



CITY OF STONECREST, GEORGIA

CITY COUNCIL MEETING – AGENDA

3120 Stonecrest Blvd., Stonecrest, GA 30038

Monday, September 28, 2026 at 6:00 PM

Mayor Jazzmin Cobble

Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves - District 1 Vacant - District 2

Council Member Alecia Washington - District 3 Council Member George Turner - District 4

Council Member Karmesha W. Smith - District 5

Citizen Access: [Stonecrest YouTube Live Channel](#)

- I. CALL TO ORDER:** Tara Graves, Mayor Pro-Tem
- II. ROLL CALL:** Sonya Isom, City Clerk
- III. INVOCATION**
- IV. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE:** Alecia Washington, District 3 Councilmember
- V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA**
- VI. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
 - [a.](#) 2026 Strategic Planning Retreat Minutes
 - [b.](#) Approval of Meeting Minutes - Special Called Meeting, July 2, 2026
 - [c.](#) Approval of Meeting Minutes - Work Session, July 13, 2026
 - [d.](#) Approval of Meeting Minutes - City Council Meeting, July 27, 2026
 - [e.](#) Approval of Meeting Minutes - City Council Meeting, August 24, 2026
- VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS**

Citizens wishing to make a public comment may do so in person. Citizens may also submit public comments via email to cityclerk@stonecrestga.gov by 2 pm on the day of the meeting to be read by the City Clerk.

All members of the public wishing to address the City Council shall submit their name and the topic of their comments to the city clerk prior to the start of any meeting held by the City Council. There is a three (3) minute time limit for each speaker submitting or reading a public comment. Individuals will be held to those established time limits.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Citizens wishing to participate and comment during the public hearing portion of the meeting may comment in person. You may also submit your request including your full name, address, position on the agenda item you are commenting on (for or against) via email to cityclerk@stonecrestga.gov by 2 pm the day of the Public Hearing to be read into the record at the meeting. A zoom link for the meeting will be sent to you upon your request.

When it is your turn to speak, please state your name, address and relationship to the case.. There is a ten (10) minute time limit for each item per side during all public hearings. Only the applicant may reserve time for rebuttal.

IX. CONSENT AGENDA

X. APPOINTMENTS & ANNOUNCEMENTS

XI. REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

a. Proclamation - Annie Smith Raines, George Turner, District 4 Councilmember

XII. OLD BUSINESS

a. For Decision - Resolution for the Matrix Fee Study - Shawanna Qawiy, Division Director Community Development, Keisha Franklin, Finance Director & Catherine Turner, City Manager

b. For Decision - Cooperation Agreement for the SLIP CID - George Turner, District 4 Councilmember

XIII. NEW BUSINESS

a. For Decision - Appointment of Ethics Officer - Sonya Isom, City Clerk

b. For Decision - FY 2027 Budget Calendar - Catherine Turner, City Manager

XIV. CITY ATTORNEY COMMENTS

XV. CITY MANAGER UPDATE

XVI. MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

XVII. EXECUTIVE SESSION

(When an executive session is required, one will be called for the following issues: 1) Personnel, 2) Litigation, 3) Real Estate, 4) Cyber Security

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT

Americans with Disabilities Act

The City of Stonecrest does not discriminate on the basis of disability in its programs, services, activities and employment practices.

If you need auxiliary aids and services for effective communication (such as a sign language interpreter, an assistive listening device or print material in digital format) or reasonable modification to programs, services or activities contact the ADA Coordinator, Sonya Isom, as soon as possible, preferably 2 days before the activity or event.



CITY OF STONECREST, GEORGIA

CITY COUNCIL BUDGET RETREAT

The Kimpton Brice Hotel, 601 E. Bay Street, Savannah, Georgia 31401

Sunday, June 28, 2026

Mayor Jazzmin Cobble

Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves - District 1

District 2 – Vacant

Council Member Alecia Washington - District 3

Council Member George Turner – District 4

Council Member Karmesha W. Smith - District 5

MINUTES

The Stonecrest Mayor and Council met on June 28, 2026, for a budget retreat. The retreat was designed to help the Mayor, Council, and staff build common understanding around the City's current financial condition, clarify governance roles and expectations, and translate Council priorities into a realistic FY2027 budget framework. A central theme was moving from a budget that is balanced on paper to one that is structurally sustainable, transparent, and tied to measurable priorities. The meeting took place at the Brice Hotel in Savannah, Georgia.

Attending:

Councilmembers: Tara Graves, Alecia Washington, George Turner, and Karmesha Washington Smith

Staff: City Manager Cathy Turner, Finance Director Keisha Franklin, City Engineer Hari Karikaran, City Attorneys Winston Denmark and Alicia Thompson,

Facilitators: Terrell Jacobs

Introduction

The day opened with a review of the agenda, ground rules, expectations for the day, and check-in, followed by reports from the city manager on the state of the city and reflecting on 2025. (Agenda

City Manager Cathy Turner provided the state of the city and reflected on 2025. The Information provided included:

Governance and Organizational Alignment:

The facilitator Terrell Jacobs reinforced the importance of clear governance roles, effective communication, and shared expectations among the Mayor, Council, City Manager, and staff. Council's role was framed around setting vision, adopting policies, approving the budget, overseeing management performance, and representing the community. The City Manager's role centered on day-to-day

operations, policy implementation, fiscal responsibility, staffing, agenda support, compliance, and coordination across the organization.

Financial Condition and Audit Status

Finance Director Keisha Franklin provided an update on the financial condition and audit status. These two sessions addressed the City's fiscal health as the pivot point for the budget and pathway to address outstanding audits.

Capital Improvement Program:

City Engineer Hari Karikaran provided an update on all capital improvement projects. He covered the following topics regarding the Capital Improvement Program:

- Current capital projects
- Infrastructure priorities
- Funding sources
- Project delivery challenges
- Future capital needs

FY27 Council Initiative Requests

The council put together some initiatives or priorities that they will need to flush out and provide staff with more detail or specifics on some of the items. Here are these initiatives or priorities in no order and include some district priorities that were given as well:

- More Retail in District 1
- More lighting
- Budget for Youth Council Academy
- Develop Resource Center for Community
- Start on Phase 2 of Botanical Garden
- Streetscaping Improvement
- Street sweeping
- Public Safety
- Community Engagement
- Improving Housing Condition “Fairington”
- Address illegal dumping
- Address data center
- Sponsor monthly senior event
- Increase should access
- More Recreation (putt putt)
- Panola Shoals Road Improvement
- Beautification
- Liaison with Dekalb on work order issues
- Transparency with policies
- Place penalty provisions in policies and review for their intent every year
- Unhoused policies
- Sponsorship policies
- Filming policies

- Develop policies for illegal vendors on private property

The facilitator Terrell Jacobs led a vision discussion with the Council and staff to determine where Stonecrest will be in five years. The Council and staff determined three categories to develop their vision for Stonecrest:

Community Identity:

- Desirable
- Engaged
- Community Orientated
- Metropolis

Economic Growth:

- Booming Business
- Live, Work, and Play
- Thriving

Infrastructure Improvement:

- Futuristic (Increasing Technology)
- Walkable neighborhoods
- Well Lit communities
- Internet connectivity
- Safe Roads
- Improve MARTA stops

The Council prioritized their focus for the upcoming year to be included in the upcoming FY2027 budget. Here are the five focuses that the Council agreed upon in no order:

- Financial Sustainability
- Customer Service
- Public Safety
- Infrastructure Improvements
- Economic Development and Growth
- Due to the time constraints, we didn't have enough time to develop five goals for FY2027 so the facilitator gave the Council and staff homework to develop five goals for the City of Stonecrest.

City Manager and Finance Director discussed the budget development and approach with the Council.

The facilitator Terrell Jacobs reviewed the action items with Council and staff and updated the information for Stonecrest to act on.

Action Item #1: Review and send financial management policies

Assigned to: City Attorney

Timeframe: Within two months

Action Item #2: Review external audit contract

Assigned to: City Attorney

Timeframe: one month

Action Item #3: Research and find the answer regarding if a local government used ARPA funds as revenue replacement can they obligate and unobligated funds by December 31, 2024.

Assigned to: City Attorney

Timeframe: one month

Action Item #4: Research and determine what laws address illegal dumping and determine if new laws need to be developed.

Assigned to: City Attorney

Timeframe: 3 months

Action Item #5: Research and determine laws that address vendors on the roadside selling products

Assigned to: City Attorney

Timeframe: 3 months

Action Item #6: Research and determine how the city enforces noise ordinance within the City of Stonecrest

Assigned to: City Attorney

Timeframe: 3 months

Action Item #7: Review and develop IGA for the following services regarding GCIC, police and public works

Assigned to: City Attorney

Timeframe: 6 months

The City of Stonecrest wanted to discuss an issue that occurred with the Mayor and staff around June 25, 2026. It appears that incident escalated to the point that a complaint was submitted by the Finance Director Keisha Franklin against the Mayor. The Council discussed the next steps to address the complaint and consider the process of censorship.

Closing Statement

The June 28, 2026, Budget Retreat provided the Mayor, Council, and staff with an opportunity to openly discuss the City of Stonecrest's financial condition, governance expectations, capital needs, and priorities for the FY2027 budget. The discussions reinforced the importance of aligning limited resources with clearly defined priorities, improving transparency, strengthening communication, and ensuring that budget decisions support long-term financial sustainability.

Council identified key focus areas for the upcoming year, including financial sustainability, customer service, public safety, infrastructure improvements, and economic development and growth. These focus areas will serve as a foundation for further goal development and will help guide staff as the FY2027 budget is prepared. The retreat also highlighted the need for Council and staff to continue refining proposed initiatives, identifying funding sources, and developing measurable goals that can be implemented and tracked throughout the year.

Moving forward, the city will need continued collaboration between elected officials and staff to turn the retreat discussions into actionable budget recommendations. By maintaining a shared commitment to accountability, fiscal responsibility, and community-centered decision-making, Stonecrest can continue building toward a more sustainable, responsive, and forward-looking future.



CITY OF STONECREST, GEORGIA

CITY COUNCIL SPECIAL CALLED MEETING – MINUTES

3120 Stonecrest Blvd., Stonecrest, GA 30038

Thursday, July 02, 2026 at 6:00 PM

Mayor Jazzmin Cobble

Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves - District 1 Vacant - District 2

Council Member Alecia Washington - District 3 Council Member George Turner - District 4

Council Member Karmesha W. Smith - District 5

Citizen Access: [Stonecrest YouTube Live Channel](#)

I. **CALL TO ORDER:** Tara Graves, Mayor Pro-Tem

The meeting began at 6:16pm.

II. **ROLL CALL:** Sonya Isom, City Clerk

All members were present with District 2 seat vacant.

Ground rules were established for today's meeting. In an effort to conduct an effective and orderly meeting, all comments and responses to each item will be limited to five minutes per person. This time limit will apply to everyone including council, mayor, staff and anyone responding to questions. If a speaker would like another individual to speak and respond to questions, they must first ask for permission from Mayor Pro Tem before yielding the floor or inviting another person to speak.

Motion – made by Councilmember Karmesha Smith to allocate a maximum of five minutes to speak, per person, per agenda item. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

It was confirmed these rules are for this Special Called Meeting only.

III. **AGENDA ITEMS**

- a. For Decision** - Execution of the City Manager Employment Agreement and Authorization of Signatory - *Tara Graves, Mayor Pro Tem*

There was an overview by Mayor Pro Tem Graves stating the city's governing body has approved the appointment of the City Manager. This item is to ensure that the employment agreement is properly carried out so that the city can move forward. Attorney Thompson

confirmed the employment agreement has not been signed, stating it was presented to the mayor for signature. The mayor spoke of discrepancies in the agreement and stated the charter references a ceremonial mayor and that the contract is valid as the council voted and approved of it. Attorney Thompson read the section of the charter referencing this matter. It was stated the mayor's signature is a requirement.

Motion – made by Councilmember Alecia Washington to authorize the Mayor Pro Tem to execute the City Manager Employment Agreement and any related documents necessary to implement the council's previously approved appointment of the City Manager based on the mayor's refusal to execute the agreement. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.
Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

b. For Decision - Resolution Ratifying Emergency Actions Taken by Council Prior to the City Manager Appointment - Tara Graves, Mayor Pro Tem

The purpose of this resolution is to formally acknowledge the actions that council took during the declared state of emergency to ensure the continued operations of the city government, including the uninterrupted delivery of essential services. These actions were put in place while the City Manager position remained vacant. The resolution was read by Councilman Turner, giving examples of some of the emergency declarations. It was noted the mayor attempted to make an Acting City Manager appointment, however, the recommendation was denied by way of vote of council. The mayor requested a correction to the resolution stating the date and time of mayor's appointment, as well as the votes.

The City Attorney read the preamble.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the resolution by the City Council for the City of Stonecrest, Georgia, to acknowledge and ratify certain actions taken to preserve the continuity of Municipal Government. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

c. For Discussion - Supplemental Pay Policy - Keisha Franklin, Finance Director, Myrlene Thomas, Human Resources Analyst & Robin Jackson, Human Resources Generalist

The presentation was given by Myrlene Thomas, HR Analyst, giving the definition of supplemental pay and stating this is when an employee is placed in acting status when they are temporarily reassigned to a position that is different from their hired position or they are assigned significantly to greater duties and responsibilities than those assigned. This pay will come in at 5% or an amount that appropriately reflects the additional duties and responsibilities and will only remain in effect during the duration of the acting assignment. The employee placed in this status must meet the minimum requirements of the position before the reassignment begins. The acting assignment may not exceed 12 consecutive months unless the City Manager provides written approval for an extension. The City Manager may also approve supplemental pay for employees with additional or specialized degrees and/or certifications when recommended by the Department Director. There were a series of questions from council to be answered at a later date due to the HR Director being out of the office.

d. For Discussion - The Consideration of a Resolution to Censure the Mayor - *Tara Graves, Mayor Pro Tem*

The presentation was led by Mayor Pro Tem Graves stating that a censure is a formal expression of the council's disapproval regarding conduct. This does not remove an elected official from office; nor does it impose a legal penalty. The purpose of this item is to allow the council to consider the proposed resolution, review the facts, hear from parties involved, engage in discussion and determine whether the proposed action is granted. Council is considering this during an open meeting for transparency. This stems from an incident that took place on June 25th, involving an elected official and appointed staff member.

The City Manager read a statement submitted by the Finance Director. Mayor Cobble asked for Attorney Tyson to respond but was denied. Mayor Cobble read her statement. The City Manager also read a statement from the City Manager's Office. There were additional statements that were given to the City Manager only. It was decided the council will ask the City Manager to initiate an investigation into the matter before moving forward with the idea of censuring. The city will ask for assistance from GMA to assist with the investigation due to the HR Director not being in the office.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

(When an executive session is required, one will be called for the following issues: 1) Personnel, 2) Litigation, 3) Real Estate, 4) Cyber Security

V. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 7:49pm

Americans with Disabilities Act

The City of Stonecrest does not discriminate on the basis of disability in its programs, services, activities and employment practices. If you need auxiliary aids and services for effective communication (such as a sign language interpreter, an assistive listening device or print material in digital format) or reasonable modification to programs, services or activities contact the ADA Coordinator, Sonya Isom, as soon as possible, preferably 2 days before the activity or event.



CITY OF STONECREST, GEORGIA

CITY COUNCIL WORK SESSION – MINUTES

3120 Stonecrest Blvd., Stonecrest, GA 30038

Monday, July 13, 2026 at 6:00 PM

Mayor Jazzmin Cobble

Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves - District 1 Vacant - District 2

Council Member Alecia Washington - District 3 Council Member George Turner - District 4

Council Member Karmesha W. Smith - District 5

Citizen Access: [Stonecrest YouTube Live Channel](#)

I. CALL TO ORDER: Tara Graves, Mayor Pro-Tem

The meeting was called to order at 6:11pm.

II. ROLL CALL: Sonya Isom, City Clerk

All members were present.

III. AGENDA DISCUSSION ITEMS

There was a request to:

1. Add For Discussion – Cooperation Agreement with the SLIP CID as item g.
2. Add For Decision – Resolution for Bank Signatories as item b.
3. Add For Decision – Ordinance to amend section 2-180 – Authority to Execute Checks, Written Orders and Financial Instruments, 1st Read as item c.
4. Add For Decision – Audit Contract as item d.

The new agenda for Order of Business is as follows:

- a. For Discussion - May Monthly Financial Update
- b. For Decision – Resolution for Bank Signatories
- c. For Decision – Ordinance to Amend Section 2-180 – Authority to Execute Checks, Written Orders and Financial Instruments, 1st Read
- d. For Decision – Contract for Auditor Services
- e. For Decision – Ordinance for SLUP 25-007 1695 Spring Hill Cove
- f. For Decision – Ordinance Appointing DeKalb County to Conduct the City of Stonecrest Special Election, 2nd Read
- g. For Discussion – Cooperation Agreement with the SLIP CID

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the agenda with the stated changes. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

a. For Discussion - May Monthly Financial Update - *Keisha Franklin, Finance Director*

The presentation was given by Director Franklin, providing a financial update for the month of May, with revenues representing 40% of the annual budget and expenditures representing 29%. The surplus year-to-date as of May is \$3.3 Million. Staff is currently working on all required PBC's for the upcoming audit. The city has received the contract engagement letter for Mauldin & Jenkins along with a contract for professional services, which will be for additional support services for the audit information. Staff are also working on budget adjustments to be submitted at the next meeting, which will include security, aquatics, storm water, trails, utility, building security and travel.

b. For Decision – Resolution for Bank Signatories – *Alicia Thompson, City Attorney*

The presentation was given by Attorney Thompson, stating that this item is only to amend the signatories for the city's bank accounts. There were added positions such as: Deputy City Manager, which the council has requested to remove from the bank accounts and update the name of the new City Manager. The signatories will be: Mayor Jazzmin Cobble, Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves, City Manager Cathy Turner and Finance Director Keisha Franklin.

The preamble was read by the City Attorney.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the resolution after removing the Deputy Finance Director as a signatory. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

c. For Decision – Ordinance to Amend Section 2-180 – Authority to Execute Checks, Written Orders and Financial Instruments, 1st Read – *Alicia Thompson, City Attorney*

The presentation was given by Attorney Thompson stating this request is to amend section 2-180 of the Code of Ordinance. Chapter 2, Article 6 and Section 2-180, that speaks to the execution of checks and financial instruments, and the listed position must be amended based on the removal of the Deputy City Manager from the bank accounts. The listed positions will be Mayor, Mayor Pro Tem, City Manager and the Finance Director.

The City Clerk gave the 1st read of the preamble.

d. For Decision – Contract for Auditor Services – *Cathy Turner, City Manager & Keisha Franklin, Finance Director*

The presentation was given by Director Franklin, stating a copy of the contract was emailed to council on July 9th by Director Franklin and Attorney Thompson stated she also forwarded it to Mayor Cobble, who did not receive the email and would like to see a copy of the contract. There are no additional stipulations or asks of the auditors. Attorney Thompson will add adherence to cyber security and equipment use and these

terms will be included in the independent contract. The term date for auditor services will begin the date it is signed and will end December 2027. Per legal, the contract is not available to be shared with council but will be ready at the next council meeting.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to defer the approval of this matter to a special called meeting. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

- e. **For Decision** - Ordinance for SLUP 25-007 1695 Spring Hill Cove - *Shawanna Qawiy, Division Director Community Development*

The presentation was given by Director Qawiy stating that the applicant has gone through the public hearing process and is asking to withdraw this application without prejudice.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to deny Ordinance for SLUP 25-007 1695 Spring Hill Cove. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 3-1 with District 1 voting Nay and District 2 being vacant.

- f. **For Decision** - Ordinance Appointing DeKalb County to Conduct the City of Stonecrest Special Election, 2nd Read - *Sonya Isom, City Clerk*

The presentation was given by City Clerk Isom stating that this ordinance is to seek council's approval to appoint DeKalb County to conduct the city's special election for 2026. The date for the election is November 3, 2026, and the runoff date is December 1, 2026.

The City Clerk gave the 2nd read of the preamble.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the Ordinance Appointing DeKalb County to Conduct the City of Stonecrest Special Election, 2nd Read. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

- g. **For Discussion** – Cooperation Agreement with SLIP CID – *George Turner, Councilmember*

The presentation was given by Councilman Turner stating that the East Metro CID was in place and active when Stonecrest became a city. To function within the boundaries of the city, the city is putting together an agreement with East Metro CID through SLIP CID. The Stonecrest Lithonia Industrial Park CID can perform certain duties such as impacts on our right ways and services within our city. The agreement will outline what they will and will not do and how SLIP CID and East Metro CID will interact together. The draft agreement was sent to council prior to this meeting and will establish a cooperative partnership between the city and the CID.

The CID requested that council consider proposals on both September 1, 2026, and September 30, 2026, as well as during the TIPS Meeting in January of each calendar year. Additional questions were:

1. Would city staff such as City Manager, Code Enforcement, Planning & Zoning have internal meetings with the CID to discuss current or future projects.

2. Would proposals come before council during the TIPS Meeting or during the monthly City Council Meetings.

Legal read a list of services that would be provided to the city.

This item will be moved to the City Council Meeting for decision.

IV. EXECUTIVE SESSION

(When an executive session is required, one will be called for the following issues: 1) Personnel, 2) Litigation, 3) Real Estate, 4) Cyber Security

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to enter executive session for personnel, litigation, real estate and cyber security. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to exit executive session and return to the regular scheduled meeting. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the minutes from executive session. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

Councilmember George Turner reminded Stonecrest citizens to sit their trash out tonight as DeKalb Sanitation announced they are starting pickups early.

V. ADJOURNMENT

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to adjourn the meeting. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

The meeting adjourned at 8:59pm.

Americans with Disabilities Act

The City of Stonecrest does not discriminate on the basis of disability in its programs, services, activities and employment practices. If you need auxiliary aids and services for effective communication (such as a sign language interpreter, an assistive listening device or print material in digital format) or reasonable modification to programs, services or activities contact the ADA Coordinator, Sonya Isom, as soon as possible, preferably 2 days before the activity or event.



CITY OF STONECREST, GEORGIA

CITY COUNCIL MEETING – MINUTES

3120 Stonecrest Blvd., Stonecrest, GA 30038

Monday, July 27, 2026 at 6:00 PM

Mayor Jazzmin Cobble

Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves - District 1 Vacant - District 2

Council Member Alecia Washington - District 3 Council Member George Turner - District 4

Council Member Karmesha W. Smith - District 5

Citizen Access: [Stonecrest YouTube Live Channel](#)

I. CALL TO ORDER: Tara Graves, Mayor Pro-Tem

The meeting began at 6:17pm.

II. ROLL CALL: Sonya Isom, City Clerk

All members were present with Councilmember Alecia Washington participating via zoom.

