



Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District

Fee Cost Analysis **DRAFT REPORT** September 13, 2023

Contents

1.	INTRODUCTION1
	PROJECT SCOPE1
	ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS1
2.	METHODOLOGY
	DIRECT COSTS
	INDIRECT COSTS
	OVERHEAD AND ADMINISTRATIVE COSTS
	TOTAL COST OF SERVICES
3.	CALCULATION OF DISTRICT COSTS
	OVERHEAD COSTS
	DEPARTMENT ADMINISTRATION6
	DIRECT COSTS7
	TOTAL COSTS
4.	REVIEW OF DISTRICT FEES AND COSTS
	BUSINESS LICENSING FEES
	ALCOHOL LICENSING FEES10
	CODE ENFORCEMENT FEES11
	BUILDING PERMIT FEES12
	ADDITIONAL BUILDING PERMIT FEES
	OTHER INSPECTION FEES15
	PLAN CHECK FEES15
	PUBLIC BODY REVIEW FEES17
	ADMINISTRATIVE REVIEW FEES
	ADDRESSING FEES
	RIGHT-OF-WAY FEES
	ENGINEERING CHECK FEES
	OTHER ENGINEERING FEES
	BOND ADMINISTRATION FEES

Contents

	RESEARCH FEES	24
	PARK FACILITY RENTAL FEES	25
5.	NEXT STEPS	26
6.	CLOSING	27
AP	PPENDIX 1: SUMMARY OF FEES AND COSTS	28
AP	PPENDIX 2: FEE COMPARISON	31
AP	PPENDIX 3: RECOMMENDED FEE SCHEDULE FORMAT	40

1. Introduction

Baker Tilly US, LLP (Baker Tilly) was engaged by the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District to review the District's costs related to the provision of building permits, inspections, plan checks and development-related services such as plat reviews, conditional use permits and zoning adjustments. This report provides an overview of the steps taken to identify and calculate the District's costs along with the findings of our analysis.

Project Scope

Our project plan included the completion of the following tasks:

- Task 1 Project kick-off: introductions; review of scope, schedule and deliverables; requests for data
- Task 2 Review of background information: current fees; current cost allocations and overhead calculations; recent financial reports and budgets; trends in service volume and staffing
- Task 3 Analysis and cost calculations: review of payroll and budget information; identification of overhead services and personnel; calculation of per-hour costs for personnel
- Task 4 Data collection and reporting: surveys and interviews with District staff; estimates of time required to perform fee-related services; preliminary report of costs
- Task 5 Recommendations: identify mismatches between costs and fees charged; review fee schedules from comparable communities; recommend potential process changes and fee adjustments
- Task 6 Final Report: preparation and presentation of findings and recommendations to the District

Acknowledgements

This cost of services project was conducted as a collaboration between the Baker Tilly consulting team and members of the District's management team and staff. We thank the District and its staff members for their assistance in collecting background information and providing answers to our questions about departmental costs and processes along with their estimates of time spent on various fee-related services.



2. Methodology

To calculate the total costs of providing services, one must look beyond the direct costs associated with an employee's time and include an accounting of the indirect and overhead costs required for that employee to work effectively. In this section, we outline the components of service costs in general terms.

Direct Costs

Direct costs are the most obvious and easy-to-understand component of service costs. The direct cost of service provision is essentially the District's cost for the employee or contractor providing the service.

For example, if an employee is paid \$40 per hour in wages, and receives another \$20 per hour in benefits for health insurance, retirement contributions and the like, the direct cost of that employee's time would be \$60 per hour. If the employee performs a fee-related task which takes 20 minutes to complete, the direct cost for that service would be \$20.

When services are provided by an outside consultant or contractor, the direct cost can be easily understood as the amount charged by the contractor to the District.

Direct staff costs are generally what people think of when giving consideration to the costs of providing services, but these amounts represent just one element of the total cost.

Indirect Costs

Looking beyond the immediate costs of an employee's time, we take into consideration other budget items from the department in which the employee works. These expenses include budget line items for supplies and materials, contracted services and related costs outside of those linked to employee compensation.

For most government operations, personnel costs represent the lion's share of departmental expenses; indirect costs generally contribute a modest amount to overall costs. In special cases, a department may have significant costs related to supplies and materials, or may rely heavily on contracted services to supplement the work done by department staff. For services provided by such departments, indirect costs will represent a larger proportion of total costs.

For services provided by outside contractors, no indirect costs are usually required to be calculated. Costs for materials and support are already reflected in the fees charged by the contractor for the services provided.



Overhead and Administrative Costs

The costs described above are directly related to the expenses within a particular department, either the personnel costs of staff members or the indirect costs representing supplies or contracted services needed for the department to function effectively.

An additional cost component to consider represents the efforts of other departments within the larger organization which are required to support the staff directly involved in service provision. These expenses typically include functions like Human Resources, Legal, Finance, Administration and Information Technology. For the District's "back office" functions, the costs of these departments are spread across the entire organization, and each employee's share of these expenses is added to the overall cost of their time spent on fee-related services.

A more localized variant of overhead costs may also be present in the form of departmental administration. This component reflects the costs of managers and department heads who spend time supervising front-line employees, along with the costs of administrative assistants needed to schedule a department's activities and keep operations running smoothly.

Overhead and department administration are typically expressed in terms of multipliers which are applied to an employee's direct and indirect costs. Calculations will usually use a single overhead multiplier for every employee in the organization, and will use administrative multipliers specific to each department.

For contracted services, the organizational overhead multiplier is typically applied to represent the District's costs for administration: negotiating contracts, communicating with contractors, processing invoices and payments and tracking total expenditures against departmental budgets.

Total Cost of Services

Combining each of the costs components described above allows one to calculate the District's total cost for providing specific services. For our analyses, we use a cost per hour for each employee with direct involvement in the services being analyzed. A typical calculation is shown on the following page.



John Smith - cost calculation			
Annual pay:	\$ 60,000		
Annual benefits:	\$ 24,000		
Share of indirect* budget costs:	\$ 16,000		
Subtotal - budget costs:	\$ 100,000		
Annual hours available**:	1,792		
Cost per hour:	\$55.80		
Departmental administration:	11.4%		
Subtotal:	\$62.17		
Districtwide overhead:	15.23%		
TOTAL COST PER HOUR:	\$ 71.63		
 * Costs for supplies, materials, contracted services, etc. ** Total hours less holidays, sick leave, vacation, training, etc. 			

In the calculation above, the employee makes \$60,000 in annual salary. A rudimentary calculation might look at the salary and divide by 2,000 hours per year to arrive at a cost of \$30 per hour.

A more thorough analysis of costs, taking into account the employee's benefits and indirect budget costs, generates a significantly higher cost per hour. In the case above, the employee's benefits and indirect costs add \$40,000 to his total annual cost, while accounting for paid time off results in a lower number of hours to spread the costs across. The result is an hourly cost of \$55.80, which is 85% higher than the basic calculation described above.

Adding the employee's share of departmental administration (supervision and administrative support) along with Districtwide overhead brings the employee's total calculated cost to over \$71 per hour, more than double the hourly cost generated by the initial rudimentary calculation.

To generate the cost of providing fee-related services, we take the contributions of each employee involved in the process based on their calculated per-hour cost. The total cost of a fee type is the sum of the contributions of all the employees involved in the process.

We hope this example provides an illustration of how important it is to perform a proper accounting of departmental costs, and how significant the difference can be between an hourly cost based solely on an employee's hourly wage versus the total cost to the District when each cost component is included.



3. Calculation of District Costs

While the previous section examined the standard methodology for calculating total costs of service, in this section we will look specifically at the calculations used for the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District.

Overhead Costs

In order to generate total costs for the District to provide building and development services, we relied on the methodology outlined in the previous section.

Reviewing the District's budget for 2023, we identified departments providing services in support of the overall organization. These costs were concentrated in Administration, Legal, Other Professional Services, Information Technology, and Non-Classified charges. A summary of the District's budget and overhead calculations is shown in the table below.

