	\$69	\$937	(\$868)	\$281	\$375	\$468	\$562	\$656
Historic District Signs	\$69	\$437	(\$368)	\$131	\$175	\$218	\$262	\$306
Historic District Banners	\$31	\$237	(\$205)	\$71	\$95	\$118	\$142	\$166
Planned Development	\$138	\$5,108	(\$4,970)	\$1,532	\$2,043	\$2,554	\$3,065	\$3,575
Maui Redevelopment Agency Approval	\$138	\$998	(\$861)	\$299	\$399	\$499	\$599	\$699
Use determination (Non-Administrative)	\$0	\$5,258	(\$5,258)	\$1,577	\$2,103	\$2,629	\$3,155	\$3,680
Use determination (Administrative)	\$0	\$371	(\$371)	\$111	\$148	\$185	\$222	\$259
Flood Development Permit	\$0	\$710	(\$710)	\$213	\$284	\$355	\$426	\$497
Landscape Planting Approval for Parking	\$0	\$406	(\$406)	\$122	\$162	\$203	\$243	\$284
Parking Analysis	\$0	\$670	(\$670)	\$201	\$268	\$335	\$402	\$469
OTHER FEES (NOT SUBJECT TO EXCEPTIONS)								
1. Special Management Area Appeal of Director's Decision	\$688	\$4,330	(\$3,643)	\$1,299	\$1,732	\$2,165	\$2,598	\$3,031
2. Shoreline Setback Appeal	\$313	\$4,330	(\$4,018)	\$1,299	\$1,732	\$2,165	\$2,598	\$3,031
3. Adoption, Amendment or Repeal of Planning Commission Rules and Regulations	\$313	\$5,219	(\$4,906)	\$1,566	\$2,088	\$2,609	\$3,131	\$3,653
4. Petition to Intervene	\$313	\$1,655	(\$1,343)	\$497	\$662	\$828	\$993	\$1,159

Attachment D – Five Year Phased Schedule – Departmental Overhead

The County is looking to increase their fees over the course of the next five years, with a plan of achieving 70% cost recovery. The following table outlines the proposed fee schedule, assuming the County is looking to recover Departmental Overhead (direct staff and departmental overhead) of providing services, as outlined in the previous report.

Fee Name	Cost Per Unit Results			Recommended Fees				
	Current Fee	Dept. OH Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
TABLE A - PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED								
Geothermal Development Permit	\$688	Not Studied		\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Change of Zoning	\$688	\$5,327	(\$4,639)	\$1,598	\$2,131	\$2,663	\$3,196	\$3,729
Conditional Use Permit	\$688	\$3,671	(\$2,983)	\$1,101	\$1,468	\$1,836	\$2,203	\$2,570
Community Plan Amendment	\$688	\$5,327	(\$4,639)	\$1,598	\$2,131	\$2,663	\$3,196	\$3,729
State Land Use District Boundary Amendment	\$688	\$5,299	(\$4,611)	\$1,590	\$2,120	\$2,650	\$3,180	\$3,710
Project District Zoning	\$688	\$6,045	(\$5,357)	\$1,814	\$2,418	\$3,023	\$3,627	\$4,232
BVA Variance	\$688	\$5,045	(\$4,357)	\$1,514	\$2,018	\$2,523	\$3,027	\$3,532
BVA Appeals	\$688	\$4,429	(\$3,741)	\$1,329	\$1,771	\$2,214	\$2,657	\$3,100
County Special Use Permit	\$688	\$3,902	(\$3,214)	\$1,171	\$1,561	\$1,951	\$2,341	\$2,732
Special Permit within State Land Use Agricultural and Rural Districts	\$688	\$3,902	(\$3,214)	\$1,171	\$1,561	\$1,951	\$2,341	\$2,732
Shoreline Setback Variance								
Shoreline Setback Variance - Removals of Demolitions	\$688	\$4,503	(\$3,815)	\$1,351	\$1,801	\$2,251	\$2,702	\$3,152
Shoreline Setback Variance - All Others	\$688	\$5,247	(\$4,559)	\$1,574	\$2,099	\$2,623	\$3,148	\$3,673
Environmental Assessments (non-exempt)	\$688	\$1,744	(\$1,056)	\$688	\$698	\$872	\$1,046	\$1,221
Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits (non-exempt)								
SMA - Major - Subdivision	\$688	\$4,349	(\$3,661)	\$1,305	\$1,740	\$2,174	\$2,609	\$3,044
SMA - Major - Multifamily	\$688	\$4,349	(\$3,661)	\$1,305	\$1,740	\$2,174	\$2,609	\$3,044
SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - < 49,999 GROSS S.F. Building	\$688	\$4,349	(\$3,661)	\$1,305	\$1,740	\$2,174	\$2,609	\$3,044
SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - > 50,000 GROSS S.F. Building	\$688	\$5,374	(\$4,686)	\$1,612	\$2,149	\$2,687	\$3,224	\$3,762
SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW- < 100 ROOMS	\$688	\$4,349	(\$3,661)	\$1,305	\$1,740	\$2,174	\$2,609	\$3,044
SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW - 100+ ROOMS	\$688	\$6,400	(\$5,712)	\$1,920	\$2,560	\$3,200	\$3,840	\$4,480
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - <49,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$4,349	(\$3,661)	\$1,305	\$1,740	\$2,174	\$2,609	\$3,044
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - 50,000-99,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$5,374	(\$4,686)	\$1,612	\$2,149	\$2,687	\$3,224	\$3,762