III. INVOCATION: Jeremy Reid, City of Stonecrest Communications Department

IV. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: George Turner, District 4 Councilmember

V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

There was a request:

1. Move item *b.* from Old Business to the next Work Session
2. Move item *e.* from Old Business to the next Work Session
3. Move the Executive Session before the Public Hearing and following Public Comments

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the agenda with the stated changes. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

VI. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a. Approval of Meeting Minutes - Special Called Meeting, June 8, 2026

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the 11:30am Special Called Meeting Minutes from June 8, 2026, with attendance verification. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

b. Approval of Meeting Minutes - Work Session, June 8, 2026

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the 6:00pm Work Session Meeting Minutes from June 8, 2026. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 4-0 with District 2 being vacant.

c. Approval of Meeting Minutes - City Council Meeting, June 22, 2026

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to defer the June 22, 2026, City Council Meeting Minutes to the next city council meeting. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 3-1 with Mayor Pro Tem T. Graves voting Nay and District 2 being vacant.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Citizens wishing to make a public comment may do so in person. Citizens may also submit public comments via email to cityclerk@stonecrestga.gov by 2 pm on the day of the meeting to be read by the City Clerk.

All members of the public wishing to address the City Council shall submit their name and the topic of their comments to the city clerk prior to the start of any meeting held by the City Council. There is a three (3) minute time limit for each speaker submitting or reading a public comment. Individuals will be held to those established time limits.

Chandra Cates – Has concerns about a neighbor with cars on his front yard that has not been moved in years, as well as other issues and she is asking what can be done about this situation.

Deborah Tayliam – Has concerns about the house next door to her which has been vacant for about 8 years. There is excessive growth of grass, trees, and poison ivy, in addition to other issues. Code Enforcement has come to the house and fined the owner, but after paying the fines, the house remains the same.

Dave Marcus – Spoke of his restoration of confidence in financing, stating council is moving towards a responsible government. He also made comments on past audits as well as the break-in that took place at City Hall, stating he would like facts on the incident.

Angella Green – Stated she lives next door to a hoarder, and has concerns about her health, safety, and property value. She provided photos of a collapsed deck, remnants on the front porch and 2 broken-down cars and she is asking for help.

Bernard Knight – Thanked the council for voting to create the CID and reported that on June 23rd, the CID held its first elections and board meeting. At that meeting, 5 members were elected to serve, including Mr. Knight. A month ago, the CID submitted their draft cooperation agreement as the first step in negotiating the terms of the agreement to the council and assistant city attorney Alicia Thompson and are looking forward to receiving a response.

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Citizens wishing to participate and comment during the public hearing portion of the meeting may comment in person. You may also submit your request including your full name, address, position on the agenda item you are commenting on (for or against) via email to cityclerk@stonecrestga.gov by 2 pm the day of the Public Hearing to be read into the record at the meeting. A zoom link for the meeting will be sent to you upon your request.

When it is your turn to speak, please state your name, address and relationship to the case. There is a ten (10) minute time limit for each item per side during all public hearings. Only the applicant may reserve time for rebuttal.

a. Public Hearing - RZ 26-004 7224 & 7226 Maddox Road - Shawanna Qawiy, Division Director Community Development

The presentation was given by Director Qawiy stating this is a city-initiated application requesting the rezoning and future land use of approximately 92.19 acres from M-Light Industrial to M2- Heavy Industrial to allow various heavy industrial uses. There was review of the background, public participation, zoning map, future land use map, property location map, aerial map and site photos. By way of legal, the staff recommendation is neither approval nor denial and should be left up to the council's discretion. There is no recommendation from staff.

Motion – made by Councilmember Karmesha Smith to open public hearing for RZ 26-004 7224 & 7226 Maddox Road. Second by Councilmember George Turner.

Motion passed 3-0 with District 2 being vacant and Councilmember A. Washington being absent during the vote.

There was additional review and background information shared by the applicant stating the requested information has been provided to staff and is in the agenda packet. It was stated the Planning Commission no longer recommends denial. There was an additional review of the rezoning factors, economic use under the current zoning and the benefits, stating it is not a landfill.

In Favor

None

In Opposition

Linda Miller

Dave Marcus

Renee Cail – Email

Jennifer Wilson – Email

Pyper Bunch - Email

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to close public hearing for RZ 26-004 7224 & 7226 Maddox Road. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 3-0 with District 2 being vacant and Councilmember A. Washington being absent during the vote.

To have a rezoning, the city will need an amendment to the comprehensive plan. It was stated there will be no burning on site and the uses will be confined within three parcels, in

which special use applications have been submitted for both parcels.

- b. For Decision** - Ordinance for RZ 26-004 7224 & 7226 Maddox Road - *Shawanna Qawiy, Division Director Community Development*

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the Ordinance for RZ 26-004 7224 & 7226 Maddox Road. Second by Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves.

Motion tied 2-2 with Mayor Pro Tem T. Graves and Councilmember K. Smith voting Nay and District 2 being vacant. Mayor Cobble abstained from casting a vote as the tie breaker due to the council legislative authority to make decisions. The motion failed.

Motion – made by Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves to defer RZ 26-004 7224 & 7226 Maddox Road to the next council meeting. Second by Councilmember George Turner.

Motion tied 2-2 with Mayor Pro Tem T. Graves and Councilmember A. Washington voting Nay and District 2 being vacant. Mayor Cobble cast a vote as the tie breaker, voting Yay for the deferral. Motion passed.

IX. CONSENT AGENDA

X. APPOINTMENTS & ANNOUNCEMENTS

XI. REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

XII. OLD BUSINESS

- a. For Discussion** - Supplemental Pay Policy - *Robin Jackson, HR Generalist*

The presentation was led by Ms. Jackson of HR, responding to each question asked by Councilmember Smith at a previous meeting. There were also some examples given in regard to city positions that have received supplemental pay. It was stated the percentage of the supplemental pay is based on the level of responsibility. It was suggested this item is discussed at another council meeting.

- b. For Decision** - Resolution for the Matrix Fee Study - *Shawanna Qawiy, Division Director Community Development & Keisha Franklin, Finance Director*

Moved to the August Work Session.

- c. For Decision** - Ordinance to Amend Section 2-180 - Authority to Execute Checks, Written Orders and Financial Instruments, 2nd Read - *Tara Graves, Mayor Pro Tem & Alicia Thompson, City Attorney*

An overview was given by Attorney Thompson stating this is the second read for the ordinance to amend section 2-180 that will remove the Deputy City Manager and Deputy Finance Director from the list of individuals who are authorized to execute checks and written orders.

The preamble was read by the City Clerk as the 2nd Read.

Attorney Thompson stated check signing is duty assigned to the City Manager and council has the authority to assign to others in the city. Checks over \$25,000 should have two signatures.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to defer the Ordinance to Amend Section 2-180 – Authority to execute Checks, Written Orders and Financial Instruments, 2nd Read to allow for a meeting with legal. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.
Motion passed 3-0 with District 2 being vacant and Councilmember A. Washington being absent during the vote.

- d. For Decision** - Contract for Auditor Services - *Catherine Turner, City Manager & Keisha Franklin, Finance Director*

A presentation was given by City Manager Turner stating the contract for Mauldin & Jenkins has already been approved and submitted with the mayor signing the first version. There were changes from the vendor after the mayor signed. It was stated the contract in the packet does reflect the noted changes by Mauldin & Jenkins. The timelines have been provided, and Mauldin & Jenkins is ready for engagement.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the Contract for Auditor Services as outlined in the packet. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.
Motion passed 3-0 with District 2 being vacant and Councilmember A. Washington being absent during the vote.

- e. For Decision** - Cooperation Agreement with SLIP CID - *George Turner, District 4 Councilmember*

Moved to the August Work Session.

XIII. NEW BUSINESS

- a. For Discussion** - Stonecrest Development Authority (SDA) Update - *Mayor Jazzmin Cobble*

Mayor Cobble stated she will get with the Economic Development Director to prepare and present for this item at a future meeting.
 This item will be moved to the August Work Session.

- b. For Discussion** - Urban Redevelopment Authority (URA) Update - *Mayor Jazzmin Cobble*

This item will be moved to the August Work Session.

- c. For Decision** - Contract for Vendor Recommendation for Pour-In-Place Playground Surface Project - *Tanisha Boynton, Procurement Manager and Hari Karikaran, City Engineer*

The presentation was given by Director Karikaran stating that the scope of work for this project is to replace the existing Fairington Park play area. The Procurement Division solicited bids from vendors and received 5 responses and recommended Lanier Plans Inc.

dba KorKat to be awarded \$76,037 along with a program grant for \$134,940. The grant money will fund this project. Once approved, a notice to proceed will be issued. It was confirmed that wood chips will be replaced with upgraded material. Construction should take approximately three days.

Motion – made by Councilmember Karmesha Smith to approve the Contract for Vendor Recommendation for Pour-In-Place Playground Surface Project. Second by Councilmember George Turner.

Motion passed 3-0 with District 2 being vacant and Councilmember A. Washington being absent during the vote.

d. For Decision - Purchase and Installation of Safety Equipment for City Hall - *Tanisha Boynton, Procurement Manager and Reginald Powell, Facilities Operations Manager*

The presentation was given by Mr. Powell stating City Hall is in need of two metal detectors and x-ray machines to enhance the security currently in place. The request is for approval to purchase the detectors, machines and accessories from Mallory Safety and Supply, Inc. through a cooperative purchase under Omnia Contract No. 159498. The city is receiving a discount on the safety equipment which includes installation, training, state required certification and a 4-year warranty. The total for the safety equipment is \$95,044.84. The funding account is 100-1565-542500 – Other Equipment and Facilities.

When asked if this item needs to be on a future URA meeting agenda, Attorney Thompson stated only if the equipment impacts the building or causes need for renovation. She was asked to follow up and let the URA know if the agreement has been reviewed and require landlord approval. It was stated there is a need to review the URA and city's IGA. It was also stated there is a need for a URA meeting.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the Purchase and Installation of Safety Equipment for City Hall with amendments to verify the fund source. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion withdrawn.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the Purchase and Installation of Safety Equipment for City Hall. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 3-0 with District 2 being vacant and Councilmember A. Washington being absent during the vote.

e. For Decision - Resolution for Mid-Year Budget Adjustment - *Keisha Franklin, Finance Director*

The presentation was given by Director Franklin stating there were amendments made to the original budget that was submitted. There is zero impact from this amendment. There was also an adjustment made to the FICA account. There was a review of the original spreadsheet, including reasons for amendments, fund balance use by fund and the effect of the changes from the two items mentioned. It was stated council has the presentation without two changes that were made.

The preamble was read by the City Clerk.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the Resolution for Mid-Year Budget Adjustment with the stated changes and updated documents. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 3-0 with District 2 being vacant and Councilmember A. Washington being absent during the vote.

XIV. CITY ATTORNEY COMMENTS

No Comments

XV. CITY MANAGER UPDATE

The City Manager stated that the leadership team updates have been sent to council prior to this meeting. There was recognition given to Myrlene Thomas, Human Resources Analyst as Employee of the Month, stating her professionalism, dedication and collaborating spirit have had a meaningful impact, and her positive energy is contagious.

XVI. MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Mayor Jazzmin Cobble – No comments

District 1 – Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves – No Comments

District 3 – Alecia Washington – Absent

District 4 – George Turner – Mentioned streets that are getting paved in District 4, a gazebo at Salem Park, and improvements at Browns Mill. Also, Fairington Park looks really good. There have been some calls on the feral hogs. The feral hog program is down to trapping but can only be put on public property. The city has been working with DeKalb County to help accelerate this.

District 5 – Karmesha Smith – Thank you to the staff who stayed late with us this evening. Would like to highlight paving currently going on in District 5 and also give kudos to the staff for who assisted with the Back-to-School Backpack Giveaway.

XVII. EXECUTIVE SESSION

(When an executive session is required, one will be called for the following issues: 1) Personnel, 2) Litigation, 3) Real Estate, 4) Cyber Security

Moved to take place before the Public Hearing section of the agenda.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to enter Executive Session for Personnel, Litigation, Real Estate and Cyber Security. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 3-0 with District 2 being vacant and Councilmember A. Washington being absent during the vote.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to exit Executive Session and return to the regular scheduled meeting. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 3-0 with District 2 being vacant and Councilmember A. Washington being absent during the vote.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the minutes from Executive Session. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed 3-0 with District 2 being vacant and Councilmember A. Washington being absent during the vote.

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 11:26pm.

Americans with Disabilities Act

The City of Stonecrest does not discriminate on the basis of disability in its programs, services, activities and employment practices. If you need auxiliary aids and services for effective communication (such as a sign language interpreter, an assistive listening device or print material in digital format) or reasonable modification to programs, services or activities contact the ADA Coordinator, Sonya Isom, as soon as possible, preferably 2 days before the activity or event.



CITY OF STONECREST, GEORGIA

CITY COUNCIL MEETING – MINUTES

3120 Stonecrest Blvd., Stonecrest, GA 30038

Monday, August 24, 2026 at 6:00 PM

Mayor Jazzmin Cobble

Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves - District 1 Vacant - District 2

Council Member Alecia Washington - District 3 Council Member George Turner - District 4

Council Member Karmesha W. Smith - District 5

Citizen Access: [Stonecrest YouTube Live Channel](#)

I. CALL TO ORDER: Tara Graves, Mayor Pro-Tem

The meeting began at 6:04pm.

II. ROLL CALL: Sonya Isom, City Clerk

All members were present with Mayor Cobble arriving after roll call.

III. INVOCATION: Pastor Aaron Jones III, Mt. Nebo Baptist Church

IV. PLEDGE OF ALLEGIANCE: Alecia Washington, District 3 Councilmember

V. APPROVAL OF THE AGENDA

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the agenda as written. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion was amended.

There was a request to add: Approval of Power of Attorney for Mauldin & Jenkins as item c, under New Business.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the agenda with the one stated addition. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion passed unanimously.

VI. REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES

- a.** Approval of Meeting Minutes - City Council Meeting, June 22, 2026

Motion – made by Councilmember Alecia Washington to approve the meeting minutes from the June 22, 2026, City Council Meeting with the stated changes. Second by Councilmember George Turner.

Motion passed unanimously.

b. Approval of Meeting Minutes - Special Called Meeting, July 2, 2026

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to defer the meeting minutes from the July 2, 2026, Special Called Meeting. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed unanimously.

c. Approval of Meeting Minutes - Work Session, July 13, 2026

Motion – made by Councilmember Alecia Washington to defer the meeting minutes from the July 13, 2026, Work Session. Second by Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves.

Motion tied with D1 & D5 voting Nay and D3 & D4 voting Yay.

Motion failed due to Mayor being absent and unable to break the tie.

Motion – made by Councilmember Karmesha Smith to approve the meeting minutes from the July 13, 2026, Work Session. Second by Councilmember George Turner.

Motion tied with D1 & D3 voting Nay and D4 & D5 voting Yay.

Motion failed due to Mayor being absent and unable to break the tie.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to defer the meeting minutes from the July 13, 2026, Work Session. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion passed unanimously.

d. Approval of Meeting Minutes - City Council Meeting, July 27, 2026

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the meeting minutes from the July 27, 2026, City Council Meeting. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion failed 3-1 with D1, D4 & D5 voting Nay and D3 voting Yay.

Motion – made by Councilmember Karmesha Smith to defer the meeting minutes from the July 27, 2026, City Council Meeting. Second by Councilmember George Turner.

Motion passed unanimously.

VII. PUBLIC COMMENTS

Citizens wishing to make a public comment may do so in person. Citizens may also submit public comments via email to cityclerk@stonecrestga.gov by 2 pm on the day of the meeting to be read by the City Clerk.

All members of the public wishing to address the City Council shall submit their name and the topic of their comments to the city clerk prior to the start of any meeting held by the City Council. There is a three (3) minute time limit for each speaker submitting or reading a public comment. Individuals will be held to those established time limits.

In Person

Bernard Knight – gave 3rd status report on the Stonecrest CID, sharing an update on the progress they are making.

Faye Coffield – stated it is time for the City of Stonecrest to be dissolved. Also shared her disapproval with Metro Green.

Alisa Clark – asked if the city can define who is responsible for what? Need traffic light at Thompson Mill and Miller Road. Stated the city is lagging behind on amenities.

Diane Adoma – concerns on the Metro Green settlement and agreement. Shared some key concerns and her requested call to action. Had questions on SLUPS undergoing public routing.

Ruth Johnson-Floyd – disappointed at what's going on with Metro Green and would like council to make the best decisions for the city.

Dave Marcus – shared reasons to reject Metro Green's rezoning, including research done on concrete recycling.

Raymond Randle – discussed blight in Stonecrest, speaking of the broken window theory, the condition of the Stonecrest Mill Apartments, trash, and the effect on families and children.

Dwania McGhee – wanted to know how Metro Green would affect the lives and health of Stonecrest residents, mentioning more traffic, the ozone, real estate issues, and future developments. Asked what can legally operate there today.

Serena Thornton – concerns about Metro Green and asked city to revoke their certificate of occupancy.

Juanita Sheppard – opposing any rezoning on Maddox Road and has concerns about District 2 and its vacant seat.

Sharee Scott – asked council to think about what is in the best interest of Stonecrest. Opposed to the rezoning on Maddox Road for Metro Green.

Chandra Cates – Thanked Code Officer Frank Austin for assistance. Spoke of neighbor hoarding garbage in front yard, which is creating a rodent infestation. She has concerns with homeowners not cutting their grass, abandoned houses and its appearance, and broken fences in a common area that she would like removed.

Stephanie Grain – asked council to do a study on the pollution that will come with Metro Green.

Mesha Hardin – asked how the rezoning will benefit the community's air pollution and property value. Spoke of shaking that has affected wiring in her home and asked council not to rezone.

CA Nation – concerns about gentrification of his home and spoke of rezonings and failed businesses.

Linda Miller – Would like to see signs and something coming into the city, asking to bring in developers.

Renee Cail – comments on rezoning of 7224 and 7226 Maddox Road and spoke on the effect of pollutions to the lungs.

State Representative Doreen Carter – spoke of families being affected by Metro Green, resident concerns, air quality, noise, quality of life and industrial development. Asked council to decline the request for rezoning and to consider the families who this will affect.

Public Comments Sent Via Email

Pyper Bunch – opposition to Metro Green operating anywhere in Stonecrest

Ann Rogers – against proposed rezoning of 7224 and 7226 Maddox Road

A. Sabrena Farmer – does not want any part of Metro Green in community

Kathy Andrews – concerns about environment and health impacts of rezoning

Lequvia Ousley - say no to rezoning of Metro Green properties

Gayle Andrews – please vote no to proposed rezoning of 7226 Maddox Road

Bola Tolase – vote no to Metro Green

VIII. PUBLIC HEARINGS

Citizens wishing to participate and comment during the public hearing portion of the meeting may comment in person. You may also submit your request including your full name, address, position on the agenda item you are commenting on (for or against) via email to cityclerk@stonecrestga.gov by 2 pm the day of the Public Hearing to be read into the record at the meeting. A zoom link for the meeting will be sent to you upon your request.

When it is your turn to speak, please state your name, address and relationship to the case.. There is a ten (10) minute time limit for each item per side during all public hearings. Only the applicant may reserve time for rebuttal.

IX. CONSENT AGENDA

X. APPOINTMENTS & ANNOUNCEMENTS

XI. REPORTS & PRESENTATIONS

XII. OLD BUSINESS

- a. For Decision** - Ordinance for RZ 26-004 7224 & 7226 Maddox Road - *Shawanna Qawiy, Division Director Community Development*

There was a comment from Councilmember Turner stating a decision must be made on scientific facts.

Motion – made by Councilmember Alecia Washington to deny the Ordinance for RZ 26-004 7224 & 7226 Maddox Road. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed unanimously.

- b. For Decision** - Ordinance to Amend Section 2-180 - Execution of Checks or Financial Instruments, 2nd Read - *Tara Graves, Mayor Pro Tem and Alicia Thompson, City Attorney*

Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves stated that the ordinance that is in the packet is not the correct ordinance, but the City Attorney has the correct ordinance. The updated ordinance was read by Attorney Thompson, stating there are no major changes. It was confirmed the cap is \$25,000.

The preamble was read by the City Attorney.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the Ordinance to Amend Section 2-180 – Execution of Checks or Financial Instruments, 2nd Read. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed unanimously.

- c. For Decision** - Resolution to Censure the Mayor - *Tara Graves, Mayor Pro Tem*

Presentation led by Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves asking the city attorney to define censure. Attorney Denmark proceeded to explain that a censure is not a measure that removes an individual from office or carries any specific penalty but power to express displeasure of actions. It is a public reprimand of one member by majority of the governing body and does not carry any other consequence. Mayor Pro Tem mentioned an incident that took place at City Hall during the month of June and stated the censure does not require an investigation. She stated this is an administrative matter, and council did not request or complete an investigation and does not require any public funds to investigate this matter.

The resolution preamble and findings were read by the City Clerk.

Motion – made by Councilmember Karmesha Smith to approve the Resolution to Censure the Mayor. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion passed unanimously.

Mayor Cobble asked about the attorneys role in the language of the resolution and it was stated it was modified to be placed in legal format and that council drafted the language.

XIII. NEW BUSINESS

- a. For Decision** - Resolution for SDL 26-004 7132 Hayden Quarry Road - 3 Lots Combination/Lot Division/Boundary Adjustment - *Shawanna Qawiy, Division Director Community Development*

The presentation was given by Director Qawiy stating this is a three Lot Combination Lot Division – Boundary Agreement of 7132, 7124 and 7150 Hayden Quarry Road to be known as 7132 Hayden Quarry Road. There was a review of the major plat and instructions on how to apply for a major plat, which has the same procedures of a preliminary plat and final. The applicant must submit an application and preliminary plat for approval prior to the issuance of a building permit. The major plat certifies that the preliminary and final plats all comply with zoning environmental regulations. An

adjustment was made to remove the property lines as they are combining three lots to build a single family home.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the Resolution for SDL 26-004 7132 Hayden Quarry Road – 3 Lots Combination/Lot Division/Boundary Adjustment. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion passed unanimously.

b. For Decision - Supplemental Security Services - Independent Contractor Agreement - Michael McCoy, Deputy City Manager

The presentation was given by Deputy City Manager McCoy, stating this item is administrative housekeeping and a request to address the pay disparity between the two entities that are providing security services to the city. The city's off duty sheriff deputies are currently being paid \$45 per hour, while the DeKalb Police Officers are being paid \$70 per hour. There is a correction in the document presented that shows \$75 per hour should be \$70 per hour. This request is to increase the Sheriff Deputies pay from \$45 to \$70 per hour so that all providing security are being compensated at the same rate.

Motion – made by Councilmember George Turner to approve the Supplemental Security Services – Independent Contractor Agreement. Second by Councilmember Karmesha Smith.

