

Moraga-Orinda Fire District MEMORANDUM

TO: The Board of Directors

FROM: Kathy Leonard, Fire Marshal

DATE: August 7, 2013

SUBJECT: Item 9.2 – Fire Prevention Fee Study

BACKGROUND

The Fire Prevention Division provides a wide range of services; both to the public and internally to support operations and other agencies. Services include fire and life safety inspections for new construction and existing occupancies, plan review for all new developments, issuance of operational permits, participation in the City and Town planning process, code consulting, code development and public education related to all aspects of life safety and fire engineering, fire hazard abatement, code enforcement, Company inspection support, fireworks enforcement, public relations and information.

The District is authorized to establish fees for individual services or activities under Article XIIIB, Section 8 of the California State Constitution, which limits fees to the established cost of the service. Additionally, several constitutional laws, such as Proposition 218, State Government Codes 66012 through 66024, as well as Health and Safety Codes 13916, et seq., set parameters under which user fees typically administered by local government are established and administered.

The current fee schedule for plan review and permit issuance by the District was last updated effective January 17, 2005 and cites the 2001 California Fire Code. We are now using the 2010 Fire Code and will soon adopt the 2013 CFC.

In March 2013, the District contracted with NBS, an independent consulting company to conduct a fee study analysis in order to compare the approximate annual services generated at current fee levels to the estimated total annual cost of providing services. The results of the study found that the District is only recovering 43% of the cost. NBS is recommending we achieve a 96% recovery rate of fees for services.

Additionally, an in-house comparative analysis was performed using fee data of similar services and fees from six (6) neighboring or similar fire agencies. The results of the analysis found that MOFD charges 38% less per hour for fire inspections. Plan review hourly rate fees, even without the additional project valuation factor that many agencies use, was an average of 59% lower.

RECOMMENDATION

1) Discuss; 2) Deliberate; 3) Authorize staff to proceed with updating the fee schedule.

ATTACHMENT

- 1. Attachment "A" Summary of NBS Draft final report
- 2. Attachment "B" Comparative analysis of 6 selected agencies

NBS Fee Study for Moraga-Orinda Fire District Summary of Outcomes

This Analysis ultimately compares the approximate annual revenues generated at current fee levels to the estimated total annual cost of providing services. A summary of results is provided in the table below.

Fee Level	Total (\$)
Annual Estimated Revenues -	94.405
Current Fee	84,495
Annual Estimated Revenues -	100 25 4
100% Cost Recovery Fee Levels	198,354

As shown in the table above, NBS concludes that, on average, the District's current Fire Prevention fees recover approximately 43% of the total annual costs to the District associated with providing the services studied.

Staff's initial proposals for recommended fee amounts are reflected in the "Recommended Fee Level / Deposit" column of Attachment A, as well as in the District's staff report, and should be equal to or less than the full cost of service quantified by this study. The full cost of service represents the maximum fee amount allowed, at or beneath which the District must determine its policy position.

Fee Level	Total (\$)
Annual Estimated Revenues -	100 254
100% Cost Recovery Fee Levels	198,354
Annual Estimated Revenues -	100 510
Recommended Fee Levels	190,518

As shown, the District currently recovers approximately \$84,000 in revenue per year from current fees. If fees were charged at 100% of the total estimated cost to the District for providing each service, approximately \$198,000 per year could be recovered. Currently, the District recovers approximately 43% of the costs of providing services.

The results compiled for this report are not intended as a precise measurement, but rather show an average annual "snapshot" of the current cost recovery performance services provided where a current fee is charged, or a User / Regulatory fee could be established at the current level of service. These estimates should be applied conservatively when assuming the impact of implementation going forward.

All of the fees presented in Attachment A may be set with the sole approval of the Board. Proposed fee amounts represent an implicit policy position regarding cost recovery. When a fee is set equal to its full cost of service, the recommended fee implies that no general District revenues will be used to subsidize the provision of that individual service. When a fee is set less than the full cost of service, a judgment has

Attachment A

Exhibit "A"

been made that the use of general District revenues to pay for a portion of that individual service is warranted and/or necessary.

