

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED 2025/26 FEE CHANGES BY DEPARTMENT

1. AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT – (Exhibit I)

The Agriculture Department proposes increasing 20 fees, most ranging from \$1 to \$16, representing increases of 2.8% to 4.3% based on the current year's fee. The increases are due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for the staff who perform the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits, as well as increased overhead costs. Two fees are decreasing from \$106 for a $\frac{3}{4}$ hourly rate to a flat rate of \$85 and one new fee is propose for requested testing at an hourly rate of \$147. All other fees remain unchanged, 29 of which are established or capped by statute.

The department anticipates a slight decrease of approximately \$1,000 in revenues resulting from fee revisions. The recommended fees are commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

2. ASSESSOR/RECORDER – (Exhibit II)

The Assessor's Office proposes increasing 23 fees ranging from \$1 to \$16, or 2.7% to 20.0%, and no change to the remaining six fees. The increases are due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for the staff who perform the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits, as well as increased overhead costs.

The Recorder's Office proposes increasing three fees by \$1 to \$2 each, or 1.6% to 3.1%, and no change to the remaining fees that are not set by statute. The increases are due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for the staff who perform the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits, as well as increased overhead costs.

The department does not anticipate a significant change in revenues resulting from fee revisions. One of the Assessor's fees and many of the Recorder's code-mandated standard fees are not commensurate with actual costs per unit.

3. RESOURCE MANAGEMENT

The Department of Resource Management calculates a composite hourly rate for each of its divisions separately. These composite hourly rates reflect direct operational costs in addition to the department's full administrative costs, which are proportionally allocated to each of the operating divisions. Fees are based on the average time it takes to perform a specific service multiplied by the composite hourly rate to recover direct operational and indirect administrative overhead costs for providing the service.

a. Environmental Health – (Exhibit III-A)

The Department of Resource Management proposes increasing 49 of its Environmental Health fees from \$1 to \$385, or 1.1% to 117.4%. The increases are due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for the staff who perform the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits, as well as increased overhead costs, and the anticipated time to perform services for the environmental health and hazardous materials programs.

A number of fees are proposed to decrease by \$1 to \$770, or 0.9% to 24.9%.

The Department anticipates an increase of approximately \$46,000 in revenue resulting from fee revisions. Where fees are charged, the recommendations are commensurate with the actual cost per unit as allowed by fee authority.

b. Planning Services – (Exhibit III-B)

The Department of Resource Management proposes increasing three of its Planning Services fees from \$233 to \$327 or 39.0% to 101.3%. The department proposes two new fees for Sign Permit Submitted with Use or Minor Use Permit for \$357, and Administrative Permit for Farm Stand at \$231. The department also proposes to delete two of its fees, MDP Planning Commission Extension, and Review and Report as Required by Permit.

The Department anticipates a nominal increase in revenues resulting from fee revisions and additions. The recommended fees are commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

c. Building and Safety – (Exhibit III-C)

The Department of Resource Management proposes increasing 16 fees in the Building Division due to an increase in the productive hourly rate, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits, as well as operating costs, staffing levels, and the time required to perform inspection services. Increases range from \$3 to \$79, or 2.1% to 5.8%. Seven fees are proposed to decrease from \$1.50 to \$23 or 2.1% to 12.2%. The department also proposes one new fee for Land Use Permit – Minor: new, revision, agriculture; and Major: new, revision, agriculture for \$184.

The Department anticipates an increase of approximately \$14,000 in revenues resulting from fee revisions. Where fees are charged, the recommendations are commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

d. Administrative Services (Exhibit III-D)

The Department of Resource Management proposes decreasing five fees for the Business License program from \$2 to \$10 or 5.3% to 7.6%, for review and processing of initial, renewal and revised business license applications. No business license fees continue to be proposed for veterans.

The department anticipates a decrease of approximately \$2,600 in revenues resulting from fee changes. Where fees are charged, the recommendations are commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

e. Public Works/Engineering/Surveyor – (Exhibit III-E)

The Department of Resource Management proposes increasing its productive hourly rate by \$22 for Civil Engineer, \$10 increase for Engineering Technician, and \$22 increase for the County Surveyor as a result of Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits and operating costs. As a result of changes in the productive hourly rates, the time required to perform the inspection or service, overhead, and equipment costs, most of the fees not capped by code are proposed to increase from \$1 to \$144 or 1.8% to 12.5%. Two Map Check fees for Parcels and Subdivisions are increasing by \$1,120 or 59.6% and \$2,674 or 201.7%, respectively. The department is proposing three new fees for Map Checks and Certificate of Correction, ranging

from \$50 to \$100 each. The department is also proposing to change the cost for one fee for Map Reproductions – Mylar and Vellum to base the cost on a per sheet basis.