Motion passed unanimously.

c. For Decision – Approval of Power of Attorney for Mauldin & Jenkins – Catherine Turner, City Manager

The presentation was given by City Manager Turner asking for approval to move forward with Mauldin Jenkins as the city's Power of Attorney, authorizing them to represent the City of Stonecrest before the IRS in any tax matters. Having Mauldin & Jenkins as the city's Power of Attorney could possibly reduce fees and penalties. If the mayor is unable to execute the Power of Attorney for Mauldin & Jenkins, council would allow the City Manager to move forward and execute the request on behalf of the city.

Motion – made by Councilmember Karmesha Smith to approve the Approval of Power of Attorney with Mauldin & Jenkins for the city to move forward with tax related items. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion withdrawn.

Motion – made by Councilmember Karmesha Smith to authorize the City Manager to execute the Power of Attorney for Mauldin & Jenkins for tax related matters. Second by Councilmember Alecia Washington.

Motion passed unanimously.

XIV. CITY ATTORNEY COMMENTS

It was good to see everyone in Savannah.

XV. CITY MANAGER UPDATE

The city has partnered with an external firm for a payroll audit. An update will be given to the Mayor, Mayor Pro Tem and Council once the final results are received. The audit with Mauldin & Jenkins is on schedule. There was discussion of events taking place in city hall, staffing needs, new restaurants and expansions, and details on current projects, and beautification in the city.

XVI. MAYOR AND COUNCIL COMMENTS

Mayor Cobble – No comments

District 1 – Mayor Pro Tem Tara Graves – No comments

District 3 – Alecia Washington – Thanks to the organizations, Stonecrest staff and volunteers for assisting with the events that have taken place the last three weeks, and thanks to everyone that participated.

District 4 – George Turner – Gave an update on the trapping of the feral hogs. We have identified some hot spots and can hopefully eliminate them soon.

District 5 – Karmesha Smith – Thanks to everyone who came out this evening. She is open to receiving feedback and noted council cannot do this without the impact of citizens. You are appreciated.

XVII. EXECUTIVE SESSION

(When an executive session is required, one will be called for the following issues: 1) Personnel, 2) Litigation, 3) Real Estate, 4) Cyber Security

XVIII. ADJOURNMENT

The meeting was adjourned at 8:34pm.

Americans with Disabilities Act

The City of Stonecrest does not discriminate on the basis of disability in its programs, services, activities and employment practices. If you need auxiliary aids and services for effective communication (such as a sign language interpreter, an assistive listening device or print material in digital format) or reasonable modification to programs, services or activities contact the ADA Coordinator, Sonya Isom, as soon as possible, preferably 2 days before the activity or event.



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Resolution for the Matrix Fee Study

AGENDA SECTION: *(check all that apply)*

☐ PRESENTATION ☐ PUBLIC HEARING ☐ CONSENT AGENDA ☒ OLD BUSINESS
☐ NEW BUSINESS ☐ OTHER, PLEASE STATE: DISCUSSION

CATEGORY: *(check all that apply)*

☐ ORDINANCE ☒ RESOLUTION ☐ CONTRACT ☐ POLICY ☐ STATUS REPORT
☐ OTHER, PLEASE STATE: Click or tap here to enter text.

ACTION REQUESTED: ☒ DECISION ☐ DISCUSSION, ☐ REVIEW, or ☐ UPDATE ONLY

Previously Heard Date(s): 06/22/26 & Click or tap to enter a date.

Current Work Session: Click or tap to enter a date.

Current Council Meeting: Monday, September 28, 2026

SUBMITTED BY: Shawanna Qawiy, Division Director Community Development

PRESENTER: Shawanna Qawiy, Division Director Community Development, Keisha Franklin, Finance Director & Catherine Turner, City Manager

PURPOSE: To review and discuss the submitted study and fee schedule by Matrix Consulting Group to determine updated full cost (direct and indirect) fees for city services. Where proposed fees increases are proposed, staff recommends a phased implementation approach to reduce the immediate impact on businesses and residents, provide predictability, and allow the City to gradually achieve its costs recovery objectives within five (5) years. As a general guideline, increases exceeding 50 percent of current fees should be considered for multi-year implementation unless mayor, city council, operational, legal, or regulatory considerations warrant a more immediate adjustment.

FACTS: The Matrix Consulting Group analyzed the cost of service relationships that exist between fees for service activities in the following areas; Building, Finance, Parks and Recreation, and Planning and Zoning. The results of this study provide a tool for understanding current service levels and the cost for those services. The request is to review, discuss and approve the final fees based on the recommendations of the final study.



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

OPTIONS: Table, Deny, Approve, Approve with Modifications Approve with modifications

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve with Modifications Approve with modifications

ATTACHMENTS:

- (1) Attachment 1 - Resolution
- (2) Attachment 2 - Matrix Consulting Fee Study.
- (3) Attachment 3 - (Amended) Supporting document/spreadsheet.
- (4) Attachment 4 - Click or tap here to enter text.
- (5) Attachment 5 - Click or tap here to enter text.

CITY OF STONECREST

RESOLUTION NO. _____

**A RESOLUTION BY THE MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF STONECREST
APPROVING THE CITY OF STONECREST COMPREHENSIVE USER FEE STUDY AND
ADOPTING CHANGES TO THE CITY OF STONECREST FEE SCHEDULE; AND FOR OTHER
PURPOSES.**

WHEREAS, the City of Stonecrest ("City") is a municipal corporation duly organized and existing under the laws of the State of Georgia; and

WHEREAS, the Mayor and City Council are the governing authority of the City of Stonecrest, Georgia; and

WHEREAS, the City engaged Matrix Consulting Group to conduct a formal fee study to evaluate and determine the full cost (direct and indirect) of providing a variety of City services; and

WHEREAS, the City of Stonecrest intends to establish a Fee Schedule for the purpose of providing reasonable fees that reflect the current service levels and the cost for those services within the City; and

WHEREAS, the City of Stonecrest is recommending to gradually achieve its cost recovery objectives, where fees are increased exceeding 50 percent of current fees should be considered for multi-year implementation based on EXHIBIT A -MASTER FEE SCHEDULE-City of Stonecrest.

WHEREAS, City's Fee Schedule must be approved by the City Council in accordance with Sec. 2-177 -2-179, Division 1. Article VI. Chapter 2 of the Code of Ordinances.

**NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED BY MAYOR AND CITY COUNCIL THE CITY OF
STONECREST, GEORGIA**, that the City of Stonecrest Comprehensive User Fee Study is hereby adopted as attached in Exhibit "A".

BE IT RESOLVED, that the City's Schedule of Fees located in Appendix A of the Code of Ordinances is amended in accordance with changes to certain fees as established in Exhibit A.

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED that this Resolution shall be effective immediately upon its adoption.

SO RESOLVED THIS _____ DAY OF _____ 2026.

CITY OF STONECREST, GEORGIA

JAZZMIN COBBLE, MAYOR

ATTEST:

CITY CLERK

APPROVED AS TO FORM

CITY ATTORNEY

EXHIBIT A



COMPREHENSIVE USER FEE STUDY REPORT

OCTOBER 2025

STONECREST, GA

MATRIX
CONSULTING GROUP

TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY	1
LEGAL FRAMEWORK	4
USER FEE STUDY METHODOLOGY	7
RESULTS OVERVIEW	9
BUILDING	10
FINANCE	15
PARKS & RECREATION	16
PLANNING & ZONING	20
COST RECOVERY CONSIDERATIONS	27
APPENDIX – COMPARATIVE SURVEY	30

INTRODUCTION AND EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

The report, which follows, presents the results of the Comprehensive User Fee study conducted by Matrix Consulting Group for the City of Stonecrest, Georgia.

PROJECT BACKGROUND AND OVERVIEW

The City of Stonecrest has never conducted a formal fee study. The purpose of this study is to evaluate and determine the full cost (direct and indirect) of providing a variety of City services. The Matrix Consulting Group analyzed the cost-of-service relationships that exist between fees for service activities in the following areas: Building, Finance, Parks & Recreation, and Planning & Zoning. The results of this study provide a tool for understanding current service levels and the cost for those services.

GENERAL PROJECT APPROACH AND METHODOLOGY

The methodology employed by Matrix Consulting Group is a widely accepted “bottom up” approach to cost analysis, where time spent per unit of fee activity is determined for each position within a Department or Program. Once time spent for a fee activity is determined, all applicable City costs are then considered in the calculation of the “full” cost of providing each service. The following table provides an overview of types of costs applied in establishing the “full” cost of services provided by the City:

TABLE 1: OVERVIEW OF COST COMPONENTS

Cost Component	Description
Direct	Fiscal Year 2025 Budgeted salaries, benefits, and allowable expenditures.
Indirect	Division, departmental, clerical, and Citywide support.

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

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

- **Department / Program Staff Interviews:** The project team interviewed department / program staff regarding their needs for clarification to the structure of existing fee items or for addition of new fee items.
- **Data Collection:** Data was collected for each permit / service, including time estimates. In addition, all budgeted costs and staffing levels for Fiscal Year 2025 were entered into Matrix Consulting Group’s analytical software model.
- **Cost Analysis:** The full cost of providing each service included in the analysis was established.

- **Review and Approval of Results with City Staff:** Department management has reviewed and approved these documented results.

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

SUMMARY OF RESULTS

The detailed documentation of this study will show an over-collection for some fees (on a per unit basis) and an undercharge for most others. The results of this analysis will provide the Departments and the City with guidance on how to right-size their fees to ensure that each service unit is set at an amount that does not exceed the full cost of providing that service. The display of the cost recovery figures shown in this report are meant to provide a basis for policy development discussions among City Councilmembers and City staff and do not represent a recommendation for where or how the City Council should act. The setting of the “rate” or “price” for services, whether at full cost recovery or lower, is a policy decision to be made only by the City Council with input from City staff and the community.

CONSIDERATIONS FOR COST RECOVERY POLICY AND UPDATES

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

ADOPT A FORMAL COST RECOVERY POLICY

The Government Finance Officers Association’s (GFOA) best practices for *Establishing Government Charges and Fees* states that governmental entities should adopt formal policies regarding charges and fees which include the jurisdiction’s intention to recover the full cost or partial costs of providing services, sets forth circumstances under which the jurisdiction might set a charge for fee at less than or more than 100% of full cost, and outlines the considerations that might influence the jurisdiction’s pricing decision.

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

ADOPT AN ANNUAL FEE UPDATE / INCREASE MECHANISM

GFOA best practices for *Establishing Government Charges and Fees* states that governmental entities should review, and update charges and fees periodically based on factors such as the impact of inflation, other cost increases, adequacy of cost recovery, use of services, and the competitiveness of current rates to avoid large, infrequent fee increases.

The purpose of a comprehensive update is to completely revisit the analytical structure, service level estimates and assumptions, and to account for any major shifts in cost components or organizational structures that have occurred since the City's previous analysis. The City should conduct comprehensive analyses every five to seven years as this practice captures any changes to organizational structure, processes, as well as any new service areas.

In between comprehensive updates, the City should utilize published industry economic factors, such as Consumer Price Index (CPI) or other regional factors, to update the cost calculations established in the Study on an annual basis.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

This section of the report is intended to provide an overview of the legal rules and regulations that govern what is considered a fee for service, how those fees can be calculated, general principles, philosophies, and general policy considerations for setting fees for service.

LEGAL FRAMEWORK

A “user fee” is a charge for service provided by a governmental agency to a public citizen or group. Georgia municipalities are authorized to collect fees by the Georgia constitution.¹ Georgia has several additional legal provisions that regulate fees for service, with the purpose of ensuring that fees are reasonable and justified. The most prominent and relevant of these relate to the following fee types:

- **Administrative Fees:** Municipalities are permitted to charge administrative fees related to the collection of occupation taxes; these fees must be directly related to the reasonable cost of processing the tax transactions.²
- **Regulatory Fees:** These fees can be charged when the municipality routinely inspects or otherwise investigates a business or other entity to ensure compliance with laws and regulations related to the health and safety of the community.³ The revenue from these fees can only be used in carrying out the associated activities and cannot be used for general purposes; it must also be directly related to the cost of the service provided.⁴ Building-related fees are classified as regulatory fees, but the current law explicitly excludes development impact fees and other zoning and land development costs from this category.⁵
- **Other Fees:** Although the Code of Georgia does not have definitive regulations for fees other than those previously discussed, Georgia case law generally holds that all user fees should be directly related to the cost of providing a service and that the service provided should provide some level of benefit to the applicant.⁶

When determining fees for service it is important to ensure there is a **direct benefit** – the service is provided directly to the payer – and that it is **cost-based** and does not exceed the reasonable cost of providing the service.

GENERAL PRINCIPLES AND PHILOSOPHIES REGARDING USER FEES

Local governments are providers of many types of general services to their communities. While all services provided by local government are beneficial to constituents, some services can be classified as

¹Ga. Const. Article IX, § IV, para. I(b)(2)

²GA Code § 48-13-5; GA Code § 48-13-10

³GA Code § 48-13-9

⁴GA Code § 48-13-5; GA Code § 48-13-9

⁵GA Code § 48-13-5; GA Code § 8-2-26

⁶*McLeod v. Columbia County*, 278 Ga. 242 (2004)

globally beneficial to all citizens, while others provide more of a direct benefit to a specific group or individual. The following table provides examples of services provided by local government within a continuum of the degree of community benefit received:

TABLE 2: SERVICES IN RELATION TO BENEFIT RECEIVED

"Global" Community Benefit	"Global" Benefit and an Individual or Group Benefit	Individual or Group Benefit
•Police •Park Maintenance •Fire Suppression	•Recreation / Community Services •Fire Prevention	•Building Permits •Planning and Zoning Approval •Engineering Development Review

Funding for local government is obtained from myriad revenue sources such as taxes, fines, grants, special charges, user fees, etc. In recent years, alternative tax revenues, which typically offset subsidies for services provided to the community, have become increasingly limited. These limitations have caused increased attention on user fee activities as a revenue source that can offset costs otherwise subsidized (usually) by the general fund. In Table 3, services in the "global community benefit" section tend to be funded primarily through voter-approved tax revenues. In the middle of the table, one typically finds a mixture of taxes, user fees, and other funding sources. Finally, in the "individual / group benefit" section of the table are the services provided by local government that are typically funded almost entirely by user fee revenue.

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

- ❖ **Fees should be assessed according to the degree of individual or private benefit gained from services.** For example, the processing and approval of a land use or building permit will generally result in monetary gain to the applicant, whereas Police services and Fire Suppression are examples of services that are essential to the safety of the community at large.
- ❖ **A profit-making objective should not be included in the assessment of user fees.** Georgia state case law generally requires that user fees be closely tied to the costs associated with providing the associated services. Once a charge for service is assessed at a level higher than the actual cost of providing a service, the term "user fee" no longer applies. The charge then becomes a tax subject to voter approval.

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

GENERAL POLICY CONSIDERATIONS REGARDING USER FEES

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

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

- **Limitations posed by an external agency.** The State or an outside agency will occasionally set a maximum, minimum, or limit on the jurisdiction's ability to charge a fee. Examples include pass-through fees, such as fees charged by Dekalb County.
- **Encouragement of desired behaviors.** Keeping fees for certain services below full cost recovery may provide better compliance from the community. For example, if the cost of a permit for changing a water heater in a residential home is higher than the cost of the water heater itself, many citizens will avoid pulling the permit.
- **Benefit received by user of the service and the community at large is mutual.** Many services that directly benefit a group or individual equally benefit the community. Examples include Planning Design Review, historical dedications, and certain types of special events.

The Matrix Consulting Group recognizes the need for policies that intentionally subsidize certain activities. The primary goals of a User Fee Study are to provide a fair and equitable basis for determining the costs of providing services and ensure that the City complies with State law.

SUMMARY OF LEGAL RESTRICTIONS AND POLICY CONSIDERATIONS

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

USER FEE STUDY METHODOLOGY

The Matrix Consulting Group utilizes a cost allocation methodology commonly known and accepted as the “bottom-up” approach to establishing User Fees. The term means that several cost components are calculated for each fee or service. These components then build upon each other to comprise the total cost for providing the service. The following chart describes the components of a full cost calculation:



The following subsections discuss the two components of the basis of the full cost.

TIME ESTIMATION

Utilization of time estimates is a reasonable and defensible approach, especially since experienced staff members who understand service levels and processes unique to the City developed these estimates. The project team worked closely with City staff in developing time estimates with the following criteria:

- Estimates are representative of **average times** for providing services. Extremely difficult or abnormally simple projects are not factored in the analysis.
- Estimates reflect the time associated with the **position or positions** that typically perform a service.
- Estimates are reviewed by the project team for “**reasonableness**” against their experience with other agencies.
- Estimates were not based on time-in-motion studies, as they are not practical for the scope of services and time frame for this project.
- Estimates match the current or proposed staffing levels to ensure there is no over-allocation of staff resources to fee and non-fee related activities.

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

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

- Accuracy in time tracking is compromised by the additional administrative burden required to track, bill, and collect for services in this manner.

- Additional costs are associated with administrative staff's billing, refunding, and monitoring deposit accounts.
- Customers often prefer to know the fees for services in advance of applying for permits or participating in programs.
- Departments can better predict revenue streams and staff needs using standardized time estimates and anticipated permit volumes.

Situations arise where the size and complexity of a given project warrants time tracking and billing on a "time and materials" basis. The Matrix Consulting Group has recommended taking a deposit and charging actual costs for such fees as appropriate and itemized within the current fee schedule.

FULLY BURDENED HOURLY RATES

The fully burdened hourly rates calculated through this study include the following components:

- **Salaries:** FY2025 Budgeted salaries were utilized and consolidated at the positional level.
- **Benefits:** FY2025 Budgeted benefits were utilized and consolidated at the positional level.
- **Productive Hours:** Based on Stonecrest's current personnel system rules, working or productive hours were calculated. This means taking the starting total working hours and reducing the hours by vacation, sick, holidays, trainings, and administrative leave.
- **Departmental / Divisional Overhead:** This captures any internal service charges or operating costs such as vehicles, supplies, etc. Additionally, this component includes the cost associated with support from Director, administrative, and analytical staff that do not directly work on fees.
- **Citywide Overhead:** This captures support provided by the City Council, City Manager, City Clerk, City Attorney, Finance, and Human Resources. The costs are based on a standard *de minimis* rate (15%).

Together these components result in the generation of fully burdened hourly rates by position / classification and / or department / division. These rates were multiplied against the time assumptions to calculate the full cost of services noted in this report.

RESULTS OVERVIEW

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

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

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

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

The full analytical results were provided to City staff under separate cover from this summary report.

BUILDING

The Building and Permitting Division ensures that any construction within the City complies with state and local building codes and regulations. The Building fees examined in this study relate to new construction; remodels and tenant improvements; mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (MEP) permits; swimming pools; certificates of occupancy; and demolition projects. The following subsections discuss fee schedule modifications and detailed per unit results for the fee-related services provided by the Building Department.

FEE SCHEDULE MODIFICATIONS

In discussions with City staff, the following modifications were proposed to the current fee schedule:

- **Eliminated Fees:** In discussions with City staff, the following eliminations were proposed to the current fee schedule as they represent services no longer offered by the City or are duplicative:
 - 'Electrical Permits – Low Voltage – Residential'
 - 'Plumbing Permits – Miscellaneous fee'
 - 'Sprinkler system processing'
- **New Fee:** Staff proposed the addition of a 'Temporary Certificate of Occupancy' fee to represent a service already offered by not codified on the fee schedule.
- **Condensed Fees:** Staff proposed condensing the following fees to simplify the fee schedule:
 - 'Commercial Grease Trap Processing' from a base fee with an additional fee per \$1,000 valuation to a single flat fee.
 - 'HVAC Permits' from a list of individual appliances to more general fee categories such as 'Fee per heating appliance' and 'Fee per cooling appliance'.
 - 'Plumbing Permits' from a list of individual fixtures to a single 'Fee per plumbing fixture'.
- **Modified Fees:** The following fee modifications were proposed to better clarify the services being provided:
 - 'Swimming Pool' fee was created to combine all related MEP permits and was divided into 'Single-Family' and 'Commercial / Multi-Family' categories.
 - All 'Minimum Permit Fees' were renamed 'Base Permit Fees'.
 - 'Grease Trap', 'Irrigation System', 'Sewer Service', and 'Water Service' had the phrase 'Application Processing' added to clarify that the fee is only for the City to process these applications and submit them to the County for their review.
 - The 'Technology Fee' was converted from a flat fee to a percentage-based fee; this allows the City to better recover costs for large projects that have a greater impact on technology systems.

The modifications noted ensure that the proposed fee schedule more accurately reflects the services being provided by Building and Permitting staff.

DETAILED RESULTS

The Building Division collects fees for new construction; remodels and tenant improvements; mechanical, electrical, and plumbing (MEP) permits; certificates of occupancy; swimming pools; demolition; and processing certain applications that the County reviews. The total cost calculated for each service includes direct staff costs and Departmental, Divisional, and Citywide overhead. The following table details the fee name, current fee, total cost, and difference associated with each service offered.