However, for reasons noted in previous sections of full analysis report, charging 100% of the cost of providing services is not often feasible for a number of reasons. If the Board were to adopt staff's initial recommended fee levels, approximately \$191,000 in cost would be recovered per year; the District would recover approximately 96% of the costs of providing services.

Cost of Service Analysis and Fee Establishment

A cost of service analysis is a quantitative effort which compiles the full cost of providing governmental services and activities. There are two primary types of costs considered: direct and indirect costs. Direct costs are those which specifically relate to the activity in question, including the real-time provision of the service. Indirect costs are those which support the provision of services but cannot be directly or easily assigned to the activity in question. An example of a direct cost is the salary and benefit expense associated with an individual performing a service. In the same example, an indirect cost would include the expenses incurred to provide an office and equipment for that individual to perform his or her duties, including (but not exclusive to) the provision of the service in question.

Components of the full cost of service include direct labor costs, indirect labor costs, specific direct non-labor costs where applicable, allocated non-labor costs, and allocated organization-wide overhead. Definitions of these cost components are as follows:

- Direct Labor Costs These are the salary/wage and benefits expenses for personnel specifically involved in the provision of services and activities to the public.
- Indirect Labor Costs These are the salary/wage and benefits expenses for personnel supporting the provision of services and activities. This can include line supervision, departmental management, and administrative support within a department, as well as staff involved in technical activities related to the direct services provided to the public.
- Specific Direct Non-labor Costs These are discrete expenses incurred for a specific service or activity performed, such as contractor costs, third-party charges, and very specific materials used in the service or activity. (In most fee types, this component is not used, as it is very difficult to directly assign most non-labor costs at the activity level.)

- Allocated Indirect Non-labor Costs These are expenses other than labor involved in the provision of services. In most cases, these costs are a specific fee category. Throughout the cost of service analysis used in this study, many non-labor expenses have been excluded from allocation if they can be directly attributable to a service not under review in this study. For example, expenses wholly related to the provision of general fire suppression and emergency response have been primarily excluded, as those expenses would be entirely recovered by the General Fund or other funding sources not covered by this study.
- Allocated Indirect Agency-wide overhead These are expenses, both labor and non-labor, related to the District's support services. Support services include: general administrative services provided internally such as human resources, payroll, financial management, information technology, and other similar business functions.

These cost components were expressed using annual (or annualized) figures, representing a twelve-month fiscal year cycle of budgeted expenses (FY 2012-13) incurred by the District in the provision of the services studied.

			Assignment of Cost to Functional Activity							
Expenditure Type			Operations	E	P - Pub Ed / merg Prep / /eed Abate / Code Enf		P - Plan Review, Inspection, and Permitting	Е	mergency Resp (Ambulance)	
Labor		•	7.045.674	Φ.	457.050	Φ.	145.250	•	1.044.046	
Labor	Non Lohor	\$	7,245,674 782.146	\$	157,056	\$ \$	145,356	\$	1,944,946	
Recurring			-, -		36,682	_	1,283	\$	111,400	
District-wid	de Administration	\$	1,082,953	\$	23,474	\$	21,725	\$	290,695	
Division Ad	dministration	\$	952,584	\$	33,992	\$	31,459	\$	255,701	
Division T	otal	\$	10,063,358	\$	251,203	\$	199,823	\$	2,602,743	
Blended Co	st per Direct Hour	\$	132	\$	50	\$	112	\$	124	
	Reference Direct Hours		76,120		5,015		1,785		21,036	

The following broadly describes each category of the proposed fee structure:

Inspection – Singular Permitted Activities: The scope of this study determined
the full cost of providing inspection services for regulated activities such as special
events, tents and booths, fireworks and explosives, hazardous materials, etc. These
permits are called "singular" because the fee payer is required to secure a permit
each time they wish to perform the regulated activity.

