

SUMMARY OF PROPOSED 2026/27 FEE CHANGES BY DEPARTMENT

1. AGRICULTURE DEPARTMENT – (Exhibit I)

The Agriculture Department proposes increasing 21 fees. Proposed increases range from \$2 to \$44, or by 7.5% to 8.3%, with many fees increasing by approximately \$11 (7.5%) based on current fees. These increases are primarily due to a higher productive hourly rate for staff performing the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits, as well as increased overhead costs. All other fees remain unchanged, including 39 that are established or capped by statute.

The department recommends deleting two fees: Second Commercial Reinspections and Requested Equipment.

The department anticipates an increase of approximately \$15,000 in revenues from these fee revisions. Where fees are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service.

2. ASSESSOR/RECORDER – (Exhibit II)

The Assessor's Office proposes increasing 24 fees by \$1 to \$18, or by 2.6% to 6.7%, with no change to the remaining five fees. The increases are due to a higher productive hourly rate for the staff performing the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits, as well as increased overhead costs.

The Recorder's Office proposes decreasing six fees by \$1 to \$6 each, or by -5.3% to -16.7%, and no change to the remaining fees that are not set by statute. The decreases are due to a decrease in the productive hourly rate for the staff who perform the work as a result of more staff being assigned to the task.

The change to departmental revenue resulting from fee revisions is undeterminable as most of the fees are based on real estate and other transactions that cannot be predicted. Two of the Assessor's fees (Assessment Map Records and List of Transfers) and many of the Recorder's code-mandated standard fees do not recover the actual cost per unit. In most cases where fees are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service.

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 199 of its Environmental Health fees by \$1 to \$2,290 (one refinery permit), or by 2.3% to 32.8%, with most fees increasing between 2.7% to 3.0%. The increases are due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for

staff performing 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. The department is also proposing the addition of eight new fees, ranging from \$183 to \$3,575.

The Department anticipates an increase of approximately \$150,000 in revenue from the new fees and fee revisions. Where fees are charged and are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service.

b. Planning Services – (Exhibit III-B)

The Department of Resource Management proposes increasing 85 of its Planning Services fees by \$3 to \$1,555 or by 3.3% to 233.3%. The increases are due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for staff performing 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. The department is proposing to delete one fee: Review & Report as required by Permit.

The Department anticipates an increase of approximately \$52,000 in revenues resulting from fee revisions. Where fees are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service.

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

The Department of Resource Management proposes increasing 29 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 \$4 to \$114, or by 5.1% to 7.4%.

The Department anticipates an increase of approximately \$25,000 in revenues from fee revisions. Where fees are charged and are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service.

d. Administrative Services (Exhibit III-D)

The Department of Resource Management proposes increasing five fees for the Business License program by \$3 to \$13 or by 8.3% to 9.9%, for review and processing of initial, renewal and revised business license applications. The increases are due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for staff performing 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 \$3,500 in revenues from fee increases. Where fees are charged and are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service.

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

The Department of Resource Management proposes increasing 66 of its fees as a result of changes in the productive hourly rates resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits, the time required to perform the inspection or service, overhead, and equipment costs. The proposed increases range from \$1 to \$175 or 0.5% to 18.9%. The department is also proposing to delete one fee: Map Reproductions (Mylar and Vellum up to 18”

X 26”) and is proposing to decrease the Road Vacation Application Processing fee by -\$99 or -2.7%. Six fees established or capped by code are not proposed to increase.

The department anticipates an increase of approximately \$29,000 in revenues from proposed fee increases. Where fees are charged and are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service.

4. PUBLIC GUARDIAN – (Exhibit IV)

The Public Guardian (a program in the Health and Social Services Department) proposes increasing five of its fees and decreasing one fee (Property Management), which recover a portion of the cost for providing services. 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 changes are due to corresponding changes in indirect costs compared to FY2025/26. The increases range from \$10 to \$115, or by 8.3% to 8.4%, and the decrease is \$86, or -18.7%.

The department anticipates a net increase of approximately \$2,300 in revenues from fee revisions.

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

The Treasurer/Tax Collector/County Clerk proposes increasing 18 fees by \$2 to \$50, or by 5.3% to 33.3%, due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for staff performing 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 \$22,000 in revenues from fee increases. Where fees are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service.

6. AUDITOR/CONTROLLER – (Exhibit VI)

The Auditor-Controller proposes increasing six of its eight fees by \$0.65 to \$9, or by 2.6% to 5.7%, for the services it provides to independent special districts, title companies, and other agencies. The department is decreasing one fee (Property Tax Services, or the rate charged to local agencies for bond handling), by -\$0.40 or -12.5%.

The department anticipates a net increase of approximately \$29,000 in revenues from fee increases. Where fees are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service.

7. REGISTRAR OF VOTERS – (Exhibit VII)

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

The ROV proposes increasing four fees. Fees based on a quarter hour of work are proposed to increase \$1.78 (3.4%) per quarter hour. The Vote-By-Mail Subscription fee is proposed to increase by \$11.80 (3.5%) due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for staff performing

the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits. The fee for Staff Time Hourly Rate – Election Support is proposed to decrease by \$5 (4.8%), reflecting a reduction in the overhead component included in the rate.

Where fees are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service. Any increase in revenue to the ROV as a result of the fee increases is projected to be negligible.

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

The Clerk of the Board proposes a decrease to one fee, the hourly rate for Certified Verbatim Transcript – Assessment Appeals Board. The proposed fee represents a decrease of \$9 (7.0%) per hour. The net decrease is due to an increase in the productive hourly rate resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits offset by a decrease in related overhead costs.

There is no projected change to department revenues due to the revised fee. Where fees are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service.

