

To: Community Priorities Advisory Committee

From: Mike Isom, Development Services Manager
Kathy Pease, Planning Manager

Date: December 20, 2017

Subject: January 10th Meeting Agenda Packet

The following materials are attached for committee review and consideration in advance of the January 10, 2018 CPAC meeting:

- 1. Meeting Agenda**
- 2. Responses to Development Services Department Questions Received**
- 3. Development Services Priority Ranking Exercise #1 Results (12 responses received)**

Follow up materials for the Committee's information from previous meetings include:

- 4. December 13th Meeting Summary**

Hard copies of items #1-4 will be provided at the meeting.

If you have any questions prior to the meeting, please contact Mike Isom at (916) 774-5527 or misom@roseville.ca.us, and Kathy Pease (916) 774-5434 or kpease@roseville.ca.us.



EngageROSEVILLE

**Community Priorities Advisory Committee
Meeting #12**

Wednesday, January 10, 2018 / 6:00 pm – 8:00 pm
Mahany Meeting Rooms | 1501 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Roseville, CA

A G E N D A

- 6:00 pm** **I. Welcome!**
- A. Roll Call
 - B. Agenda Overview
- 6:05** **II. Development Services Follow-Up Questions
Follow-Up Questions**
- *Kevin Payne, Director*
- 6:20** **III. Preliminary Voting Ranking Discussion**
- 7:00** **IV. Public Comment**
- Members of the public are invited to offer comments on any item within the purview of the CPAC. For those wishing to make oral comments, please complete a Speaker Card, turn it in to a staff member and wait for your name to be called. Speakers are asked to observe a 2-minute time limit.
- 7:10** **V. Committee Voting**
- 7:30 pm** **VI. Next Steps**
- 8:00 pm** **Adjourn**

To: Community Priorities Advisory Committee

From: Kevin Payne, Development Services Director

Date: December 21, 2017

Subject: Response to Committee Questions

No written questions were submitted to the Development Services Department subsequent to the December 13th meeting. The following questions requiring responses were presented by Committee members at the December 13th meeting:

1. If you could develop a hypothetical “wish list,” how could you best leverage the Development Services Department to produce the most economic benefit for the community?

The following represents a list of items that - if there were no budgetary or other restrictions - we believe would produce the most economic benefit for the community. These include items that are currently not within our control, but also include those that are within our control.

Starting with the items that are not within our control:

No more unfunded State mandates and unrealistic performance standards: *Legislative actions taken at the state level consistently and negatively impact our budget by mandating specific development-related operations to be performed by local government, but not providing a funding source to aid with implementation. Recent examples include: storm water quality monitoring, water efficiency measures, changes in air quality and greenhouse gas standards, and changes to traffic impact standards.*

Staffing levels/Qualified Staff: *As noted in our presentation, the Department attempts to balance workload with a staffing model consisting of core full-time staff coupled with part-time/contract staff to flexibly respond to changes in development activity. However, we’re finding it increasingly difficult to recruit and retain full-time and contract staff to fill the need when development activity heats up, as we’re competing with the private sector for qualified staff.*

Customer Service Representatives/Dedicated Large Project Coordinators: *The Department facilitates rapid development of large priority projects with tight schedules – such as those bringing beneficial employment centers to the City (e.g., McKesson, Galleria Mall, Adventist Health, Kaiser, etc.) - by assigning a dedicated staff member to each stage of the approval process (entitlement, plan check, inspection). In order to provide this service, staff members are either pulled away from other projects and assignments, or are burdened with the additional workload.*

A potential solution would be to add and dedicate a position with sufficient authority to act as a coordinator for these types of projects. The City has made several attempts in the past but, in an effort to continually do more with less, resources have not been available to dedicate a position exclusively for this purpose. Doing so would allow such a staff member to “hand hold” large, priority projects through the development process, acting as a single point of contact for the

project proponents. This position could live in DSD or Economic Development. Given current fiscal constraints, this would be a “nice to have” but not a “must have.”

Items within our control:

Staffing and Process Modifications: This year we shifted water and sewer plan check and inspection staff to the civic center from the corporation yard. In doing so, the City finally implemented its long-sought vision of implementing a “one-stop shop” at the permit center. We are in the process of cross training staff to eliminate the need for review by multiple plan checkers and inspectors of the same plan set/construction project. Under this new model, one plan checker looks at all engineering items in a plan set, including above-ground and under-ground improvements, and one inspector looks at all engineering-related improvements in the field. Completing cross training and having everyone up to speed is on our “wish list.”

Electronic Plan Submittal and Review: Staff has been working for the past two years on modifying the way we do business by leveraging technology to make ourselves more efficient. Anticipated in the spring of 2018, we will no longer be using paper plan sets. Plans and applications will be submitted electronically, saving the customer time and money in reproduction costs. The all-paper process required submittal of 15 paper sets of plans to distribute to reviewing departments and agencies, and physical distribution of the plan sets to the various departments and agencies often took up to a week. The new all-electronic submittal and distribution process will allow for instantaneous distribution of plan sets to reviewers, and will allow customers greater transparency regarding the status of their submittals. Given the significant investment in staff time to complete this effort, this is high on our “wish list”.

These are items that we believe would definitely continue to set our services apart from other jurisdictions.

2. Why is the Business Services/Permit Center division budget presented as \$1.4 million in the budget narrative and \$650,000 in the power point presentation?

The gross Business Services/Permit Center division budget is approximately \$1.4 million. As indicated in footnote #2 of the Development Services Department White Paper, this division does not direct-bill for the majority of its time. Rather, customer service and back-of-house functions that support permit processing are factored into Building, Engineering and Planning time-motion studies and resulting billing rates for entitlement processing, plan check, and permitting. For accounting purposes, this is not reflected as offsetting revenue in the Business Services/Permit Center division budget. For illustrative purposes, the budget number presented in the Power Point reflected this offset. Nevertheless, the gross Development Services Department budget is \$10.5 million with \$4.1 million of budgeted offsetting reimbursements, resulting in a total budgeted cost recovery of 61%. Fiscal year to date cost recovery is 71%.

3. Please provide more information regarding the Council-adopted cost recovery plan for Development Services, and identify the various permit types and targeted cost recovery for each.

Applicable pages from the City of Roseville “Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees” book are attached for more detail. The City Council is the approving authority for all user and regulatory fees, and sets policies pertaining to targeted cost recovery. In summary:

Planning Entitlements

Of the 77 Planning-related actions listed on the attached Entitlement Fee matrix, only 11 are less than 100% cost-recoverable. These application types are typically those most frequently sought by homeowners/residents and small businesses, including:

- Appeals of Planning Director and/or Planning Commission and Design Committee decisions (30%),*
- Development agreements associated with affordable housing (50%)*
- Sign permits and planned sign programs (50%)*
- Administrative permits (50%)*
- Administrative variance (50%)*
- Zoning clearance approved at public counter (50%)*
- Zoning interpretations (staff level) (50%)*
- Farmer's market (50%)*
- Home occupation permit (50%)*

Major development entitlements are 100% cost-recoverable for all City staff time and materials spent in processing the applications.

Engineering Permits

As indicated in the attached Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees, most Engineering division activities are billed on a time and materials basis, with minimums. Flat fees for other activities that are more routine in nature and generally less time-intensive are based on the average time and motion required to process such applications. Please see the attachment for a full description of flat fee and full cost Engineering division activities.

Building Permits

Building permit fees are structured to recover the City's actual cost (time, materials, and overhead) required to process various permit types. Permit fees are calculated using discreet valuation factors which correlate to the project's per-square foot cost associated with the City's costs in permitting, plan review, and inspection services based on an hourly rate of \$172.00. The fee schedule establishes minimum valuations for specific types of permit activities. The various permit types and minimum valuations are detailed in the attached Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees.

In Fiscal Year 2016-17, the Building division issued 6,166 permits of various nature. A report is attached detailing all permit types and number of permits issued for each type.

Attachments

1. Building Permit Fee Schedule (from "Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees)
2. Building Permit Types and Counts Report – FY2016-17
3. Planning Entitlement Fees (from "Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees)
4. Planning Entitlement Cost Recovery Target Matrix
5. Engineering Fees (from "Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees)

City of Roseville

Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees

Building Fees

A. Construction Valuation Table - Table A is the construction valuation table adopted for the purpose of establishing permit fees as construction valuation is a factor in the cost of providing permitting services. These valuations correlate to the square footage costs of permitting, plan review, and inspection services based upon the hourly rate for building services identified in this fee schedule.