- Inspection Annual Operational Permits: The District inspects commercial and multifamily occupancies on an annual basis. Fees are structured by occupancy type, and / or the type of California Fire Code permit required.
- **Development Review and Fire Protection Systems**: Prevention staff reviews and provides comments on City development applications and building construction plan submittals, and reviews and approves fire alarm and sprinkler systems.
- Miscellaneous Fees: Includes hourly rates for services required in excess of standard (such as re-inspection or excessive plan review submittals), processing of deposits and weed abatement actions, records research, False Alarm Responses, and CPR classes.

CONCLUSIONS

As discussed throughout this report, the proposed fee schedule includes fees intended to recover District costs incurred to provide individual services.

The NBS project team notes that while on an individual fee basis, some fees were recovering more than the average total cost of providing services; others were not recovering their true, fully burdened costs. Additionally, significant changes to the District's fee structure typically result in the best possible comparison of current fees to total cost. Overall, however, NBS concludes that the District is under-recovering costs of providing fee related services.

The District's fee schedule should continue to remain a living document that is handled with care:

- A fundamental purpose of any fee schedule is to provide clarity and transparency to the public and to staff regarding fees imposed by the District. Once adopted by the Board, the fee schedule is the final word on the amount and manner in which fees should be imposed.
- The Board should consider adjusting these user and regulatory fees on an annual basis to at least keep pace with the cost of inflation. A common practice in California is to apply an annual Consumer Price Index adjustment. Conducting a *user fee study* is not an annual requirement; it becomes worthwhile only over time as significant shifts in organization, local practices, legislative values, or legal requirements change.

Attachment A

Exhibit "A"

As a final note in this study, it is worth acknowledging the path that fees in general have taken in California. The public demands ever more precise and equitable accounting of the basis for governmental fees and a greater say in when and how they are imposed. It is inevitable that user and regulatory fees will demand an even greater level of analysis and supporting data to meet the public's evolving expectations.

Technology systems will play an increased and significant role in an agency's ability to accomplish this. As the District proceeds in the years to come, specifically in the update, replacement, or acquisition of new financial and data management systems or software, it is recommended that staff be consulted as to how new systems might also help in tracking fee related responsibilities, in areas such as tracking of staff time at a project or case level, and the tracking of volumes at a service/activity category level

Attachment B

Exhibit "B"

Permit and Plan Review Hourly Rates From Six Selected Fire Departments Based on Size and Locality

Fire	Permit fee per	% compared to	Plan review	% compared to
Department	hourly rate	MOFD	fee hourly rate	MOFD
Berkeley	350. + Project	+61%	235.	+42%
Hayward	210./532. min	+35%	316.	+57%
Con Fire	243.	+44%	243.	+44%
Vallejo	248+Project	+45%	185.	+26%
Vacaville	174. + Project	+21%	174.	+21%
Burlingame	160.	+14%	160.	+14%
Average	231.	+36%	219.	+34%
MOFD	137.		137.	



Moraga-Orinda Fire District MEMORANDUM

TO: The Board of Directors

FROM: Kathy Leonard, Fire Marshal

DATE: August 21, 2013

SUBJECT: Item 8.3 – Fire Prevention Fee Study

BACKGROUND

On August 7, 2013 Fire Prevention staff reported on the results of a third party independent fee study analysis and in-house comparable agency survey in order to evaluate MOFD's current fees, which have not been updated since 2005.

The Board instructed staff to continue development of a new fee structure, with substantiating data that will restructure fees for services and reflect the true cost of providing those services for revenue cycle improvement to the District.

If authorized, the new fee schedule would take effect after the new Fire Code goes into effect on January 1, 2014.

RECOMMENDATION

1) Discuss; 2) Deliberate; 3) Authorize Staff to adopt new fee schedule recommendation.