Attachment D – Five Year Phased Schedule – Departmental Overhead

Cost Per Unit Results				Recommended Fees				
Fee Name	Current Fee	Dept. OH Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION > 100,000 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$6,656	(\$5,968)	\$1,997	\$2,662	\$3,328	\$3,993	\$4,659
SMA - Major - Mixed Use (<15 ACRES)	\$688	\$4,349	(\$3,661)	\$1,305	\$1,740	\$2,174	\$2,609	\$3,044
SMA - MAJOR - MIXED USE (>15.01 acres)	\$688	\$5,374	(\$4,686)	\$1,612	\$2,149	\$2,687	\$3,224	\$3,762
SMA - Major - SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING(S) ON ONE LOT	\$688	\$2,972	(\$2,284)	\$892	\$1,189	\$1,486	\$1,783	\$2,081
SMA - Boundary Amendment	\$688	\$688	(\$0)	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Non-decennial General Plan Amendment	\$688	Not Studied		\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
TABLE B - NO PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED								
Shoreline Setback Variance								
Shoreline Setback Approval	\$688	\$550	\$138	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Shoreline Setback Determination	\$688	\$425	\$263	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Shoreline - Annual Erosion Hazard Rate Amendment	\$688	\$722	(\$34)	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Special Management Area (SMA) Use Permits (non-exempt)								
SMA - Emergency Permit	\$688	\$583	\$105	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
All other permits or reviews for which no public hearing is required, unless otherwise specified herein	\$206	Not Studied		\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
Business - Country Town Design Appeal	\$206	Not Studied		\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
Additional review required by changes, additions, revisions, time extensions or renewals	\$206	Not Studied		\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
BED AND BREAKFAST PERMITS								
1. New Permit								
Administrative	\$500	\$1,771	(\$1,271)	\$531	\$708	\$886	\$1,063	\$1,240
If Public Hearing Required	\$688	\$3,902	(\$3,215)	\$1,171	\$1,561	\$1,951	\$2,341	\$2,732
2. Renewal								
Application Fee	\$375	\$1,444	(\$1,069)	\$433	\$578	\$722	\$867	\$1,011
SHORT TERM RENTAL HOME PERMIT								
1. New Permit								
Application Fee	\$813	\$1,771	(\$958)	\$813	\$813	\$885	\$1,062	\$1,240
If Public Hearing Required	\$688	\$3,903	(\$3,215)	\$1,171	\$1,561	\$1,951	\$2,342	\$2,732
2. Renewal								
Application Fee	\$375	\$1,444	(\$1,069)	\$433	\$578	\$722	\$867	\$1,011