Table A - Construction Valuation

Group	Valuation		Unit	Y'rly In'fltr	
	A	B			
1	A-1 Assembly, theaters, with stage	\$93.60	\$46.80	per SF	N
2	A-1 Assembly, theaters, without stage	\$93.60	\$46.80	per SF	N
3	A-2 Assembly, nightclubs	\$93.60	\$46.80	per SF	N
4	A-2 Assembly, restaurants, bars, banquet halls	\$111.80	\$55.90	per SF	N
5	A-3 Assembly, churches	\$93.60	\$46.80	per SF	N
6	A-3 Assembly, general, community halls, libraries, museums	\$88.40	\$44.20	per SF	N
7	A-4 Assembly, arenas	\$105.30	\$52.65	per SF	N
8	B Business	\$88.40	\$44.20	per SF	N
9	E Educational	\$94.90	\$47.45	per SF	N
10	F-1 Factory and Industrial, moderate hazard	\$49.40	\$24.70	per SF	N
11	F-2 Factory and Industrial, low hazard	\$49.40	\$24.70	per SF	N
12	H-1 High Hazard, explosives	\$49.40	\$24.70	per SF	N
13	H-2,3,4 - High Hazard	\$49.40	\$24.70	per SF	N
14	H-5 - HPM	\$79.30	\$39.65	per SF	N
15	I-1 Institutional, supervised environment	\$126.72	\$63.36	per SF	N
16	I-2 Institutional, hospitals	\$131.29	\$65.65	per SF	N
17	I-2 Institutional, nursing homes	\$249.09	\$124.55	per SF	N
18	I-3 Institutional, restrained	\$145.80	\$72.90	per SF	N
19	I-4 Institutional, day care facilities	\$126.72	\$63.36	per SF	N
20	M Mercantile	\$62.40	\$31.20	per SF	N
21	R-1 Residential, hotels	\$97.50	\$48.75	per SF	N
22	R-2 Residential, multiple-family	\$100.18	\$50.09	per SF	N
23	R-3 Residential, one- and two-family	\$110.00	\$55.00	per SF	N
24	R-4 Residential, care/assisted living facilities	\$106.60	\$53.30	per SF	N
25	S-1 Storage, moderate hazard	\$42.90	\$21.45	per SF	N
26	S-2 Storage, low hazard	\$41.60	\$20.80	per SF	N
27	U Utility, miscellaneous	\$32.50	\$16.25	per SF	N

B. Determination of Construction Valuations - The building official shall determine construction valuations as follows:

- New Construction.** New construction shall be based upon the square footage of the proposed project multiplied by the amount stated in **Column A of Table A** corresponding to the occupancy group, as determined by the building official, for a total construction value.
- Improvements.** Improvements to existing buildings shall be based upon the square footage of the proposed improvements multiplied by the amount stated in **Column B of Table A** corresponding to the occupancy group, as determined by the building official, for a total construction value.

Building Fees

C. Commercial Building Valuations - Minimum commercial building valuations are stated below for the purposes of establishing minimum permit fees to cover the cost of service for the project listed. The higher valuation shall be assessed unless otherwise stated.

- 1 **Tenant Improvements Processed Over the Counter (OTC Permits).** Tenant Improvement OTC permits shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 2 **Tenant Improvements Requiring Plan Submittal.** Tenant Improvements (TIs) requiring plan submittal shall have a minimum valuation based upon Column B of Table A. For purposes of this section, a tenant improvement is defined as any improvement, maintenance or other updating on commercial property; improvement, maintenance or other updating on multi-family property; improvement, maintenance or other updating on residential care facilities and model home sales complexes, including sales trailers.
- 3 **Commercial Photovoltaic.** Commercial photovoltaic permits shall be based on a set valuation of \$40,000.
- 4 **Electrical Service Upgrade.** Electrical service upgrade permit fees shall have a minimum valuation of \$3,000.
- 5 **Commercial Reroofing.** Commercial reroofing permits shall have a minimum valuation of \$423.17 per 100 square feet of roof area or a total minimum valuation of \$20,000.
- 6 **OTC Permits for Commercial Projects.** OTC permits for commercial projects such as demolition, electrical, mechanical, plumbing and other work not otherwise defined shall have a minimum valuation of \$3,000.
- 7 **OTC Permits for Commercial Projects.** OTC permits for commercial projects such as demolition, electrical, mechanical, plumbing and other work not otherwise defined shall have a minimum valuation of \$3,000.
- 8 **Cell Towers - Change out of Antennas Only.** Cell towers requiring change-out of antennas only shall be considered a TI remodel with a minimum valuation of \$3,000.
- 9 **Cell Towers - Major Remodel.** Cell towers undergoing a major remodel shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 10 **Shelves and Racking.** Permits for shelves and racking shall be considered a TI remodel. Construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 11 **Stucco or Siding on Multi-Family.** For permits for stucco or siding on multi-family units, construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the linear footage of exterior home and garage x 1 SF (= remodel SF) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the R-2, Residential Multi-Family Occupancy Group.
- 12 **Stair Repair on Multi-Family.** For permits for stair repair on multi-family units, construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage of the stair area(s) x number of floors of the building(s) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the R-2, Residential Multi-Family Occupancy Group.
- 13 **Pool Replaster and Repairs.** For permits for commercial pool replaster and/or repairs, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the pool square footage by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 14 **Electronic Gates.** For permits for electronic gates, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the lineal footage of the gate and replacement fence x 1 SF (=SF) by the amount stated in Column A of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 15 **Facade Remodel.** For permits for facade remodel, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the lineal footage of the facade x 1 SF (=SF) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the Occupancy Group listed on the certificate of occupancy.

Building Fees

- 16 **Spray Booth.** For permits for spray booth installation, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$8,000 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage of the booth area by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the F, Factory and Industrial Occupancy Group.
- 17 **Parking Lot Restriping: Site Work.** Permits for parking lot restriping shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 18 **ADA Upgrades.** Permits for ADA upgrades shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 19 **Barrier Removal.** Permits for barrier removal shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 20 **Crane install runways.** Permits for crane install runways shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 21 **Construction Trailer.** For permits for construction trailers hooking up to water/sewer and/or electric, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be calculated by multiplying the trailer square footage by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the B, Business Occupancy Group.
- 22 **Commercial Charging Station.** For permits for commercial charging stations, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be based on the construction valuation provided by the applicant with a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 23 **Emergency Generator to Cell Site.** Permits for emergency generators to cell sites shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.
- 24 **Pumpkin Lot/Tree Lot.** Permits for pumpkin or tree lots shall have a minimum valuation of \$8,000.

D. Residential Building Valuations - Minimum residential building valuations are stated below for the purposes of establishing minimum permit fees to cover the cost of service for the project listed. The higher valuation shall be assessed unless otherwise stated.

- 1 **Patio Covers.** Patio covers shall have minimum valuation based upon new construction valuation of Column A of Table A.
- 2 **Swimming Pools.** Swimming pools shall have a set valuation of \$25,000 for the purposes of establishing the building permit fee. The swimming pool construction contract valuation shall be reported on the permit application if such amount exceeds \$25,000.
- 3 **Residential Remodel.** Residential remodel permits shall have a minimum valuation based upon Column B of Table A.
- 4 **Residential Additions.** Residential additions shall have a minimum valuation based upon Column A of Table A (new construction).
- 5 **Combination of Residential Remodel and Residential Addition.** With respect to a permit application for a combination residential remodel and residential addition subsection (D)(3) shall apply with respect to the residential remodel portion and subsection (D)(4) shall apply with respect to the residential addition (new construction) portion for a total construction valuation for the permit.
- 6 **Photovoltaic.** Photovoltaic permits shall be based upon a set valuation of \$18,000 for the purposes of establishing the permit fee.
- 7 **Reroof.** Reroof permits for residential structures shall have a minimum valuation of \$239.49 per 100 square feet of roof area or a total minimum valuation of \$2,400.
- 8 **Plumbing OTC Permits.** OTC permits pertaining to plumbing shall have a minimum valuation of \$900.
- 9 **Mechanical, Electrical, Car Charging Stations, Demolition and Other OTC Permits Not Specified in this Section.** OTC permits for mechanical, electrical, car charging stations, demolition, and other permits not specified in this section shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.

Building Fees

- 10 **Stucco or Siding.** For permits for stucco or siding on residential units, construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the linear footage of exterior home and garage x 1 SF (= remodel SF) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the R-3, Residential, One- and Two-Family Occupancy Group.
- 11 **Fence or Retaining Wall.** For permits for residential fences or retaining walls, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the linear footage of fence or wall x 1 SF (= SF) by the amount stated in Column A of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 12 **Windows.** Permits for residential windows shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.
- 13 **Freestanding Fireplace.** Permits for a freestanding fireplace shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.
- 14 **BBQ.** Permits for a barbeque (BBQ) shall have a minimum valuation of \$2,400.
- 15 **Pool Replaster and Repairs.** For permits for residential pool replaster and/or repairs, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the pool square footage by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 16 **Shed.** For permits for residential sheds, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage of the shed (= SF) by the amount stated in Column A of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 17 **Deck Repair.** For permits for deck repair, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be the GREATER OF \$2,400 OR the construction valuation calculated by multiplying the square footage of the deck area being repaired (= SF) by the amount stated in Column B of Table A for the U, Utility, Miscellaneous Occupancy Group.
- 18 **Fire Repair.** For permits for residential fire repair, the construction valuation for fee setting purposes shall be calculated in the same manner as a residential remodel.