ATTACHMENTS

1. Attachment A – Draft Fee Schedule

				Cost Recovery Analysis			
Fee No.	ee Description	Unit	Current Fee / Deposit		Recommended Fee Level / Deposit		
INSPE	CTION - SINGULAR PERMITTED ACTIVITIES						
	pecial Events, Tents and Booths						
	ents between 200 and 5000 ft² in Size, and canopies in excess of 400 s.f.	per permit	\$	137.00	\$	157	
	ents greater than 5000 ft² in Size	per permit	\$ \$	137.00 137.00	\$ \$	165 215	
3 E	xtended Period of Use, up to 180 Days per Tent or Air Supported Structure	per permit	Ψ	137.00	lΨ	213	
4 S	treet Fairs, Carnivals, and Special Events	per permit (1)	\$	273.00	\$	290	
	xplosives - any kind	per permit (3)	\$	137.00	\$	336	
11.	Apiosives - arry kind	per permit (3)	Ψ	137.00	Ψ	330	
	ireworks						
	ireworks Aerial	per permit (3)	\$	411.00	\$	672	
2 S	et Piece / Theatrical	per permit (3)	\$	-	\$	448	
IV. H	azardous Materials	per permit (3)	\$	137.00	\$	448	
V. B	surn Permit - Recreational / Open Flame	per permit	\$	68.50	\$	137	
VI. S	ingular Permits - Other						
	change of Occupancy	per permit	\$	137.00	\$	274	
	nstall/Maintain Acid Battery Systems > 50 gallons	per permit	\$	274.00	\$	280	
	liscellaneous Permit (otherwise not listed above)	per permit	\$	137.00	\$	215	
INSPE	CTION - ANNUAL OPERATIONAL PERMITS						
I. L	PG Dispense	per year	\$	137.00	\$	323	
			•	407.00		000	
II. V	Velding or Hot Works	per year	\$	137.00	\$	323	
III. S	praying Flammable Finishes	per year	\$	205.50	\$	323	
IV. C	compressed Gas / Cryogenics	per year					
1 Ir	nert		\$	205.00	\$	323	
	lammable		\$	205.00		323	
	ryogenics Portable Tanks		\$	205.00		323	
4 0	ryogenics Portable Tanks Fixed System		\$	274.00	\$	323	
V. F	lammable / Combustible Liquids	per year					
	lammable Liquid Storage Cabinet	po. you.	\$	137.00	\$	323	
	lammable Liquid Storeroom		\$		\$	323	
	boveground Storage Outside		\$	274.00	\$	336	
4 U	Inderground Storage Tank		\$	-	\$	336	
\/I =	naine Deneis Feeilitiee						
VI. E	ngine Repair Facilities 1 - 4 Bays	per year	\$	205.50	\$	323	
2	5 - 8 Bays		\$	274.00		323	
3	9 + Bays		\$	342.50		323	
\/II B	Jacob Of Bullia Assembly						
1 VII. P	Cocupancy Load 50-100	per year	\$	205.50	\$	269	
2	Occupancy Load 101-200		\$		\$	323	
3	Occupancy Load 201-299		\$	342.50	\$	430	
4	Occupancy Load 300 +		\$	411.00	\$	430	
VIII. A	dult & Residential Care Facilities	per year					
1 R	4 Adult Residential Day Care (Non-Medical), Client Load 7+, max of 6 non-ambulatory		\$	137.00	\$	376	
2 L	icensed Facilities (includes R-2.1,R-4)		•	407.00		2=2	
	Occupant Load > 6		\$	137.00	\$	376	
ર ૦	Occupant Load > 6 50 Form Fire Clearance Inspection	+	\$ \$	205.50	\$ \$	376 188	
3 0	oo i omi i iio olcaranoo mopection		Ψ	-	Ψ	100	
	nstitutional (I-2.1, I-4)	per year					
	Occupant Load 7-20		\$	274.00	\$	430	
2 C	Occupant Load 21-99		\$	411.00	\$	484	