TABLE 3: TOTAL COST PER UNIT RESULTS – BUILDING

Fee Name	Current Fee	Total Cost	Difference
Building Permit Fee Schedule			
Base Permit Fee	\$175	\$178	(\$3)
Technology Fee	Modified	6%	N/A
Plan Review Fee	20%	40%	(20%)
Building Permit (New Construction)			
Building Permit Fee Schedule	\$0.0065	\$0.0085	(\$0.0020)
Interior Tenant Finish/Residential Remodel			
Minimum permit fee	\$175	\$174	\$1
Technology Fee	Modified	6%	N/A
Commercial Interior finish	\$6.00	\$9.33	(\$3.33)
Residential renovation/addition/repair	\$6.00	\$6.97	(\$0.97)
Other Fees			
Certificate of Occupancy Fee/Letter of Completion Fee	\$50	\$122	(\$72)
Temporary Certificate of Occupancy	New	\$182	N/A
Plans Revision Fee			
Residential Site Plan	\$25	\$62	(\$37)
Other	\$50	\$70	(\$20)
Resubmittal Fee - each resubmittal after the 2nd, Temporary Certificate of Occupancy, nonresidential only	\$25	\$62	(\$37)
Permit Extension - same owner	\$300	\$317	(\$17)
Change of Contractor after permit issued	\$175	\$188	(\$13)
House moving permit	\$150	\$169	(\$19)
Swimming Pool			
Single-Family	\$100	\$394	(\$294)
Commercial / Multi-Family			
Up to \$16,000 value	\$100	\$394	(\$294)
Per \$1,000.00 value added	\$7	\$7	(\$1)
Demolition			
Single-Family	\$100	\$164	(\$64)
Commercial / Multi-Family			
Up to \$16,000 value	\$100	\$164	(\$64)
Per \$1,000.00 value added	\$7	\$7	(\$1)
Temporary Construction Trailer	\$100	\$282	(\$182)
Temporary Structure	\$150	\$282	(\$132)

Fee Name	Current Fee	Total Cost	Difference
Minimum Miscellaneous Fee	\$100	\$99	\$1
Commercial Grease Trap Processing	\$200	\$49	\$51
Irrigation system Processing	\$100	\$49	\$51
After hours inspection (min. 4 hours)	\$50	\$142	(\$92)
Reinspection Fees - Building and Trades			
Reinspection - first occurrence	\$25	\$40	(\$15)
Reinspection - second occurrence	\$50	\$80	(\$30)
Reinspection - third and others	\$100	\$120	(\$20)
Plumbing Permits			
Base Permit Fee	\$100	\$109	(\$9)
Technology Fee	Modified	6%	N/A
Fee per plumbing fixture	\$5	\$20	(\$15)
Fee per gas service added	\$25	\$20	\$5
Other			
Re-inspection fee - First	\$25	\$40	(\$15)
Re-inspection fee - Second	\$50	\$80	(\$30)
Re-inspection fee - Third and subsequent	\$100	\$120	(\$20)
After hours inspection (min 4 hours)	\$50	\$142	(\$92)
Sewer Service Application Processing	\$30	\$49	(\$19)
Water Service Application Processing	\$30	\$49	(\$19)
HVAC Permits			
Base Permit Fee	\$100	\$109	(\$9)
Technology Fee	Modified	6%	N/A
Fee per heating appliance	\$35	\$40	(\$5)
Fee per cooling appliance	\$35	\$40	(\$5)
Fee per residential exhaust fan	\$15	\$40	(\$25)
Fee per commercial exhaust fan	\$25	\$40	(\$15)
Fee per gas service added	\$25	\$40	(\$15)
Fee per commercial vent hood	\$80	\$80	\$0
Fee per residential vent hood	\$25	\$40	(\$15)
Miscellaneous equipment	\$15	\$40	(\$25)
Gas Service	\$25	\$40	(\$15)
Gas Reconnect	\$50	\$50	\$0
Electrical Permits			
Base Permit Fee	\$100	\$109	(\$9)
Technology Fee	Modified	6%	N/A
Other			
Re-inspection fee - First	\$25	\$40	(\$15)
Re-inspection fee - Second	\$50	\$80	(\$30)
Re-inspection fee - Third and subsequent	\$100	\$120	(\$20)
After hours inspection (min 4 hours)	\$50	\$142	(\$92)
Temporary Service Pole	\$25	\$30	(\$5)
Number of receptacles	\$2	\$4	(\$2)
Number of Light Fixtures	\$2	\$4	(\$2)
Service Panel between 30 amps and 125 amps	\$20	\$30	(\$10)
Service Panel between 126 amps and 400 amps	\$30	\$40	(\$10)
Service Panel 401 amps and above	\$40	\$60	(\$20)
Number of appliances including furnace and air conditioning	\$5	\$10	(\$5)

Fee Name	Current Fee	Total Cost	Difference
Swimming pool, spa, Jacuzzi	\$50	\$60	(\$10)
Miscellaneous equipment	\$20	\$30	(\$10)
Construction trailer	\$50	\$60	(\$10)
Power reconnect	\$50	\$60	(\$10)
Low Voltage			
Commercial	\$50	\$60	(\$10)

The fees administered by the Building and Permitting Division generally under-recover. The largest deficits are in relation to the base fees for both 'Single-Family' and 'Commercial / Multi-Family' swimming pool permits at around \$300 each. A few fees do show over-recoveries; the largest overages are in relation to the 'Commercial Grease Trap Processing' and 'Irrigation System Processing' fees at about \$50 each. The City should review these results and adjust these fees to be in compliance with the state regulations, as well as to allow for greater cost recovery.



FINANCE

The Finance Department is responsible for administering the City's Alcoholic Beverage and Business Licenses. The fees examined in this study relate to the administrative fees charged for managing those programs. The following subsections discuss fee schedule modifications and detailed per unit results.

FEE SCHEDULE MODIFICATIONS

In discussions with City staff, no modifications were proposed to the fees administered by the Finance Department.

DETAILED RESULTS

Finance's fees are related to the administrative costs associated with providing Alcoholic Beverage Licenses and Business Licenses. The total cost calculated for each service includes direct staff costs and Departmental, Divisional, and Citywide overhead. The following table details the fee name, current fee, total cost, and difference associated with each service offered.

TABLE 4: TOTAL COST PER UNIT RESULTS – FINANCE

Fee Name	Current Fee	Total Cost	Difference
Alcoholic Beverage E License			
Administrative Fee			
Beer/Wine	\$100	\$214	(\$114)
Liquor	\$200	\$214	(\$14)
Business Licenses			
Administrative Fee	\$75	\$131	(\$56)

The administrative fees administered by the Finance Department all under-recover the associated costs. The largest under-recovery is for a 'Beer/Wine' permit at just over \$100. The smallest under-recovery is for a 'Liquor' permit at about \$15.

PARKS & RECREATION

The Parks and Recreation Department operates and maintains the City's parks and facilitates various activities and programs for City residents. The fees examined in this study relate to facility, field, and pavilion rentals; athletic activities; and camps. The following subsections discuss fee schedule modifications and detailed per-unit results.

FEE SCHEDULE MODIFICATIONS

In discussions with City staff, the following modifications were proposed to the current fee schedule:

- **Eliminated Fees:** Staff proposed eliminating the 'Field Rentals – Artificial Turf Fields' fee, as the City currently does not have any of these fields available for rent.
- **New Fees:** Staff proposed the addition of the following fees as they highlight services the City would like to provide in the near future:
 - 'Afterschool Programming'
 - 'Co-Ed Softball League'
 - 'Co-Ed Kickball League'
 - 'Co-Ed Volleyball League'
 - 'Concession Stand' Rental
 - 'Flag Football'
 - 'Lacrosse'
 - 'Men's / Women's Basketball League'
 - 'School Break Camps'
 - 'Soccer'
 - 'Track and Field'
 - 'Tumbling'
 - 'Youth Basketball Clinic'
 - 'Youth Basketball League'
 - 'Youth T-Ball / Baseball League'
- **Expanded Fees:** For all rentals of spaces in the Browns Mill Recreation Center, staff proposed adding a separate fee for 'Specialty Groups.'

The modifications noted ensure that the proposed fee schedule more accurately reflects the services being provided by Parks and Recreation staff.

DETAILED RESULTS

The Parks and Recreation Department collects fees for rentals, athletic activities, and camps. The total cost calculated for each service includes direct staff costs and Departmental, Divisional, and Citywide overhead. The following table details the fee name, current fee, total cost, and difference associated with each service offered.

TABLE 5: TOTAL COST PER UNIT RESULTS – PARKS & RECREATION

Fee Name	Current Fee	Total Cost	Difference
Browns Mill Recreation Center			
Multipurpose Room			
Event	\$250	\$289	(\$39)
Meeting	\$100	\$149	(\$49)
All Other Rentals:			
Resident	\$45	\$90	(\$45)
Non-Resident	\$70	\$90	(\$20)
Non-Profit	\$35	\$90	(\$55)
Specialty Groups	New	\$90	N/A
Multipurpose Room A or B			
Event	\$250	\$150	\$100
Meeting	\$100	\$59	\$41
All Other Rentals:			
Resident	\$35	\$74	(\$39)
Non-Resident	\$60	\$74	(\$14)
Non-Profit	\$25	\$74	(\$49)
Specialty Groups	New	\$74	N/A
Large Gymnasium			
Athletic Events	\$250	\$236	\$14
All Other Rentals:			
Resident	\$85	\$107	(\$22)
Non-Resident	\$110	\$107	\$3
Non-Profit	\$75	\$107	(\$32)
Specialty Groups	New	\$107	N/A
Auxiliary Gymnasium			
Athletic Events	\$250	\$146	\$104
All Other Rentals:			
Resident	\$60	\$84	(\$24)
Non-Resident	\$85	\$84	\$1
Non-Profit	\$50	\$84	(\$34)
Specialty Groups	New	\$84	N/A
Entire Gymnasium			
Athletic Events	\$250	\$339	(\$89)
All Other Rentals:			
Resident	\$125	\$132	(\$7)
Non-Resident	\$150	\$132	\$18
Non-Profit	\$115	\$132	(\$17)
Specialty Groups	New	\$132	N/A
Opening Facility Fee	\$100	\$85	\$15

Fee Name	Current Fee	Total Cost	Difference
Field Rentals			
Baseball / Football / Soccer / Softball			
Youth	\$40	\$35	\$5
Adult	\$50	\$35	\$15
Non-Profit	\$35	\$35	\$0
Tournaments			
Youth / Adult	\$120	\$218	(\$98)
Lights	\$50	\$85	(\$35)
Field Prep	\$75	\$168	(\$93)
Cleaning / Trash Removal	\$100	\$126	(\$26)
Concession Stand	New	\$63	N/A
Pavilion Rentals			
Salem Pav.			
Half day (< 4 hrs.)			
Resident	\$55	\$144	(\$89)
Non-Resident	\$75	\$144	(\$69)
Full day (4 + hrs.)			
Resident	\$95	\$204	(\$109)
Non-Resident	\$135	\$204	(\$69)
Gregory Moseley Pav.			
Half day (< 4 hrs.)			
Resident	\$55	\$129	(\$74)
Non-Resident	\$75	\$129	(\$54)
Full day (4 + hrs.)			
Resident	\$95	\$174	(\$79)
Non-Resident	\$135	\$174	(\$39)
Browns Mill Pav.			
Half day (< 4 hrs.)			
Resident	\$55	\$135	(\$80)
Non-Resident	\$75	\$135	(\$60)
Full day (4 + hrs.)			
Resident	\$95	\$187	(\$92)
Non-Resident	\$135	\$187	(\$52)
Athletic Programs			
Men's / Women's Basketball League	\$600	\$1,322	(\$722)
Co-Ed Softball League	\$500	\$1,317	(\$817)
Co-Ed Kickball League	\$500	\$1,317	(\$817)
Co-Ed Volleyball League	\$500	\$1,317	(\$817)
Flag Football	\$600	\$1,317	(\$717)
Youth Basketball Clinics	\$125	\$174	(\$49)
Tumbling	\$125	\$174	(\$49)
Youth Basketball League			
Resident	\$80	\$131	(\$51)
Non-Resident	\$95	\$131	(\$36)
Youth T-Ball / Baseball League			
Resident	\$85	\$131	(\$46)
Non-Resident	\$100	\$131	(\$31)
Track and Field			
Resident	\$95	\$131	(\$36)

Fee Name	Current Fee	Total Cost	Difference
Non-Resident	\$110	\$131	(\$21)
Soccer			
Resident	\$85	\$131	(\$46)
Non-Resident	\$100	\$131	(\$31)
Flag Football			
Resident	\$85	\$131	(\$46)
Non-Resident	\$100	\$131	(\$31)
Lacrosse			
Resident	\$95	\$131	(\$36)
Non-Resident	\$110	\$131	(\$21)
Non-Athletic Programs			
Afterschool Programming	New	\$275	N/A
School Break Camps	New	\$382	N/A
Summer Camp	\$60	\$710	(\$650)

The fees charged by the Parks and Recreation Department generally under-recover the costs of providing the associated services, with some exceptions. The largest deficit is seen between the proposed fee and the total cost for the co-ed softball, kickball, and volleyball leagues at about \$800 per team.

A few rental fees show over-recoveries, ranging from just over \$100 ('Auxiliary Gymnasium – Athletic Events') to \$1 ('Auxiliary Gymnasium – Non-Resident'). It is important to note that rental fees are generally not bound by the same cost restrictions as other types of user fees; because rentals are purely voluntary transactions that are influenced by many market factors other than cost (desirability of the facility, availability of other comparable facilities in the area, etc.), these fees can be set at the market rate, rather than purely on a cost basis.

PLANNING & ZONING

The Planning and Zoning Division is responsible for managing the City's growth and development through implementation of the Comprehensive Plan and the Zoning Ordinance. The Planning and Zoning fees included in this study relate to rezoning, variances, public notice, special administrative permits, signs, and land development. The following subsections discuss fee schedule modifications and detailed per-unit results for the fee-related services provided by Planning and Zoning.

FEE SCHEDULE MODIFICATIONS

In discussions with City staff, the following modifications were proposed to the current fee schedule:

- **Eliminated Fees:** Staff proposed eliminating the following fees as they are either no longer needed or are duplicative:
 - 'Residential – Final Plats – Inspection'
 - 'Residential – Final Plats – Final Inspection and Punch List'
 - 'Revisions'
- **New Fees:** Staff proposed the addition of the following fees as they highlight services either already provided and not codified on the fee schedule or services the City would like to provide in a different way:
 - 'Re-Posting Signs'
 - 'Sign Review'
 - 'Tree Removal Permit'
- **Condensed Fees:** Staff proposed collapsing the 'Clearing', 'Clearing and Grubbing', and 'Grading Permit' fees into a single fee for all residential and non-residential projects.
- **Expanded Fees:** For all zoning districts under the 'Rezoning from any district/major modification' section, staff proposed expanding the current list of acreage-based subcategories to include an additional subcategory for Overlays.
- **Modified Fees:** The 'Technology Fee' was converted from a flat fee to a percentage-based fee; this allows the City to better recover costs for large projects that have a greater impact on technology systems.

The modifications noted ensure that the proposed fee schedule more accurately reflects the services being provided by Planning and Zoning staff.

DETAILED RESULTS

Planning and Zoning collects fees for rezoning, variances, signs, public noticing, and land development. The total cost calculated for each service includes direct staff costs and Departmental, Divisional, and

Citywide overhead. The following table details the fee name, current fee, total cost, and difference associated with each service offered.

TABLE 6: TOTAL COST PER UNIT RESULTS – PLANNING & ZONING

Fee Name	Current Fee	Total Cost	Difference
Technology Fee	Modified	6%	N/A
Permit Applications			
Variances			
<u>Residential Single-Family Zoning Districts</u>			
Base	\$250	\$4,111	(\$3,861)
For each additional variance on the same piece of property (maximum of three variances)	\$50	\$417	(\$367)
<u>Medium and High Density Residential Districts, Mixed-Use Districts, Nonresidential Districts, and Commercial Uses in Residential</u>			
Base	\$350	\$4,359	(\$4,009)
For each additional variance on the same piece of property (maximum of three variances)	\$100	\$417	(\$317)
<u>All Signs</u>			
Base	\$350	\$4,111	(\$3,761)
For each additional variance on the same piece of property (maximum of three variances)	\$100	\$417	(\$317)
Sign Review	New	\$208	N/A
Zoning Certification Letter	\$50	\$124	(\$74)
Minor Modification	\$250	\$339	(\$89)
Major Modification	\$250	\$3,117	(\$2,867)
Special Land Use Permit (SLUP)	\$400	\$4,111	(\$3,711)
Swimming Pool	\$50	\$339	(\$289)
Rezoning from any district/major modification			
RE District			
0 to 5 acres	\$500	\$2,032	(\$1,532)
5+ to 10 acres	\$1,000	\$3,196	(\$2,196)
10+ to 20 acres	\$1,500	\$4,111	(\$2,611)
20+ to 100 acres	\$2,000	\$4,506	(\$2,506)
<u>100+ acres</u>			
Base	\$2,500	\$4,506	(\$2,006)
Per acre for any portion thereof over 100 acres.	\$40	\$62	(\$22)
RE District in an Overlay	New	\$4,359	N/A
RLG, R-100, R-85, R-75, R- 60			
0 to 5 acres	\$300	\$2,032	(\$1,732)
5+ to 10 acres	\$700	\$3,196	(\$2,496)
10+ to 20 acres	\$1,000	\$4,111	(\$3,111)
20+ to 100 acres	\$1,500	\$4,506	(\$3,006)
<u>100+ acres</u>			
Base	\$2,500	\$4,506	(\$2,006)
Per acre for any portion thereof over 100 acres.	\$40	\$62	(\$22)
RLG, R-100, R-85, R-75, R- 60 in an Overlay	New	\$4,359	N/A
MHP, RNC, Medium and High Density Residential Districts, Mixed-Use Districts, Nonresidential Districts			
0 to 5 acres	\$500	\$2,281	(\$1,781)

Fee Name	Current Fee	Total Cost	Difference
5+ to 10 acres	\$100	\$3,568	(\$3,468)
10+ to 20 acres	\$1,500	\$4,359	(\$2,859)
20+ to 100 acres	\$2,000	\$5,127	(\$3,127)
100+ acres			
Base	\$2,500	\$5,127	(\$2,627)
Per acre for any portion thereof over 100 acres.	\$20	\$93	(\$73)
MHP, RNC, Medium and High Density Residential Districts, Mixed-Use Districts, Nonresidential Districts in an Overlay	New	\$4,607	N/A
Public Notice			
All Land Use and Variance, and Administrative Appeal Petitions (except Administrative and Minor)			
Signs	\$80	\$45	\$35
Re-Posting Signs	New	\$45	N/A
Advertising (Public Notice)	\$50	\$68	(\$18)
Special Administrative Permit			
Temporary outdoor events			
Base	\$50	\$508	(\$458)
Per Day	\$10	\$84	(\$74)
Temporary outdoor sales, seasonal	\$50	\$508	(\$458)
Temporary Outdoor Retail Sales			
Base	\$50	\$508	(\$458)
Per Day	\$10	\$84	(\$74)
Temporary or seasonal farmer's markets; Temporary produce stand	\$50	\$508	(\$458)
Temporary Structure	\$50	\$508	(\$458)
Urban Community Garden, over 5 acres	\$50	\$508	(\$458)
Telecommunication	\$50	\$508	(\$458)
Home Occupation or Home-based business	\$100	\$339	(\$239)
Festival/Event (horseshow, music festival, etc.)			
Base	\$50	\$508	(\$458)
Per Day	\$10	\$84	(\$74)
Events, Outdoors Seasonal (Christmas tree, pumpkinseed)	\$50	\$508	(\$458)
Roadside Vendor			
Base	\$50	\$508	(\$458)
Per Day	\$10	\$84	(\$74)
Roadside Produce Stand	\$50	\$508	(\$458)
Sexually Oriented Business	\$50	\$4,359	(\$4,309)
Special Administrative Event Permit			
5 days or less	\$200	\$508	(\$308)
14 days	\$300	\$1,378	(\$1,078)
All Other Administrative Permits	\$25	\$508	(\$483)
Sign Variances			
Sign Variances			
Minor Modification	\$30	\$339	(\$309)
Major Modification	\$250	\$3,117	(\$2,867)
Sign Permit Fees			
Directional Sign/Wayfinding Signs	\$100	\$4,111	(\$4,011)
Special Event Sign	\$100	\$84	\$16

Fee Name	Current Fee	Total Cost	Difference
All other sign permits	\$100	\$508	(\$408)
Banner	\$25	\$508	(\$483)
Wall Signs			
Under 50 square feet	\$50	\$666	(\$616)
50 to 100 square feet	\$75	\$1,084	(\$1,009)
Over 100 square feet	\$100	\$1,378	(\$1,278)
Ground / Monumental Signs			
Under 50 square feet	\$100	\$666	(\$566)
50 to 100 square feet	\$150	\$1,084	(\$934)
Over 100 square feet	\$200	\$1,378	(\$1,178)
Land Development Fee Schedule			
Technology Fee	Modified	6%	N/A
Clearing or Clearing and Grubbing or Grading Permit - Residential/Nonresidential			
Review	\$300	\$852	(\$552)
Inspection	\$25	\$532	(\$507)
Tree Removal Permit	New	\$527	N/A
Development Permit			
Residential - Single Family			
Engineering (less than 2 Acres)			
Review			
Base	\$300	\$1,052	(\$752)
Per Lot	\$15	\$22	(\$7)
Inspection			
Base	\$200	\$532	(\$332)
Per Acre	\$100	\$133	(\$33)
Erosion Control (less than 2 Acres)			
Review	\$200	\$1,052	(\$852)
Inspection			
Base	\$100	\$390	(\$290)
Per Acre	\$50	\$66	(\$16)
Engineering (more than 2 Acres)			
Review			
Base	\$400	\$1,585	(\$1,185)
Per Lot	\$15	\$22	(\$7)
Inspection			
Base	\$400	\$1,065	(\$665)
Per Acre	\$100	\$133	(\$33)
Erosion Control (more than 2 Acres)			
Review	\$300	\$1,585	(\$1,285)
Inspection			
Base	\$200	\$656	(\$456)
Per Acre	\$50	\$133	(\$83)
As-Built Plans Review			
Review	\$0	\$66	(\$66)
Inspection	\$0	\$133	(\$133)
Residential - Town Homes (Fee Simple)			
Engineering			
Review			

Fee Name	Current Fee	Total Cost	Difference
Base	\$300	\$390	(\$90)
Per Lot	\$15	\$22	(\$7)
<u>Inspection</u>			
Base	\$400	\$532	(\$132)
Per Acre	\$100	\$133	(\$33)
Erosion Control			
<u>Review</u>			
Base	\$150	\$920	(\$770)
Per Lot	\$15	\$22	(\$7)
<u>Inspection</u>			
Base	\$200	\$532	(\$332)
Per Acre	\$50	\$66	(\$16)
Residential - Final Plats			
First Review			
<u>Review</u>			
Base	\$200	\$460	(\$260)
Per Lot	\$5	\$8	(\$3)
Second Review			
<u>Review</u>			
Base	\$200	\$199	\$1
Third Review and Subsequent Reviews			
<u>Review</u>			
Base	\$200	\$199	\$1
Recording Fee			
<u>Review</u>			
Base	\$100	\$136	(\$36)
Per Lot	\$20	\$45	(\$25)
Nonresidential - Condominium			
Engineering			
<u>Review</u>			
Base	\$300	\$328	(\$28)
Per Lot	\$10	\$45	(\$35)
<u>Inspection</u>			
Base	\$400	\$532	(\$132)
Per Acre	\$100	\$133	(\$33)
Erosion Control			
<u>Review</u>			
Base	\$300	\$920	(\$620)
Per Lot	\$10	\$22	(\$12)
<u>Inspection</u>			
Base	\$200	\$266	(\$66)
Per Acre	\$50	\$66	(\$16)
Nonresidential - Apartment			
Engineering			
<u>Review</u>			
Base	\$300	\$461	(\$161)
Per Lot	\$10	\$45	(\$35)
<u>Inspection</u>			
Base	\$400	\$665	(\$265)

Fee Name	Current Fee	Total Cost	Difference
Per Acre	\$100	\$133	(\$33)
Erosion Control Review			
Base	\$300	\$1,319	(\$1,019)
Per Lot	\$10	\$22	(\$12)
Inspection			
Base	\$200	\$266	(\$66)
Per Acre	\$50	\$66	(\$16)
Nonresidential - Commercial/Institutional Engineering Review			
Base	\$300	\$328	(\$28)
Inspection			
Base	\$400	\$665	(\$265)
Per Acre	\$300	\$133	\$167
Erosion Control Review			
Base	\$300	\$1,319	(\$1,019)
Per Lot	\$10	\$22	(\$12)
Inspection			
Base	\$200	\$266	(\$66)
Per Acre	\$50	\$66	(\$16)
Nonresidential - Other Service Fees			
State Water Determination Fee			
Review	N/A	\$133	N/A
Inspection	\$200	\$266	(\$66)
Arborist Tree Assessment Fee (Per Site Visit)			
Review	N/A	\$263	N/A
Inspection	\$150	\$263	(\$113)
Dumpster Permit Fee			
Review	\$50	\$195	(\$145)
Inspection	\$50	\$133	(\$83)
Permit Extension (3 Months)	\$300	\$332	(\$32)
Land Development Revisions (After Permit Issuance)	\$300	\$719	(\$419)
Lot Division/Combination			
Review	\$200	\$532	(\$332)
Penalty for Site Activity Prior to Obtaining Permit Review	\$300	\$532	(\$232)
Stream Buffer Variance Application Fee-Existing Home			
Review	\$100	\$133	(\$33)
Inspection	\$100	\$532	(\$432)
Stream Buffer Variance Application Fee-New			
Review	\$100	\$266	(\$166)
Inspection	\$200	\$532	(\$332)
City Review			
Review	\$300	\$332	(\$32)

Most fees administered by Planning and Zoning under-recover. The largest deficit is in relation to a 'Special Administrative Permit' for a 'Sexually Oriented Business' at about \$4,300. The next largest

under-recoveries are associated with the 'Directional Sign/Wayfinding Sign' fee (\$4,000) and the base fees for 'Variances' (from \$3,800 to \$4,000).