Building Fees

E. Permit Fees - Subject to any applicable minimum permit fees stated elsewhere in this schedule, Table B and B.1, shall apply for the purpose of establishing minimum permit fees.

Table B - Permit Fees

Total Valuation	Permit Fee				Y'rly In'fltr
\$1 to \$500	\$51.00				Y
\$501 to \$1,000	\$51.00	for the first \$500	plus \$2.55	for each add'l \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000	Y
\$1,001 to \$3,000	\$63.75	for the first \$1,000	plus \$2.81	for each add'l \$100 or fraction thereof, to and including \$3,000	Y
\$3,001 to \$25,000	\$119.85	for the first \$3,000	plus \$11.22	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$25,000	Y
\$25,001 to \$50,000	\$356.75	for the first \$25,000	plus \$9.18	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$50,000	Y
\$50,001 to \$100,000	\$586.25	for the first \$50,000	plus \$6.38	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$100,000	Y
\$100,001 to \$500,000	\$905.00	for the first \$100,000	plus \$5.10	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$500,000	Y
\$500,001 to \$1,000,000	\$2,945.00	for the first \$500,000	plus \$3.83	for each add'l \$1,000 or fraction thereof, to and including \$1,000,000	Y
\$1,000,001 and up	\$4,859.54	for the first \$1,000,000	plus \$2.04	for each additional \$1,000 or fraction thereof	Y

Production Home Permit Fees - Building permits for production homes (those homes that are one and two family homes having an approved master plan, which is a complete set of building plans from which multiple homes may be constructed) shall have a minimum permit fee as calculated in Table B.1.

Table B.1 - Production Home Permit Fees

Total Valuation	Permit Fee				Y'rly In'fltr
\$0 to \$120,000	\$1,206.66				Y
\$120,001 and up	\$1,206.66	for the first \$120,000	plus \$8.16	for each add'l \$11,000 or fraction thereof	Y

Building Fees

F. Administration Fee - In addition to the permit fee, an administration fee is established for the city to recover the cost of permit application processing, permit issuance, and plan review and shall be applied as follows:

Fee Description		Fee	Y'rly In'fltr
1	Permits Requiring Plan Submittal for Review	95% of the Building Permit Fee	N
2	Over the Counter Permits Requiring Minimal or No Plan Review	25% of the Hourly Rate or Actual Cost (for time in excess of 1/2 hour)	N
3	Production Home Permits	37% of the Building Permit Fee	N
4	Plans Submitted for the Purposes of Being Mastered	95% of the Building Permit Fee (based on SF valuation of proposed design)	N
5	Emergency Water Heater Repair	Exempt From the Admin Fee (allocated one inspection visit. If add'l visits are required re-inspection fees apply for add'l visits)	N

Building Fees

G. Additional Time and Materials Fees and Refunds and Appeals - Building permits are subject to additional time and material fees where the cost of service provided by city exceeds the amount collected at application. Such fees shall be calculated as follows:

Fee Description	Fee	Unit	Note	Y'rly In'ftr
1 Additional Services (1/2 hour minimum)	\$175	per hour	[a]	Y
2 Re-inspections (per scheduled stop)	\$102	per stop	[b]	Y
3 Inspections Outside of Normal Business Hours	\$175	per hour	[c]	Y
4 Work Commenced without a Permit	\$175	minimum	[d]	Y
5 Certificate of Occupancy (1 hour minimum)	\$175	per hour	[e]	Y
6 Permit Extension or Reinstatement of an Expired Permit	\$175	per hour	[f]	Y
7 Third Party Plan Review (fee is in addition to City Administration Fee in Section F)	pass through of consultant fee		[g]	N
8 Credit Card Fee	3.0%		[h]	N
9 Fees for Services Not Listed in this Schedule	Actual Cost		[i]	N
10 Refunds and Appeals				
a) Fees erroneously paid by applicant or collected or charged by the agency	100% refund		[j][m]	N
b) When no work has been commenced	up to 75% refund		[k][m]	N
c) Expired permit applications and permits	0% refund		[l][m]	N

[a] Additional Services (e.g. administrative and plan review) Fees shall be assessed at time of permit issuance and/or prior to final inspection at application. Additional service is defined as follows:

1. Plan Reviews in excess of three (3) submittals to city for review and approval.
2. Plan Review by city departments other than the development services department for projects affecting other City services and not covered by any fees set forth in this section.
3. Other staff time and resources for the purposes of facilitating and approving permit applications and permits.
4. Expedited plan review, when available, and additional resources required to facilitate the expedited plan review process, including consultants and/or other city departments and divisions whose assistance is required for plan approval.

[b] Re-inspections may be assessed based on any of the following:

1. Inspections which are not ready at the time of the scheduled inspection, as determined by a city inspector.
2. Failure by applicant to complete inspection items from previous correction notices.
3. Inspections additional to the inspection with respect to emergency water heater permits.

[c] Inspections outside of normal business hours will be subject to a 2-hour minimum for evening work and a 4-hour minimum for weekend work.

[d] Whenever any work for which a permit is required has been commenced without first applying for a building permit and receiving permission by the building official, a minimum fee for investigation and administration shall be assessed in addition to the full cost of any required permits.

Building Fees

[e] The fee for a certificate of occupancy shall be a minimum of one hour, and any additional costs beyond one hour of staff time to approve such certificates.

[f] Permit applications and permits shall expire per the provisions of the California Building Code. Reinstatement and extensions may be granted provided that all costs incurred by the city to date of the request are paid for by the permit applicant. For this purpose, cost is defined as the hours expended for review and administration multiplied by the hourly rate.

[g] Third party plan review, when available, shall be assessed and paid at time of permit application. The fee for this service is the hourly or flat rate charged by the consulting firm performing the review. This fee is in addition to the permit Administration Fees identified in "Section F" of this fee schedule for the additional resources required to facilitate the process.

[h] Permit applicants who choose to pay with a credit card for any fees may do so providing they pay to city an administration fee, not to exceed 3% of the transaction cost. This fee is a convenience fee for merchant processing and is only charged to applicants utilizing a credit card and only with respect to the amount of the total permit fee which is paid by such credit card.

[i] Fees for services not otherwise listed in this schedule shall be determined by the building official and based upon the actual cost of providing the service.

[j] The building official may authorize refunding of any fee paid, or portion thereof, which was erroneously paid by applicant or collected by city.

[k] The building official may authorize refunding of not more than seventy-five percent (75%) of fees paid when no work has been done under a permit application or an issued permit in accordance with the adopted California Code of Regulations. In no case shall the refund exceed the cost of services provided to date of cancellation of permit issuance.

[l] Permit applications and building permits that have expired as defined in the California Building Code shall not be subject to any refund.

[m] A building permit applicant may, upon payment of the requested permit fees to city and otherwise complying with California Government Code Section 66022, protest the requested amount to the city council by lodging an appeal with the building official. City staff shall schedule the appeal to be heard by the city council as soon as reasonably practicable.

Building Fees

H. Technology Fee, General Plan Maintenance Fee, Strong Motion Impact Fee, SB 1473 Fee

Fee Description	Fee	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1 Technology Fee (applicable to building permits, fire permits, improvement plan, and entitlement fees)	3%	[a]	N
2 General Plan Maintenance Fee	\$0.50 per \$1,000 valuation, not to exceed \$20,000		N
3 Strong Motion Impact (SMI) Fee Calculation			
a) Residential	\$0.50 or valuation x .0001	[b]	N
b) Commercial	\$0.50 or valuation x .00021	[b]	N
4 Building Standards Administration Special Revolving Fund (SB 1473) Fee Calculation			
Valuation:			
a) \$1 - \$25,000	\$1		N
b) \$25,001 - \$50,000	\$2		N
c) \$50,001 - \$75,000	\$3		N
d) \$75,001 - \$100,000	\$4		N
e) Every \$25,000 or fraction thereof above \$100,000	Add \$1		N

[a] "Building permit" means the permit issued or required by the city for the construction or modification of any structure pursuant to and as defined by the building code. "Fire permit" means the permit issued or required by the city for the construction or ongoing operations of a structure or business pursuant to and as defined by the fire code. "Improvement plan" means the permit issued or required by the city for the construction of any public or private site improvements as defined by the city's improvement and construction standards. "Entitlement" means those approvals provided under Title 19, Zoning.