Department	Personal Services	Materials, Services & Other	Total	Overhead %	Overhead Amount
Administration	1,914,034	243,950	2,157,984	85.0%	1,834,286
Fleet		34,100	34,100		-
Economic Development		110,000	110,000		-
Animal Services		846,264	846,264		-
DA Prosecution		262,000	262,000		-
Engineering - Projects		3,458,737	3,458,737	5.0%	172,937
Indigent Legal		194,823	194,823		-
Justice Courts		1,100,000	1,100,000		-
Parks Maintenance		1,258,000	1,258,000		-
PW Operations		12,434,532	12,434,532	5.0%	621,727
Legal - Civil		160,000	160,000	100.0%	160,000
Legal - Land Use (allocated to Pl	anning budget)		-		-
Legal - Legislation		90,000	90,000	100.0%	90,000
Other Prof. Services		106,000	106,000	47.2%	50,000
Information Technology		254,000	254,000	100.0%	254,000
Planning	4,191,175	920,250	5,111,425		-
Non-classified		260,000	260,000	91.2%	237,000
Denominator for overhead:	6,105,209	21,732,656	27,837,865		3,419,950
			Organization	Overhead %:	12.29%
Budget lines not included in ove	erhead calculation	:		-	
Debt Service			2,203,377		
Transfers Out			4,845,907		
Total Budget - MSD			34,887,149		

The contribution from Administration was reduced to 85% of its budget due to its number of personnel in client-facing roles, as opposed to those focused on running the organization. These personnel were primarily in GIS roles, which often have direct involvement in a number of land use fee activities.



Non-Classified expenses included rent and facilities charges. Legal expenses were considered overhead, with the exception of legal expenses earmarked for land use projects. These were allocated directly to the Planning Department budget to be included as an indirect cost, instead of spreading the costs across the rest of the District. Charges from the Other Professional Services division represent budget and audit activities.

Overhead contributions also came from Public Works Operations and Engineering. For each of these departments, a 5% overhead allocation was applied. This represents an estimate of the time spent by senior staff from each department on meetings, budget development and other activities related to management of the District as a whole.

In total, the overhead contributions from each department totaled \$3.42 million, out of a budget of \$27.84 million, resulting in an overhead multiplier of 12.29%. The \$27.84 million denominator is lower than the \$34.89 million total budget for the District; we subtracted the amounts for debt service and interfund transfers, as these activities do not require regular administration.

The 12.29% overhead factor calculated for the District is well below the values we typically see, which tend to come in between 15% and 20%.

Department Administration

Because nearly all the fee-based activities we tracked are linked to the Planning department, we looked at the department's staffing to estimate the amount of time spent by staff on activities related to department administration. As mentioned in the Methodology section, department administration can be considered as a subset of the District's overhead costs. In this case, instead of accounting for support given by various departments to the District's operations as a whole, we look at contributions from the department's administrative staff necessary to support the smooth operation of the department.

We identified seven employees in the department with roles in management and coordination, and estimated the time spent by each on activities related to regular department administration. A summary of these administrative contributions is shown below.

Title	Dept Admin %
Code Enforcement Supervisor	25%
Associate Building Official	10%
Chief Building Official	25%
Permitting and Licensing Coordinator	10%
Director of Planning and Development Services	50%
Planning Coordinator	10%
Planning Manager	10%
Grading, Floodplain and Stormwater Manager	25%

The combined contribution of these employees results in a departmental administration factor of 5.6%. As with the District's overhead charge, this factor is lower than we typically see.



Direct Costs

Once the expenditure adjustments described above were settled, our primary focus was on collecting data to determine the amount of time spent by District staff on fee-related activities.

We surveyed District employees to ask for their estimates of time spent on each of the fee types included in the District's fee schedule. The survey data was supplemented by follow up conversations with District staff where clarifications were needed.

Total Costs

Using the time estimates from staff, we went through the District's fee schedule and added the contributions from each employee to each fee type. District employees reporting time against a fee type generated total costs based on direct, indirect and overhead costs. For activities performed by one of several employees in a work group, we used the average cost of all employees in those groups.

The sum of these contributions represented the District's total cost for providing the fee-based service.



4. Review of District Fees and Costs

This section provides an overview of the District's total costs for municipal services, and how these costs compare to the fee amounts charged to applicants.

Business Licensing Fees

The first group of fees we review is relate to business licenses.

Looking at the District's 2022 licensing activity, we observe the following relationship between permit fees and total service costs.

Business License Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Home business license (simple)	no charge	60.88	(60.88)
Home business license (with customers)	150.00	206.98	(56.98)
Commercial business license	150.00	121.80	28.20
Per-employee fee	6.00	18.27	(12.27)
Umbrella short-term license - base fee - commercial	500.00	121.80	378.20
Umbrella short-term license - per unit - commercial	50.00	206.98	(156.98)
Short-term rental license - homeowner	500.00	60.88	439.12
Seasonal business license	120.00	121.80	(1.80)
Solicitor ID	65.00	73.07	(8.07)
Accessory Dwelling Unit	50.00	121.80	(71.80)
Sexually-oriented business (outcall)	500.00	121.80	378.20
Sexually-oriented business (non- outcall)	300.00	121.80	178.20
Annual license renewal		2.92	(2.92)

Looking at the balance between revenues and costs for each fee type, we observe that while the District has a single \$150 fee for business licenses, the process by which staff issues these licenses changes depending on the nature of the business. For commercial businesses, District staff spend approximately 1 hour 40 minutes on verification of zoning compliance, scheduling inspections, and performing administrative tasks. For home-based businesses which will have



customers visiting the residence, staff generally spend extra time on zoning verification and inspections, resulting in an average time spent of 2 hours 50 minutes. As a result, the District sees a modest surplus on commercial business licenses, and a significant deficit for home-based businesses with visitors.

The District does not charge a license fee for simple home-based businesses without on-site visitors. The staff time needed for these licenses is limited to helping applicants complete their paperwork, with an average time of 50 minutes per license.

The per-employee fee for commercial businesses shows a small deficit, but one which could multiply quickly for businesses with a large number of employees. We would suggest the District consider an increase to the per-employee fee, or look for ways to streamline the process to close the gap between total processing costs and fee revenues. Annual license renewals are generally processed in monthly batches, where each individual renewal takes only a few minutes. The District may wish to examine its policies regarding license renewals to reflect its efficiencies in processing them.

Short-term rental licenses generate a surplus to the District whether the license is issued to homeowners or commercial entities. We believe that the higher fees for these licenses reflect additional costs borne by local authorities who may need to deal with problem rentals through law enforcement or other action, and as such we are not overly concerned by these mismatches. Further, for commercial rental managers with multiple units, we note that the cost to the District for verifying zoning compliance and scheduling inspections of each unit results in a significant deficit in the per-unit fees.

Seasonal business licenses and solicitor ID fees appear to be well balanced between District costs and fee revenues. Licenses for accessory dwelling units show a considerable deficit, for the same reasons as discussed above for home-based businesses with visitors.

Sexually-oriented business licenses show a sizeable surplus, though we feel that the fees for these businesses reflect local costs as discussed above, as well as policy positions of the local communities in the District.



Alcohol Licensing Fees

The next group of fees we review is related to licenses for the sale of alcohol. The table below shows the calculated costs of processing alcohol licenses and how these costs compare to the published fee amounts.

Alcohol License Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Single Event	150.00	36.54	113.46
Off-premise beer retailer	250.00	36.54	213.46
Beer-Only Restaurant	350.00	36.54	313.46
On-Premise Beer Tavern	350.00	36.54	313.46
Resort	500.00	36.54	463.46
Wholesale Beer	300.00	36.54	263.46
Restaurant Liquor	500.00	36.54	463.46
Manufacturing	350.00	36.54	313.46
Recreational On-Premise Beer Retail	350.00	36.54	313.46
Limited Restaurant Liquor	500.00	36.54	463.46
Club Liquor	600.00	36.54	563.46
Banquet & Catering	500.00	36.54	463.46

Our review of the licensing process showed that the District has a consistent process for every type of alcohol license. The District's activities are generally limited to helping applicants with their paperwork and forwarding applications to local communities. The District's limited involvement results in considerable surpluses for these fee types.

