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## EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

## METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE AND DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE PLANNING COMMISSION ANALYSIS OF FEES FOR SERVICES

This is a follow-up study to the recently completed performance audit for the Metropolitan Planning Commission with the scope of services expanded to conduct a detailed cost of service analysis of services provided to the private sector by the Planning Department as well as the additional cost of those services provided by other Metro departments. The scope of work includes the following:
$>$ Identifying all services provided by the department for which charging fees for services is appropriate.
> Identifying opportunities for increased revenues by reducing subsidies for services for which charges are currently levied.
$>$ Identifying opportunities for increased revenues for services for which charges are not currently levied, but for which charges are appropriate.
$>$ Recommending user fees as appropriate based on the cost of services provided.
$>$ Providing documentation to substantiate fee recommendations.

Currently, the Planning Commission is recovering only $31 \%$ of the fee related services being provided by the Planning Department and elements of the Public Works Department. As a rule, planning departments do not achieve the $100 \%$ cost recovery rate that is normally achieved by building inspections or codes administration departments. Based on Maximus studies of other planning departments, it is, however, reasonable to expect a cost recovery rate of between $50-65 \%$ of the fee related services.

Consequently, an effort was made to recommend fees that would that would be in line with fees charged by other governmental entities, that would be consistent with fees charged in the other service areas and that would achieve an overall recovery rate of between $50-65 \%$.

The following tables summarize the current, full cost and recommended fees; the annual full costs, current revenues and subsidies; the expected annual revenues at the recommended fees; and the potential additional annual revenues for each service area for current planning and GIS and mapping information services.

| Planning \& Zoning Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning Division Cost/Revenue Summary (Including Public Work Costs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (All Costs and Revenues Shown in Dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Revenue | Add'I Rev |
|  | Full | Current | Surplits |  | Current | Full Cost | Recom | at | at |
| Service Area | Cost | Revenue | (Subsiofy) | Units | Fee | Fee | Fee | RecFee | Rec ree |
| Zone Change Frequest | 211,582 | 75,221 | $(136,361)$ | 163 | 461.48 | 1,298.05 | 922.96 | 150,442 | 75,221 |
| Preliminary Plat | 101,624 | 26,400 | (75,224) | 66 | 400.00 | 1,539.75 | 800.00 | 52,800 | 26,400 |
| Final Plat | 167,334 | 59,245 | (108,089) | 289 | 205.00 | 579.01 | 410.00 | 118,490 | 59,245 |
| Preliminary PUD | 107.447 | 25,145 | $(82,302)$ | 30 | 838.16 | 3,581.56 | 1,676.32 | 50,290. | 25,145 |
| Final PUD | 48,712 | 5,295 | (43,417) | 25 | 211.80 | 1,948.49 | 423.60 | 10,590 | 5,295 |
| Mandatory Ref Abandon | 19,905 | 2,000 | (17,905) | 20 | 100.00 | 995.23 | 300.00 | 6,000 | 4,000 |
| Mandatory Ref Encroach | 7,932, | 1.000 | $(6,932)$ | 10 | 100.00 | 793.16 | 250.00 | 2,500 | 1,500 |
| Mandatory Ref Other | 3,369 | 500 | $(2,869)$ | 5 | 100.00 | 673.74 | 20000 | 1.000 | 500 |
| Deferral | 9,118 |  | $(9,118)$ | 65 |  | 140.27 | 140.00 | 9,100 | 9,100 |
| Subdivision Reg Amend | 1,462 |  | $(1, \overline{4} \mathbf{6 2})$ | 2 |  | 731.16 | 300.00 | 600 | 600 |
| Preliminary Plat Revision | 9,664 | 1,750 | $(7,914)$ | 7 | 250.00 | 1,380.52 | 600.00 | 4,200 | 2,450 |
| Final Plat Revision | 35,239 | 19,680 | (15,559) | 96 | 205.00 | 367.07 | 307.50 | 29,520 | 9,840 |
| Critical Lot Plan | 3,993 |  | $(3,993)$ | 250 |  | 15.97 | 15.00 | 3,750 | 3,750 |
| Official Zoning Letter | 1,897 |  | $(1,897)$ | 180 |  | 10.54 | 10.00 | 1,800 | 1,800 |
| Subarea Plan | 15,195 | 2,500 | $(12,695)$ | 250 | 10.00 | 60.78 | 15.00 | 3.750 | 1,250 |
| Neighborhood Plan | 1,230 | 200 | $(1,030)$ | 40 | 5.00 | 30.75 | 10.00 | 400 | 200 |
| Zoning Reg Text Amend | 986 |  | (986) | 1 |  | 985.82 | 500.00 | 500 | 500 |
| Urban Design Overlay | 18,808 | 4,191 | (14,618) | 5 | 838.16 | 3,761.69 | 1,802.04 | 9,010 | 4,819 |
| Publie Hearing Sign | 20,628. |  | (20,628) | 764 |  | 27.00 | 27.00 | 20,628 | 20,628 |
| Final Plat Bond | 25,290 | 8,000 | (17,290) | 160 | 50.00 | 158.06 | 100.00 | 16,000 | 8,000 |
| Bond Release/Reduction | 9,425 | 2,500 | $(6,925)$ | 100 | 25.00 | 94.25 | 50.00 | 5,000 | 2,500 |
| Total | 820.837 | 233,627 | (587,210) |  |  |  |  | 496,370 | 262,743 |


| Map and GIS Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Operations Division Cost/Revenue Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (All Costs and Revenues Shown in Dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Revenue | Add'l Rev |
|  | Full | Current | Surplus |  | Current | Full cost | Recom | at | at |
| Service Area | Cost | Revenue | (Subsidy) | Units | Fee | Fee | Fee | Rec Fee | RecFee |
| Standard Topo Map | 3,856 | 4,580 | 724 | 229 | 20.00 | 16.84 | 17.00 | 3,893 | (687) |
| Standard Prop/Zon Map | 6,272 | 2,232 | (4,040) | 372 | 6.00 | 16.86 | 17.00 | 6,324 | 4,092 |
| Political Map | 559 | 390 | (169) | 65 | 6.00 | 8.60 | 9.00 | 585 | 195 |
| $11 \times 17$ Digital Aerial | 1,380 | 492. | (888) | 82 | 6.00 | 16.83 | 17.00 | 1,394 | 902 |
| $36 \times 24$ Digital Aerial | 2,080 | 1,400 | (680) | 70 | 20.00 | 29.72 | 30.00 | 2,100 | 700 |
| Blueprint of Hist Aerial | 3,419 | 812 | $(2,607)$ | 203 | 4.00 | 16.84 | 17.00 | 3,451 | 2,639 |
| Digital Data CDIDownload | 13,414 | 12,851 | (563) | 181 | 71.00 | 74.11 | 75.00 | 13,575 | 724 |
| Custom Map (units in hrs) | 6,061 | 1,584 | (4,477) | 88 | 18.00 | 68.88 | 70.00 | 6,180 | 4,576 |
| Distribution License | 12,017 | 10,800 | $(1,217)$ | 4 | 2.700 .00 | $\overline{3}, 004.19$ | 3,000.00 | 12,000 | 1,200 |
| Distrib License Update | 2,798 | 2,640 | (158) | 4 | 660.00 | 699.46 | 700.00 | 2,800 | 160 |
| Site Plan Map | 1,498 | - | $(1,458)$ | 89 |  | 16.83 | 17.00 | 1,513 | 1,513 |
| Countywide Zoning Map |  | 40 | 30 | 1 | 40.00 | 10.20 | 10.00 | -10 | (30) |
| Total | 53,364 | 37,821 | (15,543) |  |  |  |  | 53,805 | 15,984 |

The following table is a departmental cost/revenue summary summarizing the totals from the preceding tables and the percentage of full cost recovery

| Planning Department Cost/Revenue Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| [All Costs and Revenues Shown in Dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  | Revenue | Add'l Rev | \% of |
|  | Full | Current | Surplus | at | at | Fulf Cost |
| Division | Cost | Revenue | (Subsidy) | Rec Fee | Rec Fee | Recovery |
| Planning | 820,837 | 233,627 | (587,210) | 496,370 | 262,743 | 60.47\% |
| Operations | 53,364 | - 37,821 | - (15,543) | - 53,805 | - 15.984 | 100.83\% |
| Total | 874,201 | 271,448 | (602,753) | 550,175 | 278,727 | 62.93\% |

The preceding table indicates that the Metropolitan Government could potentially recover an additional $\$ 278,727$ in annual revenues by increasing fees as recommended in this study if the units of service provided do not change appreciably. This would entaj] an increase in the overall full cost recovery rate of from $31 \%$ to approximately $63 \%$.

During the conduct of the study, fee comparisons were made between the fees charged by the Planning Commission and fees charged by other governmental entities. A total of 33 specific service areas were considered. In some cases, the other governmental entities either did not provide the service or report a fee for services. In other cases, the potential additional revenue for Nashville/Davidson was not sufficient to warrant displaying a comparison in this report. The following tables provide comparisons of the study recommended fees for Nashville/Davidson County with fees charged by those governmental entities in specific service areas that would provide $73 \%$ of the total potential additional revenues identified in the preceding tables.

| Residential Zone Change Request |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| (Based on 17 acres) |  |  |
| Lovisvilie, KY | \$ | 1,800 |
| Memphis, TN | S | 1,350 |
| Nashuille, TN | \$ | 923 |
| Wirston-Salem, NC | \$ | 900 |
| Brentwood. TN | $\$$ | 500 |
| Charlote, NC | \$ | 385 |
| Raleigh, NC | \$ | 375 |
| Hendersonvile, TN | \$ | 275 |
| Gallatin, TN | \$ | 275 |
| Lebanon, TN | \$ | 150 |
| Wilson County, TN | \$ | 150 |
| Chattanooga, TN | \$ | 125 |
| Rutherford County, TN | \$ | 100 |
| Williamson County, TN | 5 | 100 |


| Commercial Zone Change Request |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| (Based on 17 acres) |  |  |
| Louisville, KY | S | 5,400 |
| Memphis, TN | \$ | 2,025 |
| Charlotte | \$ | 965 |
| Nashville, TN | \$ | 923 |
| Winston-Salem, NC | 5 | 900 |
| Brentwood, TN | \$ | 500 |
| Raleigh, NC | \$ | 375 |
| Hendersonville, TN | \$ | 275 |
| Gallatin, TN | \$ | 275 |
| Chattanooga, TN | \$ | 185 |
| Lebanon, TN | \$ | 150 |
| Wilson County, TN | \$ | 150 |
| Rutherford County, TN | \$ | 100 |
| Williamson County, TN | \$ | 100 |


| Preliminary Subdivision Plats |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| (Based on 20 lots) |  |  |
| Rutherford County, TN | $\$$ | 1,250 |
| Winston-Salem, NC | $\$$ | 1,200 |
| Raleigh, NC | $\$$ | 1,200 |
| Louisville, KY | $\$$ | 800 |
| Nashville, TN | $\$$ | 800 |
| Memphis, TN | $\$$ | 700 |
| Brentwood, TN | $\$$ | 550 |
| Charlotte, NC | $\$$ | 520 |
| Hendersonville, TN | $\$$ | 185 |
| Gallatin, TN | $\$$ | 185 |
| Lebanon, TN | $\$$ | 125 |
| Wisison County, TN | $\$$ | 125 |
| Williamson County, TN | $\$$ | 100 |


| Final Subdivision Plats |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| (Based on 14 lots) |  |  |
| Rutherford County, TN | $\$$ | 600 |
| Louisville, KY | $\$$ | 470 |
| Nashville, TN | $\$$ | 410 |
| Brentwood, TN | $\$$ | 400 |
| Memphis, TN | $\$$ | 340 |
| Williamson County, TN | $\$$ | 210 |
| Raleigh, NC | $\$$ | 200 |
| Winston-Salem, NC | $\$$ | 120 |
| Gallatin, TN | $\$$ | 120 |
| Chariotte, NC | $\$$ | 110 |
| Lebanon, TN | $\$$ | 95 |
| Wilson County, TN | $\$$ | 95 |
| Hendersonville, TN | $\$$ | 58 |


| Preliminary PUD |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| (Based on 34 Acres) |  |  |
| Memphis, TN |  |  |
| Nashville, TN | $\$$ | 3,175 |
| Charlotte, NC | $\$$ | 1,676 |
| Hendersonville, TN | $\$$ | 795 |
| Chattanooga, TN | $\$$ | 420 |

# METROPOLITAN GOVERNMENT OF NASHVILLE <br> AND DAVIDSON COUNTY, TENNESSEE PLANNING DEPARTMENT ANALYSIS OF FEES FOR SERVICES 

## I. INTRODUCTION

This is a follow-up study to the recently completed performance audit for the Metropolitan Planning Commission with the scope of services expanded to conduct a detailed cost of service analysis of services provided to the private sector by the Planning Department as well as the additional cost of those services provided by other Metro departments. The scope of work includes the following:
> Identifying all services provided by the department for which charging fees for services is appropriate.
> Identifying opportunities for increased revenues by reducing subsidies for services for which charges are currently levied.
> Identifying opportunities for increased revenues for services for which charges are not currently levied, but for which charges are appropriate.
$>$ Recommending user fees as appropriate based on the cost of services provided.
$>$ Providing documentation to substantiate fee recommendations.
The study work plan included the following tasks:
> Meeting with the Metro Project Manager and the OMB Cost Accountant to review the scope of work, work plan and project schedule.
> Meeting with the Planning Commission Executive Director and Assistant Directors to ensure a full understanding of the project and to identify individuals who needed to be interviewed.
> Reviewing the current year budget; individual staff salaries; and Metro indirect cost allocation plan allocations.
$>$ Determining fee related services provided by the department.
$>$ Determining those services for which fees are currently being charged.
> Determining other services for which fees may be appropriate.
$>$ Determining the full costs for all fee related services provided.
> Estimating the units of service provided per year for all fee related service areas.
$>$ Reviewing the current fee schedule and revenues received for the past three years for all fee related service areas.
$>$ Comparing the estimated revenues per year with the calculated full costs for each fee related service area.
$>$ Conducting a survey of planning and zoning fees charged by surrounding cities and counties and other representative cities.
> Recommending appropriate fees for each service area.
$>$ Determining the estimated potential additional revenue that could be achieved by charging the recommended fees.
> Providing a draft report documenting all study findings.
$>$ Providing a final report following a review of the draft report by the Planning Commission Executive Director, Metro Project Manager and OMB Cost Accountant.

## II. SERVICES PROVIDED AND PROJECTED REVENUES

This section of the report provides a description of the services provided to the private sector, the fees charged for those services and the estimated annual revenues resulting from the fees currently charged. It includes subsections for current planning services and GIS services. In those cases where variable fees are charged an average fee was computed to be compared with the average cost of the service provided.

## Planning Division Service Areas

The Planning Division provides land development planning and community planning services to include the following fee related services:

## Zone Change Requests

A total of 163 applications were submitted for zone changes in FY 2003. The current fee is $\$ 400$ for up to five acres, plus $\$ 5.00$ for each additional acre up to and including 100 acres, with an additional fee of $\$ 2.50$ an acre for applications for zone changes encompassing over 100 acres. Applying this fee schedule to the number of zone change applications and acres reported by the department for FY 2003 results in revenues of $\$ 75,220$ and an average fee of $\$ 461.48$ per application.

## Preliminary Subdivision Plats

A total of 73 submissions were made in FY 2003 for preliminary plats of subdivisions with an average of 20 lots per subdivision. It is estimated that 66 of these submissions were initial applications and that 7 were for preliminary plat revisions. The current fee for preliminary plats is $\$ 100$ plus $\$ 15$ per proposed lot for the initial application. Applying this fee structure to a 20 lot subdivision results in an average fee or $\$ 400$ per initial preliminary application. Multiplying $\$ 400$ by 66 submissions per year results in an average annual revenue of $\$ 26,400$ for initial preliminary plat submissions.

The fee structure for preliminary plat revisions is $\$ 100$ plus $\$ 7.50$ per lot. Applying this fee structure to a 20 lot subdivision results in an average fee of $\$ 250$ per preliminary plat revision. Multiplying $\$ 250$ by 7 revision submissions per year results in an average annual revenue of $\$ 1,750$.

Adding the average annual revenue of $\$ 26,400$ for the initial applications to the $\$ 1,750$ average annual revenue for revisions results in a total of $\$ 28,150$ per year for preliminary plats.

## Final Subdivision Plats

A total of 385 submissions were made in FY 2003 for final plats of subdivisions with an average of 14 lots per subdivision. It is estimated that 289 of these submissions were initial applications and that 96 were for revisions. The current fee for final plats is $\$ 100$ plus $\$ 7.50$ per proposed lot for the initial applications and for revisions. Applying this fee structure to a 14 lot subdivision results in an average fee of $\$ 205$ per subdivision whether for initial applications or revisions. Multiplying $\$ 205$ by 289 initial applications results in an average annual revenue of $\$ 59,245$ for initial applications and multiplying $\$ 205$ by 96 revisions results in an average annual revenue of $\$ 19,680$ for final plat revisions. The total average annual revenue for final plats is $\$ 78,925$.

## Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD)

Services provided for preliminary, revised preliminary and amended preliminary PUD submissions were described as following the same processes and requiring approximately equivalent levels of effort. Consequently, the calculated fiscal year revenues for these submissions were grouped in order to determine the average fee to compare with the average cost. The fee for a preliminary PUD or an amended/revised PUD of 50 or more acres includes a $\$ 400$ base fee plus $\$ 20$ an acres for 6-105 acres; \$10 an acre for 106-505 acres; and $\$ 5$ an acre for a PUD exceeding 505 acres. The fee for a revised or amended PUD of less than 50 acres includes a $\$ 300$ base fee plus $\$ 15$ an acres for 6-105 acres; \$7.50 an acre for 106-505 acres; and \$3.75 an acre for a PUD exceeding 505 acres. The calculated FY 2003 revenues for preliminary, revised preliminary, and amended preliminary PUD submissions are provided at Attachment A. The total revenue for these categories was calculated to be $\$ 25,145$. The average fee for the 30 submissions in these categories is $\$ 838.16$.

## Final Planned Unit Development (PUD)

Services provided for final PUD, revised final PUD, and cancelled PUD submissions were described as following the same processes and requiring approximately equivalent levels of effort. Consequently, the calculated fiscal year revenues for these submissions were grouped in order to determine the average fee to compare with the average cost. The fee schedule for these submissions is as follows: a $\$ 200$ base fee plus $\$ 5.00$ an acres for 6-105 acres; $\$ 2.50$ an acre for 106-505 acres; and $\$ 1.25$ an acre for a PUD exceeding 505 acres. The calculated FY 2003 revenue for these submissions is provided at Attachment A. The total revenue for these categories was calculated to be $\$ 5,295$. The average fee for the 25 submissions in these categories is \$211.80.

## Mandatory Referral

Mandatory referrals are referrals to the Planning Commission by entities requesting permission to encroach on Metro property for various reasons to include street and alley closures, seeking an easement, seeking a street name change and placing a sign in the Metro right-of-way. A total of 151 mandatory referrals were submitted to the Planning Department in FY 2003. These referrals were submitted by Metro departments and the private sector. The fee for the private sector is $\$ 100$ per referral regardless of the type of mandatory referral. A total of $\$ 3,465$ was collected in revenue for this service area in FY 2003. Dividing $\$ 3,465$ by $\$ 100$ would indicate 34.65 private sector submissions in FY 2003. The number of submissions was rounded to 35 to a total of $\$ 3,500$ in revenue.

## Sub-area Plan

Approximately 250 sub-area plans are provided to customers per year. These plans are provided and updated by staff in the Community Plans section. The current fee is $\$ 10.00$ per plan.

## Neighborhood Plan

Approximately 40 neighborhood plans are provided to customers per year. These plans area also provided and updated by staff in the Community Plans section. The current fee is $\$ 5.00$ per plan.

## Urban Design Overlay

A total of six urban design overlays were submitted for approval during FY 2003. Of these five were submitted by the private sector, for which fees were charged, and one was submitted by a Metro department. Fees for urban design overlays are the same as those for a preliminary PUD. Due to the low density of submissions in this category, the average fee for a preliminary PUD was used as the average for an urban design overlay. Therefore, a fee of $\$ 838.16$ was multiplied by five urban design overlays per year for a total annual revenue of $\$ 4,191$.

## Final Plat Bond

Approximately 160 bonds are processed by the Planning Department in conjunction with the issuance of final plats to private entities. The current fee is $\$ 50$ per bond resulting in an estimated $\$ 8,000$ a year in revenue.

## Final Plat Bond Release, Reduction or Extension

Approximately 100 requests for final plat bond releases, reductions or extensions are processed per year. A release request is made when a developer has finished working on a subdivision and applies to get his bond money back. A reduction request is made when a developer has finished a part of the work on a project and desires to have the bond reduced. An extension request is made to have the time requirement for project completion is extended. The fee for each of these categories of service is $\$ 25$ per request.