[b] Fee set by State.

Building Fees

I. Findings Regarding Permit Fees for Residential Rooftop Solar Energy Systems - Pursuant to Section 66015 of the California Government Code (Fees for Rooftop Solar Energy Systems), the city council finds that the reasonable cost to issue a permit for a residential rooftop solar energy system exceeds \$500 plus \$15 per kilowatt (kW) for each kW above 15 because issuance of the permit requires all of the following:

- 1 One-half (1/2) hour administration time for application and data input
- 2 1/2 hour administration time for permit issuance and one hour plan review time including up to two (2) submittals
- 3 Typically 2 inspections at a minimum of 1/2 hour of staff time
- 4 Other applicable fees assessed by the State of California and by the Roseville Electric Department pursuant to the Roseville Electric Solar Energy Program Meter Upgrade Charges, as amended from time to time

This higher fee results in a quick and streamlined approval process.

Permit Counts

From 07/01/2016 to 06/30/2017

Page 1 of 3

	Applied	Issued
Building		
Commercial C of O	38	34
Commercial Demolition	23	23
Commercial Foundation Only	1	1
Commercial Multi-Family Addition	1	1
Commercial Multi-Family New	53	33
Commercial Multi-Family Remodel	99	96
Commercial New Construction	27	20
Commercial Other	184	180
Commercial Photovoltaic	5	7
Commercial Pool	2	1
Commercial Sales Complex	6	7
Commercial Sales Trailer	6	7
Commercial Sign	142	141
Commercial TI Addition	8	6
Commercial TI Remodel	352	310
Demolition	15	16
Electric Car Charger	18	18
Electrical	150	152
Fire System	316	303
Mechanical	1188	1199
Other	300	304
Plumbing	650	660
Re-Roof	304	306
Residential Master Plan	132	0
Residential Other	76	73
Residential Patio Cover	302	292
Residential Photovoltaic	342	351
Residential Pool	266	265
Residential Remodel	306	303
Residential Single Family	1079	1057
Total Building	6391	6166

Permit Counts

From 07/01/2016 to 06/30/2017

Page 2 of 3

	Applied	Issued
Code		
Case	1345	1403
Total Code	1345	1403
Engineering		
CIP	27	0
Encroachment	228	221
Grading	2	1
Improvement Plan	64	62
Map	39	0
Stormwater Facility History	113	0
Stormwater Management	5	90
Stormwater Runoff	384	335
Traffic Study	9	0
Total Engineering	871	709
Planning		
Administrative Permit	21	0
Allocation Change	31	3
Conditional Use Permit	3	0
Design Review Permit	40	0
Development Agreement	4	0
Easement Abandonment	1	0
General Plan Amendment	5	0
Grading Plan	1	0
Lot Line Adjustment	14	0
Major Project Permit	9	0
Notes	14	0
Ordinance Amendment	1	0
OTC	311	0
Planned Sign Permit Program	1	0

Permit Counts

From 07/01/2016 to 06/30/2017

Page 3 of 3

	Applied	Issued
Planning Support	8	0
Pre-Application	2	0
Project	1	0
Rezone	3	0
Specific Plan Amendment	2	0
Tentative Subdivision Map	14	0
Tree Permit	4	0
Variance	1	0
Voluntary Merger	3	0
Total Planning	494	3

City of Roseville
Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Fee Description	Fixed Fee	Deposit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
Appeals				
1 Planning Director's Decision	\$1,194			Y
2 PC/DC Decision to City Council	\$1,118			Y
Annexations				
1 Annex/PZ/Detach/SOI		\$20,000		Y
Development Agreements (DA)				
1 Adoption of DA		\$20,000		Y
2 Amendment of DA		\$20,000		Y
3 Associated with Affordable Housing	\$2,177			Y
4 Associated with Single Topic Item	\$4,922			Y
Environmental Review				
1 Exemption Without Initial Study	\$288			Y
2 Exemption With Initial Study	\$726			Y
3 Negative Declaration with No Mitigation	\$1,090			Y
4 Tiered Negative Declaration with Mitigation	\$2,262			Y
5 EIR Deposit		\$20,000		Y
General Plan Amendment (GPA)				
1 GPA 10 Acres or Less, Map/Text		\$10,000		Y
2 GPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text		\$17,000		Y
3 GPA - Text Policy Amend		\$15,000		Y
Public Utility Easement Abandonment				
1 Summary Vacation	\$2,247			Y
2 General Vacation	\$3,272			Y
Signs				
1 Standard Sign Permit	\$232			Y
2 Planned Sign Permit Program	\$891			Y
3 Sign Permit/Program - Public Hearing Required	\$1,813			Y
4 Administrative Permit for Sign Exception (Variance)	\$1,498			Y
5 PSP Minor Modification	\$214			Y
Specific Plan Amendment (SPA)				
1 SPA Adoption, Map/Text		\$30,000		Y
2 SPA 10 Acres or Less, Map/Text		\$10,000		Y
3 SPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text		\$20,000		Y
4 SPA Text/Policy Deposit		\$15,000		Y
Subdivisions/Condominiums				
1 Grading Plan - Minor	\$2,058			Y
2 Grading Plan - Major		\$8,000		Y
3 Lot Line Adjustment	\$2,058			Y
4 Extension to a Tentative Map	\$2,058			Y

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Fee Description	Fixed Fee	Deposit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
5 Voluntary Merger	\$2,058			Y
6 Reversion to Acreage	\$2,938			Y
7 Minor Modification to a Tentative Map		\$2,000		Y
8 Major Modification to a Tentative Map		\$10,000		Y
9 Tentative Parcel Map, 4 or Fewer Lots		\$6,000		Y
10 Tentative Parcel Map, 5 - 99 Lots		\$11,000		Y
11 Tentative Parcel Map, 100 - 499 Lots		\$16,000		Y
12 Tentative Parcel Map, 500+ Lots		\$24,000		Y
Zoning Ordinance Entitlements				
1 Administrative Permit	\$1,026			Y
2 Conditional Use Permit		\$9,000		Y
3 CUP Modification		\$5,000		Y
4 CUP Extension	\$4,723			Y
5 Design Review Permit (DRP)		\$8,000		Y
6 DRP - Modification		\$5,000		Y
7 DRP - Extension	\$4,206			Y
8 DRP - Minor	\$159			Y
9 DRP - Additions or New Construction (DTSP Only)	\$159			Y
10 DRP - Façade Improvements (DTSP Only)	\$159			Y
11 DRP - Predesign (DTSP Only)	\$159			Y
12 DRP - Residential Subdivision with Other Permit	\$4,571			Y
13 Flood Encroachment Permit		\$8,000		Y
14 MPP Stage 1 or Stages 1 & 2		\$20,000		Y
15 MPP Modification		\$7,000		Y
16 MPP Stage 2, Extend of Stage 1 and/or 2		\$7,000		Y
17 MPP Administrative Modification	\$1,311			Y
18 Planned Development Permit		\$11,000		Y
19 TP Admin - Approved at Public Counter	\$160			Y
20 TP - Req. Public Hearing for SFD or 10 Trees or Less	\$3,170			Y
21 TP - Req. Public Hearing for DRP/TM or 11+ Trees	\$4,845			Y
22 Administrative Variance	\$1,024			Y
23 Variance to Develop Standards - Req. Public Hearing	\$3,626			Y
24 Variance to Parking Standards	\$4,319			Y
25 Zoning Clearance	\$121			Y
26 Zoning Interpretation - Hearing Required	\$2,716			Y
27 Zoning Interpretation - Non Hearing Item	\$106			Y
Zoning Ordinance Amendments				
1 Ordinance Text Amend (Zoning, Subdivision, Sign)		\$10,000		Y
2 Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10 Acres or Less		\$10,000		Y
3 Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10+ Acres		\$17,000		Y

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Fee Description		Fixed Fee	Deposit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
	Other				
1	Pre-Application Meetings		\$4,000	[a]	Y
2	New Non-Residential Plan Check	15% of Bldg PC		[b]	N
3	Commercial Plan Check - TI	\$119		[b]	Y
4	Planning Department Plot Plan Review (Bundles of 10)	\$119			Y
5	Radius List Prep-Previously Developed Area	\$111			Y
6	Preparation Undeveloped Area/Mailing	\$277			Y
7	Farmer's Market Permit	\$375			Y
8	Home Occupation Permit	\$121			Y
9	Parking In-Lieu Fee (DTSP Only)	\$9,680		[c]	N
10	In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee (Per Inch)	\$118		[d]	N
11	CUP - Vernon St. and Historical District Only	\$1,026			Y
12	Technology Fee	3%			N

Full Cost Deposits and Deposit Replenishment

Applicants for Full Cost Entitlement Applications shall pay for all City staff time required to process the application. A full cost reimbursement agreement shall be included with the project application submittal package. Projects outside the scope of this fee schedule (as determined by the Development Services Director) will be subject to a full cost reimbursement agreement to be approved by the City Council. This reimbursement agreement will include the identification of a work program and will include cost estimates for both City staff time and consultant services based on a defined scope of work.