As with the fees for sexually-oriented businesses, we believe that the higher fee amounts are intended to reflect additional costs at the local level for law enforcement and other social costs related to the consumption of alcohol, and as such we have no recommendations for fee changes in this area.



Code Enforcement Fees

Code enforcement fees are a distinct category in comparison to regular fees for services. The purpose of these fees is to encourage compliance and penalize infractions, and as such there is no expected link between the District's costs and the amount charged for fees or penalties.

Code Enforcement Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Administrative Citation	100.00	11.57	88.43
Civil Penalty - Building Enforcement cases	100.00	46.26	53.74
Civil Penalty - Business Licensing cases	100.00	34.69	65.31
Cleanup Fees	cost plus \$100	398.98	N/A
Post-Compliance Penalty	based on # of days	23.13	N/A
Civil Penalty - Zoning (major case)	100.00	173.47	(73.47)
Civil Penalty - Zoning (minor case)	100.00	86.74	13.26
Short-term Rental Violation	100.00	34.70	65.30
Noise or Nuisance	100.00	-	100.00
Operating Short-term Rental w/o License	650.00	-	650.00
Short-term Rental under 2 nights	650.00	-	650.00
Special Event at Short-term Rental	650.00	34.70	615.30
Parking Violation-lesser (11.20.070/.080/.090/.140)	75.00	8.09	66.91
Parking Violation-greater (11.20.050/.060/.110135)	150.00	127.20	22.80
Administrative Citation	100.00	11.57	88.43

One area of concern in this category is the District's costs to process major zoning cases. Our review of staff activity indicates that more than two hours are generally required for follow-up inspections of these violations, resulting in District costs well above the amount of the penalty. To the extent that the District wishes to cover its costs of enforcement, it may wish to increase the penalty for major zoning violations.



Staff indicated that the District does not process noise/nuisance violations, and that short-term rental violations were usually referred to business licensing or land use, depending on whether the property would be allowed to hold a short-term rental license.

Building Permit Fees

The next group of fees covers building permits.

Building Permit Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Building Permits-typical townhome	2,058.00	1,869.65	188.35
Building Permits-typical single- family home	2,871.00	1,869.65	1,001.35
Mechanical/Plumbing/Electric – base fee	70.00	175.15	(105.15)
Mechanical/Plumbing/Electric – addl fee per appliance/fixture	20.00	24.20	(4.20)
Demolition	70.00*	194.16	(124.16)
Grading Permit	350.00*	199.35	150.65
Retaining Wall	value*	199.35	N/A
Mobile Home Setup	200.00	175.15	24.85

* Value-based permits show an average fee amount for 2022 where available; some permit types did not have enough examples in 2022 to estimate an average value.

Building permit fees are calculated based on the valuation of the property being constructed or modified. While the common assumption is that values are based on the sale price of a new home or the cost of an improvement project, valuations for permit fees are instead based on square footage, with different types of construction assigned differing per-square-foot valuations based on estimated construction costs. These valuations vary widely, from small home improvement projects to luxury homes and commercial developments.

For the purposes of this report, we look at two typical new home construction projects. The first is a townhome with a valuation of \$235,000, and the second is a single-family new home with a valuation of \$360,000. The permit fee for the townhome is \$2,058, and for the single-family home the fee is \$2,871. According to our surveys and conversations with staff, total time spent on new home construction projects was approximately 18 hours, resulting in costs of just under \$1,900 for each permit. Comparing costs against fee revenues, we see that the townhome project results in a surplus of \$188, while the higher-value home shows a surplus of just over \$1,000.

While the single-family new home is a useful benchmark for examining building permit costs and revenues, these permits are only a part of the valuation-based building permits processed each

bakertilly

year. Permits for additions, remodels, building exteriors and the like make up nearly half of these permits, and the relationship between costs and revenues varies considerably for each type of project. We recommend that the District look at the balance of revenues and costs for building permits as a collection before making major adjustments to its valuation-based fee schedule.

Moving on to other building permits, we found that the District incurred a sizeable deficit related to mechanical, plumbing and electrical permits and inspections. The imbalance was primarily due to the base fee for such inspections; the surcharge for additional appliances was close to being balanced. As with the building permits referenced above, we recommend that the District take steps to bring costs and revenues into balance for these permits.

The District's costs for demolition permits, grading permits and retaining wall permits were very similar, though the fees charged for these permits types varied widely. Demolition permits showed a significant deficit, with fee revenues covering just 36% of costs. Conversely, the average fee for grading permits in 2022 came to approximately \$350, creating a large surplus for this fee. Few retaining wall permits were listed in the 2022 report, making it difficult to calculate an overall average. We did observe that a residential retaining wall with a valuation of \$9,600 was issued a permit for \$208.50, which is fairly close to the District's calculated cost.

Mobile home setup permits showed a modest surplus.

Additional Building Permit Fees

Additional building permits include those for reroofing, solar power installations, and stormwater related permits and reviews.

Additional Building Permit Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Solar power system up to 20 kWA - Base Fee	70.00	175.15	(105.15)
Solar power system up to 20 kWA - addl fee per kWA	30.00	24.20	5.80
Solar power system over 20 kWA	value*	145.24	value
Battery Storage System (per battery)	2.00	48.42	(46.42)
Residential re-roof with sheathing	110.00	129.66	(19.66)
Residential re-roof without sheathing	70.00	105.46	(35.46)
Commercial re-roof under \$10,000	150.00	129.66	20.34
Commercial re-roof \$10,000 to \$49,999	300.00	153.86	146.14
Commercial re-roof \$50,000 and up	500.00	202.28	297.72



Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Window/Door Replacement – Residential	70.00	105.46	(35.46)
Window/Door Replacement - Commercial	value*	153.86	N/A
SWPPP – base fee	200.00	181.13	18.87
SWPPP – addl fee per acre	50.00	23.17	26.83
Stormwater Review	NEW	88.44	N/A
Floodplain Development Permit	50.00	132.69	(82.69)

* Value-based permits show an average fee amount for 2022 where available; some permit types did not have enough examples in 2022 to estimate an average value.

The District's permit costs for solar power installations do not track well with its expenses. The base fee is insufficient to cover staff time and expense, and the surcharge for additional capacity is only slightly higher than the estimated cost for the additional work required. As a result, any solar installation under 18kW results in a deficit. Costs for battery storage permits were based on the need for an independent inspection; if battery storage is included as part of a solar installation already being inspected, the deficit for this fee type would be greatly diminished.

Residential reroofing permits showed modest deficits for projects with and without new sheathing. Conversely, commercial reroofing showed a surplus of fee revenue, especially for larger projects. We recommend that the District take a closer look at reroofing permits, particularly on the residential side, which sees much higher permit volume than commercial projects.

Residential window and door replacement permits showed a deficit. We did not find any commercial window/door replacement fees for 2022, so we cannot calculate a typical fee for these at this time.

Permit fees for SWPPP showed a surplus of revenues, particularly for larger projects where the peracre fee would cause the surplus to widen. The District may wish to look at lowering the per-acre charge to keep revenues and costs in balance.

The stormwater review fee is a proposed new fee type, intended to allow the District to determine whether a full SWPPP is required for a particular project. The floodplain development permit currently shows a significant deficit against estimated costs. Our interviews indicated that this is a fairly new permit type, so the District may wish to see what its actual costs are after more permits are processed.



Other Inspection Fees

These fees are related to other inspection activities. Many of the District's building permits listed above include inspection activities as part of the permitting process. This section is focused on other inspections outside of the building permit system.

Other Inspection Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Reinspection	50.00	48.42	1.58
Pre-inspection (after fire/disaster)	70.00	72.62	(2.62)
Multi-unit inspection	100.00	193.66	(93.66)

The District's fees for reinspections and post-disaster inspections are very close to its calculated costs. For multi-unit inspections, estimated costs are considerably higher than the current fee. Our interviews indicated that a significant expense was due to driving times and the frequency of follow-up visits being necessary.