Two fees currently over-recover the associated costs. The Development Fee for 'Nonresidential - Commercial/Institutional – Engineering Inspection Per Acre' has the largest overcharge at about \$170.

City staff should review these results and consider adjusting fees to be in compliance with laws and regulations, as well as to allow for greater cost recovery.

COST RECOVERY CONSIDERATIONS

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

FEE ADJUSTMENTS

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

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

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

FULL COST RECOVERY

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

Increasing fees associated with permits and services that are already close to full cost recovery can potentially bring a Department's overall cost recovery level higher. Often, these minimal increases can provide necessary revenue to counterbalance fees that cannot be increased.

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

PHASED INCREASES

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

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

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

ANNUAL ADJUSTMENTS

Conducting a comprehensive analysis of fee-related services and costs annually would be quite cumbersome and costly. The general recommendation is that a comprehensive fee analysis should be conducted every five to seven years. This allows jurisdictions to ensure they account for organizational changes, such as staffing levels and merit increases, and process efficiencies, code or rule changes, or technology improvements. Developing annual update mechanisms allow jurisdictions to maintain current levels of cost recovery, while accounting for increases in staffing or expenditures related to permit services. The two most common types of update mechanisms are Consumer Price Index (CPI) and Cost of Living Adjustment (COLA) factors. The following points provide further detail on each of these mechanisms:

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

The City of Stonecrest should pick one of these factors to ensure that fees are increased in alignment with cost increases.

POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

This study has identified areas where the City is under-collecting the costs associated with providing services. This known funding gap is therefore being subsidized by other City revenue sources.

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

TYPICAL COST RECOVERY

The Matrix Consulting Group has extensive experience in analyzing local government operations across the United States and has calculated typical cost recovery ranges. The following table outlines cost recovery ranges by major service area.

TABLE 7: TYPICAL COST RECOVERY RANGES BY MAJOR SERVICE AREA

Service Areas	Typical Cost Recovery Ranges
Building	80-100%
Finance	50-80%
Parks & Recreation	70-90%
Planning & Zoning	50-80%

On average, Stonecrest's Building fees recover **65%** of their costs on a per-unit basis. This is below the typical cost recovery range seen in other jurisdictions. The average per-unit cost recovery for Finance is **66%**, which is within the typical cost recovery range. Parks and Recreation recovers **71%** of the costs of administering its fees, on average. This falls within the typical cost recovery range. Planning falls below the typical cost recovery range, recovering an average of **40%** of its costs on a per-fee basis.

DEVELOPMENT OF COST RECOVERY POLICIES AND PROCEDURES

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

APPENDIX – COMPARATIVE SURVEY

As part of the Cost of Services (User Fee) study for the City of Stonecrest, Matrix Consulting Group conducted a comparative survey of user fees. The City identified five municipalities to be included in the comparative survey: Alpharetta, Brookhaven, Dunwoody, Marietta, and Smyrna. The project team then reviewed public documents (i.e., agenda items, staff reports, budgets, fee schedules, and ordinances) and/or contacted jurisdictions to get comparative information.

While this full report provides the City with a reasonable estimate and understanding of the true costs of providing services, many jurisdictions also wish to benchmark themselves against other comparable jurisdictions to understand the local “rates” for comparable services. This type of comparative analysis allows for the City to assess what types of changes in fee levels their community can bear. However, benchmarking does not provide adequate information regarding the relationship of other jurisdictions’ costs to their fees (i.e., policy decisions to subsidize, cost recovery goals, etc.). To contextualize this portion of the analysis, the project team provided economic and recency factors for the comparable jurisdictions.

The following sections detail various factors to consider when reviewing comparative survey results, as well as graphical comparisons of current fees and total calculated costs for various permits issued or services provided by the City.

ECONOMIC FACTORS

To provide additional context to the comparative survey information, the project team collected economic factors for the jurisdictions included. Three important economic factors to consider when comparing fees across multiple jurisdictions are: population, budget, and workforce size. These factors can impact how and when fees are administered, as a jurisdiction with a smaller population may choose to not charge a fee, or a smaller workforce size may inhibit their ability to administer a fee.

The following tables rank each jurisdiction from smallest to largest for each of these economic factors:

TABLE 8: RANKING OF JURISDICTIONS BY POPULATION

Jurisdiction	Population⁷
Dunwoody	51,795
Smyrna	57,177
Brookhaven	59,370
Stonecrest	61,015
Marietta	63,122
Alpharetta	67,275

⁷ 2024 Census estimates were used for all jurisdictions.

TABLE 9: RANKING OF JURISDICTIONS BY CITYWIDE TOTAL BUDGET

Jurisdiction	FY2025 Budget⁸
Stonecrest	\$30,147,100
Dunwoody	\$70,533,717
Smyrna	\$105,697,703
Brookhaven	\$142,447,818
Alpharetta	\$163,590,569
Marietta	\$359,947,689

TABLE 10: RANKING OF JURISDICTIONS BY FTE

Jurisdiction	FY2025 Authorized FTE
Stonecrest	102.00
Dunwoody	127.50
Brookhaven	230.60
Alpharetta	473.50
Smyrna	480.49
Marietta	810.00

When compared to the surveyed jurisdictions, the City of Stonecrest has an average population size but the lowest budget and FTE count.

RECENCY FACTOR

While the above comparative information can provide some perspective when paralleling Stonecrest's fees with surveyed jurisdictions, other key factors to consider are when a jurisdiction's fee schedule was last updated and when the last comprehensive analysis was undertaken. It is important to note that even when jurisdictions have conducted recent fee studies, their fees are not always adopted at full cost recovery. The comparative results only show the adopted fee for the surveyed jurisdiction, not necessarily the full cost associated with the comparable service. The following tables detail when each surveyed jurisdiction last updated its fee schedule:

TABLE 11: LAST FEE SCHEDULE UPDATE

Jurisdiction	Response
Alpharetta	N/A ⁹
Brookhaven	2023
Dunwoody	2024
Marietta	2024
Smyrna	2025

All the surveyed jurisdictions have published an updated fee schedule within the last two to three years. However, none of the surveyed jurisdictions have conducted a comprehensive fee study.

⁸ To ensure appropriate comparisons, full operating budget (all funds) has been used for all jurisdictions.

⁹ Alpharetta generally updates fees individually on an as-needed basis.

ADDITIONAL FACTORS

Along with keeping the statistics outlined in the previous sections in mind, the following issues should also be noted regarding the use of market surveys in the setting of fees for service:

- **Cost Recovery Factors:** Each jurisdiction and its fees are different, and many are not based on the actual cost of providing services as various policy decisions may subsidize services.
- **Fee Variance Factors:** A fee with the same name may encompass different types of services or activities across jurisdictions. Variability may stem from differences in service delivery models (e.g., in-house vs. contracted), the scope of work included under the fee, and staffing configurations, all of which can influence how indirect and overhead costs are allocated.


In addition to the issues noted, market surveys can also run the risk of creating a confusing excess of data that will obscure rather than clarify policy issues. Because each jurisdiction is different, the Matrix Consulting Group recommends that the information contained in the market comparison of fees be used as a secondary decision-making tool, rather than the primary method for determining an acceptable price point for services.

COMPARATIVE SURVEY RESULTS

As part of this study, the project team conducted a survey of how the City's current user fees and calculated full cost compare to other identified jurisdictions. The following subsections provide a comparative look at several fee-related services provided by the City versus the surveyed jurisdictions.

RESIDENTIAL NEW CONSTRUCTION


For a residential new construction project valued at \$350,000, Building and Permitting currently charges a fee of \$2,730, which includes both plan check and inspection costs. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$4,143. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.



Stonecrest's current fee is near the jurisdictional average of \$2,655 and is most similar to Smyrna's fee (\$2,800). The City's full cost, however, falls significantly above average and is higher than any other surveyed municipality. Marietta has the lowest fee at \$1,800, while Alpharetta has the highest at \$3,008.

RESIDENTIAL RENOVATION

For a small residential renovation project valued at \$15,000, Building and Permitting currently charges a fee of \$108 for plan check and inspection. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$146. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.




Stonecrest's current fee and full cost are both below the jurisdictional average of \$160. The City's current fee is most comparable to Alpharetta's fee of \$124 and is the lowest fee among the surveyed jurisdictions. The City's full cost is most comparable to Smyrna's fee (\$155).

COMMERCIAL NEW CONSTRUCTION

For a commercial new construction project valued at \$1,000,000, Building and Permitting currently charges a fee of \$7,800 for plan check and inspection. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$11,837. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.

Commercial New Construction




Stonecrest's current fee falls below the jurisdictional average of \$8,465; it is most similar to Dunwoody's fee (\$8,025). The City's full cost, on the other hand, falls above average and is most comparable to Alpharetta's fee of \$10,150, the highest among the surveyed jurisdictions. Marietta has the lowest fee at \$7,050.

COMMERCIAL INTERIOR FINISH

Building and Permitting currently charges a fee of \$1,260 for plan check and inspection of a commercial interior finish project valued at \$175,000. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$2,285. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.


Commercial Interior Finish



Stonecrest's current fee is below the jurisdictional average of \$1,496 and is closest to Dunwoody's fee (\$1,425). The City's full cost falls above average; it is higher than the fee of any surveyed jurisdiction but most similar to Alpharetta's fee of \$1,900.

CERTIFICATE OF OCCUPANCY

Building and Permitting currently charges a fee of \$50 for a Certificate of Occupancy. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$123. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.




The City's current fee is below the jurisdictional average of \$81; it is most comparable to Brookhaven's fee, which is also \$50. Stonecrest's full cost falls above average and is closest to Alpharetta and Smyrna's fees (\$100 each).

WATER HEATER REPLACEMENT

Building and Permitting currently charges a fee of \$110 for the replacement of a water heater. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$130. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.

Water Heater Replacement




Both Stonecrest's current fee and full cost are above the jurisdictional average of \$60. The jurisdictions with the highest fees among the survey group are Brookhaven and Dunwoody at \$75; all other jurisdictions charge \$50 for this permit.

SWIMMING POOL – SINGLE-FAMILY

Building and Permitting currently charges a fee of \$100 for a Single-Family Residential Swimming Pool permit. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$394. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.¹⁰

Swimming Pool - Single-Family




The City's current fee falls below the jurisdictional average of \$146 and is most similar to Smyrna's fee of \$100 (the lowest fee among the surveyed jurisdictions). Stonecrest's full cost falls above average,

¹⁰ For those jurisdictions that do not have a separate Swimming Pool permit, a valuation of \$15,000 was used.

though, and is well above the fee of any surveyed municipality. Among the localities included here, only Brookhaven has a separate Pool fee; the other cities charge this fee based on valuation.

BUSINESS LICENSE ADMINISTRATIVE FEE

Finance currently charges a fee of \$75 as an administrative fee associated with issuing Business Licenses. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$131. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.




Stonecrest's current fee is below the jurisdictional average of \$108; it is the same as Alpharetta's fee (\$75) and higher than the lowest fee among the surveyed municipalities (Smyrna at \$55). The City's full cost is above the jurisdictional average but lower than Marietta's fee of \$158. Marietta charges both an Administrative Fee and a Processing Fee; both were considered together here to more directly compare to Stonecrest's singular fee.

BROWNS MILL RECREATION CENTER MULTIPUPOSE ROOM A RENTAL

The Parks and Recreation Department currently charges a fee of \$70 for a resident to rent Multipurpose Room A at the Browns Bill Recreation Center for two hours. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$148. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.

Browns Mill Recreation Center Multipurpose Room A Rental




The City's current fee is below the jurisdictional average of \$101 and most similar to Smyrna's fee of \$75. Stonecrest's full cost falls above average but is less than Alpharetta's fee (\$200). It is important to note that these comparisons do not take into account factors such as the newness or desirability of the facility, although the project team makes the scenarios as comparable as possible.

BASEBALL FIELD RENTAL

The Parks and Recreation Department currently charges a fee of \$200 to rent a baseball field for an adult game for 4 hours. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$140. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.


Baseball Field Rental



Stonecrest's current fee and full cost both fall below the jurisdictional average of \$330. Both fees are most comparable to Smyrna's fee (\$200). Notably, it is common for rental fees to be set at market rate, which may be above the cost of making those fields available for rent.

SALEM PAVILION RENTAL

Parks and Recreation currently charges a fee of \$135 to rent the Salem Park Pavilion for a full day. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$204. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.¹¹




Stonecrest's current fee and full cost both fall below the jurisdictional average of \$275. The City's current fee is most similar to Marietta's fee (\$120), while the full cost is closest to Dunwoody's fee (\$200). Alpharetta does not rent most of its pavilions and does not charge for those it does rent.

MEN'S / WOMEN'S BASKETBALL LEAGUE

Parks and Recreation has proposed charging a fee of \$600 per team for a men's or women's basketball league. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$1,322 per team. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.

¹¹ For those jurisdictions that charge an hourly fee, a rental duration of 6 hours was used.

Men's / Women's Basketball League




Stonecrest's proposed fee and full cost are both above the jurisdictional average of \$468. The proposed fee is similar to Brookhaven's fee of \$650, but the full cost is not comparable to any fee charged by the comparison jurisdictions. It is important to note that recreational activity fees are often subsidized below the full cost of providing the service.

YOUTH BASKETBALL LEAGUE

The Parks and Recreation Department has proposed charging a fee of \$85 per DeKalb County resident for participation in a youth basketball league. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$131. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.

Youth Basketball League




Stonecrest's current fee and full cost are both below the jurisdictional average of \$175. The City's current fee is most comparable to Marietta's fee (\$85) while the full cost is most similar to Alpharetta's fee

(\$150). Smyrna charges \$275, but it is important to note that Smyrna only provides the facility for these leagues, which are run by a local non-profit rather than in-house staff.

SUMMER CAMP

Parks and Recreation currently charges a fee of \$60 per participant per week for summer camp. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$710 per participant per week. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.




Stonecrest's current fee falls below the jurisdictional average of \$194 and is closest to Marietta's fee of \$100. The full cost of providing summer camp, however, is well above average and is not comparable to the fee charged by any of the surveyed municipalities. Brookhaven has the highest fee at \$265, followed closely by Dunwoody at \$260. Brookhaven's summer camp is provided by the YMCA at Brookhaven facilities and is not provided by City staff. It is important to note that summer camp fees are often set well below full cost recovery due to the community benefit they provide.

VARIANCE – RESIDENTIAL SINGLE-FAMILY ZONING DISTRICTS

Planning and Zoning currently charges a fee of \$250 for a variance in residential single-family zoning districts. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$4,111. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.

Variance - Residential Single-Family Zoning Districts




Stonecrest's current fee is below the jurisdictional average of \$350; the full cost is well above the fee charged by any other surveyed jurisdiction. Brookhaven, Dunwoody, Marietta, and Smyrna all charge the same fee as Stonecrest (\$250). Alpharetta charges \$750 for a variance but does not consider the type of zoning district when assessing their fee.

HOME OCCUPATION OR HOME-BASED BUSINESS

Planning and Zoning currently charges a fee of \$100 for a Home Occupation or Home-based Business permit. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$339. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.


Home Occupation or Home-based Business



Stonecrest's current fee falls below the jurisdictional average of \$167 and is the same as Brookhaven's fee (\$100). The full cost is above average and is most comparable to Dunwoody's fee (\$250).

SPECIAL ADMINISTRATIVE EVENT PERMIT

Planning and Zoning currently charges a fee of \$200 for a Special Administrative Event Permit for events that are 5 days or less. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$509. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.




Stonecrest's current fee is slightly below the jurisdictional average of \$239 and matches Alpharetta's fee (\$200). The City's full cost of providing this service is above average but similar to Marietta's fee (\$545). Marietta's fee as presented here includes an application fee and one event day; a longer event would incur a larger fee.

WALL SIGN PERMIT

Planning and Zoning currently charges a fee of \$75 for a Wall Sign Permit for signs that are between 50 and 100 square feet. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$1,084. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.

Wall Sign Permit




Stonecrest's current fee is below the jurisdictional average of \$148; it is most similar to Dunwoody's fee of \$115. The City's full cost is well above average and is not comparable to the fees charged by any of the surveyed jurisdictions. The highest fee among the surveyed municipalities is Alpharetta's fee at \$175.

RESIDENTIAL FINAL PLAT

Planning and Zoning currently charges a fee of \$250 for the first review of a Residential Final Plat with 10 lots. Through this study, the project team calculated the full cost of this service to be \$549. The following graph shows how Stonecrest's current fee and full cost compare to the surveyed jurisdictions.

Residential Final Plat



Stonecrest's current fee falls below the jurisdictional average of \$355 and falls between Marietta's fee (\$100) and Dunwoody's fee (\$400). The City's full cost is above average but is comparable to Brookhaven's fee (\$500) and below Alpharetta's fee (\$750).



SUMMARY

Overall, Stonecrest generally has current fees that are lower than the fees of the other surveyed jurisdictions. Of the surveyed jurisdictions, Stonecrest's current fees are most comparable to Dunwoody's fees. At the same time, the City's full cost is generally above the fees charged by the surveyed jurisdictions and is most comparable to the fees charged by Alpharetta. It is important to note that the results of this survey only show the fees adopted by the respective councils, not the cost recovery policy decisions of departments or a jurisdiction. As such, the results of this survey should be used as a secondary decision-making tool.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
1	Master Fee Schedule - City of Stonecrest									
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
2										
4	Building			1	1					
5	Building Permit Fee Schedule			1	1					
6	Base Permit Fee	Each	\$ 175.00	\$ 178.00	\$ 178.00	\$ 3.00	User Fee	\$ 175.00	\$ 175.00	\$ 175.00
7	Technology Fee	% of Fee	Modified	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06		User Fee	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00
8	Plan Review Fee	% of Building Permit	\$ 0.20	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.40	\$ 0.20	User Fee			
9	Building Permit (New Construction)			1	1		1			
10	Building Permit Fee Schedule	Per Valuation	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.01	\$ 0.00	User Fee			
11	Interior Tenant Finish/Residential Remodel			1	1		1			
12	Minimum permit fee	Each	\$ 175.00	\$ 174.00	\$ 174.00	\$ (1.00)	User Fee			
13	Technology Fee added to each permit	Each	Modified	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06		User Fee	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00
14	Commercial Interior finish:	Per \$1,000.00	\$ 6.00	\$ 9.33	\$ 9.33	\$ 3.33	User Fee	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.00	\$ 9.00
15	Residential renovation/addition/repair	Per \$1,000.00	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.97	\$ 6.97	\$ 0.97	User Fee	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.00	\$ 6.00
16	Other Fees			1	1		1			
17	Certificate of Occupancy Fee/Letter of Completion Fee	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 122.00	\$ 122.00	\$ 72.00	User Fee	\$ 120.00	\$ 73.33	\$ 96.67
18	Temporary Certificate of Occupancy	Each	New	\$ 182.00	\$ 182.00		User Fee	\$ 175.00	\$ 175.00	\$ 175.00
19	Plans Revision Fee			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
20	Residential Site Plan	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 62.00	\$ 62.00	\$ 37.00	User Fee	\$ 60.00	\$ 36.67	\$ 48.33
21	Other	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 70.00	\$ 20.00	User Fee			
22	Resubmittal Fee - each resubmittal after [the] 2[nd], Temporary Certificate of Occupancy, nonresidential only	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 62.00	\$ 62.00	\$ 37.00	User Fee	\$ 60.00	\$ 36.67	\$ 48.33
23	Permit Extension - same owner	Each	\$ 300.00	\$ 317.00	\$ 317.00	\$ 17.00	User Fee	\$ 300.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 300.00
24	Change of Contractor after permit issued	Each	\$ 175.00	\$ 188.00	\$ 188.00	\$ 13.00	User Fee	\$ 180.00	\$ 180.00	\$ 180.00
25	Working without valid permit	Permit Fee	2x		2x		Penalty			
26	Permit Fee refunds after plan review completed	% of Total Fee	\$ 0.50		\$ 0.50	\$ -	Other			
27	House moving permit	Each	\$ 150.00	\$ 169.00	\$ 169.00	\$ 19.00	User Fee	\$ 170.00	\$ 170.00	\$ 170.00
28	Swimming Pool			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
29	Single-Family	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 394.00	\$ 394.00	\$ 294.00	User Fee	\$ 300.00	\$ 166.67	\$ 233.33
30	Commercial / Multi-Family:			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
31	Up to \$16,000 value	Base	\$ 100.00	\$ 394.00	\$ 394.00	\$ 294.00	User Fee	\$ 300.00	\$ 166.67	\$ 233.33
32	Per \$1,000.00 value added	Per \$1,000.00 value added	\$ 6.50	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.00	\$ 0.50	User Fee			
33	Demolition			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
34	Single-Family	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 164.00	\$ 164.00	\$ 64.00	User Fee			
35	Commercial / Multi-Family			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
36	Up to \$16,000 value	Base	\$ 100.00	\$ 164.00	\$ 164.00	\$ 64.00	User Fee			
37	Per \$1,000.00 value added	Per \$1,000.00 value added	\$ 6.50	\$ 7.00	\$ 7.00	\$ 0.50	User Fee			
38	Temporary Construction Trailer	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 282.00	\$ 282.00	\$ 182.00	User Fee	\$ 280.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 220.00
39	Temporary Structure	Each	\$ 150.00	\$ 282.00	\$ 282.00	\$ 132.00	User Fee	\$ 280.00	\$ 215.00	\$ 280.00