9. COUNTY COUNSEL – (Exhibit IX)

County Counsel's fee schedule reflects an increase of \$16 or 6.5% in the hourly rate for services. The increase is due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for staff performing 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. Where fees are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service.

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 \$.07 or 9.5%. For each additional page, the fee is proposed to increase by \$.03 or 8.1%. 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. Where fees are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service.

11. HEALTH & SOCIAL SERVICES – (Exhibit XI)

Health and Social Services (H&SS) proposes increasing its fees from \$0.25 to \$81 or 0.4% to 8.7%. There are also three recommended deletions in the dental clinic fees (Repair Resin Denture Base, Removal of Fixed Space Maintainer, and Prev. Rsn. Rest. Mod High Caries Risk PT Perm. Tooth). 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 do not reflect the actual cost of providing services. Payments received from these programs are subject to audits that could result in cost settlements. The department is also adding 23 new fees in various areas.

Fees charged to the public represent approximately 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 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 requires that fees be based on reasonable costs and locally prevailing charges.

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 must 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%

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.

12. SHERIFF/CORONER - (Exhibit XIII)

The Sheriff's Office recommends increasing 12 existing fees from \$4 to \$30 or 2.3% to 28.6% to recover actual administrative and/or service-related costs as allowed by State statutes or regulations. Where fees are not set by statute or otherwise capped, the recommended fees are based on the actual cost of providing the service. The increases are due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for staff performing the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits. One fee (Jail Access) is proposed to decrease due to a slight decrease in operational costs, decreasing by -\$9 or -2.7%.

The proposed fee schedule also reflects 38 fees unchanged from the current fee schedule, of which 34 remain the same because they are established or capped by statute.

Booking Fees - 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 in any given fiscal year, local governments would be able to charge a booking fee in proportion to the amount unappropriated by the State during that same fiscal year. The State is expected to appropriate the full \$35 million for FY2026/27, in which case the booking fee listed in Exhibit XIII (fee #47) will not apply.

Jail Access Fee - 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 (fee #48) to reflect a decreased cost.

The department anticipates an increase of approximately \$19,000 in revenues resulting from proposed fee increases.

14. LIBRARY – (Exhibit XV)

The Library proposes adding six new fees ranging from \$85 to \$125 for 1) Dixon Library Community Garden Plots, and 2) Zoom room set up fees. There are two proposed fee increases, ranging from \$130 to \$260 or 186%, both for the Vacaville Cultural Center Library for Profit Group Rate and based on hours of usage.

The change to departmental revenue resulting from fee additions and revisions is undeterminable as the fees are based on usage which is difficult to project.

15. PARKS & RECREATION & OTHER PUBLIC PROPERTY (Exhibit XVI)

The Department of Resource Management – Parks & Recreation & Other Public Property proposes adding one new fee of \$5 for Peak Season Campsite (applicable between April 1 through September 30), in addition to the per day fee. The department also proposes increasing four fees from \$1 to \$5 or 14.3% to 33.3%. These fees are based on market studies of other comparable properties and uses.

The change to departmental revenue resulting from fee additions and revisions is undeterminable as the fees are based on usage which is difficult to project.

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

The Sheriff's Office oversees the operations of Animal Care and Control Services.

The Sheriff's Office recommends increasing 27 existing fees in the Animal Care and Control Services department from \$1 to \$29 or 0.4% to 111.1% to recover actual administrative, and/or service-related costs. These increases are primarily due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for staff performing the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits, as well as an increase in overhead costs. The proposed fee schedule also decreases five existing fees reflecting lower operational costs. These reductions range from -\$1 to -\$7 or -2.5% to -9.1%.

There are 32 existing fees that remain unchanged, of which eight are for adoption, nine are for licensing, and three for boarding and are based on similar fees charged by neighboring jurisdictions. Included as unchanged are two 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 (Pick up of livestock and Livestock boarding).

The increase in fees is projected to result in an estimated increase of \$8,000 in revenue when compared to the current fee schedule. Many of the fees do not reflect the actual cost of providing the service per unit but are comparable to those of neighboring jurisdictions.

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

The Department of General Services – Nut Tree Airport proposes increasing or revising 24 of its fees. Of these, nine are contractual annual hangar lease fees that are increasing by \$12 to \$23 per month, or approximately 3.0%, and two are State-mandated environmental fees from the Department of Fish and Wildlife, which are increasing by \$75 to \$104, or 2.5% each. Five fees are proposed to be changed from a fixed rate ranging from \$1,974 to \$19,740 to an hourly rate of \$769 per hour. The remaining fees, some hourly and some flat rate, are proposed to increase from \$4 to \$50, or 1.0% to 50.0% per hour, to a flat rate increase ranging from \$15 to \$50, or 11.1% to 100%. Where these fees are related to staff time, the increase is due to an increase in the productive hourly rate for staff performing the work, resulting from Board-approved increases in salaries and employee benefits, as well as in the cost of providing services. Two fees are proposed to decrease due to reduced costs: the Hourly Rate for Operations Staff Service and Operating License, which are proposed to be reduced by -\$5 and -\$69 or -1.6% and -7.9%, respectively.

Eight new fees are proposed related to the addition of three types of fuel flowage fees to fuel suppliers, an Unscheduled After-Hours Call-Out Fee, and pass-through costs associated with vendor credit card processing, offered as a convenience to customers. Two fees are proposed to be deleted, as they will each be consolidated into a single fee.

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 \$18,000 in revenue. As an Enterprise Fund, the County can establish reasonable rates, fees, and charges to recover operating costs. Pursuant to the

ATTACHMENT A

County grant obligations with the Federal Aviation Administration (FAA), the County is also required to operate the airport as a financially self-sustaining enterprise.