The department anticipates an increase of approximately \$19,000 in revenues resulting from fee increases. Where fees are charged, the recommendations are commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

4. PUBLIC GUARDIAN – (Exhibit IV)

The Public Guardian (a program in the Health and Social Services Department) proposes decreasing its fees, which recover a portion of the cost for providing services as costs are not fully reimbursed by the fees received from various clients and estates managed by the office. Fees are reviewed by County Counsel and the Superior Court and are developed based on costs or market rates and the client's ability to pay, whichever is lower. The Public Guardian's fee schedule is subject to the Probate Code. The proposed decreases are due to the decrease in indirect costs compared to FY2024/25. The decreases range from \$6 to \$70, or 4.8% to 4.9%. The recommended fees are commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

5. TREASURER/TAX COLLECTOR/COUNTY CLERK – (Exhibit V)

The Treasurer/Tax Collector/County Clerk proposes increasing four fees ranging from \$4 to \$15, or 15.4% to 37.5%, due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for the staff who perform the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits as well as increased overhead costs.

The department anticipates an increase of approximately \$3,600 in revenues resulting from fee increases. The recommended fees are commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

6. AUDITOR/CONTROLLER – (Exhibit VI)

The Auditor-Controller proposes increasing seven of its eight fees, ranging from \$0.50 to \$25, or from 7.5% to 18.5%, for the various services it provides to independent special districts, title companies and other agencies. The rates are based on budgeted numbers; however, the subsequent year's rate calculations include a roll forward adjustment based on actuals. The department also proposes decreasing one fee for Payroll – Special Projects by \$5 or 2.9%.

The department anticipates an increase of approximately \$72,000 in revenues resulting from fee increases. The recommended fees are commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

7. REGISTRAR OF VOTERS – (Exhibit VII)

The Elections Code and the Government Code establish the majority of the fees charged by the Registrar of Voters (ROV). The Department's objective is to recoup all costs associated with conducting and providing election services to outside agencies.

The Registrar of Voters proposes decreasing one fee due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for the staff who perform the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits. Four fees are proposed to increase ranging from \$1.82 per quarter hour to \$11.80, or 1.9% to 3.7%. The fee for Maps – Custom All Sizes is proposed to decrease by \$.28 or 5.0% per ¼ hour.

Where fees are revised, the new proposed amount is commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

8. CLERK OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS – (Exhibit VIII)

The Clerk of the Board proposes an increase to one fee: \$25 or 24.2% increase for Certified Verbatim Transcript – Assessment Appeals Board. The increase is due to an increase in the productive hourly rate resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits and increased overhead costs. The Department anticipates a nominal increase in revenue resulting from the fee increase. The recommended fees are commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

9. COUNTY COUNSEL – (Exhibit IX)

County Counsel's fee schedule reflects an increase of \$5 or 2.1% in the hourly rate for services. The increase is due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for the staff who perform the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits. The Department anticipates a nominal increase in revenue resulting from the fee increase. The recommended fees are commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

10. COUNTY ADMINISTRATOR'S OFFICE – (Exhibit X)

The County Administrator's Office proposes increasing the fee for the first page of standard photocopies (legal size or smaller) by \$.16 or 27.6%. For each additional page, the fee is proposed to increase by \$.12 or 48.0%. These fees are also the standard Countywide copy fee. Other departments are authorized per Government Code to charge copy fees which are different from the standard copy fees. The recommended fees are commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

11. HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES – (Exhibit XI)

Health and Social Services (H&SS) proposes increasing its fees from \$0.20 to \$120 or 0.1% to 53.1% and proposes a number of decreases ranging from \$0.03 to \$4 or 0.0% to 1.8%. There are also a number of recommended deletions. The department evaluated its existing fee structure and compared it to both actual costs and similar provider fees in the market, although the majority of the H&SS service fees are dependent on federal and state reimbursement, and as such, most fees are not commensurate with actual costs. Payments received from these programs are subject to audits that could result in cost settlements. The department is also adding three new fees in the Family Health Services' Primary Care Clinic.

Fees charged to the public represent approximately less than 2.0% of the Department's fee-for-service revenues. Patients are charged on a sliding fee discount scale to ensure income or lack of insurance is not a barrier to physical, behavioral, and dental health care.