Plan Check Fees

Consistent with the fee structure for building permits, fees for plan checks are typically based on the valuation of the project being reviewed. Plan check fees for commercial properties and properties within an FCOZ are set at 65% of the building permit fees calculated under the District's fee schedule, while residential plan checks outside of an FCOZ are set to 40% of the building permit fee. Exceptions to these calculations exist for card-file plan checks and small projects.

Plan Check Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Plan Check – Residential	675.00	698.40	(23.40)
Plan Check – Commercial	1,600.00*	812.91	787.09
Card File Plan Check - SFR/Duplex	150.00	183.16	(33.16)
Card File Plan Check - Multi- family	1,000.00	320.55	679.45
Plan Check – Smaller projects	100.00	129.73	(29.73)
Grading Plan Check	300.00	129.73	170.27



Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Plan Check Fee (FCOZ)	2,800.00*	2,140.98	659.02
Land Use Review	110.00	297.63	(187.63)
Solar Energy – up to 20 kWA	150.00	145.03	4.97
Solar Energy – over 20 kWA	value*	232.83	N/A

* Value-based plan check fees show average fee amounts for 2022 where available; some types did not have enough examples in 2022 to estimate an average value.

A review of plan check fees for 2022 showed that the District charged an average fee of approximately \$675 for residential plan checks and \$1,600 for commercial projects. The residential fee is close to being balanced with costs, while the average commercial fee represents a substantial surplus over the District's calculated costs. The District may want to consider using a different multiplier for commercial plan check fees to bring revenues and costs into closer agreement.

Card file plan checks for single-family homes and duplexes showed a small deficit. Costs for this fee type fluctuate based on the number of review cycles required for each project. For multi-family properties, the District showed a substantial surplus of fee revenues over costs. This is an area where we recommend the District consider adjusting its fee to better align with costs.

Plan checks for smaller projects showed a small deficit. Plan checks for grading projects showed a sizeable surplus.

For properties in an FCOZ, the average plan check revenue was approximately \$2,800. This resulted in a surplus for the fee type, though the District's costs for this fee type varied considerably based on the need for multiple review cycles on many of these projects.

Fees for land use reviews covered only a fraction of the District's costs. This is another fee type which should be considered for adjustment.

For solar energy installations under 20kWA, the District's plan check costs and fee revenues were in close agreement. Fee data for larger solar installations was not present in the 2022 report, so we cannot calculate average fee revenues for this category.



Public Body Review Fees

This fee category covers projects where public meetings are required to be held. Costs for these cases tend to be very high, as there are usually several personnel required to be present, and the time requirements can be high.

Public Body Review Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Planning Commission	650.00	1,274.61	(624.61)
Mayor's Meeting	115.00	1,146.48	(1,031.48)
Council Meeting	115.00	737.46	(622.46)
Text Amendment	300.00	341.70	(41.70)
Zoning Map Amendment – base fee	1,500.00	2,524.62	(1,024.62)
Zoning Map Amendment – addl fee per acre (10-50 acres)	200.00	448.49	(248.49)
Zoning Map Amendment – addl fee per acre (50-100 acres)	300.00	875.62	(575.62)
Zoning Map Amendment – addl fee per acre (100+ acres)	value*	1,729.89	N/A

* Value-based fees show an average amount for 2022 where available; some fee types did not have enough examples in 2022 to estimate an average value.

Review fees in this area are consistently far below their related costs. While the District may wish to take steps to narrow these deficits through process efficiencies and fee increases, we understand that full cost recovery in this area may not be practical, as the fees required would discourage potential applicants from complying with local ordinances.



Administrative Review Fees

The next group of fees is related to the previous, except that these are permitted uses which require internal agency review meetings rather than hearings before a Commission or Council. While costs for these fee types are generally not as high as those in the previous section, they still represent a challenge for policy makers to balance cost recovery while still encouraging compliance.

Aam	inistrative	Review	rees	and	Costs	

Administrative Deview Free and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Agency Review Meeting	455.00	383.59	71.41
Referral from Building Permit or Business License	110.00	42.72	67.28
Development Services Director Review	275.00	254.64	20.36
Staff Site Plan Review (up to 4 reviews)	535.00	1,025.12	(490.12)
Limited Agency Review	175.00	427.14	(252.14)
Final approval	535.00	1,025.12	(490.12)
Land Use Hearing Officer Review	1,000.00	2,257.11	(1,257.11)

The agency review meetings showed a surplus of fee revenue, though costs for this fee type can vary widely depending on the number of staff needed to attend the review meeting. Additionally, considerable extra cost can be generated if the review team need to visit a project site in person. The District may wish to explore a surcharge for onsite visits to help recover the costs of travel time.

Staff reviews related to referrals from Building Permits or Business Licenses tended to be simpler in nature. The costs shows for this fee type were based on the assumption that a simple review was sufficient. For projects where a more in-depth review is required, costs would likely be in line with the fee amount.

Reviews by the Development Services Director showed a small surplus, though costs for this fee type will increase when the complexity of a project or request requires additional research and analysis.

The costs generated for staff site plan reviews were based on a requirement for three review cycles. The deficit for this fee type will depend on the number of reviews required, but a surplus would be possible only if a project required a single review. For cases where limited outside reviewers are required, significant deficits are still present.

Final approvals for boundary adjustments, conditional uses, Planned Unit Developments and subdivision final plats followed a similar structure to staff site plan reviews, with similar costs and deficits.



Our calculations show that the fee for Land Use Hearing Officer reviews would be sufficient if the LUHO spent just one hour on the review. Our research indicated that up to six hours of time was routinely needed, leading to the deficit shown in the table above.

Addressing Fees

This set of fees involves GIS staff working on address assignments and street name changes.

Addressing Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Assignment of Address – base fee	100.00	614.16	(514.16)
Assignment of Address – addl per lot	40.00	31.43	8.57
Street Name Change – base fee	250.00	1,572.21	(1,322.21)
Street Name Change – addl per lot	50.00	163.78	(113.78)

Looking at the base fee for address assignments, we observed that considerable amounts of staff time were required for reviewing documentation and coordinating with planning staff, resulting in a significant deficit for these projects. The per-lot surcharge showed a small surplus, so larger projects might see the deficit narrow based on these surcharges. Even so, we recommend the District review its addressing fees to bring costs and revenues into better alignment.

Street name changes showed a very large deficit, based on the amount of time required to communicate with homeowners on the affected street. Fortunately, these requests are infrequent. We recommend that the District consider increasing fees for street name change, though we realize that full cost recovery would be a significant challenge.



Right-of-Way Fees

These fees are related to incursions to the public right of way and engineering checks for subdivisions.

Right-of-Way Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Change sidewalk and drive approach	20.00	203.05	(183.05)
Change drive approach only	20.00	203.05	(183.05)
Replace existing w/o changes	-	104.80	(104.80)
New curb, gutter, sidewalk and drive approach	150.00	N/A	N/A
New sidewalk only	100.00	N/A	N/A
New drive approach only	100.00	N/A	N/A

For changes to existing drive approaches and sidewalks, Engineering estimated approximately 2.5 hours to review parcel maps and check measurements against local ordinances and current standards. This results in costs of just over \$200, as compared to a fee of \$20. For replacement of existing improvements without changes, Engineering time was cut in half. Given that no fee is charged for these projects, this results in a deficit of just over \$100. We recommend the District increase these fees to help narrow the deficit between costs and revenues.

Projects for installing new drive approaches, sidewalks, curbs and gutters proved difficult to measure, as Engineering had no recollection of performing such a review outside the context of a new subdivision.



Engineering Check Fees

These fees cover engineering checking for subdivisions and non-subdivision developments.