			Cost Recovery Analysis			alysis
Fee No.	IFee Description		Current Fee / Deposit		Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	
3	Occupant Load 100 -249		\$	548.00		484
	Occupant Load 300 +		\$	685.00	\$	484
	Apartments	per year				
1	R-2 Occupancies Base Fee		\$	68.50	\$	129
	3-12 units, per unit		\$	68.50		129
	13-30 units, per unit		\$	3.00	\$	3
	31+ units, per unit		\$	4.00	\$	4
2	R-4 Assisted Living Facilities				_	
	Base Fee		\$	137.00	\$	323
ΥI	per unit Schools	per year	\$	4.00	\$	44
<u> </u>	Private Schools	per year				
	E-2 Occupant Load ≤ 150		\$	274.00	\$	358
	E-1 Occupant Load > 150		\$	411.00	\$	448
2	Public Schools					
	E-2 Occupant Load ≤ 150		\$	-	\$	
V:-	E-1 Occupant Load > 150		\$	-	\$	
	Daycare Commercial & Residential	per year	1			
	Occupant Load ≤ 50		\$	205.50	\$	357
	Occupant Load > 50		\$	274.00		402
2	R 3 Residential Day Care Occupant, Load 7-14		\$	137.00	\$	357
	Annual Operational Permits - Other	per year	1		т	
	-		¢.	274.00	Φ.	276
	Combustible Materials Storage Change of Occupancy	per permit per permit	\$ \$	274.00 137.00	\$	376 430
	Install/Maintain Acid Battery Systems > 50 gallons	per permit	\$	274.00	\$	430
	N REVIEW	репренни	Ť	27 1.00	ų –	100
	Site Access Review: Preliminary Plan Review, Consulting, and Meetings					
1	Pre-project application review	per appl (3)	\$	205.50	\$	448
2	Design Review					
	Residential	per project	\$	-	\$	268
	Commercial	per project	\$	- 60.50	\$	448
	Site / Water Access Review Cell Tower / Antenna Land Use Review	per project per project	\$ \$	68.50	\$ \$	358 323
	Street Numbering / Address Review	per project	\$		\$	168
	Building Construction - New Building	poi project	ΙΨ		Ψ	100
	Plan Review					
	0 - 5,000 s.f.	per project	\$	205.50	\$	430
	Greater than 5,000 s.f.	hourly (6)	\$	-	\$	108
2	Inspection		ļ.,			
	0 - 5,000 s.f.	per project	\$	205.50	\$	323
	Greater than 5,000 s.f.	hourly (6)	\$	-	\$	108
	Building Construction - Tenant Improvement Plan Review					
	0 - 5,000 s.f.	per project	\$	205.50	\$	538
	Greater than 5,000 s.f. (per hour with \$X deposit)	hourly (6)	\$	-	\$	108
2	Inspection	, (-)	†			
	0 - 5,000 s.f.	per project	\$	205.50	\$	430
	Greater than 5,000 s.f.	hourly	\$	-	\$	108
	Fire Alarm System					
1	Plan Review	per project	<u> </u>	444.00	•	
	First 25 Devices		\$ \$	411.00	\$	430 161
2	each additional 25 devices, or portion thereof Inspection	per project	Ψ	50.00	\$	101
	First 25 Devices	per project	\$	411.00	\$	323
	each additional 25 devices, or portion thereof		\$	50.00		161
	Fire Protection Systems - Residential - New / Modify		†	22.00	т	
٧.		nor project				
	Plan Review	per project				
	First 25 Heads	per project	\$	411.00	\$	323
1	First 25 Heads each additional 25 heads, or portion thereof		\$ \$	411.00	\$ \$	323 161
1	First 25 Heads each additional 25 heads, or portion thereof Inspection	per project	\$	-	\$	161
1	First 25 Heads each additional 25 heads, or portion thereof			411.00		