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
40										
41	Minimum Miscellaneous Fee	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 99.00	\$ 99.00	\$ (1.00)	User Fee	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00
42	Commercial Grease Trap Processing	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 49.00	\$ 49.00	\$ (51.00)	User Fee	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00
43	Irrigation system Processing	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 49.00	\$ 49.00	\$ (51.00)	User Fee	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00
44	Refunds for after plans review completed	% of Fee	\$ 0.50		\$ 0.50	\$ -	Other			
45	After hours inspection (min. 4 hours)	Per Hour	\$ 50.00	\$ 142.00	\$ 142.00	\$ 92.00	User Fee	\$ 140.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 110.00
46	Reinspection Fees - Building and Trades			1	1		1			
47	Reinspection - first occurrence	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 15.00	User Fee			
48	Reinspection - second occurrence	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 30.00	User Fee			
49	Reinspection - third and others	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 20.00	User Fee			
50	Plumbing Permits			1	1		1			
51	Base Permit Fee	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 109.00	\$ 109.00	\$ 9.00	User Fee	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00
52	Technology Fee	Each	Modified	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06		User Fee	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00
53	Fee per plumbing fixture	Per Fixture	\$ 5.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 15.00	User Fee			
54	Fee per gas service added	Per Gas Service	\$ 25.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00	\$ (5.00)	User Fee			
55	Other			1	1		1			
56	Re-inspection fee - First	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 15.00	User Fee			
57	Re-inspection fee - Second	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 30.00	User Fee			
58	Re-inspection fee - Third and subsequent	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 20.00	User Fee			
59	After hours inspection (min 4 hours)	Per Hour	\$ 50.00	\$ 142.00	\$ 142.00	\$ 92.00	User Fee	\$ 140.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 110.00
60	Sewer service Application Processing	Per Unit	\$ 30.00	\$ 49.00	\$ 49.00	\$ 19.00	User Fee	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00
61	Water service Application Processing	Per Unit	\$ 30.00	\$ 49.00	\$ 49.00	\$ 19.00	User Fee	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00
62	HVAC Permits			1	1		1			
63	Base Permit Fee	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 109.00	\$ 109.00	\$ 9.00	User Fee	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00
64	Technology Fee	Each	Modified	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06		User Fee	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00
65	Fee per heating appliance	Each	\$ 35.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 5.00	User Fee			
66	Fee per cooling appliance	Each	\$ 35.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 5.00	User Fee			
67	Fee per residential exhaust fan	Each	\$ 15.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 25.00	User Fee			
68	Fee per commercial exhaust fan	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 15.00	User Fee			
69	Fee per gas service added	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 15.00	User Fee			
70	Fee per commercial vent hood	Each	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ -	User Fee			
71	Fee per residential vent hood	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 15.00	User Fee			
72	Miscellaneous equipment	Each	\$ 15.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 25.00	User Fee			
73	Gas Service	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 15.00	User Fee			
74	Gas Reconnect	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ -	User Fee			
75	Electrical Permits			1	1		1			
76	Base Permit Fee	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 109.00	\$ 109.00	\$ 9.00	User Fee	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00
77	Technology Fee	Each	Modified	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06		User Fee	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00
78	Other			1	1		1			

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
79										
80	Re-inspection fee - First	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 15.00	User Fee			
81	Re-inspection fee - Second	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 30.00	User Fee			
82										
83	Re-inspection fee - Third and subsequent	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 120.00	\$ 20.00	User Fee			
84	After hours inspection (min 4 hours)	Per Hour	\$ 50.00	\$ 142.00	\$ 142.00	\$ 92.00	User Fee	\$ 140.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 110.00
85	Temporary Service Pole	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 5.00	User Fee			
86	Number of receptacles	Each	\$ 2.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 2.00	User Fee			
87	Number of Light Fixtures	Each	\$ 2.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 4.00	\$ 2.00	User Fee			
88	Service Panel between 30 amps and 125 amps	Each	\$ 20.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 10.00	User Fee			
89	Service Panel between 126 amps and 400 amps	Each	\$ 30.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 40.00	\$ 10.00	User Fee			
90	Service Panel 401 amps and above	Each	\$ 40.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 20.00	User Fee			
91	Number of appliances including furnace and air conditioning	Each	\$ 5.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 10.00	\$ 5.00	User Fee			
92	Swimming pool, spa, Jacuzzi	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 10.00	User Fee			
93	Miscellaneous equipment	Each	\$ 20.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 30.00	\$ 10.00	User Fee			
94	Construction trailer	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 10.00	User Fee			
95	Power reconnect	Base	\$ 50.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 10.00	User Fee			
96	Low Voltage			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
97	Commercial	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 10.00	User Fee			
98	Planning and Zoning Fee Schedule			1	1		1			
99	Technology Fee (applies to each permit)	% of Fee	Modified	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06		User Fee	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00	\$ 50.00
100	Permit Applications			1	1		1			
101	Variances			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
102	Residential Single-Family Zoning Districts			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
103	Base	Base	\$ 250.00	\$ 4,111.00	\$ 4,111.00	\$ 3,861.00	User Fee	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 785.71	\$ 1,321.43
104	For each additional variance on the same piece of property (maximum of three variances at any	Each Variance	\$ 50.00	\$ 417.00	\$ 417.00	\$ 367.00	User Fee	\$ 400.00	\$ 108.33	\$ 166.67
105	Medium and High Density Residential Districts, Mixed-Use Districts, Nonresidential Districts, and Commercial Uses in Residential			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
106	Base	Base	\$ 350.00	\$ 4,359.00	\$ 4,359.00	\$ 4,009.00	User Fee	\$ 4,300.00	\$ 914.29	\$ 1,478.57
107	For each additional variance on the same piece of property (maximum of three variances at any	Each Variance	\$ 100.00	\$ 417.00	\$ 417.00	\$ 317.00	User Fee	\$ 400.00	\$ 175.00	\$ 250.00
108	All Signs			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
109	Base	Base	\$ 350.00	\$ 4,111.00	\$ 4,111.00	\$ 3,761.00	User Fee	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 871.43	\$ 1,392.86
110	For each additional variance on the same piece of property (maximum of three variances at any	Each Variance	\$ 100.00	\$ 417.00	\$ 417.00	\$ 317.00	User Fee	\$ 400.00	\$ 175.00	\$ 250.00
111	Sign Review	Per Sign	New	\$ 208.00	\$ 208.00		User Fee	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00
112	Zoning Certification Letter	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 124.00	\$ 124.00	\$ 74.00	User Fee	\$ 120.00	\$ 73.33	\$ 96.67
113	Minor Modification	Each	\$ 250.00	\$ 339.00	\$ 339.00	\$ 89.00	User Fee	\$ 300.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 300.00

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
114										
115	Major Modification	Each	\$ 250.00	\$ 3,117.00	\$ 3,117.00	\$ 2,867.00	User Fee	\$ 3,100.00	\$ 657.14	\$ 1,064.29
116	Special Land Use Permit (SLUP)	Each	\$ 400.00	\$ 4,111.00	\$ 4,111.00	\$ 3,711.00	User Fee	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 1,600.00
117	Swimming Pool	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 339.00	\$ 339.00	\$ 289.00	User Fee	\$ 300.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 150.00
118	GIS Maps >11 x 17	Each	\$ 5.00		\$ 5.00	\$ -	User Fee			
119	Rezoning from any district/major modification									
120										
121	RE District									
122	0 to 5 acres	Each	\$ 500.00	\$ 2,032.00	\$ 2,032.00	\$ 1,532.00	User Fee	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 875.00	\$ 1,250.00
123	5+ to 10 acres	Each	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 3,196.00	\$ 3,196.00	\$ 2,196.00	User Fee	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 1,666.67	\$ 2,333.33
124	10+ to 20 acres	Each	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 4,111.00	\$ 4,111.00	\$ 2,611.00	User Fee	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 2,333.33	\$ 3,166.67
125	20+ to 100 acres	Each	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 4,506.00	\$ 4,506.00	\$ 2,506.00	User Fee	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
126	100+ acres									
127	Base	Base	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 4,506.00	\$ 4,506.00	\$ 2,006.00	User Fee	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 4,500.00
128	Per acre for any portion thereof over 100 acres.	Each Add 'l Acre	\$ 40.00	\$ 62.00	\$ 62.00	\$ 22.00	User Fee	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00
129	RLG District in an Overlay	Each	New	\$ 4,359.00	\$ 4,359.00		User Fee	\$ 4,300.00	\$ 4,300.00	\$ 4,300.00
130	RLG, R-100, R-85, R-75, R- 60									
131	0 to 5 acres	Each	\$ 300.00	\$ 2,032.00	\$ 2,032.00	\$ 1,732.00	User Fee	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 640.00	\$ 980.00
132	5+ to 10 acres	Each	\$ 700.00	\$ 3,196.00	\$ 3,196.00	\$ 2,496.00	User Fee	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 1,275.00	\$ 1,850.00
133	10+ to 20 acres	Each	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 4,111.00	\$ 4,111.00	\$ 3,111.00	User Fee	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 1,750.00	\$ 2,500.00
134	20+ to 100 acres	Each	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 4,506.00	\$ 4,506.00	\$ 3,006.00	User Fee	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 3,500.00
135	100+ acres									
136	Base	Base	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 4,506.00	\$ 4,506.00	\$ 2,006.00	User Fee	\$ 4,500.00	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 4,500.00
137	Per acre for any portion thereof over 100 acres.	Each Add 'l Acre	\$ 40.00	\$ 62.00	\$ 62.00	\$ 22.00	User Fee	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00
138	RLG, R-100, R-85, R-75, R- 60 in an Overlay	Each	New	\$ 4,359.00	\$ 4,359.00		User Fee	\$ 4,300.00	\$ 4,300.00	\$ 4,300.00
139	MHP, RNC, Medium and High Density Residential Districts, Mixed-Use Districts, Nonresidential Districts									
140	0 to 5 acres	Each	\$ 500.00	\$ 2,281.00	\$ 2,281.00	\$ 1,781.00	User Fee	\$ 2,200.00	\$ 925.00	\$ 1,350.00
141	5+ to 10 acres	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 3,568.00	\$ 3,568.00	\$ 3,468.00	User Fee	\$ 3,500.00	\$ 477.78	\$ 855.56
142	10+ to 20 acres	Each	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 4,359.00	\$ 4,359.00	\$ 2,859.00	User Fee	\$ 4,300.00	\$ 2,433.33	\$ 3,366.67
143	20+ to 100 acres	Each	\$ 2,000.00	\$ 5,127.00	\$ 5,127.00	\$ 3,127.00	User Fee	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 4,000.00
144	100+ acres									
145	Base	Base	\$ 2,500.00	\$ 5,127.00	\$ 5,127.00	\$ 2,627.00	User Fee	\$ 5,000.00	\$ 3,750.00	\$ 5,000.00
146	Per acre for any portion thereof over 100 acres.	Each Add 'l Acre	\$ 20.00	\$ 93.00	\$ 93.00	\$ 73.00	User Fee	\$ 90.00	\$ 37.50	\$ 55.00
147	MHP, RNC, Medium and High Density Residential Districts, Mixed-Use Districts, Nonresidential Districts in an Overlay	Each	New	\$ 4,607.00	\$ 4,607.00		User Fee	\$ 4,600.00	\$ 4,600.00	\$ 4,600.00
148	Public Notice									
149	All Land Use and Variance, and Administrative Appeal Petitions (except Administrative and Minor)									

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
150	Signs	Per Sign	\$ 80.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	\$ (35.00)	User Fee			
151	Re-Posting Signs	Per Sign	New	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00		User Fee			
152	Advertising (Public Notice)	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 68.00	\$ 68.00	\$ 18.00	User Fee	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00	\$ 65.00
153	Special Administrative Permit			1	1		1			
154	Temporary outdoor events			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
155	Base	Base	\$ 50.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 458.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 200.00
156	Per Day	Per Day	\$ 10.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 74.00	User Fee	\$ 80.00	\$ 21.67	\$ 33.33
157	Temporary outdoor sales,seasonal	Base	\$ 50.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 458.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 200.00
158										
159										
160	Temporary Outdoor Retail Sales			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
161	Base	Base	\$ 50.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 458.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 200.00
162	Per Day	Per Day	\$ 10.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 74.00	User Fee	\$ 80.00	\$ 21.67	\$ 33.33
163	Temporary or seasonal farmer's markets; Temporary produce stand	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 458.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 200.00
164	Temporary Structure	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 458.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 200.00
165	Urban Community Garden, over 5 acres	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 458.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 200.00
166	Telecommunication	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 458.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 200.00
167	Home Occupation or Home-based business	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 339.00	\$ 339.00	\$ 239.00	User Fee	\$ 330.00	\$ 176.67	\$ 253.33
168	Festival/Event (horseshow, music festival, etc.)			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
169	Base	Base	\$ 50.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 458.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 200.00
170	Per Day	Per Day	\$ 10.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 74.00	User Fee	\$ 80.00	\$ 21.67	\$ 33.33
171	Events, Outdoors Seasonal (Christmas tree, pumpkinseed)	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 458.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 200.00
172	Roadside Vendor			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
173	Base	Base	\$ 50.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 458.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 200.00
174	Per Day	Per Day	\$ 10.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 74.00	User Fee	\$ 80.00	\$ 21.67	\$ 33.33
175	Roadside Produce Stand	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 458.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 125.00	\$ 200.00
176	Sexually Oriented Business	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 4,359.00	\$ 4,359.00	\$ 4,309.00	User Fee	\$ 4,300.00	\$ 436.36	\$ 822.73
177	Special Administrative Event Permit			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
178	5 days or less	Each	\$ 200.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 308.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 300.00	\$ 400.00
179	14 days	Each	\$ 300.00	\$ 1,378.00	\$ 1,378.00	\$ 1,078.00	User Fee	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 550.00	\$ 800.00
180	All Other Administrative Permits	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 483.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 84.38	\$ 143.75
181	Sign Variances			1	1		1			
182	Sign Variances			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
183	Minor Modification	Each	\$ 30.00	\$ 339.00	\$ 339.00	\$ 309.00	User Fee	\$ 330.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 130.00
184	Major Modification	Each	\$ 250.00	\$ 3,117.00	\$ 3,117.00	\$ 2,867.00	User Fee	\$ 3,000.00	\$ 642.86	\$ 1,035.71
185	Sign Permit Fees			1	1		1			
186	Directional Sign/Wayfinding Signs	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 4,111.00	\$ 4,111.00	\$ 4,011.00	User Fee	\$ 4,000.00	\$ 490.00	\$ 880.00
187	Special Event Sign	Per Sign	\$ 100.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 84.00	\$ (16.00)	User Fee	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 60.00
188	All other sign permits	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 408.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 300.00

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
189	Banner	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 508.00	\$ 483.00	User Fee	\$ 500.00	\$ 84.38	\$ 143.75
190	Wall Signs			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
191	Under 50 square feet	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 666.00	\$ 666.00	\$ 616.00	User Fee	\$ 600.00	\$ 128.57	\$ 207.14
192	50 to 100 square feet	Each	\$ 75.00	\$ 1,084.00	\$ 1,084.00	\$ 1,009.00	User Fee	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 207.14	\$ 339.29
193	Over 100 square feet	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 1,378.00	\$ 1,378.00	\$ 1,278.00	User Fee	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 271.43	\$ 442.86
194	Ground / Monumental Signs			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
195	Under 50 square feet	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 666.00	\$ 666.00	\$ 566.00	User Fee	\$ 600.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 300.00
196	50 to 100 square feet	Each	\$ 150.00	\$ 1,084.00	\$ 1,084.00	\$ 934.00	User Fee	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 320.00	\$ 490.00
197	Over 100 square feet	Each	\$ 200.00	\$ 1,378.00	\$ 1,378.00	\$ 1,178.00	User Fee	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 420.00	\$ 640.00
198	Land Development Fee Schedule			1	1		1			
199	Technology Fee	Each	Modified	\$ 0.06	\$ 0.06		User Fee			
200	Resubmittal Fee (each resubmittal after second)	% of Permit Fee	\$ 0.25	1	\$ 0.25	\$ -	User Fee			
201	Clearing or Clearing and Grubbing or Grading Permit - Residential/Nonresidential			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
202	Review	Each	\$ 300.00	\$ 852.00	\$ 852.00	\$ 552.00	User Fee	\$ 850.00	\$ 483.33	\$ 666.67
203	Inspection	Per Acre	\$ 25.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 507.00	User Fee	\$ 530.00	\$ 88.13	\$ 151.25
204	Tree Removal Permit/Residential	Each	New	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00		User Fee	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00	\$ 80.00
205	Development Permit			1	1		1			
206	Residential - Single Family			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
207	Engineering (less than 2 Acres)			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
208	Review	Base	\$ 300.00	\$ 1,052.00	\$ 1,052.00	\$ 752.00	User Fee	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 533.33	\$ 766.67
209	Base	Per Lot	\$ 15.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 7.00	User Fee	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00
210	Inspection			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
211	Base	Base	\$ 200.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 332.00	User Fee	\$ 530.00	\$ 310.00	\$ 420.00
212	Per Acre	Per Acre	\$ 100.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 33.00	User Fee	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00
213	Erosion Control (less than 2 Acres)			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
214	Review	Each	\$ 200.00	\$ 1,052.00	\$ 1,052.00	\$ 852.00	User Fee	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 400.00	\$ 600.00
215	Inspection			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
216	Base	Base	\$ 100.00	\$ 390.00	\$ 390.00	\$ 290.00	User Fee	\$ 390.00	\$ 172.50	\$ 245.00
217	Per Acre	Per Acre	\$ 50.00	\$ 66.00	\$ 66.00	\$ 16.00	User Fee	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00
218	Engineering (more than 2 Acres)			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
219	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
220	Base	Base	\$ 400.00	\$ 1,585.00	\$ 1,585.00	\$ 1,185.00	User Fee	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 675.00	\$ 950.00
221	Per Lot	Per Lot	\$ 15.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 7.00	User Fee	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00
222	Inspection			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
223	Base	Base	\$ 400.00	\$ 1,065.00	\$ 1,065.00	\$ 665.00	User Fee	\$ 1,000.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 800.00