## Service Without Fees

The Planning Department provides several categories of service for which fees are not currently charged, but for which fees are deemed appropriate. Those categories are listed along with the estimated units of service per year in the following table.

| Current Planning |  |
| :--- | ---: |
| Services Without Fees | Units |
|  | Per |
|  | Year |
| Service Area | 65 |
| Subdivision Deferrals, Withdrawn Applications \& Incomplete Submissions | 2 |
| Subdivision Regulation Amendments | 250 |
| Critical Lot Plans | 180 |
| Official Zoning Letters | 1 |
| Zoning Regulation Text Amendment | 764 |
| Provision of Public Hearing Signs |  |

The service areas will be discussed in more detail in subsequent sections of this report.

## Summary of Estimated Planning Division Annual Revenues

The following table provides a summary of the calculated annual fees and the estimated annual revenues from current planning requests and submissions based on fees currently being charged.

| Current Planning Revenue Summary |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | :--- | ---: |
|  |  | Current | Current |  |
| Service Area | Units | Fee | Revenue |  |
| Zone Change Request | 163 | $\$ 461.48$ | $\$$ | 75,221 |
| Preliminary Plat | 66 | $\$ 400.00$ | $\$$ | 26,400 |
| Final Plat | 289 | $\$ 205.00$ | $\$$ | 59,245 |
| Preliminary Plat Revision | 7 | $\$ 250.00$ | $\$$ | 1,750 |
| Final Plat Revision | 96 | $\$ 205.00$ | $\$$ | 19,680 |
| Preliminary PUD | 30 | $\$ 838.16$ | $\$$ | 25,145 |
| Final PUD | 25 | $\$ 211.80$ | $\$$ | 5,295 |
| Mandatory Referral | 35 | $\$ 100.00$ | $\$$ | 3,500 |
| Subarea Plan | 250 | $\$ 10.00$ | $\$$ | 2,500 |
| Neighborhood Plan | 40 | $\$ 85.00$ | $\$$ | 200 |
| Urban Design Overlay | 5 | $\$ 838.16$ | $\$$ | 4,191 |
| Final Plat Bond | 160 | $\$ 50.00$ | $\$$ | 8,000 |
| Bond Release/Reduction | 100 | $\$ 25.00$ | $\$$ | 2,500 |
| Total |  |  | $\$$ | 233,627 |

## Operations Division Service Areas

The Operations Division provides GIS and mapping information services to include the following fee related services:

## Maps

The following table provides a list of the categories of maps that are provided customers on request and the fees charged for those maps.

| Map Services |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  | Current |  |
| Service Area | Units | Fee |  |
| Standard Topo Map | 229 | $\$$ | 20.00 |
| Standard Property/Zoning Map | 372 | $\$$ | 6.00 |
| Political Map | 65 | $\$$ | 6.00 |
| $11 \times 17$ Digital Aerial Map | 82 | $\$$ | 6.00 |
| $36 x 24$ Digital Aerial Map | 70 | $\$$ | 20.00 |
| Blueprint of Historical Aerial Map | 203 | $\$$ | 4.00 |

## Digital Data on CD or Download

GIS data in DXF or e00 digital formats is provided on compact disks or downloaded directly into a file for customers. The current fee for this service is $\$ 71$ per map tile. A total of 181 map tiles were provided to private sector customers during FY 2003.

## Customized Mapping Services

The Operations Division provides customized mapping to private sector customers and charges $\$ 18.00$ an hour for this service. A total of 88 hours of customized mapping was provided in FY 2003. The service hours were derived by dividing the revenues received for this service by $\$ 18.00$ an hour.

## Countywide Data Distribution License

The department provides private sector customers with a countywide download of GIS data with a three year license to distribute this data for a fee of $\$ 8,100$, which equates to an average of $\$ 2,700$ a year for this service. Four customers currently have this license.

## Countywide Data Distribution License Update

Customers receiving the countywide data distribution license have an option to receive quarterly data updates for an additional $\$ 660$ a year. The four customers that currently have the countywide data distribution license also pay an additional \$660 a year to receive the quarterly updates.

## Countywide Zoning Map

Customers occasionally request countywide zoning maps. The fee for this service is $\$ 40.00$

## Service Without Fee

Customers who are submitting site plans for the construction of buildings often request GIS site plan map services. A total of 89 site plan maps were provided to customers in FY 2003. No fee is being charged for this service.

## Summary of Estimated Operations Division Annual Revenues

The following table provides a summary of the annual fees and the estimated annual revenues from GIS and mapping information services based on fees currently being charged.

| GIS and Mapping Information Services |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | :---: | ---: | :---: | ---: |
|  |  | Current | Current |  |  |
| Service Area | Units | Fee |  | Revenue |  |
| Standard Topo Map | 229 | $\$$ | 20.00 | $\$$ | 4,580 |
| Standard Property/Zoning Map | 372 | $\$$ | 6.00 | $\$$ | 2,232 |
| Political Map | 65 | $\$$ | 6.00 | $\$$ | 390 |
| $11 \times 17$ Digital Aerial Map | 82 | $\$$ | 6.00 | $\$$ | 492 |
| 36x24 Digital Aerial Map | 70 | $\$$ | 20.00 | $\$$ | 1,400 |
| Blueprint of Historical Aerial Map | 203 | $\$$ | 4.00 | $\$$ | 812 |
| Digital Data CD/Download | 181 |  | 71.00 | $\$$ | 12,851 |
| Custom Map (units in hrs) | 88 | 18.00 | $\$$ | 1,584 |  |
| Distribution License | 4 | $2,700.00$ | $\$$ | 10,800 |  |
| Distribution License Update | 4 | 660.00 | $\$$ | 2,640 |  |
| Countywide Zoning Map | 1 | 40.00 | $\$$ | 40 |  |
| Total |  |  | $\$$ | 37,821 |  |

## Total Planning Commission Annual Revenue Projection

The FY 2003 Planning Commission revenue was determined to be $\$ 252,916$. Adding the projection of $\$ 37,821$ for Operations Division services to the projection of $\$ 233,627$ for Planning Division services results in a total annual revenue projection of $\$ 271,448$, which is within $\$ 18,532$ of the total revenue determined for FY 2003. The actual reported revenues vary considerably by the year for this department depending on when large projects are submitted and when the three-year countywide data distribution licenses are issued. For example, the departmental revenues for FY 2001 and FY 2002 were $\$ 276,016$ and 208,952, respectively, excluding bond revenues. Consequently, it is felt that an annual revenue projection of $\$ 271,448$ is sufficiently accurate for future planning.

## III. COST OF SERVICES

The first step in the service cost analysis was to determine services deemed appropriate for charging user fees. The results of this assessment are provided in the previous section of the study report. The next step was to determine the required tasks in processing, reviewing or working in any other way to provide services in specific service areas. Once those tasks were determined, the next step was to determine the average time required by specific individuals to complete those tasks. Those times were then added to determine the total average time required for each individual for a unit of service in each service area.

The Operations Division staff provides labor hours for the GIS and mapping information services while the Planning Division staff provides labor hours for current planning services. Other departments also are involved with the current planning services for which fees are being collected by the Planning Commission. The costs of some of these departments (such as Legal) are already included in the Metro indirect cost allocation and, therefore, cannot be included in the direct cost of providing services. The Water and Sewer Department is a major participant in the review process for land development fees. The costs for that department cannot be included in the fee cost since that department is an enterprise fund and is already being funded by taxpayers. The other major participant in providing services for Planning Commission fee areas is the Public Works Department. The costs associated with services provided by that department are appropriate for inclusion in the costs of current planning services for land development service areas and have been so included in this study.

A detailed analysis of tasks and times was made for the Planning Division as a result of extensive staff interviews. The results of that analysis are provided for specific service areas at Attachment B. Interviews were also conducted of Public Works staff and the results of the analysis of that departments is provided at Attachment C. Interviews were also conducted with Operations Division staff. The processes were not as complex and the time requirements were not as extensive for the Operations Division staff. Consequently, the results of their interviews are provided in the discussions of the specific service areas in this section of the report.

After the labor requirements were determined for each service area, they were entered into computerized Departmental Labor Distribution spreadsheets to compute the direct labor costs for each service area. The direct labor costs were then moved to computerized Departmental Cost Distribution spreadsheets, from which the fringe benefit, supply and service, supervisory and administrative, and central service indirect costs were computed for each service area. Those costs were then summarized in CostRevenue Summary spreadsheets. The respective organization cost spreadsheets are provided at the following attachments to this report:

Attachment D—Planning Division of the Planning Department.
Attachment E-Operations Division of the Planning Department.

Attachment F-Engineering Consultant Services Division of the Public Works Department.
Attachment G—Traffic Engineering Division of the Public Works Department.

The Public Works divisions’ line item costs were taken from the respective division's line item budget for FY 2004. The full time equivalent staff positions and the line item costs associated with the Planning Department Planning Division were taken from the Results Matters Resource Management costs associated with current planning work. Those costs are summarized in the following table:

| Current Planning Line Item Expenditures |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Council |  | Development | Compliance | MPC |  |
| Line Item | Support | Consultation | Guidance | Reviews | Support | Total |
| Salaries | 81,700 | 193,200 | 328,300 | 144,200 | 278,800 | 1,026,200 |
| Fringe Benefits | 23,200 | 50,900 | 79,300 | 39,700 | 76,500 | 269,600 |
| Flight Services |  |  |  |  | 7,500 | 7,500 |
| Postage \& Delivery |  |  |  | 4,000 | 1,000 | 5,000 |
| Public Hearing Signs |  |  |  |  | 12,000 | 12,000 |
| Printing | 2,000 |  | 5,000 | 2,500 | - | 9,500 |
| Advertising \& Promotion |  |  | 7,500 |  | 2,000 | 9,500 |
| Registration |  |  |  |  | 1,200 | 1,200 |
| Membership \& Dues |  |  |  | 400 | 500 | 900 |
| Repair \& Maintenance |  |  | 1,800 |  | 3,400 | 5,200 |
| Central Print Charge | 1,500 |  | 2,100 |  | 800 | 4,400 |
| Metro Postal Charges | 2,000 |  | 4,000 |  | 16,400 | 22,400 |
| Fleet Management |  |  | 1,600 |  | 1,600 | 3,200 |
| Host \& Hostess | 3,000 |  | 1,500 |  | 4,000 | 8,500 |
| Office \& Admin Supplies | 1,500 | 1,000 | 1,200 | 2,200 | 9,700 | 15,600 |
| Equipment Rental | - | - | - | - | 1,000 | 1,000 |
| Total | 114,900 | 245,100 | 432,300 | 193,000 | 416,400 | 1,401,700 |

The full time equivalent (FTE) staff positions and the line item costs associated with the Planning Department Operations Division were taken form the Results Matters Resource Management costs associated with GIS and mapping information services. Additional costs were applied to this division for GIS database development since Tennessee statutes allow the inclusion of those costs for computing cost-based fee for the private sector. Costs totaling $\$ 407,754$ were incurred in FY 2000. A five-year use allowance was applied to these costs resulting in an annual cost of $\$ 81,551$. An estimated $3 \%$ of that cost was attributed to the three-year countywide data distribution license and license update agreements and the remaining $97 \%$ was distributed to other GIS services. The following table provides a summary of GIS and mapping information service costs from the FY 2004 budget, which does not include the database development cost.

| Planning Commission GIS Budget |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | GIS Admin \& | GIS | GIS | Total |
|  | Application | Sales \& | Data | GIS |
|  | Development | Service | Management | Budget |
| Salaries | 161,600 | 100,100 | 239,700 | 501,400 |
| Fringe Benefits | 41,500 | 28,400 | 73,300 | 143,200 |
| Software Consultant Fees | 3,400 | 15,900 | 16,000 | 35,300 |
| Film Developing \& Framing | - | 200 | - | 200 |
| Out-of-Town Travel | 4,300 | 3,000 | 1,200 | 8,500 |
| Air Travel | 700 | 400 | 400 | 1,500 |
| Local Travel \& Parking | 300 | 300 | 300 | 900 |
| Postage \& Delivery Service | - | 500 | 500 | 1,000 |
| Registration | 1,000 | 1,600 | 1,000 | 3,600 |
| Membership \& Dues | - | - | 700 | 700 |
| Other Repair \& Maintenance Services | - | 500 | 7,300 | 7,800 |
| Office \& Admin Supplies | 2,300 | 1,900 | 4,600 | 8,800 |
| Software Licenses | 3,000 | $\square-$ | - - | 3,000 |
| Total | 218,100 | 152,800 | 345,000 | 715,900 |

Metro indirect costs were allocated to each organization whose work was considered in accordance with the most recent indirect cost allocation plan that is applicable to the respective organization. For Public Works Engineering Consulting Services, a factor of $62.14 \%$ was applied to the division salaries. For Public Works Traffic Engineering, a factor of $74.68 \%$ was applied to the division salaries. For the Planning Department Planning Division, the ratio of the 22.7 FTE positions providing current planning services divided by a total of 29 division positions was multiplied by the most recent indirect cost allocation of $\$ 327,942$ resulting in an allocation of $\$ 256,699$. For the Planning Department Operations Division, the ratio of 12.2 positions providing GIS and mapping information services divided by 18 division positions was applied to the most recent indirect cost allocation of $\$ 241,205$ resulting in an allocation of $\$ 163,483$.

Each FTE position was considered to have 1,800 available work-hours per year after making an allowance for vacation, sick leave, holidays, and training. Computed hourly rates for staff positions were based on dividing the position incumbent's annual salary by 1,800 .

The following paragraphs discuss the labor requirements and the full costs for each fee related service area. Detailed listings of work-hours by the Planning Department Planning Division and the Public Works Department divisions are provided at Attachments B and C, respectively. The derivation of service area annual and unit costs for each organizational division considered are provided at Attachments D through G.

## Planning Division Service Areas

## Zone Change Request

Approximately 163 zone change requests are submitted per year. The average zone change request was determined to require approximately 29.83 labor hours of processing, review and meeting time to include 23.06 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section, 34 hours from the Planning Division Community Plans Section, 5 hours from the Planning Division Assistant Director, 59 hours from the Public Works Engineering Consultant Services Section and 5.34 hours from the Public Works Traffic Engineering Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 1,298.05$ and the annual full cost for 163 zone change requests was calculated to be \$211,582.

## Preliminary Subdivision Plat

Approximately 66 preliminary plats are submitted per year. The average preliminary plat was determined to require approximately 34.73 labor hours of processing, review and meeting time to include 27.06 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section, 1.45 hours from the Planning Division Community Plans Section, 67 hours from the Planning Division Assistant Director, 2.9 hours from the Public Works Engineering Consultant Services Section and 2.65 hours from the Public Works Traffic Engineering Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 1,539.75$ and the annual full cost for 66 preliminary plats was calculated to be \$101,624.

## Final Subdivision Plat

Approximately 289 final plats are submitted per year. The average final plat was determined to require approximately 13.38 labor hours of processing, review and meeting time to include 10.25 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section, .17 hours from the Planning Division Community Plans Section, 24 hours from the Planning Division Assistant Director, 1.35 hours from the Public Works Engineering Consultant Services Section and 1.37 hours from the Public Works Traffic Engineering Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 579.01$ and the annual full cost for 289 final plats was calculated to be \$167,334.

## Revised Preliminary Subdivision Plat

Approximately 7 revisions to preliminary plats are submitted per year. The average preliminary plat revision was determined to require approximately 30.66 labor hours of processing, review and meeting time to include 23.58 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section, 1.45 hours from the Planning Division Community Plans Section, 67 hours from the Planning Division Assistant Director, 2.9 hours from the Public Works Engineering Consultant Services Section and 2.06 hours from the Public Works Traffic Engineering Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 1,380.52$ and the annual full cost for 7 revised preliminary plats was calculated to be $\$ 9,664$.

## Revised Final Subdivision Plat

Approximately 96 final plat revisions are submitted per year. The average final plat revision was determined to require approximately 8.2 labor hours of processing, review and meeting time to include 5.58 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section, .08 hours from the Planning Division Community Plans Section, .12 hours from the Planning Division Assistant Director, 1.35 hours from the Public Works Engineering Consultant Services Section and 1.07 hours from the Public Works Traffic Engineering Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be \$367.07 and the annual full cost for 96 revised final plats was calculated to be $\$ 35,239$.

## Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD)

Approximately 30 preliminary, revised preliminary or amended preliminary PUD submissions are made per year. The average submission was determined to require approximately 72.64 labor hours of processing, review and meeting time to include 36.16 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section, 1.78 hours from the Planning Division Community Plans Section, 1.08 hours from the Planning Division Assistant Director, 19.09 hours from the Public Works Engineering Consultant Services Section and 14.53 hours from the Public Works Traffic Engineering Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 3,581.56$ and the annual full cost for 30 submissions was calculated to be $\$ 107,447$.

## Final Planned Unit Development (PUD)

Approximately 25 final, revised final, or cancelled final PUD submissions are made per year. The average submission was determined to require approximately 40.26 labor hours of processing, review and meeting time to include 23.13 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section, 34 hours from the Planning Division Community Plans Section, .75 hours from the Planning Division Assistant Director, 8.77 hours from the Public Works Engineering Consultant Services Section and 7.27 hours
from the Public Works Traffic Engineering Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 1,948.49$ and the annual full cost for 25 submissions was calculated to be $\$ 48,712$.

## Mandatory Referrals

Approximately 35 requests for mandatory referrals are made per year. There are several types of mandatory referrals. While the fee is $\$ 100$ regardless of the type referral, the amount of staff time requires varies significantly depending on the type of referral. Consequently, mandatory referrals were separated into three categories for consideration; those categories being mandatory referrals for abandonment of Metro property, mandatory referrals for encroachment on Metro property and all other types of mandatory referrals.

## Mandatory Referral for Abandonment

An estimated 20 applications for mandatory referral for abandonment are made per year. These applications were determined to require approximately 22.07 labor hours include 16.91 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section, 08 hours from the Planning Division Assistant Director, 33 hours from the Public Works Consultant Services Section and 4.75 hours from the Public Works Traffic Engineering Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 995.23$ and the annual full cost for 20 submissions was calculated to be $\$ 19,905$.

## Mandatory Referral for Encroachment

An estimated 10 applications for mandatory referral for encroachment are made per year. These applications were determined to require approximately 19.66 labor hours include 16.91 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section, 08 hours from the Planning Division Assistant Director, and 2.67 hours from the Public Works Consultant Services Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 793.16$ and the annual full cost for 10 submissions was calculated to be $\$ 7,932$.

## Other Mandatory Referrals

An estimated 5 applications for other types of mandatory referrals are made per year. These applications were determined to require approximately 16.99 labor hours include 16.91 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section and . 08 hours from the Planning Division Assistant Director. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 673.74$ and the annual full cost for 5 submissions was calculated to be \$3,369.

## Sub-area Plan

Approximately 250 requests for sub-area plans are made per year. The average sub-area plan was determined to require approximately one hour of initial development time by a Community Planner II in the Planning Division Community Plans Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 60.78$ and the annual full cost for providing 250 sub-area plans was calculated to be $\$ 15,195$.

## Neighborhood Plan

Approximately 40 requests for neighborhood plans are made per year. The average neighborhood plan was determined to require approximately 30 minutes of initial development time by a Community Planner II in the Planning Division Community Plans Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 30.75$ and the annual full cost for providing 40 neighborhood plans was calculated to be \$1,230.

## Urban Design Overlay

Approximately five private sector urban design overlay submissions are made per year. The average submission was determined to require approximately 74.64 labor hours of processing, review and meeting time to include 31.16 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section, 7.00 hours from the Planning Division Design Section, 1.78 hours from the Planning Division Community Plans Section, 1.08 hours from the Planning Division Assistant Director, 19.09 hours from the Public Works Engineering Consultant Services Section and 14.53 hours from the Public Works Traffic Engineering Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 3,761.69$ and the annual full cost for five submissions was calculated to be $\$ 18,808$.

## Final Plat Bond

Approximately 160 final plat bond submissions are made per year. The average submission was determined to require approximately 4.79 labor hours of processing, research and review time to include 2.79 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section and 2.00 hours from the Public Works Engineering Consultant Services Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 158.06$ and the annual full cost for 160 submissions was calculated to be $\$ 25,290$.

## Final Plat Bond Release, Reduction or Extension

Approximately 100 submissions are made per year for final plat bond releases, reductions in the amount of the bond or bond timeframe extensions. The average
submission was determined to require approximately 3.07 labor hours of processing, research and review time to include 2.07 hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section and 1.00 hours from the Public Works Engineering Consultant Services Section. The average full cost per unit was calculated to be $\$ 94.25$ and the annual full cost for 100 submissions was calculated to be $\$ 9,425$.

## Subdivision Deferral, Withdrawn Application or Incomplete Submission

Approximately 65 times a year subdivision applications either consist of totally incomplete submissions, are withdrawn to be resubmitted, or deferred after submission. Such actions require approximately two additional labor hours from the Planning Division Land Development Section at a cost of approximately $\$ 140.27$ per applications and an annual cost of $\$ 9,118$. No fee is being charged for this service.

## Subdivision Regulation Amendments

No fee is being charged for the review of subdivision regulation amendments. Most such requests are made from Metro staff. Consequently, a fee for such requests would not be appropriate. Occasionally, a request for this service could be made from the private sector. Therefore, the service cost was calculated. The unit cost was calculated to be $\$ 731.16$ based on 12 hours or labor from the Planning Division Land Development Section. The total annual cost for two such submissions would be approximately $\$ 1,462$.