			Cost Recovery Analysis			
Fee No.	IFee Description	Unit		rent Fee / Deposit	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	
1	Plan Review	per project				
	First 25 Heads		\$	411.00	\$	430
	each additional 25 heads, or portion thereof		\$	_	\$	161
2	Inspection	per project				
	First 25 Heads		\$	137.00	\$	430
	each additional 25 heads, or portion thereof		\$	-	\$	161
3	Per additional Riser	per riser	\$	137.00	\$	108
VII.	Fire Protection Systems - Commercial - Tenant Improvement	·			<u> </u>	
	Plan Review	per project				
	First 25 Heads		\$	411.00	\$	430
	each additional 25 heads, or portion thereof		\$	_	\$	161
2	Inspection	per project	Ť		T	
	First 25 Heads		\$	137.00	\$	358
	each additional 25 heads, or portion thereof		\$	-	\$	161
VIII.	Fire Protection Systems - Miscellaneous		Ť		Ψ	
	-		Φ.	205.00	Φ.	420
	Additional Overhead Hydro Test	per test	\$		\$	430
	Spray Booths Including Fire Protection System (New Install)	per project	\$	274.00	\$	376
3	Fire Pumps & Related Equipment - Install or Modify (Non-Residential Applications)	per project	\$	685.00	\$	376
	Standpipe System (Wet or Dry)	per project	\$	548.00	\$	430
5	Pre-Action Fire Protection System Review	per project	\$	548.00		430
6	Hood and Duct Fire Protection system	per project	\$	342.50	\$	430
7	Clean Agent Fire Protection System	per project	\$	548.00	\$	484
8	Nitrous Oxide/Medical Gas System	per project	\$	274.00	\$	484
9	Smoke Management System	per project	\$	822.00	\$	484
10	Fire Hydrant Plan Review	per project	\$	137.00	\$	376
11	Water Flow Field Test for Sprinkler Systems	per project	\$	274.00	\$	376
IX.	Tanks / Piping					
1	Install Underground	per permit				
	Plan Review		\$	548.00	\$	430
	Inspection		\$	_	\$	430
2	Remove Underground	per permit				
	Plan Review		\$	411.00	\$	430
	Inspection		\$	-	\$	430
3	Install Aboveground Tank with Lines	per permit			<u> </u>	
	Plan Review		\$	548.00	\$	430
	Inspection		\$	_	\$	430
4	Temporary Construction Tank (Install and Use per Location / Site)	per permit	Ť		T	
	Plan Review	1 12 13	\$	411.00	\$	430
	Inspection		\$	-	\$	430
X.	Special Hazard - Hazardous Material		<u> </u>		-	
	Hazardous Materials Approval for Use & Compliance	per project	\$	411.00	\$	538
2	Compressed Gas & Cryogenics (Initial plan review and install)	per project	\$	411.00		538
	Tomp. 2000 a Cryogomoo (milan plan rovion and motally	p 5. p. 0,000		111.00	<u> </u>	
XI.	High Piled Stock / Rack Systems		\$	411.00	\$	430

			Cost Recovery Analysis			
Fee No.	I FAA I JASCRINTIAN		Current Fee Deposit	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit		
MISC	 CELLANEOUS					
1	Alternative Means and Methods	per project (3)	\$ 274.00	\$ 560		
2	Additional Inspections	per inspection	\$ 137.00) \$ 215		
3	Additional Plan Review Submittal	per submittal	\$ 137.00) \$ 215		
4	(2 Hour Minimum)	per project	\$ 274.00	323		
5	Photocopies (per Page) Letter or legal Size	per copy	\$ 0.10)		
6	Research Fee	hourly (4)	\$ -	\$ 108		
7	Medical Records Request	per request (5)	\$ -	\$ 54		
9	Repeated False Alarm Responses (per response after the X response in X consecutive days)	per response	\$ -	\$ 148		
	Weed Abatement Action Administrative Fee	per instance	\$ -	\$ 616		
11	Deposit processing fee	per project	\$ -	\$ 54		

[Notes]

- [1] Does not include standby time. Separate fee would apply.
- [2] Actual Cost of photos not included. Separate fee would apply.
- [3] Minimum fee includes time shown. For service required in excess of standard, hourly rate would apply.
- [4] Research fee applies for records requests that require retreival & formatting of records information above and beyond basic retreival and copy of a public record
- $\begin{tabular}{ll} [5] & Fee applies for records requiring redaction of personal / private information \end{tabular}$
- [6] Deposit fee of \$X applies. Non-refundable deposit processing fee also applies.