Initial deposits as shown on the fee schedule will be collected and held by the City in a deposit account at the time the application is submitted. The cost of staff time will be drawn from the deposit account. A positive account balance shall be maintained at all times during the review process. No work will be performed on a project with a negative fund balance. If the deposit is reduced to below 20% of the initial deposit amount, the applicant will be notified and required to supplement the deposit account with an additional amount no less than 50% of the original deposit.

When more than one Full Cost application is submitted, the sum total of the initial full cost deposit amount can be reduced by 20%.

Funds expended for staff time shall not be dependent upon the City's approval or disapproval of the application request. The deposit account will be held open for 90 days after project approval for City to complete any miscellaneous clean up items and to account for all project related costs. Any deposit amounts remaining after final project close out will be returned to applicant. In the event that the deposit account is exhausted prior to final close out, the balance owed to the City will be credited against the plan check and inspection fee deposit at time of improvement plan review.

As may be required by the Development Services Department for project evaluation or environmental review, all payment for consultant work shall be the responsibility of the applicant.

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: The Initial deposit amounts will not be inflated annually, but the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

Planning (Entitlement) Fees

Fee Description	Fixed Fee	Deposit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
-----------------	-----------	---------	------	------------------

Refund Policy

Application fees are not refundable except as follows:

A. Refund of 100% shall be made if a determination is made by the Development Services Director that the permit and associated fee are not required by the City of Roseville Municipal Code or adopted City Resolution.

B. If an applicant requests to withdraw a fixed fee application prior to the PEM, refund of 50% of the applicable fee shall be refunded.

C. No refund of application fees shall be made after a Project Evaluation Meeting has been held, unless a fee waiver is approved by the Roseville City Council.

[a] Pre Application Meetings – The City will provide up to 2 meetings with staff to discuss the initial project review and City policies relative to the proposed project. Additional meetings and staff review prior to a formal application shall be billed on a time and material basis. The project proponent will be asked to submit the pre application deposit and a full cost reimbursement agreement. Staff will record all time against the deposit account. Balances remaining in the deposit account will be applied to the application deposit account or refunded within 60 days. Negative balances will be due in full along with the application deposit or fee at time of Entitlement Application submittal.

[b] Non-Residential - Per Building Code, this includes Commercial and Multi-family developments. Plan Check Fees to be assessed as part of Building Department Plan Check Fee. This fee shall be 15% of the building Plan Check Fee for New Non-Residential construction (Commercial and Multi-family). Fee to be collected with Building's Plan Check Fee.

[c] Parking In-Lieu Fee is an optional fee that non-residential uses in the Downtown Specific Plan Area can utilize instead of providing required parking on-site. Fees for the 1st stall will be 10% of the parking in-lieu fee, 2nd stall 25%, 3rd Stall 50%, 4th stall 75% and 5 or more stalls 100% of the in-lieu fee.

[d] In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee for the removal of protected trees is calculated per inch of the diameter at breast height of the tree.

ENTITLEMENT FEE COST RECOVERY TARGETS

TASK	Ultimate % Recovery of Indirect Costs
APPEALS	
1. Planning Director's Decision	30%
2. PC/DC to City Council	30%
ANNEXATIONS (FULL COST)	
1. Annex/PZ/Detach/SOI	100%
DEVELOPMENT AGREEMENTS (DA)	
1. Adoption of DA	100%
2. Amendment of DA	100%
3. Associated with Affordable Housing	50%
4. Associated with Single Topic Item	100%
ENVIRONMENTAL REVIEW	
1. Exemption without Initial Study	100%
2. Exemption with Initial Study	100%
3. Negative Declaration with NO Mitigation	100%
4. Tiered Negative Declaration with Mitigation	100%
5. EIR Deposit	100%
GENERAL PLAN AMENDMENT	
1. GPA 10 Acres or LESS, Map/Text	100%
2. GPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text	100%
3. GPA-Text/Policy Amend	100%
PUBLIC UTILITY EASEMENT ABANDONMENT	
1. Summary Vacation	100%
2. General Vacation	100%
SIGNS	
1. Standard Sign Permit	50%
2. Planned Sign Permit Program	50%
3. Sign Permit/Program Public Hearing Req	100%
4. Administrative Permit for Sign Exception	100%
5. PSP Minor Modification	100%
SPECIFIC PLAN AMENDMENT	
1. SPA Adoption, Map or Text	100%
2. SPA 10 Acres or LESS	100%
3. SPA 10+ Acres, Map/Text	100%
4. SPA Text/Policy Deposit	100%
SUBDIVISIONS	
1. Grading Plan/Minor	100%
2. Grading Plan/Major	100%
3. Lot Line Adjustment	100%
4. Extension to a Tentative Map	100%
5. Voluntary Merger	100%
6. Reversion to Acreage	100%
7. Minor Modification to a Tentative Map	100%
8. Major Modification to a Tentative Map	100%
9. Tentative Parcel Map with 4 or fewer lots	100%
10. Tentative Map, 5 through 99 lots	100%
11. Tentative Map, 100 through 499 lots	100%
12. Tentative Map, 500+ lots	100%

ZONING ORDINANCE ENTITLEMENTS	
1. Administrative Permit	50%
2. Conditional Use Permit	100%
3. CUP Modification	100%
4. CUP Extension	100%
5. Design Review Permit	100%
6. DRP Modification	100%
7. DRP Extension	100%
8. Minor DRP	100%
9. DRP- Additional or New Construction (DTSP only)	100%
10. DRP- Façade Improvements (DTSP only)	100%
11. DRP - Predesign (DTSP only)	100%
12. DRP/Residential Subdivision w/other Permit	100%
13. Flood Encroachment Permit	100%
14. MPP Stg 1 or Stages 1&2	100%
15. MPP Modification	100%
16. MPP Stg 2, Mod/Exten of Stge 1 &/or 2	100%
17. MPP Administrative Modification	100%
18. Planned Development Permit	100%
19. TP Admin - Approved Public Counter	100%
20. TP-Req PH for SFD or less than 10 trees	100%
21. TP-Req PH for DRP/TM or 11+ trees	100%
22. Administrative Variance	50%
23. Variance to Develop. Standards Req PH	100%
24. Variance to Parking Standards	100%
25. Zoning Clearance Approved Public Counter	50%
26. Zoning Interpretation - Hearing Required	100%
27. Zoning Interpretation - Non-Hearing Item (ZI/City - ZI/Non-hear)	50%
ZONING ORDINANCE AMENDMENTS	
1. Zoning Text Amend (Zoning, Subd, Sign (FULL COST/Deposit) (O/City))	100%
2. Zoning Map Change (RZ) 10 Acres or LESS (RZ/City - RZ)	100%
3. Zoning Map Change (RZ) 11+ Acres (FULL COST/Deposit) (RZ/RZ3)	100%
OTHER	
1. Pre-Application Meeting	100%
2. Non-Residential Plan Check	
3. Commercial Tenant Improvement Review	100%
4. Planning Dept Plot Plan Review ^(Bundle of 10)	100%
5. Radius List Prep-Previously Developed Area	100%
6. Preparation-Undeveloped Area/Mailing	100%
7. Farmer's Market (Farmer)	50%
8. Home Occupation Permit	50%
9. Parking in Lieu Fee (DTSP Only) ¹	100%
10. In-Lieu Tree Mitigation Fee	
11. CUP-Vernon St. & HOT Only	100%

* Amount of recovery approved by City Council (Reso. No. 05-176)

KEY:

(1) DTSP Parking In-Lieu Fee is an optional fee that non-residential uses in the DTSP area can utilize instead of