Engineering Check Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Final subdivision fee - prior to review	value (35% of 6%)	-	N/A
Final subdivision fee - prior to recording or construction	value (100% of 6%)	1,139.70	N/A
Amended subdivision plat	350.00	874.42	(524.42)
Non-subdivision developments - prior to engineering review	150.00	-	150.00
Non-subdivision developments - prior to approval or construction	value (4.5%)	1,139.70	N/A

Our interviews with Engineering staff indicated that the group does not generally spend time on prospective development applications, so we were unable to generate District costs for this item. For final engineering reviews of subdivisions, Engineering estimated approximately 14.5 hours of time, translating to approximately \$1,140 in costs. The fees charged for these projects are based on project values; we do not have a set of typical values for subdivision projects, and for that reason are unable to estimate a surplus or deficit value at this time.

For reviews of amended subdivision plats, Engineering estimated its time at approximately 7 hours, with a cost to the District of \$875. This is considerably higher than the current fee of \$350, and we encourage the District to adjust this fee to help reduce the deficit amount.



Other Engineering Fees

The last group of engineering fees covers a variety of types relating to road dedication fees, geology/natural hazard reviews, and traffic impact reviews.

Other Engineering Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Road dedication fees - for widening and improvements	150.00	-	150.00
Road dedication fees - for street signs	200.00	-	200.00
Geology/Natural Hazard Review - Initial Site Assessment	200.00	19.65	180.35
Geology/Natural Hazard Review - Review of technical reports	at cost	314.40	N/A
Traffic Impact Review - Initial Site Assessment	200.00	39.30	160.70
Traffic Impact Review - Review of technical reports	at cost	98.25	N/A

The Engineering staff we spoke with had no experience reviewing applications strictly related to roadway dedications or improvements, and had no estimated time for such applications. Similarly, they indicated that street signs were charged based on estimates from the County sign shop, with numbers and placement of signs generated as part of other reviews.

For initial assessments of sites in regard to natural hazards, these reviews are generally brief. This results in a sizeable surplus for this fee type. For initial assessment of traffic impacts, the Engineering time is slightly higher, but still results in a significant surplus.

For technical reviews by contracted experts, Engineering generates just over \$300 in costs for coordinating reviews of natural hazards, and just under \$100 for coordinating traffic impact reviews. The District should be sure to include these costs along with its contracted costs when calculating fees for these projects.



Bond Administration Fees

When development bonds are needed, the District incurs costs related to administration of these bonds. The related fees are shown in the table below.

Bond Administration Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Bond Processing	100.00	136.85	(36.85)
Bond Forfeiture	value	136.85	N/A
Deferred Curb and Gutter	value	-	N/A
Bond Reinspection	100.00	136.86	(36.86)

For initial processing prior to acceptance of a bond, our interviews determined that approximately 2 hours of staff time was involved in setting up templates and gathering information. Costs related to the time spent result in a modest deficit for this fee type.

Bond forfeitures require a similar amount of staff time for drafting and sending notification letters to various parties. Fee collection is based on the amount of the bond; we do not have an estimate for a typical bond amount involved in a forfeiture, so we do not have a calculated deficit or surplus for this fee.

Staff indicated that deferred curb and gutter projects went through the County Engineering department. In cases where a hydrology bond was required, the District would use the same process as for initial bond processing described above.

Bond reinspections are the same as reinspections for building permits described earlier in this report.



Research Fees

The District offers research services to determine the legal status of a parcel or lot, and to provide zoning compliance letters and administrative decisions. For this type of research, an hourly fee is charged for staff time.

Research Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Legal status of parcel, etc. (per hour)	25.00	82.69	(57.69)

We estimate the average hourly cost of District planners to be \$82.69. We recommend that the District implement fee changes to make revenues comparable with costs.



Park Facility Rental Fees

Baker Tilly was asked to review the costs associated with renting facilities in the County's parks. After speaking with Parks Maintenance staff, we generated the costs listed below.

Park Facility Fees and Costs

Fee Type	Avg Fee Collected	Average District Cost	Difference
Pavilion rental - daily	75.00	40.64	34.36
Pavilion rental - special event	250.00	81.28	168.72
Field rental - daily	250.00	65.02	184.98
Field rental - seasonal	per player	520.11	N/A

For pavilion rentals, staff estimated that one hour would be required for setup and cleanup of the facility, along with a minimal amount of time needed to receive and confirm reservations. For special events (defined as events with over 50 attendees), additional time for cleanup and reservations would be needed. In either case, the revenues generated from fees were considerably higher than the estimated costs. Bear in mind that our cost calculations include employee time, but no costs related to the facilities themselves. Without data to show the costs of depreciation, borrowing, or other capital expenses, we cannot estimate an all-inclusive cost for these facilities.

For ballfields, the time needed to prep a baseball field for a special event was estimated at approximately two hours, which results in a significant surplus between fee revenues and costs. For seasonal baseball leagues, an estimate of 1 hour per field per week plus office staff time for coordination resulted in a total cost of just over \$500 per field for a 13-week season. Any surplus or deficit for baseball leagues will depend on the number of teams and players, and the number of games played on a given ballfield in a day.

Parks staff remarked that the extra work required for pavilion cleanup and groundskeeping for fields did not add considerably to their normal duties of keeping facilities and grounds well maintained.



5. Next Steps

We hope that this analysis of the District's fee-related costs provides a good starting point for decisions about future changes to the fee schedule. As the District considers such changes, we recommend that efforts start with the fees having the highest volume and largest gaps (positive or negative) between fees and costs. Changes made to these fees will have the largest impact on the District's financial operations.

Where fee revenues are significantly higher than estimated costs, lowering the fees charged is generally a straightforward process. While care should be taken to identify fee types with variable costs and make certain the District is protected against expected "high-maintenance" projects, there aren't usually any obstacles to making reductions in fees.

Where significant deficits exist, the District should determine whether there are process improvements which could be implemented to reduce staff time and costs. Where such efficiencies are unavailable or insufficient to close the deficit, then the District should consider increasing fees to reduce or eliminate the imbalance.

In some cases, the fee increases required to make a fee type revenue-neutral are impractical for one reason or another. The District may need to absorb some costs in order to encourage applicants to comply with local ordinances and regulations. In other cases, fees may be related to developments considered desirable by local communities, who wish to encourage such development even if it means that costs for services aren't covered.

In other cases, fees may be much higher than the District's costs, but the amounts set for these fee types reflect costs borne by other organizations or policy decisions made to regulate the amount of development in specific locations or industries.

In circumstances where balancing costs and fee revenues are not practical, the District should have a clear understanding of the reasons for the imbalance and be able to explain the circumstances to residents, developers and policy makers. As conditions change, policy preferences may change to reflect the new environment, at which point further adjustments to fees can be implemented.



6. Closing

We hope that this analysis of fee-related costs proves useful to the District as it reviews its fee schedule for the coming years. We encourage the District to revisit its costs on a regular basis, and to make adjustments based on changes to the District's payroll and budgets, as well as changing costs for contracted services.

If the process for processing an application or providing inspection services changes significantly, we encourage the District to do a careful review of the impacts of these changes. Similarly, if the staff members involved in the permit process change, it would be prudent to verify that costs do not change significantly. This is especially important if responsibilities for a fee type move to a new department; because indirect and administrative costs can vary greatly between departments, the hourly cost of personnel can change in surprising ways.

It has been our pleasure to work with the District on this important project. If updates to the District's costs are needed in the future, we would be happy to provide any assistance which may be required.



Appendix 1: Summary of Fees and Costs

The tables which follow show the fee amounts and associated costs for each fee type included in the study.