Attachment D – Five Year Phased Schedule – Departmental Overhead

Cost Per Unit Results				Recommended Fees				
Fee Name	Current Fee	Dept. OH Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
OTHER PERMITS AND APPROVALS								
Building Permit Review Fees								
Initial Review	\$0	Not Studied		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Review of First Resubmittal	\$313	Not Studied		\$313	\$313	\$313	\$313	\$313
Review of Second Resubmittal	\$625	Not Studied		\$625	\$625	\$625	\$625	\$625
Review of Additional Resubmittal	\$1,250	Not Studied		\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250
Sign Variances	\$688	\$3,805	(\$3,117)	\$1,141	\$1,522	\$1,902	\$2,283	\$2,663
Other Sign Permits	\$69	\$97	(\$28)	\$69	\$69	\$69	\$69	\$69
Other Promotional Signs	\$31	Not Studied		\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31
Parking Reduction	\$138	\$638	(\$500)	\$191	\$255	\$319	\$383	\$447
Parking Reduction (Molokai PC)	\$69	\$926	(\$857)	\$278	\$370	\$463	\$556	\$648
Historic District Commission Applications	\$138	\$1,581	(\$1,444)	\$474	\$632	\$791	\$949	\$1,107
Historic District Administrative Applications	\$69	\$688	(\$620)	\$206	\$275	\$344	\$413	\$482
Historic District Signs	\$69	\$316	(\$247)	\$95	\$126	\$158	\$190	\$221
Historic District Banners	\$31	\$167	(\$136)	\$50	\$67	\$84	\$100	\$117
Planned Development	\$138	\$3,791	(\$3,653)	\$1,137	\$1,516	\$1,895	\$2,274	\$2,653
Maui Redevelopment Agency Approval	\$138	\$735	(\$598)	\$221	\$294	\$368	\$441	\$515
Use determination (Non-Administrative)	\$0	\$3,902	(\$3,902)	\$1,171	\$1,561	\$1,951	\$2,341	\$2,732
Use determination (Administrative)	\$0	\$292	(\$292)	\$88	\$117	\$146	\$175	\$204
Flood Development Permit	\$0	\$547	(\$547)	\$164	\$219	\$274	\$328	\$383
Landscape Planting Approval for Parking	\$0	\$302	(\$302)	\$91	\$121	\$151	\$181	\$212
Parking Analysis	\$0	\$513	(\$513)	\$154	\$205	\$256	\$308	\$359
OTHER FEES (NOT SUBJECT TO EXCEPTIONS)								
1. Special Management Area Appeal of Director's Decision	\$688	\$3,202	(\$2,515)	\$961	\$1,281	\$1,601	\$1,921	\$2,241
2. Shoreline Setback Appeal	\$313	\$3,202	(\$2,890)	\$961	\$1,281	\$1,601	\$1,921	\$2,241
3. Adoption, Amendment or Repeal of Planning Commission Rules and Regulations	\$313	\$3,875	(\$3,562)	\$1,162	\$1,550	\$1,937	\$2,325	\$2,712
4. Petition to Intervene	\$313	\$1,226	(\$913)	\$368	\$490	\$613	\$736	\$858

Attachment E – Five Year Phased Schedule – Staff Cost Only

The County is looking to increase their fees over the course of the next five years, with a plan of achieving 70% cost recovery. The following table outlines the proposed fee schedule, assuming the County is looking to only recover direct staff costs associated with providing services, as outlined in the previous report.