Mental Health specialty clinics use the UMDAP system (Uniform Method of Determining the Ability to Pay) which is based on an annual sliding scale liability based on the client's or responsible party's ability to pay as required by Welfare and Institutions Code § 5709 and 5710 and the California Code of Regulations, title 9, Division 1, section 524. This state mandate has an annual deductible liability based on gross family income of the client/responsible person. Once the annual liability is met each treatment year, mental health services are free to the client so that critical access to services will not be impeded.

Primary and dental care clinics use a sliding fee discount scale, consistent with the requirements of the 42 Code of Federal Regulations 51c.303 which governs the use of funds under Section 330 of the Public Health Act and Health Resources Services Administration (HRSA), the federal oversight agency for Federally Qualified Health Center (FQHC) designated clinics.

HRSA also requires that fees be based on reasonable costs and locally prevailing charges. H&SS is proposing changes to the primary care and dental health fees to comply with this requirement.

Health and Social Services may need to adjust its fees charged to clients during the year as reimbursement rates from Medi-Cal, Medicare or other third-party payers change, actual cost per unit information becomes available, or as the volume of services rendered changes to allow the Department to recover more of their actual costs. Any new procedures added during the fiscal year will be based on existing or established methodologies for setting rates. If actual costs for services, procedures or supply items increase, H&SS may elect to pass the increased cost on to the client.

The H&SS fee schedule includes charges for the following divisions: (a) Behavioral Health Services, (b) Public Guardian/Public Administrator, and (c) Health Services.

a. Behavioral Health Services

- Mental Health

The California Advancing and Innovating Medi-Cal (CalAIM) payment reform initiative significantly changed the way county behavioral health plans claim reimbursement for specialty mental health services. Previously, reimbursement was based on interim rates cost settled to actual costs through a Certified Public Expenditure (CPE) process. With payment reform, Current Procedural Terminology (CPT) and Health Care Common Procedure Coding System (HCCPS) codes by provider types will be used. As the Department of Health Care Services (DHCS) continues to provide updated information, the impact of this change on the fee schedule may change. H&SS will update the fee schedule as needed if more information becomes available.

b. Public Guardian/Public Administrator (See Exhibit IV)

The cost of operating the Office of Public Guardian is not covered by the fees received from the various clients and estates managed by the office. The fees assessed by the Public Guardian's office are reviewed by County Counsel and the Superior Court and are developed based on costs or market rates and the client's ability to pay, whichever is lower. The Public Administrator's fee schedule is subject to Probate Code.

c. Health Services

- Medical Marijuana Identification Card

In June 2009, the Board of Supervisors adopted a resolution to impose annual program fees of \$100.00 for Medi-Cal recipients and \$200.00 for non-Medi-Cal clients to recover the costs of administering the Medical Marijuana Identification Card program.

With the passage of Proposition 64 in November 2016, counties may only charge 50% of the \$100.00 previously charged to Medi-Cal clients or \$50.00, 50% of the \$200.00 previously charged to non-Medi-Cal clients or \$100.00, and zero charge to County Medical Services Program (CMSP) clients.

- California Children Services (CCS)

The CCS program may collect an assessment and/or enrollment fee based on a sliding scale established by the DHCS/CCS program.

- Family Health Services (FHS)

The fee schedule for Family Health Services (FHS) has been set and adjusted utilizing several approaches.

<i>Primary Care</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local prevailing rates based on national averages with adjustments for geographic variability and applicable percentile. • Actual staff time and cost to provide the service (e.g., administering injections). • Negotiated contract rates or invoice amounts for certain laboratory procedures, drugs, supplies and vaccines.
<i>Dental Care</i>	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Local prevailing rates based on national averages with adjustments for geographic variability and applicable percentile.

The proposed fees include an increase over current rates based on the methodologies described above to better align charges with the cost of providing services and maintain consistency with locally prevailing rates as required by HRSA.

HRSA also requires the establishment of a sliding fee discount scale which should be applied uniformly to all patients and to all services within the approved scope of project for a FQHC designated clinic. The scale must discount the amount on the fee schedule for patients at or below 200% of the Federal Poverty Guidelines (FPG) with patients at or below 100% of the FPG receiving a full discount and have at least three discount pay classes above 100% and at or below 200% of the FPG.

The table below is the Sliding Fee Discount Scale for FHS primary and dental care clinics specifically designed to meet HRSA requirements and ensure that income or lack of insurance is not a barrier to care.