Category	Fee Name	Fee Amt	Direct Cost	Indirect	Dept Admin	Overhead	TOTAL COST	Surplus/ (Subsidy)
Business Licensing	Home business license (simple)	-	42.39	9.31	2.83	6.35	60.88	(60.88)
Business Licensing	Home business license (with customers)	150.00	144.13	31.65	9.61	21.59	206.98	(56.98)
Business Licensing	Commercial business license	150.00	84.80	18.63	5.67	12.70	121.80	28.20
Business Licensing	Per-employee fee	6.00	12.72	2.79	0.85	1.91	18.27	(12.27)
Business Licensing	Umbrella short-term license - base fee - commercial	500.00	84.80	18.63	5.67	12.70	121.80	378.20
Business Licensing	Umbrella short-term license - per unit - commercial	50.00	144.13	31.65	9.61	21.59	206.98	(156.98)
Business Licensing	Short-term rental license - homeowner	500.00	42.40	9.30	2.83	6.35	60.88	439.12
Business Licensing	Seasonal business license	120.00	84.80	18.63	5.67	12.70	121.80	(1.80)
Business Licensing	Solicitor ID	65.00	50.88	11.17	3.40	7.62	73.07	(8.07)
Business Licensing	Accessory Dwelling Unit	50.00	84.80	18.63	5.67	12.70	121.80	(71.80)
Business Licensing	Sexually-oriented business (outcall)	500.00	84.80	18.63	5.67	12.70	121.80	378.20
Business Licensing	Sexually-oriented business (non-outcall)	300.00	84.80	18.63	5.67	12.70	121.80	178.20
Business Licensing	Annual license renewal		2.03	0.45	0.14	0.30	2.92	(2.92)
Alcohol Licensing	Single Event	150.00	25.44	5.58	1.71	3.81	36.54	113.46
Alcohol Licensing	Off-premise beer retailer	250.00	25.44	5.58	1.71	3.81	36.54	213.46
Alcohol Licensing	Beer-Only Restaurant	350.00	25.44	5.58	1.71	3.81	36.54	313.46
Alcohol Licensing	On-Premise Beer Tavern	350.00	25.44	5.58	1.71	3.81	36.54	313.46
Alcohol Licensing	Resort	500.00	25.44	5.58	1.71	3.81	36.54	463.46
Alcohol Licensing	Wholesale Beer	300.00	25.44	5.58	1.71	3.81	36.54	263.46
Alcohol Licensing	Restaurant Liquor	500.00	25.44	5.58	1.71	3.81	36.54	463.46
Alcohol Licensing	Manufacturing	350.00	25.44	5.58	1.71	3.81	36.54	313.46
Alcohol Licensing	Recreational On-Premise Beer Retail	350.00	25.44	5.58	1.71	3.81	36.54	313.46
Alcohol Licensing	Limited Restaurant Liquor	500.00	25.44	5.58	1.71	3.81	36.54	463.46
Alcohol Licensing	Club Liquor	600.00	25.44	5.58	1.71	3.81	36.54	563.46
Alcohol Licensing	Banquet & Catering	500.00	25.44	5.58	1.71	3.81	36.54	463.46
Code Enforcement	Administrative Citation	100.00	8.05	1.77	0.54	1.21	11.57	88.43
Code Enforcement	Civil Penalty - Bldg Enforcement case	100.00	32.21	7.07	2.15	4.83	46.26	53.74
Code Enforcement	Civil Penalty - Business Licensing case	100.00	24.16	5.30	1.61	3.62	34.69	65.31
Code Enforcement	Cleanup Fees	cost plus \$100	277.82	61.00	18.53	41.63	398.98	value
Code Enforcement	Post-Compliance Penalty	based on # days	16.11	3.53	1.08	2.41	23.13	value
Code Enforcement	Civil Penalty - Zoning (major case)	100.00	120.79	26.52	8.06	18.10	173.47	(73.47)
Code Enforcement	Civil Penalty - Zoning (minor case)	100.00	60.40	13.26	4.03	9.05	86.74	13.26
Code Enforcement	Short-term Rental Violation	100.00	24.16	5.30	1.62	3.62	34.70	65.30
Code Enforcement	Noise or Nuisance	100.00	-	-	-	-	-	100.00
Code Enforcement	Operating Short-term Rental w/o License	650.00	-	-	-	-	-	650.00
Code Enforcement	Short-term Rental under 2 nights	650.00	-	-	-	-	-	650.00
Code Enforcement	Special Event at Short-term Rental	650.00	24.16	5.30	1.62	3.62	34.70	615.30
Code Enforcement	Parking Violation-lesser (11.20.070/.080/.090/.140)	75.00	5.64	1.23	0.38	0.84	8.09	66.91
Code Enforcement	Parking Violation-greater (11.20.050/.060/.110135)	150.00	88.58	19.45	5.90	13.27	127.20	22.80



Category	Fee Name	Fee Amt	Direct Cost	Indirect	Dept Admin	Overhead	TOTAL COST	Surplus/ (Subsidy)
Inspections	Reinspection	50.00	33.68	7.40	2.29	5.05	48.42	1.58
Inspections	Pre-inspection (after fire/disaster)	70.00	50.53	11.09	3.43	7.57	72.62	(2.62)
Inspections	Multi-unit inspection	100.00	134.74	29.58	9.15	20.19	193.66	(93.66)
Bldg Permits	Building Permits-typical townhome	2,058.00	1,300.83	285.62	88.31	194.89	1,869.65	188.35
Bldg Permits	Building Permits-typical single-family home	2,871.00	1,300.83	285.62	88.31	194.89	1,869.65	1,001.35
Bldg Permits	Demolition	70.00	135.08	29.67	9.18	20.23	194.16	(124.16)
Bldg Permits	Mechanical/Plumbing/Electric – base fee	70.00	121.86	26.76	8.28	18.25	175.15	(105.15)
Bldg Permits	Mechanical/Plumbing/Electric – per appliance/fixture	20.00	16.84	3.70	1.14	2.52	24.20	(4.20)
Bldg Permits	Grading Permit	350.00	138.71	30.45	9.42	20.77	199.35	150.65
Bldg Permits	Retaining Wall	value	121.86	26.76	8.28	18.25	175.15	value
Bldg Permits	Mobile Home Setup	200.00	121.86	26.76	8.28	18.25	175.15	24.85
Bldg Permits	Window/Door Replacement – Residential	70.00	73.37	16.11	4.99	10.99	105.46	(35.46)
Bldg Permits	Window/Door Replacement - Commercial	value	107.06	23.50	7.27	16.03	153.86	value
Solar	System up to 20 KWA - Base Fee	70.00	121.86	26.76	8.28	18.25	175.15	(105.15)
Solar	System up to 20 KWA - addl fee per KWA	30.00	16.84	3.70	1.14	2.52	24.20	5.80
Solar	System over 20 KWA – Permit Fee	value	101.05	22.19	6.86	15.14	145.24	value
Solar	Battery Storage System (per battery)	2.00	33.68	7.40	2.29	5.05	48.42	(46.42)
Re-Roof	Residential re-roof with sheathing	110.00	90.22	19.80	6.13	13.51	129.66	(19.66)
Re-Roof	Residential re-roof without sheathing	70.00	73.37	16.11	4.99	10.99	105.46	(35.46)
Re-Roof	Commercial re-roof under \$10,000	150.00	90.22	19.80	6.13	13.51	129.66	20.34
Re-Roof	Commercial re-roof \$10,000 to \$49,999	300.00	107.06	23.50	7.27	16.03	153.86	146.14
Re-Roof	Commercial re-roof \$50,000 and up	500.00	140.74	30.90	9.56	21.08	202.28	297.72
Plan Check	Plan Check – Residential	675.00	504.52	92.12	28.47	73.29	698.40	(23.40)
Plan Check	Plan Check – Commercial	1,600.00	584.19	109.60	33.89	85.23	812.91	787.09
Plan Check	Plan Check – Smaller projects	100.00	90.27	19.82	6.12	13.52	129.73	(29.73)
Plan Check	Grading Permit	300.00	90.27	19.82	6.12	13.52	129.73	170.27
Plan Check	Plan Check Fee (FCOZ)	2,800.00	1,508.21	312.49	96.61	223.67	2,140.98	659.02
Plan Check	Land Use Review	110.00	207.08	45.46	14.06	31.03	297.63	(187.63)
Plan Check	Card File Plan Check - SFR/Duplex	150.00	127.44	27.98	8.64	19.10	183.16	(33.16)
Plan Check	Card File Plan Check - Multi-family	1,000.00	223.03	48.98	15.13	33.41	320.55	679.45
Plan Check	Solar Energy – up to 20 KWA	150.00	100.90	22.16	6.85	15.12	145.03	4.97
Plan Check	Solar Energy – over 20 KWA	value	180.59	20.99	6.49	24.76	232.83	value
Storm	Stormwater Review	new	61.53	13.51	4.18	9.22	88.44	value
Storm	SWPPP – base fee	200.00	126.02	27.67	8.56	18.88	181.13	18.87
Storm	SWPPP – addl fee per acre	50.00	16.12	3.54	1.09	2.42	23.17	26.83
Storm	Floodplain Development Permit	50.00	92.31	20.28	6.27	13.83	132.69	(82.69)