## Critical Lot Plan

A Planning Technician in the Planning Division Land Development Section reviews private sector critical lot plans, which are plans for lots flagged for floodplain; sinkholes; steep topography; or other environmental considerations that require more detailed grading plans before construction. It takes an average of 30 minutes per critical lot plan review at an average cost of $\$ 15.97$ per review. An average of 250 critical lot plan reviews are conducted per year at an average annual cost of $\$ 3,993$. No fee is being charged for this service.

## Official Zoning Letter

A Planning Technician in the Planning Division Land Development Section provides official zoning letters to private sector customers in response to their requests indicating how specific pieces of property are zoned. Approximately 180 of these letters are provided per year requiring an average of 20 minutes of staff time per letter. The average unit cost is $\$ 10.54$ and the average annual cost is $\$ 1,897$. No fee is being charged for this service.

## Zoning Regulation Text Amendment

No fee is being charged for the review of zoning regulation text amendments. As is the case with subdivision regulation amendments, most requests are made from Metro staff and a fee would not be appropriate for such services. Occasionally, a request for this service could be made from the private sector. Therefore, the service cost was calculated. Approximately 12 hours of review time are required by the Planning Division Land Development Section per text amendment at a full cost of $\$ 985.82$ per unit of service. This would also be the average annual cost if one such amendment is requested per year.

## Public Hearing Signs

The Planning Department provides the private sector approximately 764 public hearing signs per year for a unit cost of $\$ 27.00$ and a total annual cost of $\$ 20,628$. (This is the cost of materials and does not include any labor or overhead costs.) The numbers of signs provided varies with the size and location of the property requiring the public hearing. No fee is being charged specifically for the signs. A fee is required for the land development submission requiring the signs; however, in all cases the fee is inadequate to cover the full costs of services. The most equitable way to charge for the signs would be to charge for the materials costs of each sign.

## Summary of Estimated Planning Division Annual Costs

The following table provides a summary of the calculated unit and annual full costs of services provided by the Planning Division and Public Works divisions for Planning Department fee related areas. Of the total cost or $\$ 3,827,120$ for the organization elements considered, $\$ 3,016,283$ was not considered to be fee related leaving $\$ 810,837$ or roughly $21 \%$ of the total cost as the fee related cost.

| Planning \& Zoning |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Cost Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  | Engineering |  | Total | Units | Cost |
|  | Planning | Consultant | Traffic | Unit | Per | Per |
| Service Area | Division | Services | Engineering | Cost | Year | Year |
| Zone Change Request | 986.54 | 40.92 | 270.59 | 1,298.05 | 163 | 211,582 |
| Preliminary Plat | 1,229.26 | 167.08 | 143.41 | 1,539.75 | 66 | 101,624 |
| Final Plat | 427.51 | 75.63 | 75.87 | 579.01 | 289 | 167,334 |
| Preliminary PUD | 1,718.92 | 1,120.08 | 742.56 | 3,581.56 | 30 | 107,447 |
| Final PUD | 1,078.04 | 498.65 | 371.80 | 1,948.49 | 25 | 48,712 |
| Mandatory Ref Abandonment | 660.67 | 15.92 | 318.64 | 995.23 | 20 | 19,905 |
| Mandatory Ref Encroachment | 660.67 | 132.49 |  | 793.16 | 10 | 7,932 |
| Mandatory Ref Other | 660.67 | 13.07 |  | 673.74 | 5 | 3,369 |
| Deferral | 140.27 |  |  | 140.27 | 65 | 9,118 |
| Subdivision Reg Amendment | 731.16 |  |  | 731.16 | 2 | 1,462 |
| Critical Lot Plan | 15.97 |  |  | 15.97 | 250 | 3,993 |
| Official Zoning Letter | 10.54 |  |  | 10.54 | 180 | 1,897 |
| Preliminary Plat Revision | 1,106.55 | 167.08 | 106.89 | 1,380.52 | 7 | 9,664 |
| Final Plat Revision | 234.36 | 75.63 | 57.08 | 367.07 | 96 | 35,239 |
| Subarea Plan | 60.78 |  |  | 60.78 | 250 | 15,195 |
| Neighborhood Plan | 30.75 |  |  | 30.75 | 40 | 1,230 |
| Zoning Reg Text Amendment | 985.82 |  |  | 985.82 | 1 | 986 |
| Urban Design Overlay | 1,899.05 | 1,120.08 | 742.56 | 3,761.69 | 5 | 18,808 |
| Sign | 27.00 |  |  | 27.00 | 764 | 20,628 |
| Final Plat Bond | 62.87 | 95.19 |  | 158.06 | 160 | 25,290 |
| Bond Release/Reduction | 46.66 | 47.59 |  | 94.25 | 100 | 9,425 |
| Non-User Fee | 1,082,296 | 1,051,253 | 882,734 | 3,016,283 | 1 | 3,016,283 |
| Total P\&Z Related Costs |  |  |  |  |  | 3,837,120 |

## Operations Division Service Areas

## Standard Topographic Map

Approximately 229 standard topographic maps are provided to private sector customers per year. These require an average of 20 minutes of staff time to issue for an average unit cost of $\$ 16.84$ and an annual cost of $\$ 3,856$.

## Standard Property or Zoning Map

Approximately 372 standard property or zoning maps are provided to private sector customers a year. These also require an average of 20 minutes of staff time to issue for an average unit cost of $\$ 16.86$ and an annual cost of $\$ 6,272$.

## Political Map

Approximately 65 political maps are provided to private sector customers per year. These require an average of 10 minutes to issue for an average unit cost of $\$ 8.60$ and an annual cost of $\$ 559$.

## 11" by 17" Digital Aerial Map

Approximately 82 of the $11^{\prime \prime}$ by 17 " digital aerial maps are provided to private sector customers per year. These require an average of 20 minutes by the Operations Division Cadastre Maintenance staff to issue for an average unit cost of $\$ 16.83$ and an annual cost of $\$ 1,380$.

## 36" by 24" Digital Aerial Map

Approximately 70 of the 36 " by 24 " digital aerial maps are provided to private sector customers per year. These require an average of 35 minutes by the Operations Division Cadastre Maintenance staff to issue for an average unit cost of $\$ 29.72$ and an annual cost of $\$ 2,080$.

## Blueprint of Historical Aerial Map

Approximately 203 blueprints of historical maps are provided to private sector customers per year. These require and average of 10 minutes by the Operations Division Cadastre Maintenance staff to issue for an average unit cost of $\$ 16.84$ and an annual cost of $\$ 3,419$.

## Digital Data on CD or Download

Approximately 181 map tiles are provided on compact disks or downloaded directly to private sector customers per year. These require an average of 27 minutes of work Operations Division Application Development Planning Manager I to develop and 30 minutes of work by the Operations Division Cadastre Maintenance staff to issue for an average unit cost of $\$ 74.11$ and annual cost of $\$ 13,414$.

## Customized Mapping Services

An average of 88 hours per year of customized mapping services are provided to private sector customers by the Operations Division Application Development staff. The
average full cost per hour for this service is $\$ 68.88$ and the average annual cost is \$6,061.

## Countywide Data Distribution License

Over a three-year period, four countywide GIS data distribution licenses are issued. Each license requires an average of 2.41 hours per year of the GIS Manager's time. In this study, $3 \%$ of the total GIS annualized database development cost was allocated to the data distribution license and the license updates. The average annual cost per license is $\$ 3,004$ (including $\$ 497$ for database development) and the average total annual cost for the four licenses is $\$ 12,017$.

## Countywide Data Distribution License Update

Quarterly updates are provided for the entities receiving the data distribution licenses. These require approximately 35 minutes a year per update of the GIS Manager's time. A proportionate share of the 3\% of the total GIS annualized database development cost was also allocated to the license updates. The average annual cost per license update was calculated to be $\$ 699.46$ (including $\$ 115$ for database development) and the average annual cost for the four licenses was determined to be $\$ 2,798$.

## Countywide Zoning Map

Occasionally a customized countywide zoning map is issued to private sector customers. These require and average of 10 minutes by the Operations Division Cadastre Maintenance staff to issue for an average unit cost of $\$ 10.20$. That would also be the annual cost if only one map were issued per year.

## Site Plan Map

Approximately 89 site plan maps are issued by Operations Division Cadastre Maintenance staff per year. These maps take approximately 20 minutes to issue. The average unit cost is 16.83 and the total annual cost is $\$ 1,498$. No fee is being charged for this service.

## Summary of Estimated Operations Division Annual Costs

The following table provides a summary of the calculated unit and annual full costs of services provided to the private sector by the Operations Division. Of the total cost or $\$ 960,934$ for the organization elements considered, $\$ 907,570$ was not considered to be fee related leaving $\$ 53,364$ or roughly $5.5 \%$ of the total cost as the fee related cost.

| Map \& GIS Services |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| Cost Summary |  |  |  |
|  | Total | Units | Cost |
|  | Unit | Per | Per |
| Service Area | Cost | Year | Year |
| Standard Topographic Map | 16.84 | 229 | 3,856 |
| Standard Property or Zoning Map | 16.86 | 372 | 6,272 |
| Political Map | 8.60 | 65 | 559 |
| 11" $\times$ 17" Digital Aerial | 16.83 | 82 | 1,380 |
| 36" $\times 24 "$ Digital Aerial | 29.72 | 70 | 2,080 |
| Blueprint of Historical Aerial | 16.84 | 203 | 3,419 |
| Digital Data on CD or Download | 74.11 | 181 | 13,414 |
| Custom Map (units in hours) | 68.88 | 88 | 6,061 |
| County Data Distribution License | $3,004.19$ | 4 | 12,017 |
| Distribution License Update | 699.46 | 4 | 2,798 |
| Site Plan Map | 16.83 | 89 | 1,498 |
| Countywide Zoning Map | 10.20 | 1 | 10 |
| Non-Fee Related Activities | 907,570 | 1 | 907,570 |
| Total |  |  | 960,934 |

## IV. COST/REVENUE SUMMARY

This section of the report provides a summary of total annual costs and unit costs (from Section III) and the total annual revenues and unit revenues (from Section II) by service area. The following table summarizes those costs and revenues for current planning and zoning services.

| Planning \& Zoning Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning Division Cost/Revenue Summary (Including Public Work Costs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (All Costs and Revenues Shown in Dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Full | Current | Surplus |  | Current | Full Cost |
| Service Area | Cost | Revenue | (Subsidy) | Units | Fee | Fee |
| Zone Change Request | 211,582 | 75,221 | $(136,361)$ | 163 | 461.48 | 1,298.05 |
| Preliminary Plat | 101,624 | 26,400 | $(75,224)$ | 66 | 400.00 | 1,539.75 |
| Final Plat | 167,334 | 59,245 | $(108,089)$ | 289 | 205.00 | 579.01 |
| Preliminary PUD | 107,447 | 25,145 | $(82,302)$ | 30 | 838.16 | 3,581.56 |
| Final PUD | 48,712 | 5,295 | $(43,417)$ | 25 | 211.80 | 1,948.49 |
| Mandatory Ref Abandon | 19,905 | 2,000 | $(17,905)$ | 20 | 100.00 | 995.23 |
| Mandatory Ref Encroach | 7,932 | 1,000 | $(6,932)$ | 10 | 100.00 | 793.16 |
| Mandatory Ref Other | 3,369 | 500 | $(2,869)$ | 5 | 100.00 | 673.74 |
| Deferral | 9,118 |  | $(9,118)$ | 65 |  | 140.27 |
| Subdivision Reg Amend | 1,462 |  | $(1,462)$ | 2 |  | 731.16 |
| Preliminary Plat Revision | 9,664 | 1,750 | $(7,914)$ | 7 | 250.00 | 1,380.52 |
| Final Plat Revision | 35,239 | 19,680 | $(15,559)$ | 96 | 205.00 | 367.07 |
| Critical Lot Plan | 3,993 |  | $(3,993)$ | 250 |  | 15.97 |
| Official Zoning Letter | 1,897 |  | $(1,897)$ | 180 |  | 10.54 |
| Subarea Plan | 15,195 | 2,500 | $(12,695)$ | 250 | 10.00 | 60.78 |
| Neighborhood Plan | 1,230 | 200 | $(1,030)$ | 40 | 5.00 | 30.75 |
| Zoning Reg Text Amend | 986 |  | (986) | 1 |  | 985.82 |
| Urban Design Overlay | 18,808 | 4,191 | $(14,618)$ | 5 | 838.16 | 3,761.69 |
| Public Hearing Sign | 20,628 |  | $(20,628)$ | 764 |  | 27.00 |
| Final Plat Bond | 25,290 | 8,000 | $(17,290)$ | 160 | 50.00 | 158.06 |
| Bond Release/Reduction | 9,425 | 2,500 | $(6,925)$ | 100 | 25.00 | 94.25 |
| Total | 820,837 | 233,627 | $(587,210)$ |  |  |  |

The above table indicates that the department is only recovering $\$ 233,627$ or $28 \%$ of its current planning and zoning fee related cost of $\$ 820,837$. This means that Metro is subsidizing the private sector by $\$ 587,210$ for these services.

The following table summarizes the costs and revenues for GIS and mapping information services.

| Map and GIS Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Operations Division Cost/Revenue Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (All Costs and Revenues Shown in Dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  | Full | Current | Surplus |  | Current | Full Cost |
| Service Area | Cost | Revenue | (Subsidy) | Units | Fee | Fee |
| Standard Topo Map | 3,856 | 4,580 | 724 | 229 | 20.00 | 16.84 |
| Standard Prop/Zon Map | 6,272 | 2,232 | $(4,040)$ | 372 | 6.00 | 16.86 |
| Political Map | 559 | 390 | (169) | 65 | 6.00 | 8.60 |
| $11 \times 17$ Digital Aerial | 1,380 | 492 | (888) | 82 | 6.00 | 16.83 |
| 36x24 Digital Aerial | 2,080 | 1,400 | (680) | 70 | 20.00 | 29.72 |
| Blueprint of Hist Aerial | 3,419 | 812 | $(2,607)$ | 203 | 4.00 | 16.84 |
| Digital Data CD/Download | 13,414 | 12,851 | (563) | 181 | 71.00 | 74.11 |
| Custom Map (units in hrs) | 6,061 | 1,584 | $(4,477)$ | 88 | 18.00 | 68.88 |
| Distribution License | 12,017 | 10,800 | $(1,217)$ | 4 | 2,700.00 | 3,004.19 |
| Distrib License Update | 2,798 | 2,640 | (158) | 4 | 660.00 | 699.46 |
| Site Plan Map | 1,498 |  | $(1,498)$ | 89 |  | 16.83 |
| Countywide Zoning Map | 10 | 40 | 30 | 1 | 40.00 | 10.20 |
| Total | 53,364 | 37,821 | $(15,543)$ |  |  |  |

The above table indicates that the department is recovering $\$ 37,821$ or $71 \%$ of its GIS and mapping information fee related cost of $\$ 53,364$ leaving a Metro subsidy of \$15,543.

The following table provides a cost/revenue summary for the two departmental divisions.

| Planning Department Cost/Revenue Summary |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: |
| (All Costs and Revenues Shown in Dollars) |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |
|  | Full |  | Current |
|  | Surplus |  |  |
| Division | Cost | Revenue | (Subsidy) |
| Planning | 820,837 | 233,627 | $(587,210)$ |
| Operations | 53,364 | 37,821 | $(15,543)$ |
| Total | 874,201 | 271,448 | $(602,753)$ |

The above table indicates that the department is recovering \$271,448 or roughly $31 \%$ of its total full cost of $\$ 874,201$ leaving a Metro subsidy of $\$ 602,753$.

## V. FEE COMPARISON

During the process of the study, a comparison of the current Planning Commission fees was made of fees being charged by surrounding cities and counties and by comparable metropolitan areas throughout the Southeast. All the services provided by the Planning Commission are not provided by other governmental entities and the services that are provided are often provided and priced in a different manner. Therefore, selected benchmark services are compared in this report to provide the most accurate measure of the fees being charged by the Planning Commission. The following current planning service areas were selected for comparison:
> Residential zone change requests.
$>$ Commercial zone change requests.
> Preliminary subdivision plats.
> Final subdivision plats.
> Preliminary PUD.
> Final PUD.
> Mandatory referrals.
The following service areas were selected for comparison of GIS and mapping information services.
> Standard topographical and property maps.
$>$ Hourly rates for GIS custom services.
> Countywide GIS distribution Licenses.

## Residential Zone Change Request

The Nashville zone change request fee and the fees for many other governmental entities vary with the numbers of acres included in the requests. Nashville's fee is $\$ 400$ for up to five acres, plus $\$ 5$ for each additional 6-100 acres. Over 100 acres, the fee drops to $\$ 2.50$ an additional acre. The average FY 2003 revenue for Nashville for both residential and commercial zone change requests was computed to be $\$ 461.48$ by dividing the total computed zoning revenue by the 73 zone change requests for the year.

| Residential Zone Change Request |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| Louisville, KY | $\$$ | 1,800 |
| Memphis, TN | $\$$ | 1,350 |
| Winston-Salem, NC | $\$$ | 900 |
| Brentwood, TN | $\$$ | 500 |
| Nashville, TN | $\$$ | 461 |
| Charlotte, NC | $\$$ | 385 |
| Raleigh, NC | $\$$ | 375 |
| Hendersonville, TN | $\$$ | 275 |
| Gallatin, TN | $\$$ | 275 |
| Lebanon, TN | $\$$ | 150 |
| Wilson County, TN | $\$$ | 150 |
| Chattanooga, TN | $\$$ | 125 |
| Rutherford County, TN | $\$$ | 100 |
| Williamson County, TN | $\$$ | 100 |

The Metro Planning Commission fee is on the high side of the mid-range of the fees shown in the above table but below the average fee of $\$ 499$ charged by the other entities. The following, however, should be noted when making the comparison:
$>$ The $\$ 385$ fee for Charlotte is a "by right" rezoning fee. If the rezoning is "conditional", the fee is increased to $\$ 600$.
$>$ The Raleigh fee is increased to $\$ 500$ if the rezoning is conditional.
$>$ The Chattanooga fee is for medium density housing. It is decreased to $\$ 100$ for low density housing and increased to $\$ 175$ for high density housing

## Commercial Zone Change Request

The following table provides the commercial zone change request comparison. The same comments regarding the Nashville fee for the residential zone change request applies to the commercial zone change request.

| Commercial Zone Change Request |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| Louisville, KY on 17 acres) | $\$$ | 5,400 |
| Memphis, TN | $\$$ | 2,025 |
| Charlotte | $\$$ | 965 |
| Winston-Salem, NC | $\$$ | 900 |
| Brentwood, TN | $\$$ | 500 |
| Nashville, TN | $\$$ | 461 |
| Raleigh, NC | $\$$ | 375 |
| Hendersonville, TN | $\$$ | 275 |
| Gallatin,TN | $\$$ | 275 |
| Chattanooga, TN | $\$$ | 185 |
| Lebanon, TN | $\$$ | 150 |
| Wilson County, TN | $\$$ | 150 |
| Rutherford County, TN | $\$$ | 100 |
| Williamson County, TN | 100 |  |

The current Planning Commission fees place Nashville in the mid-range of the entities surveyed but well below their average fee of $\$ 877$. The following comments merit consideration in making the comparison:
> The Charlotte fee is for commercial excluding multi-family projects. The fee for multi-family projects drops from $\$ 965$ to $\$ 580$. These fees are, however, for "by right" rezoning. If the rezoning becomes "conditional", the fee is increased to $\$ 900$ for multi-family rezoning requests and $\$ 1,500$ for all other commercial rezoning requests.
> The fee for Winston-Salem rezoning requests increases to $\$ 1,400$ if the rezoning is a special use rezoning.

## Preliminary Subdivision Plats

The fee comparison for preliminary subdivision plats is based on the Nashville average of 20 lots per preliminary subdivision plat for FY 2003. The following table provides the comparison:

| Preliminary Subdivision Plats |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| (Based 20 lots) |  |  |
| Rutherford County, TN | $\$$ | 1,250 |
| Winston-Salem, NC | $\$$ | 1,200 |
| Raleigh, NC | $\$$ | 1,200 |
| Louisville, KY | $\$$ | 700 |
| Memphis, TN | $\$$ | 550 |
| Brentwood, TN | $\$$ | 520 |
| Charlotte, NC | $\$$ | 400 |
| Nashville, TN | $\$$ | 185 |
| Hendersonville, TN | $\$$ | 185 |
| Gallatin, TN | $\$$ | 125 |
| Lebanon, TN | $\$$ | 125 |
| Wilson County, TN | $\$$ | 100 |
| Williamson County, TN |  |  |

The current Planning Commission fee places Nashville in the lower mid-range of the entities considered and well below their average fee of $\$ 612$. It should be noted that Hendersonville requires a sketch plat and charges an additional fee that would equate to $\$ 95$ for a 20-lot subdivision.