Fee Name	Cost Per Unit Results			Recommended Fees				
	Current Fee	Staff Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
TABLE A - PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED								
Geothermal Development Permit	\$688	Not Studied		\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Change of Zoning	\$688	\$4,646	(\$3,958)	\$1,394	\$1,858	\$2,323	\$2,787	\$3,252
Conditional Use Permit	\$688	\$3,198	(\$2,510)	\$959	\$1,279	\$1,599	\$1,919	\$2,239
Community Plan Amendment	\$688	\$4,646	(\$3,958)	\$1,394	\$1,858	\$2,323	\$2,787	\$3,252
State Land Use District Boundary Amendment	\$688	\$4,624	(\$3,936)	\$1,387	\$1,849	\$2,312	\$2,774	\$3,236
Project District Zoning	\$688	\$5,275	(\$4,587)	\$1,583	\$2,110	\$2,638	\$3,165	\$3,693
BVA Variance	\$688	\$4,306	(\$3,618)	\$1,292	\$1,722	\$2,153	\$2,584	\$3,014
BVA Appeals	\$688	\$3,725	(\$3,037)	\$1,117	\$1,490	\$1,862	\$2,235	\$2,607
County Special Use Permit	\$688	\$3,406	(\$2,718)	\$1,022	\$1,362	\$1,703	\$2,043	\$2,384
Special Permit within State Land Use Agricultural and Rural Districts	\$688	\$3,406	(\$2,718)	\$1,022	\$1,362	\$1,703	\$2,043	\$2,384
Shoreline Setback Reviews								
Shoreline Setback Approval	\$688	\$476	\$212	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Shoreline Setback Determination	\$688	\$368	\$320	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Shoreline Setback Variance - Removals of Demolitions	\$688	\$3,925	(\$3,237)	\$1,177	\$1,570	\$1,962	\$2,355	\$2,747
Shoreline Setback Variance - All Others	\$688	\$4,575	(\$3,887)	\$1,373	\$1,830	\$2,288	\$2,745	\$3,203
Shoreline - Annual Erosion Hazard Rate Amendment	\$688	\$628	\$60	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Environmental Assessments (non-exempt)	\$688	\$1,514	(\$826)	\$688	\$688	\$757	\$909	\$1,060
Special Management Area (SMA) Permits (non-exempt)								
SMA - Major - Subdivision	\$688	\$3,796	(\$3,108)	\$1,139	\$1,519	\$1,898	\$2,278	\$2,657
SMA - Major - Multifamily	\$688	\$3,796	(\$3,108)	\$1,139	\$1,519	\$1,898	\$2,278	\$2,657
SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - < 49,999 GROSS S.F. Building	\$688	\$3,796	(\$3,108)	\$1,139	\$1,519	\$1,898	\$2,278	\$2,657
SMA - Major - Commercial / Industrial - > 50,000 GROSS S.F. Building	\$688	\$4,693	(\$4,005)	\$1,408	\$1,877	\$2,347	\$2,816	\$3,285
SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW- < 100 ROOMS	\$688	\$3,796	(\$3,108)	\$1,139	\$1,519	\$1,898	\$2,278	\$2,657
SMA - Major - Hotel - ALL NEW - 100+ ROOMS	\$688	\$5,592	(\$4,904)	\$1,678	\$2,237	\$2,796	\$3,355	\$3,914

Attachment E – Five Year Phased Schedule – Staff Cost Only

Fee Name	Cost Per Unit Results			Recommended Fees				
	Current Fee	Staff Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - <49,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$3,796	(\$3,108)	\$1,139	\$1,519	\$1,898	\$2,278	\$2,657
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION - 50,000-99,999 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$4,693	(\$4,005)	\$1,408	\$1,877	\$2,347	\$2,816	\$3,285
SMA - Major - Hotel - RENOVATION > 100,000 GROSS S.F. BUILDING* - CAN ALSO INCLUDE NEW UNITS	\$688	\$5,816	(\$5,128)	\$1,745	\$2,326	\$2,908	\$3,490	\$4,071
SMA - Major - Mixed Use (<15 ACRES)	\$688	\$3,796	(\$3,108)	\$1,139	\$1,519	\$1,898	\$2,278	\$2,657
SMA - MAJOR - MIXED USE (>15.01 acres)	\$688	\$4,693	(\$4,005)	\$1,408	\$1,877	\$2,347	\$2,816	\$3,285
SMA - Major - SINGLE FAMILY DWELLING(S) ON ONE LOT	\$688	\$2,593	(\$1,905)	\$778	\$1,037	\$1,297	\$1,556	\$1,815
SMA - Emergency Permit	\$688	\$508	\$180	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
SMA - Boundary Amendment	\$688	\$596	\$92	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
Non-decennial General Plan Amendment	\$688	Not Studied		\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688	\$688
TABLE B - NO PUBLIC HEARING REQUIRED								
All other permits or reviews for which no public hearing is required, unless otherwise specified herein	\$206	Not Studied		\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
Business - Country Town Design Appeal	\$206	Not Studied		\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
Additional review required by changes, additions, revisions, time extensions or renewals	\$206	Not Studied		\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206	\$206
BED AND BREAKFAST PERMITS								
1. New Permit								
Administrative	\$500	\$1,542	(\$1,042)	\$500	\$617	\$771	\$925	\$1,079
If Public Hearing Required	\$688	\$3,406	(\$2,718)	\$1,022	\$1,362	\$1,703	\$2,043	\$2,384
2. Renewal								
Application Fee	\$375	\$1,257	(\$882)	\$377	\$503	\$628	\$754	\$880
SHORT TERM RENTAL HOME PERMIT								
1. New Permit								
Application Fee	\$813	\$1,541	(\$729)	\$813	\$813	\$813	\$925	\$1,079
If Public Hearing Required	\$688	\$3,406	(\$2,719)	\$1,022	\$1,362	\$1,703	\$2,044	\$2,384
2. Renewal								
Application Fee	\$375	\$1,257	(\$882)	\$377	\$503	\$628	\$754	\$880