Appendix 1

Category	Fee Name	Fee Amt	Direct Cost	Indirect	Dept Admin	Overhead	TOTAL COST	Surplus/ (Subsidy)
Public Body Review	Planning Commission	650.00	886.81	194.72	60.22	132.86	1,274.61	(624.61)
Public Body Review	Mayor's Meeting	115.00	797.66	175.14	54.17	119.51	1,146.48	(1,031.48)
Public Body Review	Council Meeting	115.00	513.10	112.66	34.83	76.87	737.46	(622.46)
Public Body Review	Text Amendment	300.00	237.74	52.20	16.14	35.62	341.70	(41.70)
Public Body Review	Zoning Map Amendment – base fee	1,500.00	1,756.52	385.68	119.26	263.16	2,524.62	(1,024.62)
Public Body Review	Zoning Map Amendment – per acre (10-50 acres)	200.00	312.04	68.51	21.18	46.76	448.49	(248.49)
Public Body Review	Zoning Map Amendment – per acre (50-100 acres)	300.00	609.22	133.76	41.36	91.28	875.62	(575.62)
Public Body Review	Zoning Map Amendment – per acre (100+ acres)	value	1,203.58	264.27	81.71	180.33	1,729.89	value
Other Reviews	Agency Review Meeting	455.00	266.89	58.59	18.12	39.99	383.59	71.41
Other Reviews	Land Use Hearing Officer Review	1,000.00	1,865.74	113.24	35.01	243.12	2,257.11	(1,257.11)
Permitted Uses	Staff Site Plan Review (up to 4 reviews)	535.00	713.23	156.60	48.42	106.87	1,025.12	(490.12)
Permitted Uses	Limited Agency Review	175.00	297.18	65.25	20.18	44.53	427.14	(252.14)
Permitted Uses	Referral from Bldg Permit or Business License	110.00	29.72	6.52	2.02	4.46	42.72	67.28
Permitted Uses	Development Services Director Review	275.00	177.17	38.89	12.03	26.55	254.64	20.36
Permitted Uses	Final approval	535.00	713.23	156.60	48.42	106.87	1,025.12	(490.12)
Addressing	Assignment of Address – base fee	100.00	485.13	61.84	-	67.19	614.16	(514.16)
Addressing	Assignment of Address – addl per lot	40.00	24.83	3.17	-	3.43	31.43	8.57
Addressing	Street Name Change – base fee	250.00	1,241.92	158.29	-	172.00	1,572.21	(1,322.21)
Addressing	Street Name Change – addl per lot	50.00	129.36	16.50	-	17.92	163.78	(113.78)
Right-of-way	Change sidewalk and drive approach	20.00	180.83	-	-	22.22	203.05	(183.05)
Right-of-way	Change drive approach only	20.00	180.83	-	-	22.22	203.05	(183.05)
Right-of-way	Replace existing w/o changes	-	93.33	-	-	11.47	104.80	(104.80)
Right-of-way	New curb, gutter, sidewalk and drive approach	150.00	-	-	-	-	-	150.00
Right-of-way	New sidewalk only	100.00	-	-	-	-	-	100.00
Right-of-way	New drive approach only	100.00	-	-	-	-	-	100.00
Final Subdiv/Plat	Prior to review	value (2%)	-	-	-	-	-	value
Final Subdiv/Plat	Prior to recording or construction	value (6%)	1,015.00	-	-	124.70	1,139.70	value
Final Subdiv/Plat	Amended subdivision plat	350.00	778.75	-	-	95.67	874.42	(524.42)
Engineering Check	Prior to engineering review	150.00	-	-	-	-	-	150.00
Engineering Check	Prior to approval or construction	value (4.5%)	1,015.00	-	-	124.70	1,139.70	value
Road Dedication	for widening and improvements	150.00	-	-	-	-	-	150.00
Road Dedication	for street signs	200.00	-	-	-	-	-	200.00
	Initial Site Assessment	200.00	17.50	-	-	2.15	19.65	180.35
0,	Review of technical reports (3.52.160)	at cost	280.00	-	-	34.40	314.40	value
Traffic Impact Review	Initial Site Assessment	200.00	35.00	-	-	4.30	39.30	160.70
Traffic Impact Review	Review of technical reports (3.52.17)	at cost	87.50	-	-	10.75	98.25	value
Bond Admin	Bond Processing	100.00	108.10	13.78	-	14.97	136.85	(36.85)
Bond Admin	Bond Forfeiture	Value	108.10	13.78	-	14.97	136.85	value
Bond Admin	Deferred Curb and Gutter	Value	-	-	-	-	-	value
Bond Admin	Bond Reinspection	100.00	108.10	13.78	-	14.98	136.86	(36.86)
Research	Legal status of parcel, etc. (per hour)	25.00	57.58	12.64	3.84	8.63	82.69	(57.69)
Parks	Pavilion rental - daily	75.00	36.19	-	-	4.45	40.64	34.36
Parks	Pavilion rental - special event	250.00	72.38	-	-	8.90	81.28	168.72
Parks	Field rental - daily	250.00	57.90	-	-	7.12	65.02	184.98
Parks	Field rental - seasonal	per player	463.20	-	-	56.91	520.11	value



Appendix 2: Fee Comparison

The following tables show comparisons between the fees changed by the Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District and a selection of peer organizations. The communities used for comparison included:

- Draper
- Herriman
- Ogden
- South Jordan
- West Jordan
- West Valley City

Not every community had comparable fees listed for each item on the District's fee schedule. This appendix is focused on fee types where meaningful comparisons were possible. Fees for code enforcement are not included, because comparable values for other communities were not widely available and because these fees are primarily linked to compliance with local regulations as opposed to a regular fee for service.

Fee types on the following pages are listed in roughly the same categories and order as used in Section 4 of the main report.



Business Licensing Fees

	Home business license (with customers)	Commercial business license*	Per-employee fee	Solicitor ID**	Sexually- oriented business (outcall)	Sexually- oriented business (non- outcall)***
MSD	\$150	\$150	\$6	\$65	\$500	\$300
Draper		\$75	\$7	\$135	\$600	\$300
Herriman		\$180				
Ogden	\$100	\$100		\$100		
South Jordan	\$275	\$194				
West Jordan*	\$97	\$284	\$8	\$105	\$600	\$300
West Valley City	\$160	\$160	\$10	\$115		\$300

* The \$75 fee from Draper is a general business license fee; many types of businesses are charged higher fees. The \$284 from West Jordan includes a fire inspection but does not include a one-time application fee of \$53 (not charged for renewals).

** The solicitor ID fee for Draper includes a \$100 fee for the company. Additional individuals are charged \$35 each.

*** Most jurisdictions charge additional fees for each employee/performer at sexually-oriented businesses.

Alcohol Licensing Fees

	Off-premise beer retailer	Beer-Only Restaurant	On-Premise Beer Tavern	Restaurant Liquor	Limited Restaurant Liquor	Club Liquor
MSD	\$250	\$350	\$350	\$500	\$500	\$600
Draper	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300	\$300
Herriman	\$250					\$300
Ogden	\$125					
South Jordan				\$238		
West Jordan*	\$342	\$342		\$342		
West Valley City	\$1,500	\$500	\$1,500	\$500	\$500	

* West Jordan charges an additional application fee of \$315 to first-time applicants.



Building Permit Fees

Because building permit fees are linked to valuations, it can be difficult to compare these fees between jurisdictions. For the purposes of this report, we looked at the listed permit fees for construction of a new residential property valued at \$300,000. For this permit, the District is comparable to most of its peers, at \$2,481. Most jurisdictions charged between \$2,400 and \$2,700, with the exception of Herriman at \$3,744.