## Final Subdivision Plats

The fee comparison for final subdivision plats is based on the Nashville average of 14 lots per final subdivision plat for FY 2003. The following table provides the comparison:

| Final Subdivision Plats |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| (Bas lots) |  |  |
| Rutherford County, TN | $\$$ | 600 |
| Louisville, KY | $\$$ | 470 |
| Brentwood, TN | $\$$ | 400 |
| Memphis, TN | $\$$ | 340 |
| Williamson County, TN | $\$$ | 210 |
| Nashville, TN | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 0 5}$ |
| Raleigh, NC | $\$$ | 200 |
| Winston-Salem, NC | $\$$ | 120 |
| Gallatin, TN | $\$$ | 120 |
| Charlotte, NC | $\$$ | 110 |
| Lebanon, TN | $\$$ | 95 |
| Wilson County, TN | $\$$ | 95 |
| Hendersonville, TN | $\$$ | 58 |

The current Planning Commission fee places Nashville in the mid-range of the entities considered and slightly below their average fee of $\$ 235$.

## Preliminary PUD

The average Nashville preliminary PUD fee is based on the current fee schedule and an average of 34 acres per preliminary PUD submission for FY 2003. The number of survey respondents having preliminary PUD fees is rather limited. The resulting comparison is as follows:

| Preliminary PUD |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| (Based on 34 Acres) |  |  |
| Memphis, TN | $\$$ | 3,175 |
| Nashville, TN | $\$$ | $\mathbf{8 3 8}$ |
| Charlotte, NC | $\$$ | 795 |
| Hendersonville, TN | $\$$ | 420 |
| Chattanooga, TN | $\$$ | 125 |

The average fee charged by the Planning Commission is below the average of $\$ 1,129$ of the responding entities although that amount is largely a function of the Memphis fee schedule. Nashville is basically in the mid-range of the reporting entities.

## Final PUD

The average Nashville final PUD fee is based on the current fee schedule and an average of 9 acres per final PUD submission for FY 2003. Only four survey respondents indicated that they charge final PUD fees. The resulting comparison is as follows:

| Final PUD |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| (Based on 9 Acres) |  |  |
| Memphis, TN | $\$$ | 1,300 |
| Nashville, TN | $\$$ | $\mathbf{2 1 2}$ |
| Hendersonville, TN | $\$$ | 170 |
| Chattanooga, TN | $\$$ | 125 |

The fee charged by Memphis again is far greater that that charged by the other respondents. The average fee is $\$ 532$, which only indicates that Nashville is on the low end along with the other two respondents.

## Mandatory Referrals

The following table provides a comparison of those entities reporting mandatory referral fees:

| Mandatory Referrals |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Memphis, TN | $\$$ | 300 |
| Chattanooga, TN | $\$$ | 250 |
| Raleigh, NC | $\$$ | 200 |
| Louisville, KY | $\$$ | 160 |
| Nashville, TN | $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 0 0}$ |

The $\$ 100$ fee charged by the Planning Commission is the lowest of those being charged. The average fee of the survey respondents is $\$ 228$.

## Standard Topographical and Property Maps

The following table provides a comparison of fees charged for the provision of standard topographical and property maps by the respective planning or GIS departments. The range of fees presented in the table is provided because there are several categories of maps based on sizes, colors and other considerations.

| Standard Topo/Property Map |  |
| :--- | :---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |
| Fees vary based on size and color) |  |
| Louisville, KY | $\$ 50-\$ 100$ |
| Knoxville, TN | $\$ 8-\$ 86$ |
| Brentwood, TN | $\$ 20-\$ 40$ |
| Atlanta, GA | $\$ 25$ |
| Lebanon, TN | $\$ 15-\$ 20$ |
| Chattanooga, TN | $\$ 3-\$ 25$ |
| Nashville, TN | $\$ 6-\$ 20$ |
| Raleigh, NC | $\$ 5-\$ 10$ |
| Memphis, TN | $\$ 5$ |
| Wilson County, TN | $\$ 2-\$ 7$ |
| Winston-Salem, NC | $\$ 3-\$ 5$ |
| Gallatin, TN | $\$ .50-\$ 7.50$ |

The fees charged by the Planning Commission place Nashville slightly lower that the average fee charged. The average midpoint of fees charged by the other entities is $\$ 14.18$ while the midpoint for Nashville fees is $\$ 13.00$.

## GIS Custom Service Hourly Rate

The following table provides a comparison of the hourly rates charged for customized mapping and other GIS services:

| GIS Custom Service Hourly Rate |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | :---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| Indianapolis, IN | $\$$ | 75.00 |
| Winston-Salem, NC | $\$$ | 65.00 |
| Knoxville, TN | $\$$ | 53.00 |
| Augusta, GA | $\$$ | 50.00 |
| Louisville, KY | $\$$ | 50.00 |
| Chattanooga, TN | $\$$ | 30.00 |
| Raleigh, NC | $\$$ | 30.00 |
| Wilson County, TN | $\$$ | 20.00 |
| Nashville, TN | $\$$ | $\mathbf{1 8 . 0 0}$ |

The fee charged by the Planning Commission is the lowest of the fees being charged and far lower than the average fee of $\$ 46.63$ for the other entities.

## Countywide GIS Distribution License

Only the cities of Indianapolis and Chattanooga reported providing countywide distribution licenses on a fee for service basis. The $\$ 9,000$ Indianapolis fee is broken into two components, which are a $\$ 4,000$ for all GIS data except aerial photos and an additional $\$ 5,000$ fee for all aerial photos. The fee comparison is as follows:

| Countywide GIS Distribution License |  |  |
| :--- | :---: | ---: |
| Ranked From Highest to Lowest Fee |  |  |
| Indianapolis, IN | $\$$ | 9,000 |
| Nashville, TN | $\$$ | $\mathbf{8 , 1 0 0}$ |
| Chattanooga, TN | $\$$ | 4,000 |

## Additional GIS and Mapping Services Survey Information

The local governments surveyed provided a wide variety of GIS services and packaged their products in many different ways to the extent that it would be meaningless to try to make detailed comparisons of many of their services. Consequently, other than the benchmark services selected in the preceding three paragraphs, the remaining services have been summarized at Attachment H to this report.

## VI. FEE RECOMMENDATIONS

After considering the cost of services, the current fees and the fees being charged by other governmental entities, the fee recommendations for specific service areas have been developed. Currently, the Planning Commission is recovering only $31 \%$ of the fee related services being provided by the Planning Department and elements of the Public Works Department. As a rule, planning departments do not achieve the $100 \%$ cost recovery rate that is normally achieved by building inspections or codes administration departments. It is, however, reasonable to expect a cost recovery rate of between 50-65\% of the fee related services.

Consequently, an effort was made to recommend fees that would not more than double the current fees, that would be in line with the more aggressive fees charged by other governmental entities without exceeding the maximum fees charged, that would be consistent with fees charged in the other service areas and that would achieve an overall recovery rate of between 50-65\%.

The following tables summarize the current, full cost and recommended fees; the annual full costs, current revenues and subsidies; the expected annual revenues at the recommended fees; and the potential additional annual revenues for each service area for current planning and GIS and mapping information services.

| Planning \& Zoning Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Planning Division Cost/Revenue Summary (Including Public Work Costs) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (All Costs and Revenues Shown in Dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Revenue | Add'I Rev |
|  | Full | Current | Surplus |  | Current | Full Cost | Recom | at | at |
| Service Area | Cost | Revenue | (Subsidy) | Units | Fee | Fee | Fee | Rec Fee | Rec Fee |
| Zone Change Request | 211,582 | 75,221 | $(136,361)$ | 163 | 461.48 | 1,298.05 | 922.96 | 150,442 | 75,221 |
| Preliminary Plat | 101,624 | 26,400 | $(75,224)$ | 66 | 400.00 | 1,539.75 | 800.00 | 52,800 | 26,400 |
| Final Plat | 167,334 | 59,245 | $(108,089)$ | 289 | 205.00 | 579.01 | 410.00 | 118,490 | 59,245 |
| Preliminary PUD | 107,447 | 25,145 | $(82,302)$ | 30 | 838.16 | 3,581.56 | 1,676.32 | 50,290 | 25,145 |
| Final PUD | 48,712 | 5,295 | $(43,417)$ | 25 | 211.80 | 1,948.49 | 423.60 | 10,590 | 5,295 |
| Mandatory Ref Abandon | 19,905 | 2,000 | $(17,905)$ | 20 | 100.00 | 995.23 | 300.00 | 6,000 | 4,000 |
| Mandatory Ref Encroach | 7,932 | 1,000 | $(6,932)$ | 10 | 100.00 | 793.16 | 250.00 | 2,500 | 1,500 |
| Mandatory Ref Other | 3,369 | 500 | $(2,869)$ | 5 | 100.00 | 673.74 | 200.00 | 1,000 | 500 |
| Deferral | 9,118 |  | $(9,118)$ | 65 |  | 140.27 | 140.00 | 9,100 | 9,100 |
| Subdivision Reg Amend | 1,462 |  | $(1,462)$ | 2 |  | 731.16 | 300.00 | 600 | 600 |
| Preliminary Plat Revision | 9,664 | 1,750 | $(7,914)$ | 7 | 250.00 | 1,380.52 | 600.00 | 4,200 | 2,450 |
| Final Plat Revision | 35,239 | 19,680 | $(15,559)$ | 96 | 205.00 | 367.07 | 307.50 | 29,520 | 9,840 |
| Critical Lot Plan | 3,993 |  | $(3,993)$ | 250 |  | 15.97 | 15.00 | 3,750 | 3,750 |
| Official Zoning Letter | 1,897 |  | $(1,897)$ | 180 |  | 10.54 | 10.00 | 1,800 | 1,800 |
| Subarea Plan | 15,195 | 2,500 | $(12,695)$ | 250 | 10.00 | 60.78 | 15.00 | 3,750 | 1,250 |
| Neighborhood Plan | 1,230 | 200 | $(1,030)$ | 40 | 5.00 | 30.75 | 10.00 | 400 | 200 |
| Zoning Reg Text Amend | 986 |  | (986) | 1 |  | 985.82 | 500.00 | 500 | 500 |
| Urban Design Overlay | 18,808 | 4,191 | $(14,618)$ | 5 | 838.16 | 3,761.69 | 1,802.04 | 9,010 | 4,819 |
| Public Hearing Sign | 20,628 | - | $(20,628)$ | 764 |  | 27.00 | 27.00 | 20,628 | 20,628 |
| Final Plat Bond | 25,290 | 8,000 | $(17,290)$ | 160 | 50.00 | 158.06 | 100.00 | 16,000 | 8,000 |
| Bond Release/Reduction | 9,425 | 2,500 | $(6,925)$ | 100 | 25.00 | 94.25 | 50.00 | 5,000 | 2,500 |
| Total | 820,837 | 233,627 | $(587,210)$ |  |  |  |  | 496,370 | 262,743 |


| Map and GIS Services |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| Operations Division Cost/Revenue Summary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| (All Costs and Revenues Shown in Dollars) |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Revenue | Add'I Rev |
|  | Full | Current | Surplus |  | Current | Full Cost | Recom | at | at |
| Service Area | Cost | Revenue | (Subsidy) | Units | Fee | Fee | Fee | Rec Fee | Rec Fee |
| Standard Topo Map | 3,856 | 4,580 | 724 | 229 | 20.00 | 16.84 | 17.00 | 3,893 | (687) |
| Standard Prop/Zon Map | 6,272 | 2,232 | $(4,040)$ | 372 | 6.00 | 16.86 | 17.00 | 6,324 | 4,092 |
| Political Map | 559 | 390 | (169) | 65 | 6.00 | 8.60 | 9.00 | 585 | 195 |
| $11 \times 17$ Digital Aerial | 1,380 | 492 | (888) | 82 | 6.00 | 16.83 | 17.00 | 1,394 | 902 |
| 36x24 Digital Aerial | 2,080 | 1,400 | (680) | 70 | 20.00 | 29.72 | 30.00 | 2,100 | 700 |
| Blueprint of Hist Aerial | 3,419 | 812 | $(2,607)$ | 203 | 4.00 | 16.84 | 17.00 | 3,451 | 2,639 |
| Digital Data CD/Download | 13,414 | 12,851 | (563) | 181 | 71.00 | 74.11 | 75.00 | 13,575 | 724 |
| Custom Map (units in hrs) | 6,061 | 1,584 | $(4,477)$ | 88 | 18.00 | 68.88 | 70.00 | 6,160 | 4,576 |
| Distribution License | 12,017 | 10,800 | $(1,217)$ | 4 | 2,700.00 | 3,004.19 | 3,000.00 | 12,000 | 1,200 |
| Distrib License Update | 2,798 | 2,640 | (158) | 4 | 660.00 | 699.46 | 700.00 | 2,800 | 160 |
| Site Plan Map | 1,498 |  | $(1,498)$ | 89 |  | 16.83 | 17.00 | 1,513 | 1,513 |
| Countywide Zoning Map | 10 | 40 | 30 | 1 | 40.00 | 10.20 | 10.00 | 10 | (30) |
| Total | 53,364 | 37,821 | $(15,543)$ |  |  |  |  | 53,805 | 15,984 |

The following table is a departmental cost/revenue summary summarizing the totals from the preceding tables.

| Planning Department Cost/Revenue Summary |  |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  | Revenue | Add'l Rev |
|  | Full Costs and Revenues Shown in Dollars) |  |  |  |  |
|  | at | Current | Surplus | at | at |
| Division | Cost | Revenue | (Subsidy) | Rec Fee | Rec Fee |
| Planning | 820,837 | 233,627 | $(587,210)$ | 496,370 | 262,743 |
| Operations | 53,364 | 37,821 | $(15,543)$ | 53,805 | $-15,984$ |
| Total | 874,201 | 271,448 | $(602,753)$ | 550,175 | 278,727 |

## Specific Fee Recommendations

The following paragraphs address specific fee recommendations by service area.

## Zone Change Request

The recommendation is to double the fees currently being charged for zone change requests so as to achieve an average fee of $\$ 922.96$ per application. This will recover $71 \%$ of the full cost of $\$ 1,298.05$ while staying well within the range of fees charged by the other governmental entities surveyed. The recommended fee schedule is to charge $\$ 800$ for up to five acres, plus $\$ 10.00$ for each additional acre up to and including 100 acres, with an additional fee of $\$ 5.00$ an acre for applications for zone changes encompassing over 100 acres. This fee schedule should recover approximately $\$ 75,221$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service and the total number of acres involved.

## Preliminary Subdivision Plats

The recommendation is to double the fees currently being charged for preliminary subdivision plats as to achieve an average fee of $\$ 800$ per application. This will recover $52 \%$ of the full cost of $\$ 1,539.75$ while staying well within the range of fees charged by the other governmental entities surveyed. The recommended fee is $\$ 200$ plus $\$ 30$ per proposed lot. This fee should recover approximately $\$ 26,400$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service and the total number of lots involved.

## Final Subdivision Plats

The recommendation is to double the fees currently being charged for preliminary subdivision plats as to achieve an average fee of $\$ 410$ per application. This will recover $71 \%$ of the full cost of $\$ 579.01$ while staying within the range of fees charged by the other governmental entities surveyed. The recommended fee is $\$ 200$ plus $\$ 15$ per proposed lot. This fee should recover approximately $\$ 59,245$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service and the total number of lots involved.

## Revised Preliminary Subdivision Plat

The recommendation is to increase the fee structure of these submissions by $140 \%$, increasing the average fee from $\$ 250$ to $\$ 600$ per plat. This would still only recover approximately $43 \%$ of the full cost. While the recommended fee is more than double the current fee, it is more in line with the recommended fee for the initial preliminary plat submission since it costs approximately $90 \%$ as much for a revised preliminary plat submission as for an initial submission. The recommended fee structure would be $75 \%$ of the fee structure recommended fee structure for preliminary plats. The specific fee structure would be to charge $\$ 240$ plus $\$ 18$ per lot. This fee should recover approximately $\$ 2,450$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service and the total number of lots involved.

## Revised Final Subdivision Plat

The recommendation is increase the fee by $50 \%$ over the fee currently being charged for final subdivision plats as to achieve an average fee of $\$ 307.50$ per application. This will recover $84 \%$ of the full cost of $\$ 367.07$ and bring the average fee to $75 \%$ of the fee charged for final plats. The recommended fee is $\$ 150$ plus $\$ 11.25$ per proposed lot. This fee should recover approximately $\$ 9,840$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service and the total number of lots involved.

## Preliminary Planned Unit Development (PUD)

The recommendation is to double the fees currently being charged for preliminary PUD requests so as to achieve an average fee of $\$ 1,636.72$ per application. This will recover $46 \%$ of the full cost of $\$ 3,581.56$ while staying within the range of fees charged by the other governmental entities surveyed. The recommended fee schedule is to charge an $\$ 800$ base fee plus $\$ 440$ an acres for 6-105 acres; $\$ 20$ an acre for 106-505 acres; and $\$ 10$ an acre for a PUD exceeding 505 acres. The recommended fee schedule for a revised or amended PUD of greater that 50 acres is to charge a $\$ 600$ base fee plus $\$ 30$ an acres for 6-105 acres; \$15 an acre for 106-505 acres; and \$7.50 an acre for a PUD exceeding 505 acres. This fee schedule should recover approximately $\$ 25,145$ in annual
revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service and the total number of acres involved.

## Final Planned Unit Development (PUD)

The recommendation is to double the fees currently being charged for final PUD requests so as to achieve an average fee of $\$ 423.60$ per application. This will recover $22 \%$ of the full cost of $\$ 1,948.49$ while staying within the range of fees charged by the other governmental entities surveyed. The recommended fee schedule for final PUD, revised final PUD, and cancelled PUD submissions is to charge a $\$ 400$ base fee plus $\$ 10.00$ an acres for 6-105 acres; \$5.00 an acre for 106-505 acres; and \$2.50 an acre for a PUD exceeding 505 acres. This fee schedule should recover approximately $\$ 5,295$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service and the total number of acres involved.

## Mandatory Referral

The recommendation is to double the current fee of $\$ 100$ per mandatory referral to $\$ 200$ for all mandatory referrals except those involving property abandonment or encroachment. This fee should recover approximately $\$ 500$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service. This fee would still be less than the average fees charged by other surveyed entities charging for this service.

## Mandatory Referral for Encroachment

The recommendation is to increase the fee by $150 \%$ from $\$ 100$ to $\$ 250$ for mandatory referrals involving encroachments. This would still only recover $32 \%$ of the full cost of $\$ 793.16$ and would still be well within the range of fees charged by other governmental entities for this service. This fee should recover approximately $\$ 1,500$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service.

## Mandatory Referral for Abandonment

The recommendation is to triple the current fee to $\$ 300$ for mandatory referrals involving encroachments. This would still only recover $30 \%$ of the full cost of $\$ 995.23$ and would not exceed the highest reported fee charged by surveyed governmental entities for this service. This fee should recover approximately $\$ 4,000$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service.

## Sub-area Plan

The recommendation is to increase the fee to approximately from $\$ 10$ to $\$ 15$. Although this would only recover approximately $25 \%$ of the full cost of this service, it would be difficult to get the private sector to pay more now that the information has been made available on the Internet. This should recover approximately $\$ 1,250$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service.

## Neighborhood Plan

The recommendation is to increase the fee to approximately from $\$ 5$ to $\$ 10$, which is approximately $33 \%$ of the full cost of this service. Again, it would be difficult to get the private sector to pay more with the same information available on the Internet. This should recover approximately $\$ 200$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service.

## Urban Design Overlay

The recommendation is to increase the fees currently being charged for urban design overlay requests by $115 \%$ so as to achieve an average fee of $\$ 1802.04$ per application. This will recover $48 \%$ of the full cost of $\$ 3,761.69$ and be fairly consistent with the fee recommended for preliminary PUD applications when consideration is given to the additional work done by the Design Section on these applications. The recommended fee schedule is to charge an $\$ 860$ base fee plus $\$ 43$ an acres for 6-105 acres; $\$ 21.50$ an acre for 106-505 acres; and $\$ 10.75$ an acre for a PUD exceeding 505 acres. This fee schedule should recover approximately $\$ 4,819$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service and the total number of acres involved.

## Final Plat Bond

The recommendation is to double the current fee of $\$ 50$ per bond to $\$ 100$. This fee should recover approximately $63 \%$ of the $\$ 158.06$ full cost and approximately $\$ 8,000$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service.

## Final Plat Bond Release, Reduction or Extension

The recommendation is to double the current fee of $\$ 25$ per bond release, reduction or extension to $\$ 50$. This fee should recover approximately $53 \%$ of the $\$ 94.25$ full cost and approximately $\$ 2,500$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service.

## Subdivision Deferrals, Withdrawn Applications \& Incomplete Submissions

Subdivision applications are frequently returned to the applicant due to incomplete submissions or withdrawn or deferred from further processing by the applicant pending changes. No fee is being charged for the time spent reprocessing these applications. The recommendation is to charge the full cost fee of $\$ 140$ for the additional time spent by staff members for resubmissions. This fee schedule should recover approximately $\$ 9,100$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service. Actually, the units of service may decrease when the fee is charged, which would have the beneficial effect of reducing workload.