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
227		Per Acre	\$ 100.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 33.00	User Fee	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00
228	Erosion Control (more than 2 Acres)									
229	Review	Each	\$ 300.00	\$ 1,585.00	\$ 1,585.00	\$ 1,285.00	User Fee	\$ 1,500.00	\$ 600.00	\$ 900.00
230	Inspection			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
231	Base	Base	\$ 200.00	\$ 656.00	\$ 656.00	\$ 456.00	User Fee	\$ 650.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 500.00
232	Per Acre	Per Acre	\$ 50.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 83.00	User Fee	\$ 130.00	\$ 76.67	\$ 103.33
233	As-Built Plans Review									
234	Review	Each	-	\$ 66.00	\$ 66.00	\$ 66.00	User Fee	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00
235	Inspection	Each	-	\$ 133.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 133.00	User Fee	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00
236	Residential - Town Homes (Fee Simple)									
237	Engineering			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
238	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
239	Base	Base	\$ 300.00	\$ 390.00	\$ 390.00	\$ 90.00	User Fee			
240	Per Lot	Per Lot	\$ 15.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 7.00	User Fee	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00
241	Inspection			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
242	Base	Base	\$ 400.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 132.00	User Fee	\$ 530.00	\$ 530.00	\$ 530.00
243	Per Acre	Per Acre	\$ 100.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 33.00	User Fee	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00
244	Erosion Control									
245	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
246	Base	Base	\$ 150.00	\$ 920.00	\$ 920.00	\$ 770.00	User Fee			
247	Per Lot	Per Lot	\$ 15.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 7.00	User Fee	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00	\$ 20.00
248	Inspection			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
249	Base	Base	\$ 200.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 332.00	User Fee	\$ 530.00	\$ 310.00	\$ 420.00
250	Per Acre	Per Acre	\$ 50.00	\$ 66.00	\$ 66.00	\$ 16.00	User Fee	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00
251	Residential - Final Plats									
252	First Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
253	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
254	Base	Base	\$ 200.00	\$ 460.00	\$ 460.00	\$ 260.00	User Fee			
255	Per Lot	Per Lot	\$ 5.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 8.00	\$ 3.00	User Fee			
256	Second Review									
257	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
258	Base	Base	\$ 200.00	\$ 199.00	\$ 199.00	\$ (1.00)	User Fee	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00
259	Per Sheet	Per Sheet	\$ 200.00	\$ 199.00	\$ 199.00	\$ (1.00)	User Fee	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00
260	Third Review and Subsequent Reviews									
261	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
262	Base	Base	\$ 200.00	\$ 199.00	\$ 199.00	\$ (1.00)	User Fee	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00
263	Per Sheet	Per Sheet	\$ 200.00	\$ 199.00	\$ 199.00	\$ (1.00)	User Fee	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00	\$ 200.00
264	Recording Fee									
265	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
266										
267	Base	Base	\$ 100.00	\$ 136.00	\$ 136.00	\$ 36.00	User Fee	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00
268	Per Lot	Per Lot	\$ 20.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 25.00	User Fee			
269	Nonresidential - Condominium			1	1		1			
270	Engineering			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
271	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
272	Base	Base	\$ 300.00	\$ 328.00	\$ 328.00	\$ 28.00	User Fee	\$ 320.00	\$ 320.00	\$ 320.00
273	Per Lot	Per Lot	\$ 10.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 35.00	User Fee			
274	Inspection			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
275	Base	Base	\$ 400.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 132.00	User Fee	\$ 530.00	\$ 530.00	\$ 530.00
276	Per Acre	Per Acre	\$ 100.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 33.00	User Fee	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00
277	Erosion Control			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
278	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
279	Base	Base	\$ 300.00	\$ 920.00	\$ 920.00	\$ 620.00	User Fee			
280	Per Lot	Per Lot	\$ 10.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 12.00	User Fee	\$ 20.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 20.00
281	Inspection			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
282	Base	Base	\$ 200.00	\$ 266.00	\$ 266.00	\$ 66.00	User Fee	\$ 260.00	\$ 260.00	\$ 260.00
283	Per Acre	Per Acre	\$ 50.00	\$ 66.00	\$ 66.00	\$ 16.00	User Fee	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00
284										
285	Nonresidential - Apartment			1	1		1			
286	Engineering			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
287	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
288	Base	Base	\$ 300.00	\$ 461.00	\$ 461.00	\$ 161.00	User Fee	\$ 460.00	\$ 380.00	\$ 460.00
289	Per Lot	Per Lot	\$ 10.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 45.00	\$ 35.00	User Fee			
290	Inspection			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
291	Base	Base	\$ 400.00	\$ 665.00	\$ 665.00	\$ 265.00	User Fee	\$ 660.00	\$ 530.00	\$ 660.00
292	Per Acre	Per Acre	\$ 100.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 33.00	User Fee	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00
293	Erosion Control			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
294	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
295	Base	Base	\$ 300.00	\$ 1,319.00	\$ 1,319.00	\$ 1,019.00	User Fee	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 550.00	\$ 800.00
296	Per Lot	Per Lot	\$ 10.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 12.00	User Fee	\$ 20.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 20.00
297	Inspection			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
298	Base	Base	\$ 200.00	\$ 266.00	\$ 266.00	\$ 66.00	User Fee	\$ 260.00	\$ 260.00	\$ 260.00
299	Per Acre	Per Acre	\$ 50.00	\$ 66.00	\$ 66.00	\$ 16.00	User Fee	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00
300	Nonresidential - Commercial/Institutional			1	1		1			
301	Engineering			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
302	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
303	Base	Per Acre	\$ 300.00	\$ 328.00	\$ 328.00	\$ 28.00	User Fee	\$ 320.00	\$ 320.00	\$ 320.00
304	Inspection			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
305										
306	Base	Base	\$ 400.00	\$ 665.00	\$ 665.00	\$ 265.00	User Fee	\$ 660.00	\$ 530.00	\$ 660.00
307	Per Acre	Per Acre	\$ 300.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 133.00	\$ (167.00)	User Fee	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ (40.00)
308	Erosion Control			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
309	Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
310	Base	Base	\$ 300.00	\$ 1,319.00	\$ 1,319.00	\$ 1,019.00	User Fee	\$ 1,300.00	\$ 550.00	\$ 800.00
311	Per Lot	Per Lot	\$ 10.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 22.00	\$ 12.00	User Fee	\$ 20.00	\$ 15.00	\$ 20.00
312	Inspection			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
313	Base	Base	\$ 200.00	\$ 266.00	\$ 266.00	\$ 66.00	User Fee	\$ 260.00	\$ 260.00	\$ 260.00
314	Per Acre	Per Acre	\$ 50.00	\$ 66.00	\$ 66.00	\$ 16.00	User Fee	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00	\$ 60.00
315	Nonresidential - Other Service Fees			1	1		1			
316	State Water Determination Fee			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
317	Review	Each	N/A	\$ 133.00	\$ 133.00		User Fee	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00
318	Inspection	Each	\$ 200.00	\$ 266.00	\$ 266.00	\$ 66.00	User Fee	\$ 260.00	\$ 260.00	\$ 260.00
319	Arborist Tree Assessment Fee (Per Site Visit)			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
320	Review	Each	N/A	\$ 263.00	\$ 263.00		User Fee	\$ 260.00	\$ 260.00	\$ 260.00
321	Inspection (per developers request)	Per Inch	\$ 150.00	\$ 263.00	\$ 263.00	\$ 113.00	User Fee	\$ 260.00	\$ 205.00	\$ 260.00
322	Illegal Tree Removal Fee - determined by Tree's DBH	Per Inch	\$ 240.00		\$ 100.00	\$ (140.00)	Penalty			
323	Illegal Tree Removal Fine						1			
324	First Illegal Removal	Base	\$ 500.00		\$ 500.00	\$ -	Penalty			
325	Each additional removal	Each additional removal	\$ 1,000.00		\$ 1,000.00	\$ -	Penalty			
326										
327	Clear cut 5 or more acres within LOD, TDU will double from 120 inches to 240 inches and calculated	Each				\$ -	Penalty			
328	Dumpster Permit Fee			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
329	Review	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 195.00	\$ 195.00	\$ 145.00	User Fee	\$ 190.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 120.00
330	Inspection	Each	\$ 50.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 83.00	User Fee	\$ 130.00	\$ 76.67	\$ 103.33
331	Permit Extension (3 Months)	Each	\$ 300.00	\$ 332.00	\$ 332.00	\$ 32.00	User Fee	\$ 330.00	\$ 330.00	\$ 330.00
332	Land Development Revisions (After Permit Issuance)	Each	\$ 300.00	\$ 719.00	\$ 719.00	\$ 419.00	User Fee	\$ 700.00	\$ 433.33	\$ 566.67
333	Lot Division/Combination			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
334	Review	Each	\$ 200.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 332.00	User Fee	\$ 530.00	\$ 310.00	\$ 420.00
335	Penalty for Site Activity Prior to Obtaining Permit	Each	\$ 300.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 232.00	User Fee	\$ 530.00	\$ 415.00	\$ 530.00
336	Stream Buffer Variance Application Fee-Existing Home			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
337	Review	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 133.00	\$ 33.00	User Fee	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 130.00
338	Inspection	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 432.00	User Fee	\$ 530.00	\$ 186.00	\$ 272.00
339	Stream Buffer Variance Application Fee-New			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			
340	Review	Each	\$ 100.00	\$ 266.00	\$ 266.00	\$ 166.00	User Fee	\$ 260.00	\$ 153.33	\$ 206.67
341	Inspection	Each	\$ 200.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 532.00	\$ 332.00	User Fee	\$ 530.00	\$ 310.00	\$ 420.00
342	City Review			1	1	\$ 1.00	1			

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
343										
344	Review	Each	\$ 300.00	\$ 332.00	\$ 332.00	\$ 32.00	User Fee	\$ 330.00	\$ 330.00	\$ 330.00
345	Finance			1	1					
346	Alcoholic Beverage E License			1	1					
347	Annual License			1						
348	Consumption on the Premises			1			1			
349	Wine	Each	\$ 600.00		\$ 600.00	\$ -	Tax			
350	Malt Beverages	Each	\$ 600.00		\$ 600.00	\$ -	Tax			
351	Wine/Malt Beverage	Each	\$ 900.00		\$ 900.00	\$ -	Tax			
352	Distilled Spirits									
353	Distilled Spirits	Each	\$ 400.00		\$ 400.00	\$ -	Tax			
354	Fixed	Each	\$ 600.00		\$ 600.00	\$ -	Tax			
355	Movable	Each	\$ 300.00		\$ 300.00	\$ -	Tax			
356	Sunday Sales									
357	General	Each	\$ 1,100.00		\$ 1,100.00	\$ -	Tax			
358	Temporary	Each	\$ 200.00		\$ 200.00	\$ -	Tax			
359	Ancillary Tasting License									
360	Wine	Each	\$ 75.00		\$ 75.00	\$ -	Tax			
361	Malt Beverages	Each	\$ 75.00		\$ 75.00	\$ -	Tax			
362	Employee Permit	Each	\$ 35.00		\$ 35.00	\$ -	Tax			
363	Package									
364	Wine	Each	\$ 600.00		\$ 600.00	\$ -	Tax			
365	Malt Beverage	Each	\$ 600.00		\$ 600.00	\$ -	Tax			
366	Wine/Malt Beverage	Each	\$ 900.00		\$ 900.00	\$ -	Tax			
367										
368	Distilled Spirits	Each	\$ 4,000.00		\$ 4,000.00	\$ -	Tax			
369	Wine/Malt Beverages/Distilled Spirits	Each	\$ 3,800.00		\$ 3,800.00	\$ -	Tax			
370	Wine and Malt Beverage Tasting	Each	\$ 75.00		\$ 75.00	\$ -	Tax			
371	Wholesale									
372	Wine	Each	\$ 600.00		\$ 600.00	\$ -	Tax			
373	Malt Beverages	Each	\$ 600.00		\$ 600.00	\$ -	Tax			
374	Distilled Spirits	Each	\$ 4,000.00		\$ 4,000.00	\$ -	Tax			
375	Fraternal Organization									
376	Wine/Malt Beverages	Each	\$ 500.00		\$ 500.00	\$ -	Tax			
377	Distilled Spirits	Each	\$ 1,000.00		\$ 1,000.00	\$ -	Tax			
378	Patio Permit									
379	General	Each	\$ 50.00		\$ 50.00	\$ -	Tax			
380	Administrative Fee			1			1			

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
381										
382	Liquor	Each	\$ 200.00	\$ 214.00	\$ 214.00	\$ 14.00	User Fee			
383	Business Licenses			1			1			
384	Optional flat rate for professionals.	Each	\$ 400.00	1	\$ 400.00	\$ -	Tax			
385	Administrative Fee	Each	\$ 75.00	\$ 131.00	\$ 131.00	\$ 56.00	User Fee			
386	Minimum Receipts Tax	Each	\$ 50.00		\$ 50.00	\$ -	Tax			
387	Business Tax of Gross Receipts over \$20,000.00									
388	Class 1	Per Dollar of Gross Receipt	\$ 0.00		\$ 0.00	\$ -	Tax			
389	Class 2	Per Dollar of Gross Receipt	\$ 0.00		\$ 0.00	\$ -	Tax			
390	Class 3	Per Dollar of Gross Receipt	\$ 0.00		\$ 0.00	\$ -	Tax			
391	Class 4	Per Dollar of Gross Receipt	\$ 0.00		\$ 0.00	\$ -	Tax			
392	Class 5	Per Dollar of Gross Receipt	\$ 0.00		\$ 0.00	\$ -	Tax			
393	Class 6	Per Dollar of Gross Receipt	\$ 0.00		\$ 0.00	\$ -	Tax			
394	Employee Fee									
395	Class 1	Per Employee	\$ 4.00		\$ 4.00	\$ -	Tax			
396	Class 2	Per Employee	\$ 6.00		\$ 6.00	\$ -	Tax			
397	Class 3	Per Employee	\$ 8.00		\$ 8.00	\$ -	Tax			
398	Class 4	Per Employee	\$ 10.00		\$ 10.00	\$ -	Tax			
399	Class 5	Per Employee	\$ 12.00		\$ 12.00	\$ -	Tax			
400	Class 6	Per Employee	\$ 14.00		\$ 14.00	\$ -	Tax			
401	Permit/License Type									
402	Carnival Permit	Each	\$ 50.00		\$ 50.00	\$ -	Tax			
403	Escort or Dating Services Permit	Each	\$ 300.00		\$ 300.00	\$ -	Tax			
404	Pawn Shop Permit	Each	\$ 200.00		\$ 200.00	\$ -	Tax			
405	Precious Metal Dealer Annual Permit	Each	\$ 300.00		\$ 300.00	\$ -	Tax			
406	Precious Metal Dealers Employee/Owner Permit	Each	\$ 50.00		\$ 50.00	\$ -	Tax			
407	Sexually Oriented Business Employee License	Each	\$ 200.00		\$ 200.00	\$ -	Tax			
408										
409	Fingerprinting	Each	\$ 5.00		\$ 5.00	\$ -	User Fee			
410	Business Licenses Background Investigations			1			1			
411	Escort or Dating Services License	Per Applicant	\$ 1,000.00		\$ 1,000.00	\$ -	Tax			
412	Going-Out-Of-Business Sales License	Per Applicant	\$ 35.00		\$ 35.00	\$ -	Tax			
413	Massage Therapy/Establishment License	Per Applicant	\$ 50.00		\$ 50.00	\$ -	Tax			
414	Non-Consensual Towing License	Per Applicant	\$ 50.00		\$ 50.00	\$ -	Tax			
415	Pawn Shop License	Per Applicant	\$ 35.00		\$ 35.00	\$ -	Tax			
416	Pool Room Establishment License	Per Applicant	\$ 100.00		\$ 100.00	\$ -	Tax			
417	Sexually Oriented Business License	Per Applicant	\$ 50.00		\$ 50.00	\$ -	Tax			
418	Penalties									
419	Late Filing Fee Schedule						1			

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
420										
421	Late filing fee between January 1st through January 31st	Each	\$ 150.00		\$ 150.00	\$ -	Penalty			
422	Late filing fee between February 1st through February 28th	Each	\$ 300.00		\$ 300.00	\$ -	Penalty			
423	Late filing fee between March 1st through April 30th	Each	\$ 600.00		\$ 600.00	\$ -	Penalty			
424	Additional Penalty and Interest Fee Schedule									
425	One-time penalty on delinquent tax on or after May 1st	% of Amount Due	\$ 0.10		\$ 0.10	\$ -	Penalty			
426	Interest on delinquent tax each month after	% of Amount Due	\$ 0.02		\$ 0.02	\$ -	Penalty			
427	Evade Fee	Each	\$ 500.00		\$ 500.00	\$ -	Penalty			
428	City Clerk's Office									
429	Open Record Requests									
430	Letter or legal sized documents	Per Page	\$ 0.10		\$ 0.10	\$ -	User Fee			
431	Administrative Cost									
432	First 15 Minutes	Base	\$ -		\$ -	\$ -	User Fee			
433	Per Hour	Per Hour	\$ 24.03		\$ 24.03	\$ -	User Fee			
434	GIS Fee Schedule									
435	Maps									
436	8 x 11	Each	\$ 1.00		\$ 1.00	\$ -	User Fee			
437	24 x 36	Each	\$ 5.00		\$ 5.00	\$ -	User Fee			
438	Parks and Rec									
439	Browns Mill Recreation Center	1	1	1	1		1			
440	Multipurpose Room (Includes Kitchen)									
441	Refundable Deposit	Per Rental	\$ 100.00	\$ 149.00	\$ 149.00	\$ 49.00	User Fee	\$ 125.00		
442	Resident	Per Hour	\$ 30.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 60.00	User Fee	\$ 60.00		
443	Non-Resident	Per Hour	\$ 45.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 90.00	\$ 45.00	User Fee	\$ 75.00		
444	Classroom (Includes Kitchen)									
445	Refundable Deposit	Per Rental	\$ 100.00	\$ 149.00	\$ 149.00	\$ 49.00	User Fee	\$ 125.00		
446	Resident	Per Hour	\$ 20.00	\$ 74.00	\$ 74.00	\$ 54.00	User Fee	\$ 45.00		
447	Non-Resident	Per Hour	\$ 30.00	\$ 74.00	\$ 74.00	\$ 44.00	User Fee	\$ 55.00		
448	Large Gymnasium (Includes Kitchen)									
449			1	1	1	\$ -	1			
450	Refundable Deposit	Per Rental	\$ 100.00					\$ 150.00		
451	Resident	Per Hour	\$ 80.00	\$ 107.00	\$ 107.00	\$ 27.00	User Fee	\$ 115.00		
452	Non-Resident	Per Hour	\$ 120.00	\$ 107.00	\$ 107.00	\$ (13.00)	User Fee	\$ 145.00		
453	Auxiliary Gymnasium-									
454	Refundable Deposit		1	1	1	\$ -	1	\$ 150.00		
455	Resident	Per Hour	\$ 50.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 34.00	User Fee	\$ 80.00		
456	Non-Resident	Per Hour	\$ 75.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 84.00	\$ 9.00	User Fee	\$ 95.00		
457	Entire Gymnasium (Large +Auxiliary)		New		1					

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
458 Refundable Deposit	Per Rental	\$ 250.00	\$ 339.00	\$ 339.00	\$ 89.00	User Fee	\$ 200.00		
459 Resident	Per Hour (Based on 7.00hr)	New	\$ 132.00	\$ 132.00		User Fee	\$ 180.00		
460 Non-Resident	Per Hour (Based on 7.00hr)	new	\$ 132.00	\$ 132.00		User Fee	\$ 200.00		
461 Entire Facility		\$ 100.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 85.00	\$ (15.00)	User Fee	\$ 300.00		
462 Refundable Deposit	Per Rental						\$ 1,650.00		
463 Residents	Per 7 hour increments						\$ 1,900.00		
464 Non-Resident	Per 7 hour increments								
465 Athletic Field Rentals		1	1	1		1			
466 Browns Mil Park		1	1	1		1			
467 Practice Only		1	1	1		1			
468 Resident	Per Hour	\$ 10.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 25.00	User Fee	\$ 30.00		
469 Non-Resident	Per Hour	\$ 20.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 15.00	User Fee	\$ 40.00		
470 Game time only-non lighted 1-4hrs		1	1	1		1			
471 Deposit	Per Field	\$ 200.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 150.00	User Fee	\$ 250.00		
472 Resident	Per Hour	\$ 40.00			\$ (40.00)	User Fee	\$ 60.00		
473 Non-Resident	Per Hour	\$ 80.00			\$ (80.00)	User Fee	\$ 100.00		
474 Game time only-non lighted 4.01-6hrs		1	1	1		1			
475 Deposit	Per Field	\$ 200.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 150.00	User Fee	\$ 250.00		
476 Resident	Per Hour	\$ 80.00			\$ (80.00)	User Fee	\$ 100.00		
477 Non-Resident	Per Hour	\$ 100.00			\$ (100.00)	User Fee	\$ 120.00		
478 Game time only-non lighted 6.01 + hrs.		1	1	1		1			
479 Deposit	Per Field	\$ 200.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 150.00	User Fee	\$ 250.00		
480 Resident	Per Hour	\$ 120.00			\$ (120.00)	User Fee	\$ 140.00		
481 Non-Resident	Per Hour	\$ 140.00			\$ (140.00)	User Fee	\$ 160.00		
482 Lighted Fields (cost for lights)						User Fee			
483 Resident	Per Field	\$ 25.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 60.00	User Fee	\$ 50.00		
484 Non-Resident	Per Field	\$ 50.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 35.00	User Fee	\$ 75.00		
485 Entire BM Park 1-4 hrs.		1	1	1		1			
486 Deposit		\$ -				User Fee	\$ 250.00		
487 Resident	Per Rental (1-4 hours)	\$ 320.00			\$ (320.00)	User Fee	\$ 365.00		
488 Non-Resident	Per Rental (1-4 hours)	\$ 640.00			\$ (640.00)	User Fee	\$ 685.00		
489 Entire BM Park 4.01-6 hrs.		1	1	1		1			
490 Deposit									
491 Resident	Per Rental	\$ -				User Fee	\$ -		
492 Non-Resident	Per Rental (4-6 hr)	\$ 640.00			\$ (640.00)	User Fee	\$ 685.00		
493 Entire BM Park over 6 hrs.		1	1	1		1			
494 Deposit	Per Rental	\$ 200.00				User Fee	\$ 250.00		

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
497	Resident	Per Rental (Over 6 hr)	\$ 1,560.00			\$ (1,560.00)	User Fee	\$ 1,605.00		
498	Non-Resident	Per Rental (Over 6 hr)	\$ 1,820.00			\$ (1,820.00)	User Fee	\$ 1,865.00		
500	Lights	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 60.00	User Fee	\$ 50.00		
501	Field Prep	Per Field	\$ 75.00	\$ 168.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 25.00	User Fee	\$ 105.00		
502	Cleaning / Trash Removal	Each	New	\$ 126.00	\$ 126.00		User Fee	\$ 125.00		
503	Concession Stand (Based on 7 hours)	Per Hour	New				User Fee	\$ 300.00		
504	Southeast Athletic Complex									
505	Practice Only									
506	Resident	Per Hour	\$ 10.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 25.00	User Fee	\$ 30.00		
507	Non-Resident	Per Hour	\$ 20.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 35.00	\$ 15.00	User Fee	\$ 50.00		
508	Game time only-non lighted 1-4hrs									
509	Deposit	Per Rental	\$ 200.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 150.00	User Fee	\$ 250.00		
510	Resident	Per Rental (1-4 hr)	\$ 40.00			\$ (40.00)	User Fee	\$ 60.00		
511	Non-Resident	Per Rental (1-4 hr)	\$ 80.00			\$ (80.00)	User Fee	\$ 100.00		
512	Game time only-non lighted 4.01-6hrs									
513	Deposit	Per Rental	\$ 200.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 150.00	User Fee	\$ 250.00		
514	Resident	Per Rental (4-6 hr)	\$ 80.00			\$ (80.00)	User Fee	\$ 100.00		
515	Non-Resident	Per Rental (4-6 hr)	\$ 100.00			\$ (100.00)	User Fee	\$ 120.00		
516	Game time only-non lighted 6.01 + hrs.									
517	Deposit	Per Rental	\$ 200.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 350.00	\$ 150.00	User Fee	\$ 250.00		
518	Resident	Per Rental (over 6 hr)	\$ 120.00			\$ (120.00)	User Fee	\$ 140.00		
519	Non-Resident	Per Rental (Over 6 hr)	\$ 140.00			\$ (140.00)	User Fee	\$ 160.00		
520	Lighted Fields						User Fee			
521	Resident	Per Field	\$ 25.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 60.00	User Fee	\$ 50.00		
522	Non-Resident	Per Field	\$ 50.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 35.00	User Fee	\$ 75.00		
523	Entire SE Park 1-4 hrs.									
524	Deposit	Per Rental	\$ -				User Fee	\$ 200.00		
525	Resident	Per Rental (1-4 hr)	\$ 520.00			\$ (520.00)	User Fee	\$ 565.00		
526	Non-Resident	Per Rental (1-4hr)	\$ 1,040.00			\$ (1,040.00)	User Fee	\$ 1,085.00		
527	Entire SE Park 4.01-6 hrs.									
528	Deposit	Per Rental	\$ -				User Fee	\$ 200.00		
529	Resident	Per 4-6 hr. Rental	\$ 1,040.00			\$ (1,040.00)	User Fee	\$ 1,085.00		
530	Non-Resident	Per 4-6 hr. Rental	\$ 1,300.00			\$ (1,300.00)	User Fee	\$ 1,345.00		
531	Entire SE Park over 6 hrs.									
532	Deposit	Per Rental	\$ 200.00				User Fee	\$ 250.00		
533										
534	Resident	Per Rental (Over 6 hours)	\$ 1,560.00			\$ (1,560.00)	User Fee	\$ 1,605.00		
535	Non-Resident	Per Rental (Over 6 hours)	\$ 1,820.00			\$ (1,820.00)	User Fee	\$ 1,865.00		