Fees for other types of building permits are shown in the tables on the following page.



	Reinspection	Demolition	Mech/Plumb/ Elec – base fee	Mech/Plumb/ Elec – per fixture	Grading Permit	Retaining Wall	Mobile Home Setup
MSD	\$50	value	\$70	\$20	value	value	\$200
Draper	\$70	\$50	\$100		100% of UBC	\$250	
Herriman	\$47		\$47	\$10			
Ogden	\$56				\$150		
South Jordan	\$158	\$38	\$212	\$160		\$683	
West Jordan*	\$72	\$161	\$76				\$161
West Valley City	\$50		\$50				\$75

* West Jordan charges an additional \$11 processing fee for building permits.

	Solar up to 20 KWA - Base Fee	Addl fee per KWA	Solar over 20 KWA – Permit Fee	Battery Storage System (per battery)	Residential re- roof with sheathing
MSD	\$70	\$30	value	\$2	\$110
Draper	\$606	\$0			
Herriman					
Ogden					
South Jordan	\$443	value	\$837		\$158
West Jordan		\$44		\$55	\$105
West Valley City					

Plan Check Fees

Most jurisdictions charged plan check fees based on a percentage of the building permit fee. The table below shows percentages or flat fees as appropriate.

	Plan Check – Residential	Plan Check – Commercial	Plan Check – Smaller projects	Card File Plan Check - SFR/Duplex
MSD	40%	65%	\$100	\$150
Draper	65%			\$100
Herriman	65%		\$47	\$0
Ogden	50%	65%		
South Jordan				
West Jordan	40%	65%	65%	\$100
West Valley City	40%	65%	65%	

Land Use Fees

The Greater Salt Lake Municipal Services District charges fees related to land use based on the types of planning activities required to process a land use permit. These components include such items as staff review (internal or cross-agency), Council and Commission meetings, and similar items. By contrast, most jurisdictions in the benchmarking group charge fees for specific permit types. These include categories such as conditional uses, permitted uses, subdivisions, ordinances and appeals.

For the purposes of making reasonable comparisons, we worked with the District's planners to identify the components needed to process a variety of representative land use permits, and used these estimates to compare the District with other members of the benchmarking group. These comparisons are contained in the tables on the following pages.



Appendix 2

Reviews	Variances	Appeals	Nonconf. Use Expansion	Administrative Determination	Zoning Verification Letter
MSD	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$1,000	\$275	\$50
Draper		\$500	\$200		\$50
Herriman	\$300		\$150	\$65	\$65
Ogden		\$565			\$25
South Jordan		\$975			\$284
West Jordan		\$1,250			\$99
West Valley City	\$350	\$150		\$125	\$35

Conditional Uses	Conditional Use - Administrative	Planned Unit Development	All others (commercial and residential)
MSD	\$175	\$1,640	\$1,640
Draper			\$500
Herriman		\$1,000 + \$30/unit	\$1,000 + \$100/acre
Ogden		\$1,695	\$1,550
South Jordan			\$676
West Jordan	\$415		\$1,275
West Valley City	\$550	\$250 + \$130/lot	

Permitted Uses	Building permit site plan	Commercial Site Plan	Residential Development
MSD	\$110	\$1,070	\$1,070
Draper	\$100	\$2,000	
Herriman		\$1,000 + \$100/acre	\$800
Ogden		\$1,390	\$1,695
South Jordan		\$6,882	\$1,445
West Jordan		\$1,675 + \$145/acre	
West Valley City	\$20	\$1,300/acre	\$1,300/acre



Subdivisions	Minor Subdivision <5 lots	Major Subdivision	Subdivision amendments	Lot Line Adjustments	Extension of time
MSD	\$990	\$1,640	\$1,755	\$175	\$275
Draper	\$400 per lot	\$2,000 + \$25/lot	\$2,000	\$500	
Herriman	\$300 + \$30/lot	\$2,000+	\$250 + \$10/lot	\$250	
Ogden	\$750	\$1,000 + \$30/lot	\$695	\$675	\$200
South Jordan		\$2,816 + \$209/lot	\$3,637	\$742	1/2 of base fee
West Jordan	\$1,374 + \$52/lot	\$1,914 + \$52/lot	\$1,914 + \$52/lot	\$1,432	185
West Valley City	\$250 + \$200/lot		\$250 + \$100/lot		

Ordinances	Text change	Zoning map change up to 10 acres	Zoning map change 10+ acres	General Plan amendment
MSD	\$950	\$940	\$2,440	\$2,440
Draper	\$2,000	\$2,000 + \$25/acre		\$2,000
Herriman	\$800	\$650	\$650	\$2,000
Ogden	\$350	\$875	\$875	
South Jordan	\$1,262	\$2,227	\$2,227	
West Jordan	\$2,283	\$2,039	\$2,039	\$2,404
West Valley City	\$250	\$700	\$700 + \$50/acre	\$250



Addressing and Right-of-way Fees

	Assignment of Address – base fee	Street Name Change – base fee	Change drive approach only
MSD	\$100	\$250	\$20
Draper			\$100
Herriman			
Ogden			
South Jordan			\$193
West Jordan	\$79	\$347	\$286
West Valley City		\$150	

Engineering Check, Streets, Natural Hazard Review, and Bond Processing Fees

	Engineering Check	Street Dedication	Street Sign Fee	Geology/ Natural Hazard Review	Bond Processing
MSD	value (4.5%)	\$150	\$200	cost	\$100
Draper				\$3,000*	
Herriman	\$3000 + 3% of bond	\$100	\$345	cost	\$50
Ogden					
South Jordan					
West Jordan	value (4.5%)		cost		\$173
West Valley City		\$250	\$150		\$300



Park Facility Rental Fees

Facility rental fees charged by communities in the benchmark group may vary depending on whether the renter is a resident/non-resident and whether the rental period is on a weekend or a weekday. The table below shows resident rental fees for weekend rentals.

	Pavilion rental - daily	Pavilion rental - special event	Field rental - daily*	Field rental - seasonal
MSD	\$75	\$250	\$250	per player
Draper	\$80		\$180	\$10/player
Herriman	\$80		\$180	negotiated
Ogden			\$120	\$213/team
South Jordan	\$75		\$75	negotiated
West Jordan	\$100	\$200	\$100	\$15/hour
West Valley City	\$50	\$250	\$150	

* Additional field rental charges may be applied if field lighting is required for rentals after sunset.



Appendix 3: Recommended Fee Schedule Format

Baker Tilly was asked to provide recommendations to the District for making its fee schedule clearer and more user-friendly. Our recommended format for an updated fee schedule is included under separate cover.

The model fee schedule is provided in a Microsoft Word file. This format recognizes that the District has certain technical restrictions related to its need to distribute fee schedules to member communities. The inclusion of collapsible sections under defined section headers will allow the user to add, delete, or rearrange sections to suit each member community with a minimum of time and effort. Each header is tied to a Table of Contents which can be refreshed quickly after changes are made.

We have tried to keep the structure of the fee schedule consistent between sections. Where descriptive language about fee types was available from the District's existing fee schedule, we kept the explanatory language, making minor edits for clarity and brevity where appropriate. Where such language was not available, we consulted our interview notes to add descriptions where possible. We also made use of footnotes to tie explanatory text directly to the applicable fee types.

We encourage the District to add text to any fee types where additional descriptions would be useful for customers.

We shifted several fee types within and between sections in an attempt to group similar fee types together to be more intuitive for customers. This is particularly noticeable in the section on Land Use Fees, where we have laid out fees consistent with the format used in Appendix 2.

We recommend that the District consult with its customer-facing employees regularly (at least yearly) to identify specific fees which generate a disproportionately high number of questions or issues. For these fee types, the District should take steps to make these fee types easier for customers to find and comprehend.

Incremental improvements in the fee schedule each year should bear fruit after just a few revision cycles, leading to in a best-in-class document which generates higher satisfaction from users and fewer issues and complications for staff to work out with applicants.