## Subdivision Regulation Amendment

No fee is being charged for this service. The recommendation is to charge a fee of $\$ 300$ per application, which should recover approximately $41 \%$ of the full cost of $\$ 735.16$ and recover approximately $\$ 600$ in additional annual revenues if two such private sector applications are made per year.

## Critical Lot Plan

No fee is being charged for this service. The full cost fee was determined to be $\$ 15.97$. The recommendation is to charge a $\$ 15$ fee for this service to recover approximately $\$ 3,750$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service.

## Official Zoning Letter

No fee is being charged for this service. The full cost fee was determined to be $\$ 10.59$. The recommendation is to charge a $\$ 10$ fee for this service to recover approximately $\$ 1,800$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service.

## Zoning Regulation Text Amendment

No fee is being charged for this service. The recommendation is to charge a fee of $\$ 500$ per application, which should recover approximately $50 \%$ of the full cost of $\$ 1,034.62$ and recover approximately $\$ 500$ in additional annual revenues if one such private sector application is made per year. A $\$ 500$ would be in line with the $\$ 550$ and $\$ 500$ fees charged by the cities of Winston-Salem and Charlotte, respectively. It should be noted that an ordinance change would have to be made by the Metro Council to establish a fee for this service.

## Public Hearing Sign

No fee is being charged for this service. The recommendation is to charge a $\$ 27$ per sign fee to cover the cost of materials only with the other associated costs covered to some extent by the cost of the application submission for the respective service area. This fee schedule should recover approximately $\$ 20,628$ in annual revenues if there is no appreciable change in the units of service. (Note: The City of Winston-Salem charges a $\$ 90$ fee for signs to cover the cost of issuing the signs as well as associated material costs.)

## Standard 36" by 24" Topographical Map

The current fee for providing these maps is $\$ 20.00$. The average full cost was calculated to be $\$ 16.84$. The recommendation is to decrease the fee to $\$ 17.00$ per map. This would result in a loss of $\$ 687$ per year based on the current volume of maps provided.

## Standard 36" by 24" Property or Zoning Map

The current fee for providing these maps is $\$ 6.00$. The average full cost was calculated to be $\$ 16.86$. The recommendation is to increase the fee to $\$ 17.00$ per map. This would result in \$4,092 in additional revenue per year based on the current volume of maps provided.

## Political Map

The current fee for providing these maps is $\$ 6.00$. The average full cost was calculated to be $\$ 8.60$. The recommendation is to increase the fee to $\$ 9.00$ per map. This would result in $\$ 195$ in additional revenue per year based on the current volume of maps provided.

## 11" by 17" Digital Aerial Map

The current fee for providing these maps is $\$ 6.00$. The average full cost was calculated to be $\$ 16.83$. The recommendation is to increase the fee to $\$ 17.00$ per map. This would result in $\$ 902$ in additional revenue per year based on the current volume of maps provided.

## 36" by 24" Digital Aerial Map

The current fee for providing these maps is $\$ 20.00$. The average full cost was calculated to be $\$ 29.72$. The recommendation is to increase the fee to $\$ 30.00$ per map.

This would result in $\$ 700$ in additional revenue per year based on the current volume of maps provided.

## Blueprints of Historical Aerial Map

The current fee for providing blueprints of historical aerial maps is $\$ 4.00$. The average full cost was calculated to be $\$ 16.84$. The recommendation is to increase the fee to $\$ 17.00$ per blueprint. This would result in $\$ 2,639$ in additional revenue per year based on the current volume of blueprints provided.

## Digital Data on CD or Download

The current fee for this service is $\$ 71$ per map tile. The average full cost was calculated to be $\$ 74.11$. The recommendation is to increase the fee to $\$ 75.00$ per map time. This would result in $\$ 724$ in additional revenue per year based on the current volume of blueprints provided.

## Customized Mapping Services

The current fee for customized mapping services is $\$ 18.00$ per hour of services provided. The average full cost was calculated to be $\$ 68.88$. Fees charge by other surveyed governmental entities ranged from $\$ 20.00$ to $\$ 75.00$ and averaged $\$ 53.29$ per hour. The recommendation is to increase the fee to $\$ 70.00$ per hour. This would result in $\$ 4,576$ in additional revenue per year based on the current hours of customized service provided.

## Countywide Data Distribution License

The department provides private sector customers with a countywide download of GIS data with a three year license to distribute this data for a fee of $\$ 8,100$, equating to an average of $\$ 2,700$ a year per customer for this service. The average full cost was calculated to be $\$ 3,004.19$ per customer per year. The recommendation is to increase the fee for this service to $\$ 9,000$ per license, which equates to $\$ 3,000$ per customer per year. This would result in $\$ 1,200$ in additional revenue per year based on the current volume of services provided.

## Countywide Data Distribution License Update

Customers receiving the countywide data distribution license have an option to receive quarterly data updates for an additional \$660 a year. The average full cost was calculated to be $\$ 699.46$ per customer per year. The recommendation is to increase the
fee for this service to $\$ 700$ per update. This would result in $\$ 160$ in additional revenue per year based on the current volume of services provided.

## Countywide Zoning Map

Customers occasionally request countywide zoning maps. The fee for this service is $\$ 40.00$. The average full cost was calculated to be $\$ 10.20$. The recommendation is to decrease the fee to $\$ 10.00$ per map. This would result in a loss of $\$ 30$ per year based on the current volume of maps provided.

## Site Plan Map

No fee is currently charged for the provision of site plan maps. The average full cost was calculated to be $\$ 16.83$. The recommendation is to increase the fee to $\$ 17.00$ per map. This would result in $\$ 1,513$ in additional revenue per year based on the current volume of maps provided.

## ATTACHMENT A

## PUD REVENUES

FOR FISCAL YEAR 2003-2003

| PUD Revenues for Fiscal Year 2002-2003 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | PUD with | Acre Fee | Total Fee | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { PUD with } \\ \hline 106-505 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{\|l\|} \hline \text { Acre Fee } \\ \hline 106-505 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | Total Fee |  |  |
|  | Base |  | 6-105 | for 6-105 | for 6-105 |  |  | for 106-505 | Total |  |
|  | Fee |  | Acres | Acres | Acres | Acres | Acres | Acres | Fee |  |
| Preliminary |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PUD Acres |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 127 | \$ | 400 | 100 | \$ 20 | \$ 2,000 | 22 | \$ 10 | \$ 220 | \$ | 2,620 |
| 224 | \$ | 400 | 100 | \$ 20 | \$ 2,000 | 119 | \$ 10 | \$ 1,190 | \$ | 3,590 |
| 1 | \$ | 400 |  | \$ 20 |  |  | \$ 10 |  | \$ | 400 |
| 2 | \$ | 400 |  | \$ 20 |  |  | \$ 10 |  | \$ | 400 |
| 6 | \$ | 400 | 1 | \$ 20 | \$ 20 |  | \$ 10 |  | \$ | 420 |
| 360 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7,430 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PUD Revision |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| \& Amendment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Acres |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 11 | \$ | 300 | 6 | \$ 15 | \$ 90 |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ | \$ | 390 |
| 1 | \$ | 300 |  | \$ 15 | \$ - |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ - | \$ | 300 |
| 5 | \$ | 300 |  | \$ 15 | \$ - |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ | \$ | 300 |
| 6 | \$ | 300 | 1 | \$ 15 | \$ 15 |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ - | \$ | 315 |
| 3 | \$ | 300 |  | \$ 15 | \$ - |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ | \$ | 300 |
| 72 | \$ | 400 | 67 | \$ 20 | \$ 1,340 |  | \$ 10.00 | \$ | \$ | 1,740 |
| 1 | \$ | 300 |  | \$ 15 | \$ - |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ | \$ | 300 |
| 27 | \$ | 300 | 22 | \$ 15 | \$ 330 |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ | \$ | 630 |
| 226 | \$ | 400 | 100 | \$ 20 | \$ 2,000 | 121 | \$ 10.00 | \$ 1,210 | \$ | 3,610 |
| 4 | \$ | 300 |  | \$ 15 | \$ - |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ - | \$ | 300 |
| 18 | \$ | 300 | 13 | \$ 15 | \$ 195 |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ - | \$ | 495 |
| 1 | \$ | 300 |  | \$ 15 | \$ - |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ - | \$ | 300 |
| 1 | \$ | 300 |  | \$ 15 | \$ - |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ - | \$ | 300 |
| 55 | \$ | 400 | 50 | \$ 20 | \$ 1,000 |  | \$ 10.00 | \$ | \$ | 1,400 |
| 12 | \$ | 300 | 7 | \$ 15 | \$ 105 |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ | \$ | 405 |
| 7 | \$ | 300 | 2 | \$ 15 | \$ 30 |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ | \$ | 330 |
| 57 | \$ | 400 | 52 | \$ 20 | \$ 1,040 |  | \$ 10.00 | \$ | \$ | 1,440 |
| 2 | \$ | 300 |  | \$ 15 | \$ - |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ | \$ | 300 |
| 1 | \$ | 300 |  | \$ 15 | \$ - |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ - | \$ | 300 |
| 7 | \$ | 300 | 2 | \$ 15 | \$ 30 |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ - | \$ | 330 |
| 1 | \$ | 300 |  | \$ 15 | \$ - |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ - | \$ | 300 |
| 132 | \$ | 400 | 100 | \$ 20 | \$ 2,000 | 27 | \$ 10.00 | \$ 270 | \$ | 2,670 |
| 6 | \$ | 300 | 1 | \$ 15 | \$ 15 |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ - | \$ | 315 |
| 1 | \$ | 300 |  | \$ 15 | \$ - |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ | \$ | 300 |
| 8 | \$ | 300 | 3 | \$ 15 | \$ 45 |  | \$ 7.50 | \$ - | \$ | 345 |
| 665 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ | 17,715 |


|  |  |  | PUD with | Acre Fee | Total Fee | PUD with | Acre Fee | Total Fee |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Base |  | 6-105 | for 6-105 | for 6-105 | 106-505 | 106-505 | for 106-505 | Total |
|  | Fee |  | Acres | Acres | Acres | Acres | Acres | Acres | Fee |
| Final, Revised |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Final and |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Cancelled PUD |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| 9 | \$ | 200 | 4 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 20 |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 220 |
| 1 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 4 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 7 | \$ | 200 | 2 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 10 |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 210 |
| 1 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 2 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 1 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 4 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 10 | \$ | 200 | 5 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 25 |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 225 |
| 8 | \$ | 200 | 3 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 15 |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 215 |
| 7 | \$ | 200 | 2 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 10 |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 210 |
| 8 | \$ | 200 | 3 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 15 |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 215 |
| 25 | \$ | 200 | 20 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 100 |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 300 |
| 45 | \$ | 200 | 40 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 200 |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 400 |
| 13 | \$ | 200 | 8 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 40 |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 240 |
| 5 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 1 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 5 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 14 | \$ | 200 | 9 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 45 |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 245 |
| 2 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 1 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 8 | \$ | 200 | 3 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 15 |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 215 |
| 23 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 4 | \$ | 200 |  | \$ 5.00 |  |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 200 |
| 52 | \$ | 200 | 47 | \$ 5.00 | \$ 235 |  | \$ 2.50 |  | \$ 435 |
| 260 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | \$ 5,295 |

## ATTACHMENT B

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION TASK \& TIME ANALYSIS

## Notes Regarding Planning Commission Current Planning Labor Distribution

- All times are expressed in decimal hour equivalents to the nearest one hundredth: that is, .08 equals 5 minutes and .17 equals 10 minutes, etc.
- All times are times per unit of service: that is, times shown for PRC, DRC and other such meetings are the average times spent on one preliminary plat, zone change request or other tpe of submission and not the total meeting times. Also, other unit times such as preparing maps, providing notices to property owners, agenda preparation, etc. are for times per unit andnnot the total times per batches of units.
- Meeting times where more than one planner is present are multiplied by the number of planners present. For example: if it takes 10 minutes per zone change request for a PRC meeting, that time was multiplied by five planners (with the assumption that five planners would be present) for a total of 50 minutes or .85 hours of planner time. (Actually, multiplied the rounding of .17 hours for 10 minutes by 5).
- The titles across the top of the page represent the following positions and staff members:
> MII - Planning Manager II
> PIII - Planner III
> P - Planners
> PT - Planning Technicians
> OSI - Office Support Specialist I
$>$ OSII - Office Support Specialist II
> SIII - Secretary III
$>\mathrm{CP}-$ Community Planners
> PW - Public Works
> AD - Assistant Director

| Average Direct Labor Hours per Zone Change Request |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MII | PIII | P | PT | OSI | OSII | SIII | CP | PW | AD |
| Receive at front counter |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completeness check and enter database |  |  |  |  | 0.58 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare map |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare list for notices to adjacent property owners |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Examine application and compare with files in system |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review file with regard to policy |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Call applicant on issues |  |  | 0.05 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRC meeting (5 division planners \& 2 community planners) | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.85 | 0.17 |  |  |  | 0.34 |  | 0.17 |
| Call appicant on issues and enter comments in file |  |  | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DRC meeting (5 division planners) | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.40 | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |
| Call applicant on questions |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Write staff report |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare and send public notices |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare signs |  |  |  | 0.37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meeting between Planner III and Planner I |  | 0.17 | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Determine need for photos |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site visit |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Take photos |  |  |  | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community Plans review |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public Works Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.59 |  |
| Public Works Traffic Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.34 |  |
| Prepare for slide show |  |  | 0.25 | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slide show (5 division planners) | 0.33 | 0.33 | 1.65 | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall staff and applicant coordination | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC agenda |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.41 |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC consent agenda and Asst Director notes |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |
| Mail MPC meeting packets |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare newspaper ad |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare labels and folders; address letters |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.04 |  |  |  |
| MPC meeting (Estimated 35\% on consent agenda) | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.25 |
| MPC meeting minutes |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare action agenda after MPC meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |  |
| Prepare file for Metro Council |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare maps for signs |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meeting between Planner III and Planner I |  | 0.25 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Check file |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Post signs |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |
| Corrections to Council Bill |  | 0.21 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rework Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.64 |  |  |  |
| Recheck Counci Bill |  | 0.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reword Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |
| Review Council Bill | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare report for second reading |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare and send public notices |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Mail bill copies to Council Members |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |
| Attend P\&Z Committee meeting | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare report for P\&Z Committee |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| LIS update | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total Hours | 1.58 | 1.53 | 8.20 | 5.21 | 0.58 | 1.08 | 4.88 | 0.34 | 5.93 | 0.50 |


| Average Direct Labor Hours per Subdivision Preliminary Plat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MII | PIII | P | PT | OSI | OSII | SIII | CP | PW | AD |
| Receive at front counter |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completeness check and enter database |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare map |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare list for notices to adjacent property owners |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Preliminary review |  |  | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRC meeting (5 division planners \& 2 community planners) | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.85 | 0.17 |  |  |  | 0.34 |  | 0.17 |
| Follow up on PRC comments |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-depth review |  |  | 1.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DRC meeting (5 division planners) | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.85 | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.17 |
| Compile comments and send to applicant |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review revised plans |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribute plans to agencies |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resolve issues |  |  | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Write staff report |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Take photos |  |  |  | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community Plans review |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.11 |  |  |
| Public Works Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.90 |  |
| Public Works Traffic Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.65 |  |
| Prepare for slide show |  |  | 0.25 | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slide show (5 division planners) | 0.33 | 0.33 | 1.65 | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall staff and applicant coordination | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC agenda |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.41 |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC consent agenda and Asst Director notes |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |
| Mail MPC meeting packets |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare newspaper ad |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare labels and folders |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| Pull addresses from zone change folders for letters |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| MPC meeting (Estimated 15\% on consent agenda) | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.33 |
| MPC meeting minutes |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare action agenda after MPC meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |  |
| Prepare file for Metro Council |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meeting between Planner III and Planner I |  | 0.25 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Post signs |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Check file |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |
| Corrections to Council Bill |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rework Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.64 |  |  |  |
| Recheck Counci Bill |  | 0.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reword Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |
| Review Council Bill | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare report for second reading |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare and send public notices |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Mail bill copies to Council Members |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |
| Attend P\&Z Committee meeting | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare report for P\&Z Committee |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| LIS update | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total Hours | 1.75 | 1.49 | 12.60 | 4.76 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 4.38 | 1.45 | 5.55 | 0.67 |


| Average Direct Labor Hours per Subdivision Final Plat |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MII | PIII | P | PT | OSI | OSII | SIII | CP | PW | AD |
| Receive at front counter |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completeness check and enter database |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare map |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preliminary review |  |  | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRC meeting (5 division planners \& 2 community planners) | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.40 | 0.08 |  |  |  | 0.17 |  | 0.08 |
| Follow up on PRC comments |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-depth review |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DRC meeting (5 division planners) | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.40 | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |
| Compile comments and send to applicant |  |  | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review revised plans |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribute plans to agencies |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resolve issues |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Take photos |  |  |  | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public Works Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.35 |  |
| Public Works Traffic Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.37 |  |
| Overall staff and applicant coordination | 0.25 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC agenda |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.41 |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC consent agenda and Asst Director notes |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |
| Mail MPC meeting packets |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare newspaper ad |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare labels and folders |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| Pull addresses from zone change folders for letters |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| MPC meeting (Estimated 90\% on consent agenda) | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |
| MPC meeting minutes |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare action agenda after MPC meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |  |
| Prepare file for Metro Council |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare milar and record plat |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LIS update | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total Hours | 0.49 | 0.66 | 3.63 | 2.90 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.57 | 0.17 | 2.72 | 0.24 |
|  | 0.49 | 0.66 | 3.63 | 2.90 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 1.57 | 0.17 | 2.72 | 0.24 |


| Average Direct Labor Hours per Preliminary PUD and PUD Amendment |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MII | PIII | P | PT | OSI | OSII | SIII | CP | PW | AD |
| Receive at front counter |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare map |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare list for notices to adjacent property owners |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Completeness check and enter database |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preliminary review |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRC meeting (5 division planners \& 2 community planners) | 0.33 | 0.33 | 1.67 | 0.33 |  |  |  | 0.67 |  | 0.33 |
| In-depth review |  |  | 3.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Visit |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DRC meeting (5 division planners) | 0.50 | 0.50 | 2.50 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |
| Comments to applicant |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review revised plan |  |  | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resolve issues |  |  | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Write staff report |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare for Planning Commission |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare signs |  |  |  | 0.37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Take photos |  |  |  | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community Plans review |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.11 |  |  |
| Public Works Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.09 |  |
| Public Works Traffic Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.53 |  |
| Prepare for slide show |  |  | 0.25 | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slide show (5 division planners) | 0.50 | 0.50 | 2.50 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall staff and applicant coordination | 0.50 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC agenda |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.41 |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC consent agenda and Asst Director notes |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |
| Mail MPC meeting packets |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare newspaper ad |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare labels and folders |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| Pull addresses from zone change folders for letters |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| MPC meeting (Estimated 50\% on consent agenda) | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.25 |
| MPC meeting minutes |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare action agenda after MPC meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |  |
| Prepare file for Metro Council |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare maps for signs |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Post signs |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meeting between Planner III and Planner I |  | 0.25 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| File check |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |
| Corrections to Council Bill (40\% of cases) |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rework Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.64 |  |  |  |
| Recheck Counci Bill |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reword Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |
| Review Council Bill | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare report for second reading |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare and send public notices |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Mail bill copies to Council Members |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |
| Attend P\&Z Committee meeting | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare report for P\&Z Committee |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| LIS update | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total Hours | 2.33 | 2.66 | 19.75 | 5.96 | 0.00 | 1.08 | 4.38 | 1.78 | 33.62 | 1.08 |


| Average Direct Labor Hours per Final PUD and PUD Cancelation |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MII | PIII | P | PT | OSI | OSII | SIII | CP | PW | AD |
| Receive at front counter |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare map |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare list for notices to adjacent property owners |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Completeness check and enter database |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preliminary review |  |  | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRC meeting (5 division planners \& 2 community planners) | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.85 | 0.17 |  |  |  | 0.34 |  | 0.17 |
| In-depth review |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Site Visit |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DRC meeting (5 division planners) | 0.50 | 0.50 | 2.50 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |
| Comments to applicant |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review revised plan |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resolve issues |  |  | 2.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Write staff report |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare for Planning Commission |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare signs |  |  |  | 0.37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Take photos |  |  |  | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public Works Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 8.77 |  |
| Public Works Traffic Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 7.27 |  |
| Prepare for slide show |  |  | 0.25 | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slide show (5 division planners) | 0.50 | 0.50 | 2.50 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall staff and applicant coordination | 0.25 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC agenda |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.41 |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC consent agenda and Asst Director notes |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |
| Mail MPC meeting packets |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare newspaper ad |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare labels and folders |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| Pull addresses from zone change folders for letters |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| MPC meeting (Estimated 90\% on consent agenda) | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |
| MPC meeting minutes |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare action agenda after MPC meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |  |
| LIS update | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total Hours | 1.50 | 1.67 | 13.26 | 4.63 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.07 | 0.34 | 16.04 | 0.75 |