City of Roseville

Schedule of User and Regulatory Fees

Development Services Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Initial Deposit	Fee Paid	Bond Amount [a]	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
1 Final Subdivision Map	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs	\$2,500 plus \$10 per lot	At submittal			Y
2 Final Parcel Map						
a) base fee	\$1,275		At submittal		[b]	Y
b) per lot fee	\$51		At submittal		[b]	Y
3 Lot Line Adjustment (per adjusted line)	\$230		At submittal		[c]	Y
4 Improvement Plan Check/Inspection	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs \$1,000 minimum	5% of Eng. cost est. 2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan approval	2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan approval	100% of improvements		Y
5 Grading Plan						
a) Subdivision, Commercial, or Industrial Sites	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs \$1,000 minimum	5% of Eng. cost est. 2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan approval	2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan approval	10% of erosion control and grading		Y
b) All Other Sites						
i) Up to 500 Cubic Yards	\$306	\$100 at submittal	\$100 at submittal remainder due at permit issuance	10% of erosion control and grading		Y
ii) Greater than 500 Cubic Yards	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs	\$1,000 at submittal	\$1,000 at submittal balance due prior to final signoff	10% of erosion control and grading		Y
6 Encroachment Permit:						
a) Dumpster	\$61		At submittal	\$0		Y
b) Sidewalk	5% of Project Cost \$60 minimum		At submittal	\$1,000 / contractor		N
c) Driveway	5% of Project Cost \$60 minimum		At submittal	\$500/resident \$1,000/c'nt'rctr		N
d) Lane Closure	\$153		At submittal	\$0		Y
e) Swim Pool Access	\$153		At submittal	TBD by Director		Y
f) Monitoring Wells	5% of Project Cost \$60 minimum		At submittal	\$2,000 per well		N
g) All Others	Billed hourly based on total labor hrs	5% of Eng. cost est. 2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan appr'vl; \$1,000 minimum	2.5% at submittal 2.5% at plan appr'vl	100% of improvements		Y
7 Technology Fee	3% of permit fee		At permit issuance			N

Development Services Engineering and Encroachment Permit Fees

Fee Description	Fee	Initial Deposit	Fee Paid	Bond Amount [a]	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
-----------------	-----	-----------------	----------	-----------------	------	---------------

** Note regarding annual inflationary adjustment: The Initial deposit amounts will not be inflated annually, but the underlying hourly billing rates should inflate annually by the change in hourly labor rates and/or indirect cost rate multipliers.*

[a] Bond amounts paid at permit issuance.

[b] Final parcel map fee collected as base fee plus per lot fee.

[c] Lot line adjustment fee is fee for each adjusted line.

Trench Cut Recovery Fees

Fee Description		Permit Fee	Trench Cut Fee	Cut Fee Unit	Note	Y'rly In'fltr
Trench Cuts Requiring Pmt. of Admin. Permit Fee Only						
1	Street scheduled for resurfacing within next fiscal year	\$306	\$0.00			Y
2	Proposed excavation includes an overlay	\$306	\$0.00			Y
3	Proposed excavation for a CIP	\$306	\$0.00			Y
4	Street pavement quality index (PQI) 0-4	\$306	\$0.00			Y
All Other Trench Cuts						
5	Longitudinal Cut					
	a) Cut within 3' of lane line					
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$306	\$13.22	per LF		Y
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$306	\$17.63	per LF		Y
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater	\$306	\$22.03	per LF		Y
	b) Cut within one lane width					
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$306	\$9.91	per LF		Y
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$306	\$13.22	per LF		Y
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (<i>moratorium street</i>)	\$306	\$16.52	per LF	[a]	Y
6	Traverse Cut					
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$306	\$8.06	per LF		Y
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$306	\$10.74	per LF		Y
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (<i>moratorium street</i>)	\$306	\$13.42	per LF	[a]	Y
7	Cut is a Patch					
	i) PQI: 4.1 - 6.5	\$306	\$8.92	per LF		Y
	ii) PQI: 6.6 - 8.4	\$306	\$11.90	per LF		Y
	iii) PQI: 8.5 or greater (<i>moratorium street</i>)	\$306	\$14.87	per LF	[a]	Y

[a] Moratorium streets require director approval for trenching.

Development Services Department Services Ranking #1 - Results

Service	Highest Priority	Lowest Priority	Net Score and Ranking	
			Net Score	Ranking
BLDG-1: Plan Check* (cost recoverable)	8	0	8	HIGH
BSPC-6: Front Counter / "One Stop Shop"/Public Response/Resident Inquiry (phone calls, emails, etc.)*	7	0	7	HIGH
ENG-5: Traffic Impact Analysis / Planning / Mitigation* (cost recoverable)	6	0	6	HIGH
DSA-3: Billing / Revenue Recovery / Financial Oversight*	5	0	5	HIGH
ENG-1: Improvement Plan / Subdivision Map Plan Check* (cost recoverable)	5	0	5	HIGH
DSA-1: Departmental Oversight, Leadership & Personnel Management*	5	-1	4	MEDIUM
DSA-2: Development Agreement Monitoring*	4	0	4	MEDIUM
BSPC-4: Citywide Permitting System*	4	0	4	MEDIUM
BLDG-3: Inspections* (cost recoverable)	4	0	4	MEDIUM
ENG-2: Infrastructure Inspection Services* (cost recoverable)	4	0	4	MEDIUM
CE-1: Nuisance Abatement/Health and Safety*	3	0	3	MEDIUM
PLN-1: Development Entitlement Processing / Environmental Review / Plan Check* (cost recoverable)	3	0	3	MEDIUM
PLN-3: Develop / Maintain General Plan, Specific Plans and Other Required Planning Documents* (cost recoverable if associated with development project)	3	0	3	MEDIUM
PLN-2: Full Time Planner at Front Counter	3	-1	2	MEDIUM
PLN-8: Review Major Projects Occurring in Adjacent Jurisdictions for Impacts to Roseville	3	-1	2	MEDIUM
BSPC-3: Citywide Addressing & Land Base Management*	2	0	2	MEDIUM
BLDG-2: Enhanced Plan Check Services (Expedited, Accelerated, 3rd party, Concurrent Review, Simple Tenant Improvement) (cost recoverable)	2	0	2	MEDIUM
ENG-3: Professional Service Agreement Management (for Contracted Services)* (cost recoverable)	2	0	2	MEDIUM
ENG-8: Support Long Range Planning / Development Project Review	2	0	2	MEDIUM
BSPC-5: Enterprise GIS*	2	-1	1	MEDIUM
ENG-7: Drainage Analysis/ Planning/Mitigation	2	-1	1	MEDIUM
PLN-4: Zoning Ordinance Enforcement*	2	-2	0	MEDIUM
BSPC-8: Complimentary Development Impact Fee Estimates	2	-3	-1	MEDIUM
CE-3: Follow-Up with Complainants/Coordinate City Response	2	-3	-1	MEDIUM
DSA-5: Private Project Coordination / Development Ombudsman	2	-4	-2	MEDIUM
PLN-5: Represent City in Regional Planning Efforts	2	-5	-3	MEDIUM
BLDG-4: Outside Plan Check Contract Management* (cost recoverable)	1	0	1	MEDIUM
BSPC-1: Mapping and Development Records Management	1	-2	-1	MEDIUM
BSPC-2: Custom Mapping for Public and City Departments	1	-3	-2	MEDIUM
PLN-9: Complimentary Infill Development Project Meetings	1	-3	-2	MEDIUM
BSPC-7: Permit History Search / Plan Set Duplication Copyright Release Coordination	1	-6	-5	LOW
PLN-6: SACOG Meeting Participation	1	-7	-6	LOW
ENG-4: Encroachment Permit Management* (cost recoverable)	0	0	0	LOW
DSA-4: Special Projects (e.g. 316 Vernon, CPAC, Conf. Center)	0	-3	-3	LOW
PLN-7: Technical Advisory Committees (Placer Parkway, Airport Land Use)	0	-3	-3	LOW
DSA-6: Fee Dispute Resolution	0	-5	-5	LOW
ENG-6: Regional Traffic Representation	0	-5	-5	LOW
CE-2: Sign Enforcement	0	-9	-9	LOW

Key: Net Score of 5 and greater = High Priority; Net Score of -5 and lower = Low Priority; All others = Medium Priority

Comments on High Priority Services

Pln-2. Having a human to assist residents unfamiliar with the processes helps residents comply. This person can complete other duties when not providing the services in this role particularly in a downturn/recession where fewer projects are happening.

Keep all cost recovery services.

Since all the services in the Building Division result in no impact to the General Fund after cost recovery of 100%, the Building Division should have been left out of the survey.

As a high cost recovery department, that is a "first responder" for economic development activity, most, if not all, of the tasks above are "High" priority as they contribute directly to the business and development activity in our community.

Did not prioritize cost recoverable services since focus is on reducing GF expenditures. Considered functions that help attract new development and responsiveness to city residents/businesses a higher priority. Regional and long term planning were also prioritized higher.

Comments on Low Priority Services

DSA-1 Efficiency is the key. Perhaps some of the strategic projects can be moved to administration and retirement can result in shifting responsibilities to existing staff.

Eng-6, PLN-5, PLN-6, PLN-7. Move these to the administrative staff.

General comment 1.-Because pension costs are outside of City control, the policy needs to be that services should be contract rather than city personnel unless the job duties cannot be provided by a contractor.