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
536	Lights	Each	\$ 25.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 85.00	\$ 60.00	User Fee	\$ 50.00		
537	Field Prep	Per Field	\$ 75.00	\$ 168.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 25.00	User Fee	\$ 105.00		
539	Cleaning / Trash Removal	Each	New	\$ 126.00	\$ 126.00		User Fee	\$ 125.00		
540	Concession Stand (Based on 7 hours)	Per Hour	New				User Fee	\$ 300.00		
541	Fairington Park									
542	Entire Park (1-4 hrs)									
543	Deposit	Per Rental						\$ 150.00		
544	Resident	Per Rental (1-4 hr)						\$ 300.00		
545	Non-Resident	Per Rental (1-4 hr)						\$ 625.00		
546	Entire Park (4-6 hrs)									
547	Deposit	Per Rental						\$ 150.00		
548	Resident	Per Rental (4-6 hr)						\$ 625.00		
549	Non-Resident	Per Rental (4-6 hr)						\$ 850.00		
550	Entire Park (Over 6 hrs)									
551	Deposit	Per Rental								
552	Resident	Per Rental (Over 6 hours)						\$ 725.00		
553	Non-Resident	Per Rental (Over 6 hours)						\$ 950.00		
554	Field Prep	Per Field	1	1	1		1	\$ 75.00		
555	Pavilion Rentals		1	1	1		1			
556	Salem Pav.		1	1	1		1			
557	Half day (< 4 hrs.)		1	1	1		1			
558	Deposit	Deposit	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ -	User Fee	\$ 100.00		
559	Resident	Flat	\$ 55.00	\$ 144.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 20.00	User Fee	\$ 70.00		
560	Non-Resident	Flat	\$ 75.00	\$ 144.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 25.00	User Fee	\$ 90.00		
561	Full day (4 + hrs.)		1	1	1	\$ -	1			
562	Deposit	Deposit	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ -	User Fee	\$ 100.00		
563	Resident	Flat	\$ 75.00	\$ 204.00	\$ 115.00	\$ 40.00	User Fee	\$ 90.00		
564	Non-Resident	Flat	\$ 135.00	\$ 204.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 25.00	User Fee	\$ 150.00		
565	Gregory Moseley Pav.		1	1	1	\$ -	1			
566	Half day (< 4 hrs.)		1	1	1	\$ -	1			
567	Deposit	Deposit	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ -	User Fee	\$ 100.00		
568	Resident	Flat	New	\$ 129.00	\$ 75.00		User Fee	\$ 50.00		
569	Non-Resident	Flat	New	\$ 129.00	\$ 100.00		User Fee	\$ 70.00		
570	Full day (4 + hrs.)		1	1	1	\$ -	1			
571	Deposit	Deposit	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ -	User Fee	\$ 100.00		
572	Resident	Flat	New	\$ 174.00	\$ 115.00		User Fee	\$ 75.00		
573	Non-Resident	Flat	New	\$ 174.00	\$ 160.00		User Fee	\$ 135.00		
574	Browns Mill Pav.		1	1	1	\$ -	1			

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
575										
576	Half day (< 4 hrs.)		1	1	1	\$	1			
577	Deposit	Deposit	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ -	User Fee	\$ 100.00		
578	Resident	Flat	\$ 55.00	\$ 135.00	\$ 75.00	\$ 20.00	User Fee	\$ 70.00		
579	Non-Resident	Flat	\$ 75.00	\$ 135.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 25.00	User Fee	\$ 90.00		
580	Full day (4 + hrs.)		1	1	1	\$	1			
581	Deposit	Deposit	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ -	User Fee	\$ 100.00		
582	Resident	Flat	\$ 95.00	\$ 187.00	\$ 115.00	\$ 20.00	User Fee	\$ 90.00		
583	Non-Resident	Flat	\$ 135.00	\$ 187.00	\$ 160.00	\$ 25.00	User Fee	\$ 150.00		
584	Parking lot rental- Browns Mill Rec		1	1	1	\$	1			
585	Browns Mill Recreation Center		1	1	1	\$	1			
586	Deposit	Deposit	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ -	User Fee			
587	Resident	Hour	\$ 10.00	New	\$ 75.00	\$ 65.00	User Fee	\$ 30.00		
588	Non-Resident	Hour	\$ 20.00	New	\$ 100.00	\$ 80.00	User Fee	\$ 50.00		
589	Parking lot rental- Fairington		1	1	1	\$	1			
590	Fairington Park		1	1	1	\$	1			
591	Deposit	Deposit	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 100.00	\$ -	User Fee			
592	Resident	Hour	\$ 10.00	New	\$ 75.00	\$ 65.00	User Fee	\$ 30.00		
593	Non-Resident	Hour	\$ 20.00	New	\$ 100.00	\$ 80.00	User Fee	\$ 50.00		
594	Youth & Adult Athletic Programs		1	1	1		1			
595	Men's / Women's Basketball League	Per Team 8 Game Season	New	\$ 1,322.00	\$ 650.00		User Fee	\$ 325.00		
596	Men's Slow Pitch Softball League	Per Team 10 Game Season	New	\$ 1,317.00	\$ 650.00		User Fee	\$ 450.00		
597	Co-Ed Softball League	NEW	\$ 1,317.00	\$ 1,317.00	\$ 550.00		User Fee	\$ 450.00		
598	Co-Ed Kickball League	New	\$ 1,317.00	\$ 1,317.00	\$ 550.00		User Fee	\$ 450.00		
599	Co-Ed Volleyball League	New	\$ 1,317.00	\$ 1,317.00	\$ 550.00		User Fee	\$ 400.00		
600	Flag Football	Per Team 10 Game Season	New	\$ 1,317.00	\$ 650.00		User Fee	\$ 225.00		
601	Youth Basketball Clinics	Per 4 Week Session	\$ 125.00	\$ 174.00	\$ 175.00	\$ 50.00	User Fee	\$ 125.00		
602	Youth Basketball League		1	1	1	\$	1			
603	Resident	Per 8 Game Season	\$ 60.00	\$ 131.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 40.00	User Fee	\$ 80.00		
604	Non-Resident	Per 8 Game Season	New	\$ 131.00	\$ 130.00		User Fee	\$ 95.00		
605	Team Fee	Per Team 8 Game Season	New	\$ -	\$ -		User Fee	\$ 250.00		
606	Youth T-Ball / Baseball League		1	1	1	\$	1			
607	Resident	Per 8 Game Season	New	\$ 131.00	\$ 100.00		User Fee	\$ 65.00		
608	Non-Resident	Per 8 Game Season	New	\$ 131.00	\$ 130.00		User Fee	\$ 80.00		
609	Track and Field		1	1	1	\$	1			
610	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New	\$ 131.00	\$ 120.00		User Fee	\$ 55.00		
611	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New	\$ 131.00	\$ 135.00		User Fee	\$ 70.00		
612	Soccer		1	1	1	\$	1			
613	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New	\$ 131.00	\$ 100.00		User Fee	\$ 55.00		

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
614	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New	\$ 131.00	\$ 130.00		User Fee	\$ 70.00		
615	Flag Football		1	1	1	\$ -	1			
617										
618	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New	\$ 131.00	\$ 100.00		User Fee	\$ 80.00		
619	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New	\$ 131.00	\$ 130.00		User Fee	\$ 95.00		
620	Lacrosse		1	1	1	\$ -	1			
621	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	\$ 95.00	\$ 131.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 5.00	User Fee	\$ 80.00		
622	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	\$ 110.00	\$ 131.00	\$ 130.00	\$ 20.00	User Fee	\$ 95.00		
623	Non-Athletic Programs		1	1	1		1			
624	Afterschool Programming					\$ -				
625	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New	\$ 275.00	\$ 150.00		User Fee	\$ 85.00		
626	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New	\$ 131.00	\$ 120.00		User Fee	\$ 105.00		
627	School Break Camps									
628	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New	\$ 382.00	\$ 300.00		User Fee	\$ 85.00		
629	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New	\$ 131.00	\$ 120.00		User Fee	\$ 105.00		
630	Summer Camp									
631	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	\$ 60.00	\$ 710.00	\$ 100.00	\$ 40.00	User Fee	\$ 85.00		
632	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New				User Fee	\$ 105.00		
633	Tap									
634	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 70.00		
635	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 90.00		
636	Hip Hop									
637	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 65.00		
638	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 85.00		
639	Karate									
640	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 80.00		
641	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 105.00		
642	Youth Boxing									
643	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 75.00		
644	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 95.00		
645	Nutrition									
646	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 45.00		
647	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 60.00		
648	Spanish									
649	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 75.00		
650	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 95.00		
651	Sign Language									
652	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 75.00		

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
653	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 95.00		
654	H.I.T Fitness									
655	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 65.00		
656	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 85.00		
657	Kickboxing									
658	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 70.00		
659	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 90.00		
660	Cardio Jam									
661	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 55.00		
662	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 70.00		
663	Line Dancing									
664	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 15.00		
665	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 20.00		
666	Water Aerobics									
667	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 60.00		
668	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 80.00		
669	Aqua Zumba									
670	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 65.00		
671	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 85.00		
672	Tumbling									
673	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 75.00		
674	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 95.00		
675	Jazz									
676	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 70.00		
677	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 90.00		
678	Pilates									
679	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 65.00		
680	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 85.00		
681	Stretch/Mobility									
682	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 65.00		
683	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 85.00		
684	Yoga									
685	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 50.00		
686	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 65.00		
687	Chair Yoga									
688	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 60.00		
689	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 80.00		
690	Chair Yoga									
691	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 45.00		
692	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 60.00		

DRAFT

Item XII. a.

	A	B	C	D	E	F	G	H	K	L
	Fee Name	Unit	Current Fee	Total Cost	Consultant's Proposed Fee	Difference (Current vs. Proposed)	Fee Type	City's Proposed Fee	Phase Year 1 - 2026	Phase Year 2 - 2027
692										
693	Zumba									
694	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 55.00		
695	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 70.00		
696	Tai Chi									
697	Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 60.00		
698	Non-Resident	Per 8 Week Session	New					\$ 80.00		
699	Drone Soccer									
700	Early Registration (Resident)	Per 8 Week Session						\$ 125.00		
701										
702	Early Registration (Non- Resident)	Per 8 Week Session						\$ 150.00		
703	Regular Registration (Resident)	Per 8 Week Session						\$ 150.00		
704	Regular Registration (Non-Resident)	Per 8 Week Session						\$ 175.00		
705	City Events		1	1	1		1			
706	Vendor (non-food) One day fee	Per Event	New					\$ 50.00		
707	Annual vendor pass	Per Year	New					\$ 150.00		
708	Food Truck Fee (one day city sponsored events)	Per Event	New					\$ 100.00		
709			1	1	1					
710										
711										
712										
713										
714										
715										
716										
717										
718										
719										
720										
721										
722										
723										
724										
725										
726										
727										
728										
729										
730										

DRAFT

Item XII. a.



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Cooperation Agreement for the SLIP CID

AGENDA SECTION: *(check all that apply)*

☐ PRESENTATION ☐ PUBLIC HEARING ☐ CONSENT AGENDA ☒ OLD BUSINESS
☐ NEW BUSINESS ☐ OTHER, PLEASE STATE: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

CATEGORY: *(check all that apply)*

☐ ORDINANCE ☒ RESOLUTION ☐ CONTRACT ☐ POLICY ☐ STATUS REPORT
☒ OTHER, PLEASE STATE: **Agreement**

ACTION REQUESTED: ☒ DECISION ☐ DISCUSSION, ☐ REVIEW, or ☐ UPDATE ONLY

Previously Heard Date(s): 07/13/26 & 07/27/26

Current Work Session: [Click or tap to enter a date.](#)

Current Council Meeting: Monday, September 28, 2026

SUBMITTED BY: George Turner, District 4 Councilmember

PRESENTER: George Turner, District 4 Councilmember

PURPOSE: To make a decision regarding the Cooperation Agreement for the SLIP CID.

FACTS: [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

OPTIONS: Approve, Deny, Defer [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Approve [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

ATTACHMENTS:

- (1) Attachment 1 - Cooperation Agreement
- (2) Attachment 2 - [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)
- (3) Attachment 3 - [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)
- (4) Attachment 4 - [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)
- (5) Attachment 5 - [Click or tap here to enter text.](#)

**STONECREST / LITHONIA INDUSTRIAL PARK
COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT
COOPERATION AGREEMENT
with the
CITY OF STONECREST, GEORGIA**

THIS AGREEMENT is made and entered into this _____ day of _____ 2026, by and between the **CITY OF STONECREST, GEORGIA**, a political subdivision of the State of Georgia (“City”), and the **STONECREST/LITHONIA INDUSTRIAL PARK COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT (“CID”)**.

WHEREAS, by Section 1.06 of the Charter of the City of Stonecrest, 2016 Ga. Laws, p. 3538 (2015-2016 Reg. Session, S.B. 208, eff. April 21, 2016) , as amended by 2021 Ga. Laws (2021-2022 Reg. Session, S.B. 21, eff. April 1, 2021) (“Charter”) the General Assembly provided for the creation of the CID in City; and

WHEREAS, the CID is intended to create a means to provide, supplement, and enhance various planning and improvements within the boundary of the CID; and

WHEREAS, a majority of the owners of real property within the CID which will be subject to taxes, fees and assessments levied by the CID consented in writing to the creation of the CID; and

WHEREAS, the owners of the real property within the CID which constitutes at least seventy-five percent (75%) by value of all real property within said CID which will be subject to taxes, fees, and assessments levied by the CID according to the most recently approved County ad valorem tax digest, consented in writing to the creation of the CID; and

WHEREAS, the DeKalb Tax Commissioner certified said consents in accordance with the Charter; and

WHEREAS, the governing authority of the City created the CID by Resolution No. 2026-05-01 approved May 18, 2026; and

WHEREAS, Section 1.06 (h) of the Charter requires that the “services and facilities provided pursuant to this section shall be provided for in a cooperation agreement executed jointly by the CID board and by the City of Stonecrest”; and

WHEREAS, the City and the CID desire to enter into a cooperation agreement to effectuate the organization and operation of the CID in accordance with the Charter; and

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual covenants and benefits flowing to the parties, the City and the CID agree as follows:

1.

It is the understanding and expectation of the parties to this Agreement that the relationship between the CID and the City is and be one of cooperative partnership, with both parties working together with the common goal of improving and benefitting the CID, although nothing herein shall limit the authority of the City to provide services or

facilities within the CID, and the City shall retain authority and control over any City-owned facilities located within the CID, including but not limited to the modification of, access to, and degree and type of services provided through or by facilities of the City, and over the regulation of zoning, land use and development within the CID.

2.

It is the understanding between the City and the CID that the CID's provision of any services and facilities is meant to be in addition to and supplemental of the services and facilities currently provided by the City within the District. The parties to this Cooperation Agreement hereby acknowledge and agree that the CID's exercise of its powers to provide services and facilities, and to utilize CID funds (whether obtained through taxes, fees and assessments levied within the District on non-exempt real property or otherwise) therefor, shall neither impose any obligation on the CID to provide City services and facilities, nor operate to shift any obligations or responsibilities of the City as to governmental functions related to the CID and/or the delivery and furnishing of governmental services and facilities within the District, onto the CID, except as mutually agreed by the City and the CID. The City shall remain responsible for the provision of municipal services and facilities within the CID, with the CID, by and through the CID Board, working in cooperation with the City to provide additional or supplemental services for the benefit of the CID. To the extent of any overlap between the parties with respect to the provision of some or all of the services and facilities set forth in this Section 2, the parties shall cooperatively coordinate with one another and work in good faith to share information about their respective actions for the maximum benefit and improvement of the CID, and each shall endeavor to maximize efficiency. This

Agreement does not affect the authority of the City to increase or decrease the level of any particular service provided in the course of its operations and within the scope of those powers granted or conferred to it under any applicable law.

3.

a) The CID shall not have any power or authority to contract in the name of, encumber, or create debt for or on behalf of the City.

b) Each party acknowledges that the CID Board is authorized to exercise its powers for the provision of the following services and facilities:

- 1) Street and road construction and maintenance, including curbs, sidewalks, street lights, and devices to control the flow of traffic on streets and roads;
- 2) Parks and recreation areas and facilities;
- 3) Stormwater and sewage collection and disposal systems;
- 4) Development, storage, treatment, purification and distribution of water;
- 5) Public Transportation;
- 6) Terminal and dock facilities and parking facilities; and
- 7) Such other services and facilities as may be provided for by general law.

c) This Agreement is not intended to limit, restrict or waive any powers of the CID and its Board pursuant to Section 1.06 of the Charter of the City of

Stonecrest, and shall not be interpreted as so limiting, restricting or waiving such powers.

4.

a) At a work session meeting of the City Council no later than September 30, 2026, and at a work session meeting of the City Council in February of each calendar year thereafter, the City shall advise the CID, and the CID shall advise the City, of their respective proposals to improve infrastructure and services within the CID.

b) Each of the parties hereto shall endeavor to coordinate actions for the maximum improvement of the CID and each shall endeavor not to duplicate services and actions so as to obtain efficiency of effort. To further facilitate coordination and cooperation between the City and the CID, the City Manager and the City's planning and zoning, economic development, engineering and code enforcement staff shall meet monthly with the CID to discuss issues regarding the CID. The CID shall provide by email a list of proposed agenda topics to the City Manager no later than five (5) business days prior to the meeting.

5.

(a) The CID shall be responsible for providing written notice by email of its regular meetings thereof to the City Manager. Such notice of its regular meetings shall be sent at least seven (7) calendar days prior to the meetings. If to the City the CID must email cyturner@stonecrestga.gov, unless the City notifies the CID of a replacement for the City Manager..

(b) Subject to Subsection (c) of the Paragraph 5, the CID shall be responsible for providing public written notice of its meetings and caucuses of electors by publishing notices thereof at least seven (7) calendar days prior to the meetings in the City's legal organ as well as on the CID's website, and by making copies of the meeting agenda, agenda packet and minutes available to the public upon request after the board meeting has concluded by posting on the CID's website.

c) If a special-called meeting is scheduled fewer than seven (7) calendar days before the meeting, the City Manager shall be notified and the notice shall be posted on the CID website in advance of the meeting as soon as possible, but not less than one (1) business day prior to the meeting.

6.

The CID shall levy and tax the millage as provided by law each calendar year and shall notify the DeKalb County Tax Commissioner(the "Tax Commissioner") of the amount of the levy, in writing, so that the levy may be included on the regular County ad valorem tax bills.

7.

The City shall not be required to send out any special bills. Any tax, fee or assessment levied by the CID shall be collected by the Tax Commissioner in the same manner as other property taxes levied and collected by the City.

8.

The Tax Commissioner shall retain a fee equal to one percent (1%) of the proceeds of taxes, fees and assessments levied by the CID, or \$25,000 per calendar year, whichever is less in accordance with the Act to cover the costs of collection. The remaining proceeds shall be transmitted by the Tax Commissioner on behalf of the City to the CID within the thirty (30) days after collection so as to be expended by the CID for the purposes stated herein.

9.

This Agreement shall expire (50) years from the date last signed below or upon the dissolution of the CID. This Agreement shall not be modified except by formal written action of all parties.

10.

Either party may terminate the Agreement with thirty (30) days notice to the other party.

WHEREFORE, the parties have made and executed this Cooperation Agreement the day and year first above written.

STONECREST/LITHONIA CITY OF STONECREST, GEORGIA
INDUSTRIALPARK
COMMUNITY IMPROVEMENT DISTRICT

By: _____

Chairman, CID

By:

Jazzmin Cobble, Mayor

Attest: _____

Secretary, CID

(OFFICIAL SEAL)

ATTEST:

City Clerk

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

APPROVED AS TO FORM:

Attorney for CID

City Attorney



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: Appointment of Ethics Officer

AGENDA SECTION: *(check all that apply)*

☐ PRESENTATION ☐ PUBLIC HEARING ☐ CONSENT AGENDA ☐ OLD BUSINESS
☒ NEW BUSINESS ☐ OTHER, PLEASE STATE: Click or tap here to enter text.

CATEGORY: *(check all that apply)*

☐ ORDINANCE ☐ RESOLUTION ☐ CONTRACT ☐ POLICY ☐ STATUS REPORT
☒ OTHER, PLEASE STATE: Appointment

ACTION REQUESTED: ☒ DECISION ☐ DISCUSSION, ☐ REVIEW, or ☐ UPDATE ONLY

Previously Heard Date(s): Click or tap to enter a date. & Click or tap to enter a date.

Current Work Session: Click or tap to enter a date.

Current Council Meeting: Monday, September 28, 2026

SUBMITTED BY: Sonya Isom, City Clerk

PRESENTER: Sonya Isom, City Clerk

PURPOSE: To approve the appointment of an Ethics Officer for the City of Stonecrest.

FACTS: Click or tap here to enter text.

OPTIONS: Approve, Deny, Defer Click or tap here to enter text.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Choose an item. Click or tap here to enter text.

ATTACHMENTS:

- (1) Attachment 1 - Click or tap here to enter text.
- (2) Attachment 2 - Click or tap here to enter text.
- (3) Attachment 3 - Click or tap here to enter text.
- (4) Attachment 4 - Click or tap here to enter text.
- (5) Attachment 5 - Click or tap here to enter text.



CITY COUNCIL AGENDA ITEM

SUBJECT: FY 2027 Budget Calendar

AGENDA SECTION: *(check all that apply)*

☐ PRESENTATION ☐ PUBLIC HEARING ☐ CONSENT AGENDA ☐ OLD BUSINESS
☒ NEW BUSINESS ☐ OTHER, PLEASE STATE: Click or tap here to enter text.

CATEGORY: *(check all that apply)*

☐ ORDINANCE ☐ RESOLUTION ☐ CONTRACT ☐ POLICY ☐ STATUS REPORT
☒ OTHER, PLEASE STATE: Approval

ACTION REQUESTED: ☒ DECISION ☐ DISCUSSION, ☐ REVIEW, or ☐ UPDATE ONLY

Previously Heard Date(s): Click or tap to enter a date. & Click or tap to enter a date.

Current Work Session: Click or tap to enter a date.

Current Council Meeting: Monday, September 28, 2026

SUBMITTED BY: Cathy Turner, City Manager

PRESENTER: Cathy Turner, City Manager

PURPOSE: Stonecrest FY2027 Budget Calendar Review Approval

FACTS: Click or tap here to enter text.

OPTIONS: Approve, Deny, Defer Click or tap here to enter text.

RECOMMENDED ACTION: Choose an item. Click or tap here to enter text.

ATTACHMENTS:

- (1) Attachment 1 - Stonecrest FY2027 Budget Review Calendar
- (2) Attachment 2 - Click or tap here to enter text.
- (3) Attachment 3 - Click or tap here to enter text.
- (4) Attachment 4 - Click or tap here to enter text.
- (5) Attachment 5 - Click or tap here to enter text.

Stonecrest FY2027 Budget Review Calendar

Item XIII. b.

DATE	RESPONSIBLE PARTY	TASK
September 28, 2026	City Manager	Present FY2027 Budget Calendar to Mayor & Council for approval
October 19, 2026	Clerk Office	Advertise FY2027 Proposed Budget for October 26, 2026
October 19, 2026	Clerk Office	Advertise FY2027 Budget Public Hearings for November 9, 2026
October 26, 2026	Finance	Published FY2027 Proposed Budget
October 26, 2026	City Manager & Mayor	Presentation for FY2027 Proposed Budget
November 9, 2026	Mayor & City Council	Public Hearing for FY2027 Budget
November 23, 2026	Mayor & City Council	Adoption of FY2027 Budget
December 14, 2026	City Clerk	Published adopted FY2027 Budget on the City of Stonecrest website
January 1, 2027	City Manager	Fiscal Year 2027 begins