| Average Direct Labor Hours per Mandatory Referral |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MII | PIII | P | PT | OSI | OSII | SIII | CP | PW | AD |
| Receive at front counter |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completeness check and enter database |  |  |  |  | 0.58 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare map |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare list for notices to adjacent property owners |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Create memo for other agencies |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Create e-mail |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review file with regard to policy |  |  | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Call applicant on issues |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Call applicant on questions |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public Works review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 5.08 |  |
| Write staff report |  |  | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare and send public notices |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare for slide show |  |  | 0.25 | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slide show (5 division planners) | 0.33 | 0.33 | 1.65 | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall staff and applicant coordination | 0.25 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC agenda |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.41 |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC consent agenda and Asst Director notes |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |
| Mail MPC meeting packets |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare newspaper ad |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare labels and folders |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| Pull addresses from zone change folders for letters |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| MPC meeting (Estimated 85\% on consent agenda) | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |
| MPC meeting minutes |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare action agenda after MPC meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |  |
| Prepare file for Metro Council |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare maps for signs |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meeting between Planner III and Planner I |  | 0.25 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| File check |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |
| Corrections to Council Bill (40\% of cases) |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rework Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.64 |  |  |  |
| Recheck Counci Bill |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reword Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |
| Review Council Bill | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare report for second reading |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare and send public notices |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Mail bill copies to Council Members |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |
| Attend P\&Z Committee meeting | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare report for P\&Z Committee |  |  |  |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |  |
| LIS update | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total Hours | 0.91 | 1.66 | 4.14 | 3.74 | 0.58 | 1.00 | 4.88 | 0.00 | 5.08 | 0.08 |


| Average Direct Labor Hours per Subdivision Final Plat Revision |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MII | PIII | P | PT | OSI | OSII | SIII | CP | PW | AD |
| Receive at front counter |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completeness check and enter database |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare map |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preliminary review |  |  | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRC meeting (5 division planners \& 2 community planners) | 0.04 | 0.04 | 0.20 | 0.04 |  |  |  | 0.08 |  | 0.04 |
| Follow up on PRC comments |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-depth review |  |  | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DRC meeting (5 division planners) | 0.08 | 0.08 | 0.40 | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |
| Compile comments and send to applicant |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review revised plans |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribute plans to agencies |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resolve issues |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Take photos |  |  |  | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Public Works Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.35 |  |
| Public Works Traffic Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.07 |  |
| Overall staff and applicant coordination | 0.17 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare milar and record plat |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| LIS update | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total Hours | 0.29 | 0.37 | 2.09 | 2.33 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.08 | 2.42 | 0.12 |


| Average Direct Labor Hours per Urban Design Overlay |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MII | PIII | P | PT | OSI | OSII | SIII | DS | CP | PW | AD |
| Receive at front counter |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare map |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare list for notices to adjacent property owners |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| Completeness check and enter database |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Preliminary review |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRC meeting (5 division planners \& 2 community planners) | 0.33 | 0.33 | 1.67 | 0.33 |  |  |  |  | 0.67 |  | 0.33 |
| In-depth review |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 3.00 |  |  |  |
| Site Visit |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DRC meeting (5 division planners) | 0.50 | 0.50 | 2.50 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |
| Comments to applicant |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review revised plan |  |  | 2.00 |  |  |  |  | 2.00 |  |  |  |
| Resolve issues |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.00 |  |  |  |
| Write staff report |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare for Planning Commission |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare signs |  |  |  | 0.37 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Take photos |  |  |  | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community Plans review |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.11 |  |  |
| Public Works Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 19.09 |  |
| Public Works Traffic Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 14.53 |  |
| Prepare for slide show |  |  | 0.25 | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slide show (5 division planners) | 0.50 | 0.50 | 2.50 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall staff and applicant coordination | 0.50 | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC agenda |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.41 |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC consent agenda and Asst Director notes |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |  |
| Mail MPC meeting packets |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare newspaper ad |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare labels and folders |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |
| Pull addresses from zone change folders for letters |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |  |
| MPC meeting (Estimated 50\% on consent agenda) | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.25 |
| MPC meeting minutes |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare action agenda after MPC meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare file for Metro Council |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare maps for signs |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Post signs |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meeting between Planner III and Planner I |  | 0.25 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| File check |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |
| Corrections to Council Bill (40\% of cases) |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rework Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.64 |  |  |  |  |
| Recheck Counci Bill |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reword Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |  |
| Review Council Bill | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare report for second reading |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare and send public notices |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| Mail bill copies to Council Members |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Attend P\&Z Committee meeting | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare report for P\&Z Committee |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |
| LIS update | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total Hours | 2.33 | 2.66 | 14.75 | 5.96 | 0.00 | 1.08 | 4.38 | 7.00 | 1.78 | 33.62 | 1.08 |


| Average Direct Labor Hours per Subdivision Preliminary Plat Revision |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | MII | PIII | P | PT | OSI | OSII | SIII | CP | PW | AD |
| Receive at front counter |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Completeness check and enter database |  |  |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare map |  |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare list for notices to adjacent property owners |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Preliminary review |  |  | 1.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| PRC meeting (5 division planners \& 2 community planners) | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.85 | 0.17 |  |  |  | 0.34 |  | 0.17 |
| Follow up on PRC comments |  |  | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| In-depth review |  |  | 1.00 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| DRC meeting (5 division planners) | 0.17 | 0.17 | 0.85 | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  | 0.17 |
| Compile comments and send to applicant |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Review revised plans |  |  | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Distribute plans to agencies |  |  | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Resolve issues |  |  | 1.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Write staff report |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Take photos |  |  |  | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Community Plans review |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 1.11 |  |  |
| Public Works Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.90 |  |
| Public Works Traffic Engineering review and analysis |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 2.06 |  |
| Prepare for slide show |  |  | 0.25 | 0.35 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Slide show (5 division planners) | 0.25 | 0.25 | 1.25 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Overall staff and applicant coordination | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC agenda |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  | 0.41 |  |  |  |
| Prepare MPC consent agenda and Asst Director notes |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.09 |  |  |  |
| Mail MPC meeting packets |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare newspaper ad |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Prepare labels and folders |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| Pull addresses from zone change folders for letters |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.02 |  |  |  |
| MPC meeting (Estimated 15\% on consent agenda) | 0.33 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.33 |
| MPC meeting minutes |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare action agenda after MPC meeting |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.03 |  |  |  |
| Prepare file for Metro Council |  |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Meeting between Planner III and Planner I |  | 0.25 | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Post signs |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Check file |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.75 |  |  |  |
| Corrections to Council Bill |  | 0.25 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Rework Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.64 |  |  |  |
| Recheck Counci Bill |  | 0.07 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Reword Council Bill |  |  |  |  |  |  | 0.42 |  |  |  |
| Review Council Bill | 0.17 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare report for second reading |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare and send public notices |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |
| Mail bill copies to Council Members |  |  |  |  |  | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |
| Attend P\&Z Committee meeting | 0.08 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Prepare report for P\&Z Committee |  |  |  |  |  | 0.50 |  |  |  |  |
| LIS update | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.19 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total Hours | 1.67 | 1.41 | 9.36 | 4.68 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 4.38 | 1.45 | 4.96 | 0.67 |
|  | 1.67 | 1.41 | 9.36 | 4.68 | 1.00 | 1.08 | 4.38 | 1.45 | 4.96 | 0.67 |


| Average Direct Labor Hours per Bond for Final Plat |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | :--- |
| Obtain bond amounts from other Metro agencies | OSI | 0.25 |
| Provide bond amounts based on project costs | PW Engr | 2.00 |
| Obtain file from planner and ensure that all approvals have been made | OSI | 0.08 |
| Obtain bond application and fee from applicant | OSI | 0.08 |
| Calculate bond amount and write letters to applicant \& financial institutions | OSI | 0.25 |
| If letter of credit, send guidelines; otherwise draft performance agreement | OSI | 0.30 |
| Resolve issues | OSI | 1.00 |
| Put packet together and have notorized | OSI | 0.17 |
| Attach bond to performance agreement with corporate resolution | OSI | 0.25 |
| Send packet to Legal Department | OSI | 0.08 |
| Enter data into database | OSI | 0.25 |
| Let planner know when bond is returned from Legal | OSI | 0.08 |
| Total |  | 4.79 |


| Average Direct Labor Hours per Bond Reduction, Extension or Release Agreement |  |  |
| :--- | :--- | ---: |
| Obtain bond amounts from other Metro agencies | OSI | 0.25 |
| Provide bond amounts based on project costs | PW Engr | 1.00 |
| Generate letter for revised amount | OSI | 0.33 |
| Obtain file from planner and ensure that all approvals have been made | OSI | 0.08 |
| Obtain bond application and fee from applicant | OSI | 0.08 |
| Resolve issues | OSI | 0.75 |
| Calculate bond amount and write letters to applicant \& financial institutions | OSI | 0.25 |
| Enter data into database | OSI | 0.25 |
| File in safe | OSI | 0.08 |
| Total |  | 3.07 |


| Average Direct Labor Hours for Other Type Submissions |  |  |  |  |
| :--- | ---: | ---: | ---: | ---: |
|  |  |  |  | Commumity |
|  | Planner III | Planner | Planning Tech | Planner |
| Critical Lot Plan |  |  | 0.33 |  |
| Zoning Information Letter |  |  | 0.50 |  |
| Amendments to Subdivision Plan | 12 |  |  |  |
| Deferral |  |  | 2 |  |
| Subarea Plan Amendment |  |  |  |  |

Preliminary PUDs

|  |  |  |  |  | 4.2.85 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 12-Dec-02: Dl ( $10-0-0)$ | 2002P-008G-06 |  | Prelim | 126.72 |
| 2 | 14-Nov-02 $\times(6-1-0)$ | 2002P-006G-14 | BL2002-1270 | Prelim | 223.57 |
| 3 | 14-Nov-02 AWC (8-0-0) | 2002P-007U-10 | BL2002-1257 | Prelim | 0.9 |
| 4 | 14-Nov-02 A (8-0-0) | 2002P-005U-10 | BL2002-1266 | Prelim | 2.06 |
| 5 | 14-Nov-02 AWC (8-0-0) | 2002P-002G-02 | BL2002-1081 | Prelim | 6.26 |

Totai: 5

Revision to Preliminary PUDs


Amended Preliminary PUDs

|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 11/14/2002:AWC (7-1-0) | 95P-019G-13 | BL2002-1259 | Amend Pre! |  |
| 2 | 11/14/2002 AWC (8-0-0) | $61-85-\mathrm{P}-13$ | BL2002-1264 | Armend Prel | 8.36 |

Total: 2
Final PUDs

|  |  |  | W, | WEWMAF | M |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 5/8/2003 A (8-0-0) | 2001 UD-001G-12 | BL2001-671 | Final | - 8.9 |
| 2 | 3/27/2003 AWC (9-0-0) | 2002P-007U-10 | BL2002-1257 | Final | 0.9 |
| 3 | 12/12/2002 AWC ( $10-0-0$ ) | 88P-009G-12 |  | Final | 4.26 |
| 4 | 12/12/2002 AWC (10-0-0) | 9-77-U-12 |  | Final | 7.32 |
| 5 | $1212 / 2002$ AWC ( $10-0-0$ ) | 93P-023G-14 |  | Final | 0.87 |
| 6 | 12/12/2002 | 191-72-G-14 |  | Final | 1.56 |

PUD Applications for 2003 Fiscal Year

| 7 | 12/12/2002 AWC ( $10-0-0)$ | 18-86P-14 |  | Final | 0.5 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 8 | 11/14/2002 AWC (8-0-0) | 2002P-004G-04 | BL2002-1158 | Final | 3.59 |
| 9 | 10/24/2002 | 102-86-P-06 |  | Final | 9.77 |
| 10 | 10/10/2002 AWC ( $7-0-0$ ) | 27-87-P-03 |  | Final | 8.49 |
| 11 | 10/10/2002 AWC ( $7-0-0$ ) | 2000P-005G-06 | BL2002-1085 | Final | 6.64 |
| 12 | 10/10/2002 AEC ( $7-0-0$ ) | 88P-009G-12 |  | Final | 7.6 |
| 13 | 10/10/2002 AWC (7-0-0) | 98P-002G-13 |  | Final | 25.04 |
| 14 | 10/10/2002 AWC ( $7-0-0$ ) | 235-84-G-04 | BL2002-1100 | Final | 44.7 |
| 15 | 9/12/2002 Admin | 111.79-G-13 |  | Final | 13.4 |
| 16 | $9 / 12 / 2002$ AWC ( $7-0-0$ ) | 36-76-G-14 |  | Final | 5 |
| 17 | 8/22/2002 A (9-0-0) | 210-73-G-14 | BL2002-1003 | Final | 1.44 |
| 18 | 8/22/2002 A (9-0-0) | 74-79-G-13 |  | Final | 5.19 |
| 19 | 8/22/2002A $(9-0-0)$ | 84-87-P-13 |  | Final | 13.72 |
| 20 | 8/22/2002 AWC (9-0-0) | 74-79-G-13 |  | Final | 2.423 |

Revision to Final PUDs


## Cancelled PUDs

|  |  | ACHITJ? |  | Clume | RE6ACf | ACREE |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 | 10/10/2002 | A ( $7-0-0$ ) | $88 \mathrm{P}-023 \mathrm{G}-03$ | BL2002-1229 | Cancel PUD | 22.97 |
| 2 | 8/22/2002 | Withdrawn | 96P-007G-12 |  | Cancel | 4.14 |

Revised Preliminary and Approved Final PUDs


Total PUD Applications: 55

## Community Plans Section

Two Planner III: Includes time spent in PRC meetings which entails an average of two people each spending approximately 20 minutes for preliminary PUD and urban design overlay application; 10 minutes for each zone change request, preliminary plat and final plat submission; and 5 minutes for each final plat submission.

Transportation Planner: Spends an average of 6 hours a month for Preliminary PUD and preliminary plats for 72 hours a year for 30 preliminary PUD and 73 preliminary plat submissions. This equates to .70 hours or 42 minutes per submission.

Planner II: Spends an average of one hour of work for each sub-area plan sold and approximately one-half hour work for each neighborhood plan sold.

Planner I: Spends an average of 3.5 hours a month for Preliminary PUD and preliminary plats for 72 hours a year for 30 preliminary PUD and 73 preliminary plat submissions. This equates to .41 hours or 42 minutes per submission.

The following table summarizes the average Community Plans Section workhours for planning and zoning activities.

| Community Plans Current Planning Hours |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Prelim | Final | Prelim | Final | Zone | Urban | Sub-area | Neigh | Prelim | Final |
|  | Plat | Plat | PUD | PUD | Change | Overlay | Plan | Plan | Plat Rev | Plat Rev |
| Planner III | 0.34 | 0.17 | 0.67 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 0.67 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.34 | 0.08 |
| Planner II | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.50 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Transportation Planner | 0.70 | 0.00 | 0.70 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.70 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.70 | 0.00 |
| Planner I | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.41 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.41 | 0.00 |
| Total | 1.45 | 0.17 | 1.78 | 0.34 | 0.34 | 1.78 | 1.00 | 0.50 | 1.45 | 0.08 |

## ATTACHMENT C

## PUBLIC WORKS <br> DEPARTMENT TASK \& TIME ANALYSIS

## Public Works Hours Spent on Planning Commission Service Areas

Note: Employees have an average of 1800 available work hours per year after making an allowance for sick leave, vacation, holiday and training hours.

## Public Works Engineering Consultant Services

## EIT

Subdivision Projects: 19.5\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 351 hours. On the average, preliminary plats are twice as labor intensive as final plats. Letting " $2 x$ " represent preliminary plats and " $x$ " represent final plats, the respective comparative unit of service workloads for the these two service areas (with a total of 73 preliminary and 385 final plats per year) is solved by the following formula:
$73(2 x)+385 x=351$ hours with results of 1.32 hours per preliminary plat and .66 hours per final plat.

PUD Projects: 19.5\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 351 hours. On the average, preliminary PUDs are twice as labor intensive as final PUDs. Letting " $2 x$ " represent preliminary PUDs and " $x$ " represent final PUDs, the respective comparative unit of service workloads for the these two service areas (with a total of 30 preliminary and 25 final PUDs per year) is solved by the following formula: $30(2 x)+25 x=351$ hours with results of 8.26 hours per preliminary PUD and 4.13 hours per final PUD.

Zone Change Requests: 1\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 18 hours. 18 hours divided by 163 zone change requests equates to an average of .11 hours per request.

## Technical Specialist II

Subdivision Projects: 14.5\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 261 hours. On the average, preliminary plats are twice as labor intensive as final plats. Letting " $2 x$ " represent preliminary plats and " $x$ " represent final plats, the respective comparative unit of service workloads for the these two service areas (with a total of 73 preliminary and 385 final plats per year) is solved by the following formula: $73(2 x)+385 x=261$ hours with results of .98 hours per preliminary plat and .49 hours per final plat.

PUD Projects: 14.5\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 261 hours. On the average, preliminary PUDs are twice as labor intensive as final PUDs. Letting " $2 x$ " represent preliminary PUDs and " $x$ " represent final PUDs, the respective comparative unit of service workloads for the these two service areas (with a total of 30 preliminary and 25 final PUDs per year) is solved by the following formula:
$30(2 x)+25 x=261$ hours with results of 6.14 hours per preliminary PUD and 3.07 hours per final PUD.

Zone Change Requests: 1\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 18 hours. 18 hours divided by 163 zone change requests equates to an average of .11 hours per request.

## Engineer III

Subdivision Projects: 6.67\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 120 hours. On the average, preliminary plats are three times as labor intensive as final plats. Letting " $3 x$ " represent preliminary plats and " $x$ " represent final plats, the respective comparative unit of service workloads for the these two service areas (with a total of 73 preliminary and 385 final plats per year) is solved by the following formula: $73(3 x)+385 x=120$ hours with results of .6 hours per preliminary plat and .2 hours per final plat.

PUD Projects: $10 \%$ of available hours times 1800 hours equals 180 hours.
On the average, preliminary PUDs are three times as labor intensive as final PUDs.
Letting " $3 x$ " represent preliminary PUDs and " $x$ " represent final PUDs, the respective comparative unit of service workloads for the these two service areas (with a total of 30 preliminary and 25 final PUDs per year) is solved by the following formula:
$30(3 x)+25 x=180$ hours with results of 4.69 hours per preliminary PUD and 1.57 hours per final PUD.

Zone Change Requests: 3.33\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 60 hours. 60 hours divided by 163 zone change requests equates to an average of .37 hours per request.

## Technical Specialist I

Subdivision Final Plat Bonds: Spends approximately two hours reviewing the application and providing project cost data and other information regarding the project.

Subdivision Final Plat Bond Releases, Reductions and Extensions: Spends approximately one hour reviewing the application and providing project cost data and other information regarding the project.

## Engineering Tech III

Mandatory Referrals: Spends approximately 10 minutes for mandatory referrals regarding property abandonment and 20 minutes for other mandatory referrals.

## Technical Specialist II

Mandatory Referrals: Spends an average of 2.5 hours for mandatory referrals involving encroachment on metro property or right-of-way.

## Public Works Traffic Engineering

## Engineer I

Subdivision Projects: 21\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 378 hours. An estimated 66 new and 7 revised preliminary plat applications are submitted per year and an estimated 289 new and 96 revised final plat applications are submitted per year.
On the average, preliminary plats are twice as labor intensive as final plats and preliminary and final plat revisions take approximately $75 \%$ as much time to review and analyze as the initial submissions.
Letting " 2 x " represent preliminary plats, " x " represent final plats, " 1.5 x " represent preliminary plat revisions, and .75 x represent final plat revisions, the respective comparative unit of service workloads for the these service areas is solved by the following formula:
$66(2 x)+289(x)+7(1.5 x)+96(.75 x)=378$ hours with results of 1.5 hours per preliminary plat and .75 hours per final plat and 1.13 hours per preliminary plat revision and .56 hours per final plat revision.

PUD Projects: 21\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 378 hours.
On the average, preliminary PUDs are twice as labor intensive as final PUDs.
Letting " 2 x " represent preliminary PUDs and " x " represent final PUDs, the respective comparative unit of service workloads for the these two service areas (with a total of 30 preliminary and 25 final PUDs per year) is solved by the following formula:
$30(2 x)+25 x=378$ hours with results of 8.9 hours per preliminary PUD and 4.45 hours per final PUD.

Zone Change Requests: 21\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 378 hours. 378 hours divided by 163 zone change requests equates to an average of 2.32 hours per request.

## EIT

Subdivision Projects: 12.5\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 225 hours. On the average, preliminary plats are twice as labor intensive as final plats. Using the same formula as for the Engineer I position and equating the workload to 225 hours results in .9 hours per preliminary plat, .45 hours per final plat, .68 hours per preliminary plat revision and .34 hours per final plat revision.

PUD Projects: 12.5\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 225 hours. On the average, preliminary PUDs are twice as labor intensive as final PUDs. Letting " 2 x " represent preliminary PUDs and " x " represent final PUDs, the respective comparative unit of service workloads for the these two service areas (with a total of 30 preliminary and 25 final PUDs per year) is solved by the following formula:
$30(2 x)+25 x=225$ hours with results of 5.3 hours per preliminary PUD and 2.65 hours per final PUD.

Zone Change Requests: 25\% of available hours times 1800 hours equals 450 hours. 450 hours divided by 163 zone change requests equates to an average of 2.76 hours per request.