General comment 2. The use of part time employees instead of full time employees reduces the health and other benefit costs significantly. Policy needs to be that positions should be part time or contract whenever possible.

General comment 3. Review cost recovery calculations. Can the ongoing building maintenance costs, utilities, and other overhead be included in the cost recovery in the current and future contracts?

General comment 4. Are there facilities that have aged beyond their useful life that can be sold?
General comment 5. Some costs are not full cost recovery. Can we adjust the fees on an

ongoing basis as our costs increase so that we don't find that they haven't changed in 10 years and the actual costs have doubled?

The importance to the City of being represented in regional planning efforts, SACOG meeting participation, and various technical advisory committees cannot be overstated. Roseville needs to have a seat at these various tables.

BSPC-2 - when the Director elaborated on this, he said they could charge fees instead of eliminating the service and also said there really weren't that many requests

ENG-7 - Seems like there is overlap with Public Works in this area

CE-2 - Dept supplied notes indicated this would be a service reduction only on weekends

BSPC-7 - Dept supplied notes provided no sense of volume for this service; further, with an automated system the searches should not be difficult, so it's just a matter of managing the request queue; perhaps an expedited process could be offered for an additional fee

General note - section on impact if service was cut didn't seem to align with the list where we were to choose high and low priorities. It seemed that descriptions were provided for "non-essential" (non-asterisked) categories, but this was not consistent. Also, several category names didn't match within the divisions which made the references confusing.



Community Priorities Advisory Committee Summary of Meeting #11

December 13, 2017

Prepared by:



Moore Iacofano Goltsman, Inc.
800 Hearst Avenue
Berkeley, CA 94710

December 2017

I. Welcome and Introductions

Welcoming Remarks, Roll Call and Agenda Overview

The eleventh meeting of the Engage Roseville Community Priorities Advisory Committee (CPAC or Committee) was held on Wednesday, December 13, 2017, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Mahany Meeting Rooms, 1501 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Roseville, California. The purpose of the CPAC is to develop recommendations for the City Council regarding service-level priorities and potential service reductions for the five City departments whose operation constitutes the majority of General Fund expenses.

This summary is intended as a succinct synopsis of the meeting's presentations and discussion. More detail on all items, plus meeting materials and a schedule, can be found on the City's Engage Roseville webpage at <http://www.roseville.ca.us/council/engageroseville>.

CPAC Chair Krista Bernasconi officially opened the meeting and took a roll call of the CPAC members.

CPAC Members/Designated Alternates Present:

Krista Bernasconi, Pete Constant, Ellaisson Carroll, Stephanie Dement, Kristine Dohner, Richard Duffy, Jack Ellison, Derk Garcia, Valerie Gross, Julie Hirota, Kathryn Kitchell, Michael Laperche, Sr., Marcus Lo Duca, John Mason, Tracy Mendonsa, Jason Probst, Richard Roccucci, Dennis Snelling, Roy Sterns, John Tallman, Elaine Webb, Randall Wilson, Bruce Houdesheldt (arrived after roll call)

CPAC Members/Designated Alternates Absent:

Matthew Bridge, Wendy Gerig, Jeff Jones, Joe Landon, David Nelson, Sergey Terebkov

Agenda Overview

Facilitator **Lou Hexter** reviewed the evening's agenda, which consists of: a presentation on General Fund discretionary services provided by the Development Services Department, followed by CPAC comments and questions; and a public comment period. CPAC members were provided with a packet via email and in hard copy which included the agenda, budget information from the Development Services Department and follow-up materials from Meeting #10 held on November 29, 2017.

II. Development Services Department, Services Overview

Kevin Payne, Director of Development Services, provided a detailed overview of the Department's services and related General Fund Discretionary costs.

CPAC Questions and Comments

CPAC members provided the following comments and questions regarding the Development Services Department's presentation:

Rates of Development

- During the years that development was taking place at lower rates – 2008-2010 – did commercial development drop off significantly, leaving mostly residential, or was there still a ratio or balance?
 - *On the low end, we were doing about 460 single family residential; the rest of it was a combination of commercial and minor miscellaneous permits.*
- How many acres are left to be developed in Roseville?
 - *There are four specific plans in the western region of Roseville. The West Roseville Specific Plan is projected to build out over the next five years. The remaining three plans comprise about 6,000 acres that have yet to be developed. there are approximately 24,000 residential units that have been approved but not yet constructed. That's slightly more than 20 years of supply based on the current rate of construction (approximately 1,000-1,200 single family units annually).*
- What about commercially available project areas?
 - *We have some major projects that have been approved and going through various stages of the process. The broader changes in the retail market, with more online sales and fewer brick-and-mortar projects, have an impact on commercial development. We're trying to figure out what the opportunities are under the new model – we're early in that process, but have already found that some previously desirable commercial retail sites are not developable from an economic standpoint.*
- Medical development is the most valuable right now. We are creating a huge medical sub-market here. Before the downtown, Roseville was on track to surpass Sacramento as the second largest job center in the region.
 - *With all the medical offices, etc., Roseville is still a net importer of jobs on a daily basis, with more people coming in to work than we have housing for. However, the availability of commercial land is shrinking as we approach buildout in some of our specific plan areas.*
- In the 2018 Work Plan, it mentioned that there were over 5,800 permits issued, of which 1,043 were single-family residences and 500 were tenant improvements. What were the other 4,300 permits for?

- *They were for miscellaneous small permits – water heaters, pool, minor electrical, etc. – mostly residential.*

Staffing

- On Page B-153 of your Program Performance Budget, it seems to indicate that your Business Services and Permit Center went from 5 FTEs in 2015-2016 to 10 FTEs in 2016-2017. Was this just a reclassification, or did you double the size?
 - *It was a re-organization; the Business Services and Permit Center sections were combined and assigned to a single manager. The total number of FTEs remained the same.*
- Are you planning for potential economic downturns when there might be far fewer permit applications?
 - *Yes, in that case we would make cuts to part-time and contract employees. We assess our need for part-time workers annually and adjust as necessary; the number of part-time staff fluctuates. Full-time staff with institutional knowledge are retained and oversee part-time staff hired when development levels are peaking.*
- When do you contract out for plan checks?
 - *We contract out the majority of our commercial plans, plus those such as master residential plans which are large and time-consuming to check. Approximately 20% of permit applications get sent to consultants, but those account for 80% of the valuation of construction in the City. We would need a very large number of people to do those plan checks ourselves—more than we have room for in our office. We do checks for simpler plans, such as remodels, in our office.*
- Are contracted services reflected in the expenses you've provided?
 - *Yes, we budget for them annually, but it's a pass-through cost, with a small (5%) administration fee charged.*
- Are you staffed and budgeted to handle extra work that requirements included in new state mandates, such as the Climate Action Plan, GHG emissions reduction, will entail?
 - *We are addressing these in the General Plan update, and will augment or shift labor and contracts as necessary. I believe we're currently staffed appropriately. We are cautious about bringing on new additional staff when there isn't a long-term need for them.*
- Are the Environmental Utilities Plan Check and Inspection staff now part of your department, or are they still covered by the Enterprise Fund?
 - *That hasn't occurred yet. They are physically located in the same building, in an effort to create a "one-stop shop," but they are still included in the Enterprise Fund budget.*

Fees

- Who pays the Technology Fee?

- *That fee is paid by the applicant.*
- When did you last assess fees as they relate to the region?
 - *Earlier this year.*
- On the sheet summarizing services for the purpose of prioritization – there are a couple of services listed as “complimentary.” –and “Complimentary Infill Development Project Meetings.” Can you tell me what that means?
 - *It means we provide those services for free. “Complimentary Development Impact Fee Estimates” means we have someone who creates an estimate of all impact, plan check and permit fees for development projects. “Infill Development Project Meetings” occur when someone is looking at development in an existing building or property in the Infill or Downtown areas – we’ll walk through with them to assess what is needed to bring the space up to code.*
- Why can’t you charge for custom mapping and GIS services, etc.?
 - *There are a number of things we can charge for. We do charge time and materials for external requests. We can consider adding charges, but the net effect would be minimal – there are not many requests of this kind. As for internal requests, the rule is that the General Fund doesn’t charge for General Fund services.*

Revenue Sources or Cuts

- You mentioned that almost all you do is mandated by state law. Do you have some non-mandated, discretionary items that might provide additional revenue sources?
 - *There’s a list in the appendix of services we currently offer that could be eliminated or charged for – for example, impact fee estimates for developers.*
 - Is that an area where you’d look first to make cuts if you needed to do so?
 - Yes.
- Those sorts of assessments often come early in the process. No other cities in the region charge for fee estimation. Doing so would likely dissuade developers from choosing a site in Roseville. The bar for development in Roseville is very high, and it is expensive to develop here, but the fact that we recognize that time is money and our process moves faster gives us an advantage. The net impact of this department on the General Fund is only 3%, so cuts won’t have much impact on the budget, but Roseville will lose the competitive edge it’s enjoyed for three decades.
- Projects over 10 acres have full cost recovery. The City would rather not charge fees for smaller residential projects like water heater permits, because it won’t stop people from building them – just from getting permitted.