Attachment E – Five Year Phased Schedule – Staff Cost Only

Fee Name	Cost Per Unit Results			Recommended Fees				
	Current Fee	Staff Cost Per Unit	Surplus / (Deficit) per Unit	30%	40%	50%	60%	70%
				Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Year 4	Year 5
OTHER PERMITS AND APPROVALS								
Building Permit Review Fees								
Initial Review	\$0	Not Studied		\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Review of First Resubmittal	\$313	Not Studied		\$313	\$313	\$313	\$313	\$313
Review of Second Resubmittal	\$625	Not Studied		\$625	\$625	\$625	\$625	\$625
Review of Additional Resubmittal	\$1,250	Not Studied		\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250	\$1,250
Sign Variances	\$688	\$3,265	(\$2,577)	\$979	\$1,306	\$1,632	\$1,959	\$2,285
Other Sign Permits	\$69	\$79	(\$10)	\$69	\$69	\$69	\$69	\$69
Other Promotional Signs	\$31	Not Studied		\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31	\$31
Parking Reduction	\$138	\$561	(\$423)	\$168	\$224	\$280	\$336	\$392
Parking Reduction (Molokai PC)	\$69	\$811	(\$742)	\$243	\$324	\$406	\$487	\$568
Historic District Commission Applications	\$138	\$1,377	(\$1,239)	\$413	\$551	\$688	\$826	\$964
Historic District Administrative Applications	\$69	\$596	(\$527)	\$179	\$238	\$298	\$358	\$417
Historic District Signs	\$69	\$271	(\$202)	\$81	\$108	\$135	\$163	\$190
Historic District Banners	\$31	\$141	(\$110)	\$42	\$56	\$70	\$84	\$99
Planned Development	\$138	\$3,308	(\$3,171)	\$992	\$1,323	\$1,654	\$1,985	\$2,316
Maui Redevelopment Agency Approval	\$138	\$639	(\$502)	\$192	\$256	\$320	\$384	\$447
Use determination (Non-Administrative)	\$0	\$3,406	(\$3,406)	\$1,022	\$1,362	\$1,703	\$2,043	\$2,384
Use determination (Administrative)	\$0	\$254	(\$254)	\$76	\$102	\$127	\$153	\$178
Flood Development Permit	\$0	\$470	(\$470)	\$141	\$188	\$235	\$282	\$329
Landscape Planting Approval for Parking	\$0	\$253	(\$253)	\$76	\$101	\$127	\$152	\$177
Parking Analysis	\$0	\$438	(\$438)	\$131	\$175	\$219	\$263	\$306
OTHER FEES (NOT SUBJECT TO EXCEPTIONS)								
1. Special Management Area Appeal of Director's Decision	\$688	\$2,790	(\$2,102)	\$837	\$1,116	\$1,395	\$1,674	\$1,953
2. Shoreline Setback Appeal	\$313	\$2,790	(\$2,477)	\$837	\$1,116	\$1,395	\$1,674	\$1,953
3. Adoption, Amendment or Repeal of Planning Commission Rules and Regulations	\$313	\$3,384	(\$3,071)	\$1,015	\$1,354	\$1,692	\$2,030	\$2,369
4. Petition to Intervene	\$313	\$1,069	(\$757)	\$321	\$428	\$535	\$641	\$748

BFED Committee

From: Tamara A. Paltin
Sent: Wednesday, April 19, 2023 9:37 AM
To: BFED Committee
Subject: Pg 35, yr 3
Attachments: Matrix Fee Study Report.pdf

Get [Outlook for iOS](#)