## Transportation Manager

The Transportation Manager spends approximately 15 minutes per preliminary plat, 10 minutes per final plat, 20 minutes per preliminary PUD, 10 minutes per final PUD, 16 minutes per zone change request, and one hour per mandatory referral pertaining to abandonment of Metro property.

## Administrative Assistant

Spends approximately 45 minutes per mandatory referral pertaining to abandonment of Metro property.

## Engineer III

Spends approximately two hours per mandatory referral pertaining to abandonment of Metro property.

## Engineer Tech III

Spends approximately one hour per mandatory referral pertaining to abandonment of Metro property.

The following tables provide a summary of hours per unit of service spent by Public Works staff:

| Summary of Public Work Planning and Zoning Related Work Hours |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Preliminary | Final | Preliminary | Final | Zone | Plat | Bond Releasel |
|  | Plat | Plat | PUD | PUD | Change | Bond | Reduction/ |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  | Extension |
| Engineering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| EIT | 1.32 | 0.66 | 8.26 | 4.13 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Technical Specialist II | 0.98 | 0.49 | 6.14 | 3.07 | 0.11 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Engineer III | 0.60 | 0.20 | 4.69 | 1.57 | 0.37 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Technical Specialist I | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 1.00 |
| Total | 2.90 | 1.35 | 19.09 | 8.77 | 0.59 | 2.00 | 1.00 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Engineering |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transportation Manager | 0.25 | 0.17 | 0.33 | 0.17 | 0.26 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Engineer I | 1.50 | 0.75 | 8.90 | 4.45 | 2.32 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| EIT | 0.90 | 0.45 | 5.30 | $\underline{2.65}$ | $\underline{2.76}$ | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total | 2.65 | 1.37 | 14.53 | 7.27 | 5.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 |


| Summary of Public Work Planning and Zoning Related Work Hours |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Preliminary | Final | Mandatory | Mandatory | Other |
|  | Plat | Plat | Referral for | Referral for | Mandatory |
|  | Revision | Revision | Abandonment | Encroachment | Referral |
| Engineering |  |  |  |  |  |
| EIT | 1.32 | 0.66 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Technical Specialist II | 0.98 | 0.49 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Engineer III | 0.60 | 0.20 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Technical Specialist I | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Engineer Tech III | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.33 | 0.17 | 0.33 |
| Technical Specialist II | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.50 | 0.00 |
| Total | 2.90 | 1.35 | 0.33 | 2.67 | 0.33 |
|  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Traffic Engineering |  |  |  |  |  |
| Transportation Manager | 0.25 | 0.17 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Engineer I | 1.13 | 0.56 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| EIT | 0.68 | 0.34 | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Admin Assistant | 0.00 | 0.00 | 0.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Engineer III | 0.00 | 0.00 | 2.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Engineer Tech III | 0.00 | 0.00 | 1.00 | 0.00 | 0.00 |
| Total | 2.06 | 1.07 | 4.75 | 0.00 | 0.00 |

## ATTACHMENT D

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT PLANNING DIVISION DETAILED COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS



[^0]


2004
Metro Planning Department
Planning

|  |  |  | Fee \＃8 | Fee \＃9 | Fee \＃10 | Fee \＃11 | Fee \＃12 | Fee \＃13 | Fee \＃14 | Fee \＃15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Subdivision Reg Amendment | Critical Lot Plan | Official Zoning Letter | Final Subdivision Plat Revision | Subarea Plan | Neighborhood Plan | Zoning Reg Text Amendment | Urban Design Overlay |
| Employee Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asst Dir／Planning MGR II |  | Hours／Unit | 0.500 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.410 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 2.080 | 3.410 |
| \％Utilized | 100．00\％ | Direct Cost／Unit \＄ | 23 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 154 |
| Hrs Utilized | 3，060．0 | Hours＠Demand | 1.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 39.360 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 2.080 | 17.050 |
| Total Hrs | 3，060．000 | Proration Base（Hrs） | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Salary \＄ | 138，582 | Prorated Cost \＄ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost／Hr \＄ | 45.29 | Dir＋Prorated \＄／Unit | 23 | 0 | 0 | 19 | 0 | 0 | 94 | 154 |
| Current Planner III |  | Hours／Unit | 12.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.370 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.530 | 2.660 |
| \％Utilized | 100．00\％ | Direct Cost／Unit \＄ | 387 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 86 |
| Hrs Utilized | 1，440．0 | Hours＠Demand | 24.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 35.520 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.530 | 13.300 |
| Total Hrs | 1，440．000 | Proration Base（Hrs） | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Salary \＄ | 46，448 | Prorated Cost \＄ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost／Hr \＄ | 32.26 | Dir＋Prorated \＄／Unit | 387 | 0 | 0 | 12 | 0 | 0 | 49 | 86 |
| Current Planners |  | Hours／Unit | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 2.090 | 0.020 | 0.020 | 8.200 | 14.750 |
| \％Utilized | 100．00\％ | Direct Cost／Unit \＄ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 350 |
| Hrs Utilized | 7，920．0 | Hours＠Demand | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 200.640 | 5.000 | 0.800 | 8.200 | 73.750 |
| Total Hrs | 7，920．000 | Proration Base（Hrs） | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Salary \＄ | 187，918 | Prorated Cost \＄ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost／Hr \＄ | 23.73 | Dir＋Prorated \＄／Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 50 | 0 | 0 | 195 | 350 |
| Current Planning Tech |  | Hours／Unit | 0.000 | 0.500 | 0.330 | 2.330 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 5.210 | 5.960 |
| \％Utilized | 100．00\％ | Direct Cost／Unit \＄ | 0 | 9 | 6 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 106 |
| Hrs Utilized | 4，680．0 | Hours＠Demand | 0.000 | 125.000 | 59.400 | 223.680 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 5.210 | 29.800 |
| Total Hrs | 4，680．000 | Proration Base（Hrs） | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Salary \＄ | 83，626 | Prorated Cost \＄ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost／Hr \＄ | 17.87 | Dir＋Prorated \＄／Unit | 0 | 9 | 6 | 42 | 0 | 0 | 93 | 106 |
| Office Support Rep |  | Hours／Unit | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.500 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.680 | 1.080 |
| \％Utilized | 100．00\％ | Direct Cost／Unit \＄ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 14 |
| Hrs Utilized | 3，060．0 | Hours＠Demand | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 48.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.680 | 5.400 |
| Total Hrs | 3，060．000 | Proration Base（Hrs） | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Salary \＄ | 38，607 | Prorated Cost \＄ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost／Hr \＄ | 12.62 | Dir＋Prorated \＄／Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 6 | 0 | 0 | 21 | 14 |



|  |  | Fee \#8 | Fee \#9 | Fee \#10 | Fee \#11 | Fee \#12 | Fee \#13 | Fee \#14 | Fee \#15 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | Subdivision Reg Amendment | Critical Lot Plan | Official Zoning Letter | Final Subdivision Plat Revision | Subarea Plan | Neighborhood Plan | Zoning Reg Text Amendment | Urban Design Overlay |
|  | Hours/Unit | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 7.000 |
| 100.00\% | Direct Cost/Unit \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 239 |
| 3,240.0 | Hours @ Demand | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 35.000 |
| 3,240.000 | Proration Base (Hrs) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 110,721 | Prorated Cost \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 34.17 | Dir+Prorated \$/Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 239 |
|  | Hours/Unit | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 100.00\% | Direct Cost/Unit \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 10,260.0 | Hours @ Demand | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 10,260.000 | Proration Base (Hrs) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| 201,288 | Prorated Cost \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 19.62 | Dir+Prorated $\$ /$ Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 40,860 | Direct Cost/Unit \$ | 410 | 9 | 6 | 131 | 34 | 17 | 552 | 1,063 |
| 100.00\% | Unit Demand | 2.0 | 250.0 | 180.0 | 96.0 | 250.0 | 40.0 | 1.0 | 5.0 |
| 40,860.0 | Direct \$ @ Demand | 819 | 2,234 | 1,061 | 12,594 | 8,505 | 690 | 552 | 5,313 |
| 40,860 | Add'l Prorate \$/Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| 1,026,200 | Total Dir+Pro \$/Unit | 410 | 9 | 6 | 131 | 34 | 17 | 552 | 1,063 |
| 25.12 | Ttl Dir+Pro@Demand | 819 | 2,234 | 1,061 | 12,594 | 8,505 | 690 | 552 | 5,313 |

2004
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|  |  |  | Fee \#16 | Fee \#17 | Fee \#18 | Fee \#19 | Fee \#20 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Public Hearing Signs | Final Plat Bond | Bond Release/Reduction | Preliminary Subdivision Plat Revision | Non-User Fee Activities |
| Employee Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Asst Dir/Planning MGR ॥ |  | Hours/Unit | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 2.340 | 128.270 |
| \% Utilized | 100.00\% | Direct Cost/Unit \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 5,809 |
| Hrs Utilized | 3,060.0 | Hours @ Demand | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 16.380 | 128.270 |
| Total Hrs | 3,060.000 | Proration Base (Hrs) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Salary \$ | 138,582 | Prorated Cost \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost/Hr \$ | 45.29 | Dir+Prorated \$/Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 106 | 5,809 |
| Current Planner III |  | Hours/Unit | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 1.410 | 203.030 |
| \% Utilized | 100.00\% | Direct Cost/Unit \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 6,549 |
| Hrs Utilized | 1,440.0 | Hours @ Demand | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 9.870 | 203.030 |
| Total Hrs | 1,440.000 | Proration Base (Hrs) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Salary \$ | 46,448 | Prorated Cost \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost/Hr \$ | 32.26 | Dir+Prorated \$/Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 45 | 6,549 |
| Current Planners |  | Hours/Unit | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 9.360 | 3,149.920 |
| \% Utilized | 100.00\% | Direct Cost/Unit \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 222 | 74,738 |
| Hrs Utilized | 7,920.0 | Hours @ Demand | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 65.520 | 3149.920 |
| Total Hrs | 7,920.000 | Proration Base (Hrs) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Salary \$ | 187,918 | Prorated Cost \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost/Hr \$ | 23.73 | Dir+Prorated \$/Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 222 | 74,738 |
| Current Planning Tech |  | Hours/Unit | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 4.680 | 1,777.210 |
| \% Utilized | 100.00\% | Direct Cost/Unit \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 31,757 |
| Hrs Utilized | 4,680.0 | Hours @ Demand | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 32.760 | 1777.210 |
| Total Hrs | 4,680.000 | Proration Base (Hrs) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Salary \$ | 83,626 | Prorated Cost \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost/Hr \$ | 17.87 | Dir+Prorated \$/Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 84 | 31,757 |
| Office Support Rep |  | Hours/Unit | 0.000 | 2.790 | 2.070 | 2.080 | 887.300 |
| \% Utilized | 100.00\% | Direct Cost/Unit \$ | 0 | 35 | 26 | 26 | 11,195 |
| Hrs Utilized | 3,060.0 | Hours @ Demand | 0.000 | 446.400 | 207.000 | 14.560 | 887.300 |
| Total Hrs | 3,060.000 | Proration Base (Hrs) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Salary \$ | 38,607 | Prorated Cost \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost/Hr \$ | 12.62 | Dir+Prorated \$/Unit | 0 | 35 | 26 | 26 | 11,195 |
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| $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \text { H } \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\otimes} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |


| $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{9}{\#} \\ & \underset{4}{\otimes} \\ & \stackrel{4}{4} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\underset{\sim}{2}$ | $\left\lvert\, \begin{array}{lll} \circ \\ \underset{\sim}{\circ} \\ \underset{\sim}{\circ} \\ \underset{\sim}{\circ} & \circ \\ \hline 0 \end{array}\right.$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\infty}{\#} \\ & \stackrel{+}{\otimes} \\ & \stackrel{\otimes}{4} \end{aligned}$ |  | $0$ |  |

Fee \#17
Final Plat Bond





Nashville/Davidson County
Departmental Labor Distribution





Fee \#16

## Public Hearing Signs



|  | Hours/Unit |
| ---: | :--- |
| $100.00 \%$ | Direct Cost/Unit \$ |
| $1,800.0$ | Hours @ Demand |
| $1,800.000$ | Proration Base (Hrs) |
| 37,765 | Prorated Cost \$ |
| 20.98 | Dir+Prorated \$/Unit |

Hours/Unit




|  |
| :---: |
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2004 Panning Department Planning

## Salary \$ Wages

Distribution \% Benefits
Total Direct Labor: Services \& Supplies
Flight Services
Public Hearing Signs
Printing
Advertisiing \& Promotion
Host \& Hostess
Metro Postal Charges
Office \& Admin Supplies
Miscellaneous

[^1] G \& A Distribution
: sisos letuaurudaa |ełol Agency Overhead

| $\begin{aligned} & \text { H } \\ & \text { \# } \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{*} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \widetilde{e} \\ & \text { N } \\ & \text { On } \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{y}{*} \\ & - \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N̈ } \\ & \underset{\sim}{*} \end{aligned}$ |  |  |  | $\underset{\sim}{N}$ | 여: 영 |  | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{0}{n} \\ & \stackrel{-}{\infty} \end{aligned}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | ¢ | oे O O | ¢ | $\bigcirc$ | 영ㅇㅇㅇㅇ | O <br> 8 <br> 0 | ¢ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \text { On } \\ & \text { N} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | 영 | 영 | O |



| $\begin{aligned} & \underset{H}{\#} \\ & \stackrel{+}{\otimes} \\ & \stackrel{\otimes}{*} \end{aligned}$ |  | N N্囚 | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ & \text { O. } \\ & 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{O}{\sharp} \\ & \underset{\leftrightarrow}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { oे̀ } \\ & \text { ó } \end{aligned}$ | $\stackrel{\infty}{\infty}$ | $\underset{\leftrightarrow}{\underset{\leftrightarrow}{m}}$ | O:O |  |  | \＆ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |



| $$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \infty \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\infty}{\infty} \\ & \hline 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \sim_{N}^{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{N} \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ \text { ö } \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \circ \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\oplus} \\ & \stackrel{y}{*} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \text { i } \\ & \underset{甘}{2} \end{aligned}$ | O: O |  | $\begin{gathered} \mathbb{N} \\ \underset{\sim}{\infty} \\ \underset{\sim}{n} \end{gathered}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | $\stackrel{\text { Ǹ }}{\underset{\sim}{N}}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\infty}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \underset{\sim}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N} \\ & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\leftrightarrow} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \\ \stackrel{\sim}{\mathrm{~N}} \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{gathered} \underset{\sim}{N} \\ \underset{\leftrightarrow}{\oplus} \end{gathered}$ |  | 间: O | $\begin{gathered} \text { Ni: } \\ \text { N్ } \\ \text { N } \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \\ \vdots \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathrm{N} \\ & \underset{\aleph}{N} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ |


|  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { R } \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & 0 \\ & \Theta 0 \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { ஃे } \\ & \infty \\ & \infty \\ & \text { ó } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{N}{N} \\ \underset{\leftrightarrow}{*} \end{gathered}$ |  |  | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{y}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{\circ}{\circ} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\circ}{0} \\ & \underset{\oplus}{*} \end{aligned}$ | N N 内． － | O: | N: $\mathfrak{A l}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{N} \\ & \underset{\sim}{\aleph} \\ & \underset{\leftrightarrow}{2} \end{aligned}$ | ¢ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\begin{aligned} & \vec{H} \\ & \text { \# } \\ & \stackrel{\otimes}{\Psi} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \stackrel{0}{N} \\ & \underset{\leftrightarrow}{*} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{N}} \\ & \underset{\sim}{n} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \infty \\ & \stackrel{\sim}{\infty} \\ & \underset{\leftrightarrow}{2} \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { No } \\ & \stackrel{0}{\circ} \\ & \stackrel{0}{\Theta} \end{aligned}$ |  | $\begin{gathered} \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\circ} \\ \stackrel{\rightharpoonup}{\mathrm{j}} \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \underset{\sim}{0} \\ & \text { N } \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & \text { O} \\ & \stackrel{0}{0} \\ & \underset{\leftrightarrow}{n} \end{aligned}$ | Oi: |  | $\begin{aligned} & \text { N } \\ & \\ & \end{aligned}$ | ® ® N |



2004 Metro Planning Department
Planning

| Salary \＄Wages | \＄1，026，200 |
| :---: | :---: |
| Distribution \％ | 100．000\％ |
| Benefits | \＄269，600 |
| Total Direct Labor： | \＄1，295，800 |
| Services \＆Supplies |  |
| Flight Services | \＄7，500 |
| Public Hearing Signs | \＄20，628 |
| Printing | \＄9，500 |
| Advertisiing \＆Promotion | \＄9，500 |
| Host \＆Hostess | \＄8，500 |
| Metro Postal Charges | \＄22，400 |
| Office \＆Admin Supplies | \＄15，600 |
| Miscellaneous | \＄12，272 |
|  | \＄105，900 |
| G \＆A Distribution \％ | 100．000\％ |
| G \＆A Distribution |  |
| Total Departmental Costs ： | \＄1，401，700 |
| Agency Overhead | \＄0 |
|  | \＄0 |
| Central Overhead | \＄256，699 |
|  | \＄256，699 |
| Total Central Svcs Costs： | \＄256，699 |
| Grand Totals： | \＄1，658，399 |

## ATTACHMENT E

## PLANNING DEPARTMENT OPERATIONS DIVISION DETAILED COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS
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\begin{array}{llllll}
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| 2004 <br> Metro Planning Department Operations |  | Nashville/Davidson County Departmental Labor Distribution |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Fee \#8 | Fee \#9 | Fee \#10 | Fee \#11 | Fee \#12 | Fee \#13 |
|  |  |  | Customized Map | Distribution License | Annual License Update | Site Plan Map | Coutywide Zoning Map | Non-User Fee Activities |
| Employee Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Application Development |  | Hours/Unit | 1.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 5,852.000 |
| \% Utilized | 100.00\% | Direct Cost/Unit \$ | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137,793 |
| Hrs Utilized | 5,940.0 | Hours @ Demand | 88.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 5852.000 |
| Total Hrs | 5,940.000 | Proration Base (Hrs) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Salary \$ | 139,865 | Prorated Cost \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost/Hr \$ | 23.55 | Dir+Prorated \$/Unit | 24 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 137,793 |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positions | 21,960 | Direct Cost/Unit \$ | 24 | 98 | 24 | 6 | 3 | 310,130 |
| \% Avg Utilization | 100.00\% | Unit Demand | 88.0 | 4.0 | 4.0 | 89.0 | 1.0 | 1.0 |
| Hrs @ Demand | 21,960.0 | Direct \$ @ Demand | 2,072 | 391 | 96 | 512 | 3 | 310,130 |
| Totals Hours | 21,960 | Add'l Prorate \$/Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Salary | 501,400 | Total Dir+Pro \$/Unit | 24 | 98 | 24 | 6 | 3 | 310,130 |
| Avg Cost/Hr \$ | 22.83 | Ttl Dir+Pro@Demand | 2,072 | 391 | 96 | 512 | 3 | 310,130 |

Page: 1 of 2

|  |  |  | Fee \#1 | Fee \#2 | Fee \#3 | Fee \#4 | Fee \#5 | Fee \#6 | Fee \#7 | Fee \#8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | General \& Admin | Topo Map | $\begin{aligned} & \text { Property \& } \\ & \text { Zoning Map } \end{aligned}$ | Political Map | $11 \times 17$ Aerial | $36 \times 24$ Aerial | Historical Aerial Blueprint | GIS Map Tile | Customized Map |
| Salary \$ Wages | \$501,400 | \$177,610 | \$1,318 | \$2,142 | \$189 | \$472 | \$712 | \$1,169 | \$4,583 | \$2,072 |
| Distribution \% | 100.000\% | 35.423\% | 0.263\% | 0.427\% | 0.038\% | 0.094\% | 0.142\% | 0.233\% | 0.914\% | 0.413\% |
| Benefits | \$143,200 | \$50,726 | \$377 | \$611 | \$54 | \$135 | \$203 | \$334 | \$1,309 | \$591 |
| Total Direct Labor: | \$644,600 | \$228,336 | \$1,695 | \$2,753 | \$243 | \$607 | \$915 | \$1,503 | \$5,892 | \$2,663 |
| Services \& Supplies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Software Consultant \& License | \$38,300 | \$13,567 | \$101 | \$164 | \$15 | \$36 | \$54 | \$89 | \$350 | \$158 |
| Travel | \$10,000 | \$3,542 | \$26 | \$43 | \$4 | \$9 | \$14 | \$23 | \$91 | \$41 |
| Postal, Delivery \& Misc | \$2,800 | \$992 | \$7 | \$12 | \$1 | \$3 | \$4 | \$7 | \$26 | \$12 |
| Registration | \$3,600 | \$1,275 | \$9 | \$15 | \$1 | \$3 | \$5 | \$8 | \$33 | \$15 |
| Repair \& Maintenance Services | \$7,800 | \$2,763 | \$21 | \$33 | \$3 | \$7 | \$11 | \$18 | \$71 | \$32 |
| Office \& Admin Supplies | \$8,800 | \$3,117 | \$23 | \$38 | \$3 | \$8 | \$12 | \$21 | \$80 | \$36 |
| $3 \%$ of GIS Development | \$2,447 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| 97\% of GIS Development | \$79,104 | \$28,021 | \$208. | \$338 | \$30 | \$74 | \$112 | \$184. | \$723 | \$327 |
|  | \$152,851 | \$53,277 | \$395 | \$643 | \$58 | \$141 | \$213 | \$350 | \$1,375 | \$621 |
| G \& A Distribution \% | 100.000\% |  | 0.397\% | 0.646\% | 0.058\% | 0.142\% | 0.214\% | 0.352\% | 1.381\% | 0.624\% |
| G \& A Distribution |  |  | 1,118 | 1,819 | \$163 | \$400 | \$603 | \$991 | \$3,889 | \$1,757 |
| Total Departmental Costs | \$797,451 |  | 1,513 | 2,462 | \$221 | \$541 | \$816 | \$1,341 | \$5,264 | \$2,378 |
| Agency Overhead | \$0 |  | \$0. | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0. | \$0. | \$0 |
|  | \$0 |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Central Overhead | \$163,483 |  | \$649. | \$1,056 | \$95 | \$232. | \$350 | \$575. | \$2,258 | \$1,020 |
|  | \$163,483 |  | \$649 | \$1,056 | \$95 | \$232 | \$350 | \$575 | \$2,258 | \$1,020 |
| Total Central Svcs Costs: | \$163,483 |  | \$649 | \$1,056 | \$95 | \$232 | \$350 | \$575 | \$2,258 | \$1,020 |
| Grand Totals: | \$960,934 |  | \$3,857 | \$6,271 | \$559 | \$1,380 | \$2,081 | \$3,419 | \$13,414 | \$6,061 |
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Nashville/Davidson County
Departmental Cost Distribution
Fee \#13
Non-User Fee