% of Poverty Based on Federal Poverty Level	% of Fee Discounted
0 – 100%	100%
101 – 138%	80%
139 – 170%	60%
171 – 200%	50%

- Public Health Laboratory

Some of the proposed fees are changing to keep them in line with current market rates.

12. SHERIFF/CORONER - (Exhibit XIII)

The Sheriff's Office recommends increasing seven existing fees from \$1 to \$20 or 0.9% to 7.7% to recover actual administrative and/or service-related costs as allowed by State statutes or regulations. The increases are due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for the staff who perform the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits. Four fees are proposed to decrease due to a slight decrease in operational costs. The department also proposes to decrease four fees \$5 to \$474 or 2.6% to 58.5%.

In addition, the proposed fee schedule reflects 40 fees unchanged from the current fee schedule, of which 34 remain the same because they are established or capped by statute.

Government Code section 29552 authorizes the State Controller to appropriate up to \$35 million in the Enhancing Law Enforcement Activities subaccount to offset local government costs for booking offenders. Local governments may not charge a booking fee when the State appropriates the full \$35 million for this purpose; however, should the State appropriate less than \$35 million, local governments would be able to charge a booking fee in proportion to the amount unappropriated by the State. The State is expected to appropriate the full \$35 million for FY2025/26, in which case the booking fee listed in Exhibit XIII will not apply.

Government Code section 29551(b) authorizes local governments to charge law enforcement agencies (LEA) a jail access fee when the LEA exceeds their three-year average number of eligible non-felony bookings. Non-felony bookings related to arrests for municipal code violations and most misdemeanor violations are included while arrests for driving under the influence offenses, domestic violence misdemeanor offenses, and enforcement of protective orders are excluded from the billable jail access fees. With approval of the County Administrator's Office, the Sheriff's Office changed the methodology in how the proposed fee was calculated to mirror existing fees. The new methodology was accepted by the Auditor-Controller's Office and the Sheriff's Office recommends revising the Board-approved FY2025/26 Jail Access Fee.

The department anticipates an increase of approximately \$4,200 in revenues resulting from fee increases. The recommended fees are commensurate with the actual cost per unit.

14. LIBRARY – (Exhibit XV)

The Library proposes to add four new fees of \$75 for replacement of lost items and increase three existing fees. Copying/Printing costs are proposed to increase from \$0.10 to \$0.20 per page, and room rentals for the Vacaville Public Library – Cultural Center are proposed to increase by \$15 to \$30 for non-profit organizations, and by \$30 to \$60 for for-profit organizations due to the increased space and modeling taking place at the Cultural Center Library.

15. SHERIFF - ANIMAL CARE AND CONTROL – (Exhibit XVII)

The Sheriff's Office proposes increasing 19 fees in the Animal Care and Control Services department from \$1 to \$14 or 0.6% to 25.0% to recover actual administrative, and/or service-related costs. The increases are due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for the staff who perform the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits. The proposed fee schedule also reflects decreasing nine existing fees from \$1 to \$23 or 1.9% to 38.3% to reflect lower operational costs.

There are a number of fees that remain unchanged, of which 10 are for licensing, one is for adoptions, one is for redemption, and one for boarding, and are also based on similar fees

charged by neighboring jurisdictions. Included as unchanged are two fees related to dangerous dog permits and one for dangerous dog hearings that are set by County ordinance, and three impound penalties established by California statute. Unchanged fees also include two wherein the actual cost of the service is unknown (livestock boarding) and two wherein cost remained constant.

The proposed fees will result in an estimated increase of \$76,500 in revenue. Many of the fees are not commensurate with actual costs per unit but are comparable to those of neighboring jurisdictions.

16. GENERAL SERVICES - NUT TREE AIRPORT – (Exhibit XX)

The Department of General Services – Nut Tree Airport proposes increasing fees for 11 of its fees from \$.10 per sq. ft. to \$72.25 unit of service, or 1.8% to 8.3% due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for the staff who perform the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits, as well as in the cost of providing services. The Airport is also proposing to decrease ten of its fees by \$3 to \$160 or 0.6% or 2.2%. One new fee is proposed related to 1,228 sq. ft. hangars for \$501 per month. Fees not capped by code or statute are commensurate with the actual cost per unit. The proposed fees will result in an estimated increase of \$1,000 in revenue.

As an Enterprise Fund, the County can establish reasonable rates, fees, and charges to recover operating costs. Pursuant to the County grant obligations with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the County is also required to operate the airport as a financially self-sustaining enterprise.