- Are the activities you have to do because of these mandates recoverable or un-recoverable costs?
 - *Some are unrecoverable – e.g., oversight of storm water improvements. The only recovery we get is citation fees assessed by our inspectors during construction – after building, we are not allowed to collect fees unless we go after it through the citation process.*
- The Climate Action Plan will help because the City will already have plans in place for these activities, and it won't have to be revisited for every project. It's turning a negative into as much of an opportunity as possible. These are simply costs that the City has to bear.
- One of our challenges is that it's not realistic to rule out services just because they receive a low priority in our voting. Our comments during discussion will be more useful than the priority ranking numbers. Will you consider opportunities for revenue increases as well as cuts?
 - *Cuts to our services are difficult to make, because the majority of our expenses are in personnel, so cuts in services will cause undesirable delays in the permitting process and commensurate reduction in revenue.*
 - *Also, the faster the process, the sooner a commercial project is built and we begin to receive tax revenues. That's not shown here.*
- Sometimes working in conjunction with other jurisdictions to get infrastructure improvements made to support major developments can be an advantage – costs are shared. Roseville's good strategic planning has helped it win valuable development opportunities that might have gone elsewhere (e.g., the Galleria). Development Services is not seen as providing "quality of life" services in the way that Parks, for instance, does, and many people aren't aware it exists, but it's responsible for creating the first impression made by our City. Again, our reputation for responsiveness and the ease and speed of our permit application process helps. Getting estimates early on can help bring a big investment in.
- I recommend looking at the Flashvote responses for more information on the community's priorities. Several CPAC members have been promoting participation in Flashvote.

Info Requests

CPAC members made the following requests for further information which will require follow-up by the Development Services Department.

- What is the ratio of commercial versus residential permits issued?
 - *Typically, residential is much higher than commercial, but it depends on how you define "commercial" – whether it's commercial from the ground up or commercial include tenant improvements. If you include tenant improvements with ground-up commercial it will be a little more heavily weighted to the commercial side. Will get exact numbers.*

- On Page B-153 in the program performance budget, the amount given for Business Services/Permit Center expenses is \$1.4 million, as opposed to \$650,000 listed on the summary slide in the presentation, and on Slide 24 as well. What's the correct number?
 - *We'll check on that and get back to you.*
- I appreciate the comprehensive information packet you supplied, as well as your high rate of cost recovery. What investments would you include on a "wish list" that would make Roseville an even more attractive place for developers and families, and maximize your opportunity?
 - *We'll think about that and let you know.*
- When choosing to intentionally set a lower cost recovery than might be possible for some items – is that determined by the Council or the Department?
 - *There are not many of these. We'll provide more detailed information.*

III. Public Comment

Members of the public were invited to offer comments or ask questions regarding any item within the purview of the CPAC. No public comments were offered.

IV. Next Steps

Per a request from several CPAC members, the group discussed rescheduling the February 14th meeting so it does not conflict with Valentine's Day. The agreement reached was that staff will investigate the possibility of holding the meeting on Thursday, February 15. If that is possible, they will send out a Doodle poll asking CPAC members' preference.

The next meeting will take place on Wednesday, January 10, 2018, from 6:00 p.m. to 8:00 p.m. at the Mahany Meeting Rooms, 1501 Pleasant Grove Boulevard, Roseville. The Development Services Department survey link will be released tomorrow or Friday, with surveys due by the end of next Wednesday, December 19. The meeting packet will be sent out to CPAC members on Thursday, December 20.

Lou urged CPAC members to prepare for the last three meetings, when the CPAC's recommendations will be refined, by thinking about the issues that are most important and communicating them to ensure they are included in discussion.

Wallgraphic notes taken at the meeting are attached.

Engage ROSEVILLE

CPAC MTG. 11

12-13-17 DEV'T SVCS #1

CPAC QUESTIONS

▶ WHO PAYS TECH FEES?

• BUILDING

▶ RES VS. COMMERCIAL PERMITTING?

• WEIGHTED TO COM. - WILL GET #S

▶ CONTRACTING OF PLAN CHECKS?

• 20% OF PERMITS/80% VALUATION
LARGE/TIME-CONSUMING PLANS

▶ CONTRACTS IN EXPENSES?

• YES - PASS-THRU

▶ RE-ORG - FTES SAME

▶ OTHER 4300 PERMITS?

- MISC. RESIDENTIAL

▶ ENV. UTILS PERSONNEL IN YOUR DEPT.?

• NOT YET - SAME BLDG. STILL ENTERPRISE FUND

▶ P. B-153 - SUMMARY STAFFING \$ DISCREPANCY

\$1.4M vs \$650K

• MISTAKE - WILL CHECK

▶ SVCS. NOT MANDATED?

• SOME COULD BE ELIM. OR CHARGED - E.G.,
IMPACT FEE ESTIMATION - IN APPENDIX

▶ NO ONE ELSE CHARGES FOR FEE ESTIMATES

▶ BAR FOR DEV'T IN ROSEVILLE IS HIGH - MOVES FASTER

CUTS HAVE IMPACT! - NOT IN BUDGET BUT DISCOURAGES DEV'T

▶ NEW STATE MANDATES - GHG, ETC. - STAFFED/BUDGET TO HANDLE?

• ADDRESSING IN GEN'L PLAN UPDATE - AUGMENT
OR SHIFT LABOR/CONTRACT
THINK WE'RE STAFFED APPROP.

▶ RECOVERABLE COSTS?

• SOME ARE NOT - E.G. STORMWATER - ONLY CITATION FEES

▶ CLIMATE ACTION PLAN HELPS

▶ COMPLEMENTARY SVCS.?

• FREE - IMPACT & OTHER FEES
• CODE COMPLIANCE WALK-THROUS

Engage Roseville CPAC Meeting #11, December 13, 2017
Discussion Notes #1

- ▶ WHY CAN'T YOU CHARGE FOR GIS, ETC.? - ^{NON-ESSENTIAL MAPPING}
 - DO CHARGE FOR EXTERNAL - CAN ADD CHARGES NET EFFECT MINIMAL
- ▶ ARE YOU LOOKING AT REVENUE GENERATION? CUTS?
 - CUTS DIFFICULT - CAUSE DELAYS IN PROCESS
 - PERSONNEL MOST OF OUR RESOURCES
 - ALSO - FASTER PROCESS, TAX REV. SOONER
- ▶ PLANNING FOR DOWNTURN?
 - WILL CUT PT/CONTRACT EMP.
 - ↳ ASSESS ANNUALLY
- ▶ WHAT WOULD BE ON WISH LIST? - ^{TO MAXIMIZE OPPTY, BEST LEVERAGE DEPT.}
 - WILL RESPOND
- ▶ REGIONAL EFFORTS - GOOD PLANNING HELPS ROSEVILLE WIN (EG GALLERIA)
- ▶ DEV'T SVCS IS FIRST IMPRESSION
 - EASE/SPEED OF PROCESS HELPS
- ▶ ACRES LEFT TO BE DEVELOPED?
 - 4 SPECIFIC PLANS - 3 = 6,000 ACRES
- ▶ WHAT ABOUT COMMERCIAL?
 - CHANGES IN RETAIL ETC. - TRYING TO FIGURE PER NEW MODEL

- ▶ MEDICAL IS HIGHEST VALUE - CREATING GOOD SUB-MARKET HERE
 - NET IMPORTER OF JOBS
 - AVAIL. OF COMMERCIAL LAND IS CHALLENGING - APPROACHING BUILDOUT

- ▶ INTENTIONAL LACK OF COST RECOVERY
 - SET BY COUNCIL OR DEPT.?
 - WILL PROVIDE - FEW ITEMS

- ▶ WHEN LAST ASSESSED FEES - EARLIER THIS YR.
- SURVEYS DUE WED. - OUT THU./FRI.
- NO PUBLIC COMMENT**

- RESCHEDULING FEB. 14?
- MOVE AHEAD TO MARCH?
- NEED TO WAIT TO KNOW IF DO-ABLE
- STAFF LOOK INTO POSS. OF 15TH OR LOOK FOR FLOATER DATE THEN DOODLE POLL → NOT EXCESSIVE BURDEN

- FLASHVOTE - RECOMMEND
- LOOKING @ IT
- HAVE BEEN PROMOTING

LET SUPPORT STAFF KNOW IMPORTANT ISSUES

Engage Roseville CPAC Meeting #11, December 13, 2017
Discussion Notes #2