Fee \#12
Countywide


\% HT " 0


 Fee \#9
Distribution Operations

## ATTACHMENT F

## PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT CONSULTANT SERVICES DIVISION <br> DETAILED COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS
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|  |  |  | Fee \#8 | Fee \#9 | Fee \#10 | Fee \#11 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Mandatory Referral for Abandonment | Mandatory Referral for Encreachment | Other Mandatory Referral | Non-User Fee Activities |
| Employee Information |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Eng Tech III/Tech Spec II |  | Hours/Unit | 0.330 | 2.670 | 0.330 | 3,565.050 |
| \% Utilized | 100.00\% | Direct Cost/Unit \$ | 9 | 74 | 9 | 99,392 |
| Hrs Utilized | 3,600.0 | Hours @ Demand | 6.600 | 26.700 | 1.650 | 3565.050 |
| Total Hrs | 3,600.000 | Proration Base (Hrs) | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 |
| Salary \$ | 100,366 | Prorated Cost \$ | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Cost/Hr \$ | 27.88 | Dir+Prorated \$/Unit | 9 | 74 | 9 | 99,392 |
| Totals |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Positions | 23,400 | Direct Cost/Unit \$ | 9 | 74 | 9 | 552,719 |
| \% Avg Utilization | 100.00\% | Unit Demand | 20.0 | 10.0 | 5.0 | 1.0 |
| Hrs @ Demand | 23,400.0 | Direct \$ @ Demand | 184 | 744 | 46 | 552,719 |
| Totals Hours | 23,400 | Add'l Prorate \$/Unit | 0 | 0 | 0 | 0 |
| Salary | 617,000 | Total Dir+Pro \$/Unit | 9 | 74 | 9 | 552,719 |
| Avg Cost/Hr \$ | 26.37 | Ttl Dir+Pro@Demand | 184 | 744 | 46 | 552,719 |
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|  |  |  | Fee \#1 | Fee \#2 | Fee \#3 | Fee \#4 | Fee \#5 | Fee \#6 | Fee \#7 | Fee \#8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  | General \& Admin | Preliminary Plat | Final Plat | Preliminary PUD | Final PUD | Zone Change Request | Final Plat Bond | $\begin{array}{r} \text { Bond } \\ \text { Release/Reduct } \end{array}$ | Mandatory Referral for Abandonment |
| Salary \$ Wages | \$617,000 | \$0 | \$6,454 | \$15,406 | \$20,742 | \$6,596 | \$3,529 | \$8,060 | \$2,519 | \$184 |
| Distribution \% | 100.000\% | 0.000\% | 1.046\% | 2.497\% | 3.362\% | 1.069\% | 0.572\% | 1.306\% | 0.408\% | 0.030\% |
| Benefits | \$157,000 | \$0 | \$1,642 | \$3,920 | \$5,278 | \$1,678 | \$898 | \$2,050 | \$641 | \$47 |
| Total Direct Labor: | \$774,000 | \$0 | \$8,096 | \$19,326 | \$26,020 | \$8,274 | \$4,427 | \$10,110 | \$3,160 | \$231 |
|  | \$774,000 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Services \& Supplies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Out-of-town Travel | \$1,400 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Registration | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Repair \& Maintenance | \$1,000 | \$0 | \$10 | \$25 | \$34 | \$11 | \$6 | \$13 | \$4 | \$0 |
| Other Equipment Maintenance | \$1,300 | \$0 | \$14 | \$32 | \$44 | \$14 | \$7 | \$17 | \$5 | \$0 |
| Office \& Admin Supply | \$2,500 | \$0 | \$26 | \$62 | \$84 | \$27 | \$14 | \$33 | \$10 | \$1 |
| Professional Privilege Tax | \$1,100 | \$0 | \$12 | \$27 | \$37 | \$12 | \$6 | \$14 | \$4 | \$0 |
| Miscellaneous | \$2,800 | \$0 | \$29 | \$70 | \$94 | \$30 | \$16 | \$37 | \$11 | \$1 |
| Other Equipment Maintenance | \$3,600 | \$0. | \$0. | \$0. | \$0 | \$0. | \$0 | \$0 | \$0. | \$1 |
|  | \$15,200 | \$0 | \$91 | \$217 | \$293 | \$93 | \$50 | \$114 | \$35 | \$3 |
| G \& A Distribution \% | 100.000\% |  | 1.046\% | 2.497\% | 3.362\% | 1.069\% | 0.572\% | 1.306\% | 0.408\% | 0.022\% |
| G \& A Distribution |  |  | 0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Departmental Costs : | \$789,200 |  | 91 | 217 | \$293 | \$93 | \$50 | \$114 | \$35 | \$3 |
| Agency Overhead | \$0 |  | \$0. | \$0. | \$0 | \$0. | \$0 | \$0 | \$0. | \$0 |
|  | \$0 |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Central Overhead | \$383,404 |  | \$4,010 | \$9,574 | \$12,890 | \$4,099 | \$2,193 | \$5,007 | \$1,564 | \$84 |
|  | \$383,404 |  | \$4,010 | \$9,574 | \$12,890 | \$4,099 | \$2,193 | \$5,007 | \$1,564 | \$84 |
| Total Central Svcs Costs: | \$383,404 |  | \$4,010 | \$9,574 | \$12,890 | \$4,099 | \$2,193 | \$5,007 | \$1,564 | \$84 |
| Grand Totals: | \$1,172,604 |  | \$12,197 | \$29,117 | \$39,203 | \$12,466 | \$6,670 | \$15,231 | \$4,759 | \$318 |

2004
Public Works Department

| Fee <br> Title | Volume | Dir Labor |  | Dept'l Costs |  | Central Svcs Costs |  | Full Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gross | Unit | Total | Unit | Total | Unit | Total | Unit | Total |
| Preliminary Plat | 73.0 | \$110.90 | \$8,096.00 | \$1.24 | \$90.54 | \$54.93 | \$4,010.00 | \$167.08 | \$12,197 |
| Final Plat | 385.0 | \$50.20 | \$19,326.00 | \$0.56 | \$217.27 | \$24.87 | \$9,574.00 | \$75.63 | \$29,117 |
| Preliminary PUD | 35.0 | \$743.43 | \$26,020.00 | \$8.37 | \$292.87 | \$368.29 | \$12,890.00 | \$1,120.08 | \$39,203 |
| Final PUD | 25.0 | \$330.96 | \$8,274.00 | \$3.73 | \$93.31 | \$163.96 | \$4,099.00 | \$498.65 | \$12,466 |
| Zone Change Request | 163.0 | \$27.16 | \$4,427.00 | \$0.31 | \$50.04 | \$13.45 | \$2,193.00 | \$40.92 | \$6,670 |
| Final Plat Bond | 160.0 | \$63.19 | \$10,110.00 | \$0.71 | \$113.56 | \$31.29 | \$5,007.00 | \$95.19 | \$15,231 |
| Bond Release/Reduct | 100.0 | \$31.60 | \$3,160.00 | \$0.35 | \$35.42 | \$15.64 | \$1,564.00 | \$47.59 | \$4,759 |
| Mandatory Ref Aband | 20.0 | \$11.55 | \$231.00 | \$0.17 | \$3.31 | \$4.20 | \$84.00 | \$15.92 | \$318 |
| Mandatory Ref Encro | 10.0 | \$93.40 | \$934.00 | \$1.49 | \$14.93 | \$37.60 | \$376.00 | \$132.49 | \$1,325 |
| Other Mandatory Ref | 5.0 | \$11.40 | \$57.00 | \$0.07 | \$0.34 | \$1.60 | \$8.00 | \$13.07 | \$65 |
| Non-User Fee Activities | 1.0 | \$693,363.00 | \$693,363.00 | \$14,293.81 | \$14,293.81 | \$343,461.00 | \$343,461.00 | \$1,051,118 | \$1,051,118 |

Cost-Revenue Summary

## ATTACHMENT G

## PUBLIC WORKS DEPARTMENT TRAFFIC ENGINEERING DIVISION <br> DETAILED COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS
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## Nashville/Davidson County <br> 

Fee \#9
$\begin{array}{r}\text { Non-User Fee } \\ \text { Activities }\end{array}$


2004
Public Works Department
Traffic Engineering

$$
\begin{aligned}
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|  |  | General \& Admin | Fee \#1 | Fee \#2 | Fee \#3 | Fee \#4 | Fee \#5 | Fee \#6 | Fee \#7 | Fee \#8 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  |  |  | Preliminary Plat | Final Plat | Preliminary PUD | Final PUD | Zone Change Request | Preliminary Plat Revision | Final Plat Revision | Mandatory Referral for Abandonment |
| Salary \$ Wages | \$510,200 | \$0 | \$4,884 | \$11,312 | \$13,409 | \$4,795 | \$22,757 | \$411 | \$3,012 | \$3,513 |
| Distribution \% | 100.000\% | 0.000\% | 0.957\% | 2.217\% | 2.628\% | 0.940\% | 4.460\% | 0.081\% | 0.590\% | 0.688\% |
| Benefits | \$86,600 | \$0 | \$829 | \$1,920 | \$2,276 | \$814 | \$3,862 | \$70 | \$511 | \$596 |
| Total Direct Labor: | \$596,800 | \$0 | \$5,713 | \$13,232 | \$15,685 | \$5,609 | \$26,619 | \$481 | \$3,523 | \$4,109 |
|  | \$596,800 |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Services \& Supplies |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| Work Equipment | \$1,200 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1 | \$7 | \$8 |
| Registration | \$1,500 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$1 | \$9 | \$10 |
| Repair \& Maintenance | \$2,700 | \$0 | \$26 | \$60 | \$71 | \$25 | \$120 | \$2 | \$16 | \$19 |
| Other Equipment Maintenance | \$2,200 | \$0 | \$21 | \$49 | \$58 | \$21 | \$98 | \$2 | \$13 | \$15 |
| Office \& Admin Supply | \$1,800 | \$0 | \$17 | \$40 | \$47 | \$17 | \$80 | \$1 | \$11 | \$12 |
| Professional Privilege Tax | \$1,200 | \$0 | \$11 | \$27 | \$32 | \$11 | \$54 | \$1 | \$7 | \$8 |
| Miscellaneous | \$3,200 | \$0 | \$31 | \$71 | \$84 | \$30 | \$143 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Other | \$4,500 | \$0 | \$0. | \$0. | \$0 | \$0. | \$0 | \$4. | \$27 | \$31 |
|  | \$18,300 | \$0 | \$106 | \$246 | \$292 | \$104 | \$495 | \$12 | \$90 | \$104 |
| G \& A Distribution \% | 100.000\% |  | 0.957\% | 2.217\% | 2.628\% | 0.940\% | 4.460\% | 0.067\% | 0.490\% | 0.567\% |
| G \& A Distribution |  |  | 0 | 0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Total Departmental Costs : | \$615,100 |  | 106 | 246 | \$292 | \$104 | \$495 | \$12 | \$90 | \$104 |
| Agency Overhead | \$0. |  | \$0. | \$0. | \$0 | \$0. | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
|  | \$0 |  | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 | \$0 |
| Central Overhead | \$381,017 |  | \$3,646. | \$8,447. | \$10,013 | \$3,582 | \$16,993 | \$255 | \$1,867 | \$2,160 |
|  | \$381,017 |  | \$3,646 | \$8,447 | \$10,013 | \$3,582 | \$16,993 | \$255 | \$1,867 | \$2,160 |
| Total Central Svcs Costs: | \$381,017 |  | \$3,646 | \$8,447 | \$10,013 | \$3,582 | \$16,993 | \$255 | \$1,867 | \$2,160 |
| Grand Totals: | \$996,117 |  | \$9,465 | \$21,925 | \$25,990 | \$9,295 | \$44,107 | \$748 | \$5,480 | \$6,373 |

2004
Public Works Department

| Fee <br> Title | Volume | Dir Labor |  | Dept'l Costs |  | Central Svcs Costs |  | Full Cost |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
|  | Gross | Unit | Total | Unit | Total | Unit | Total | Unit | Total |
| Preliminary Plat | 66.0 | \$86.56 | \$5,713.00 | \$1.61 | \$106.39 | \$55.24 | \$3,646.00 | \$143.41 | \$9,465.39 |
| Final Plat | 289.0 | \$45.79 | \$13,232.00 | \$0.85 | \$246.23 | \$29.23 | \$8,447.00 | \$75.87 | \$21,925.23 |
| Preliminary PUD | 35.0 | \$448.14 | \$15,685.00 | \$8.34 | \$291.75 | \$286.09 | \$10,013.00 | \$742.56 | \$25,989.75 |
| Final PUD | 25.0 | \$224.36 | \$5,609.00 | \$4.16 | \$103.96 | \$143.28 | \$3,582.00 | \$371.80 | \$9,294.96 |
| Zone Change Request | 163.0 | \$163.31 | \$26,619.00 | \$3.03 | \$494.64 | \$104.25 | \$16,993.00 | \$270.59 | \$44,106.64 |
| Preliminary Plat Rev | 7.0 | \$68.71 | \$481.00 | \$1.74 | \$12.21 | \$36.43 | \$255.00 | \$106.89 | \$748.21 |
| Final Plat Rev | 96.0 | \$36.70 | \$3,523.00 | \$0.93 | \$89.68 | \$19.45 | \$1,867.00 | \$57.08 | \$5,479.68 |
| Mandatory Ref Aban | 20.0 | \$205.45 | \$4,109.00 | \$5.19 | \$103.78 | \$108.00 | \$2,160.00 | \$318.64 | \$6,372.78 |
| Non-User Fee Activities | 1.0 | \$521,828.00 | \$521,828.00 | \$16,905.79 | \$16,905.79 | \$333,154.00 | \$333,154.00 | \$871,887.79 | \$871,887.79 |

## ATTACHMENT H

 GIS SERVICE SURVEY
## GIS Service Survey

City of Chattanooga, Tennessee: County provides GIS services and charges fees.
> Maps: $81 / 2$ by 11 inch— $\$ 3.00$; 11 by 17 inch— $\$ 5.00$; 24 inch— $\$ 20.00$; 36 inch-\$25.
$>$ All data- $\$ 100$.
> Special project labor-\$30 an hour.
> Aerial photography: Image format-\$1,000; Ortho-photography, compressed image- $\$ 1,500$; All aerial photography loaned on CD—\$2,000; All aerial photography to keep- $\$ 4,000$.
$>$ GIS data distribution license- $\$ 4,000$.
$>$ Current year property map set-\$400.
> Single sheet property map-\$15.
$>$ Property map sets—\$30 to \$70.

## City of Knoxville, Tennessee: County provides GIS services and charges fees.

 (See web site KGIS.org)> Parcel Plot Maps: $\$ 8.00$ per map sheet.
$>$ Standard map with scale of 1:1200 or 1:2400: $\$ 53$ for standard service; $\$ 86$ for priority service; \$20 for second copy.
> Standard map with aerial photography: \$86 for standard service; $\$ 119$ for priority service; \$53 for second copy.
> Customized map: $\$ 20$ plus $\$ 33$ per hour for standard service; $\$ 40$ plus $\$ 66$ an hour for priority service; $\$ 20$ for second copy.
> Customized map with aerial photography: $\$ 53$ plus $\$ 66$ an hour.
> Planimetric, topographic, orthophoto and property data: Digital data-\$200 per map sheet; data conversion-\$15 per map sheet.
$>$ IDS-GIS viewing product on CD: Initial license- $\$ 600$; second copy- $\$ 300$; orthophoto option-\$225.
$>$ Special project labor: Not rushed-\$33 an hour; rushed-\$56 an hour.
City of Indianapolis, Indiana: City, county, private agencies consortium provides services and charges fees.
> Customers can receive services with a license costing \$. 04 per acre per layer.
$>$ All GIS data for county except aerial photos: \$4,000.
$>$ Aerial photos for county: An additional \$5,000.
$>$ Electronic predefined base map (one square mile): \$25.
$>$ Plots: $\$ 25$ plus $\$ 50$ an hour for labor.
$>$ Special project labor: \$50 an hour.

City of Louisville, Kentucky: Consortium of Local Government provides services and charges fees:
> Standard planimetric/topographical 24 " by 36 " map sheets- $\$ 50$ to $\$ 100$ for baseline/blackline copy and $\$ 250$ to $\$ 500$ for reproducible mylar depending on scale.
$>$ Custom plots- $\$ .18$ to $\$ .44$ per acre for non-reproducible plots and $\$ .91$ to $\$ 1.83$ for reproducible plots.
> Planimetric/topographical property data-\$3.63 per acre.
$>$ Planimetric/topographical sewer data-\$3.03 to \$7.26 per acre.
$>$ GIS aerial photography- $\$ 5$ to $\$ 20$ per frame depending on the number of frames purchased.
> Customized staff services-\$37 an hour to $\$ 60$ per hour depending on the salary level of the persons providing the services.
> License and maintenance agreement for a two-volume map set including an initial fee plus yearly update and annual renewals-\$500 initial fee with update fees computed each year.
> Street centerline data package full version-\$760 with annual update and $\$ 1,170$ with semiannual update.

## City of Augusta-Richmond County, Georgia:

$>$ Special project labor: \$50 an hour.
$>$ GIS for entire county showing roads, parcels and topography: \$300.
> Aerial photography for 800 photos: $\$ 300$.
> Maps: $81 / 2$ by 11 inches- $\$ 5.00$ plus labor cost; 3 by 4 feet- $\$ 40$ plus labor cost.

## City of Raleigh, North Carolina:

> Made practically all GIS information (topographic, planimetric, and public utility) available on web site; do not sell much.
> Maps: $8 \frac{1}{2}$ by 11 inch maps for $\$ 5.00$.
$>$ All digital data available on CD for $\$ 100$.
$>$ Special project labor: \$30 an hour.

## City of Winston-Salem, North Carolina:

$>$ Limited GIS information available on web site.
> Only charging for special project labor: $\$ 65$ for first hour and $\$ 35$ for additional hours.

## City of Atlanta, Georgia:

> No centralized GIS function. City code does not allow release of information to public.
> Only sell maps for $\$ 35$ each.
City of Memphis, Tennessee:
$>$ Not doing large maps.
$>$ Charge $\$ 5.00$ for 11 by 17 inch maps.
$>$ Contract out aerial photography.

## Glynn County, Georgia:

> Tax maps: From $\$ 1.25$ to $\$ 5.00$ depending on size.
$>$ Orthographic maps $\$ 4.25$ to $\$ 11.50$ depending on size.
$>$ CD with GIS data: $\$ 80$.
$>$ CD with parcel layer: $\$ 80$.
$>$ CD with parcel layer with digest: $\$ 120$.
$>$ CD with orthographic maps: $\$ 150$.
$>$ Special project labor: \$18 an hour.

## Wilson County, Tennessee:

$>$ Digital data: $\$ 10$ per layer per grid; $\$ 100$ for all layers in one grid.
$>$ Aerial photo: $\$ 20$.
$>$ An additional $\$ 20$ per layer service for exporting into requested format.
City of Brentwood, Tennessee:
$>$ Digital map: $\$ 50$ per tax grid.
> Black and white maps: \$20.
> Color maps: \$40.
City of Lebanon, Tennessee:
> Zoning and FEMA information maps: \$15 to \$25.
$>$ Street maps: \$10 to \$20.
$>$ Topographical, planimetric, thoroughfare, aerial and property maps: \$15.
City of Gallatin, Tennessee:
$>$ Black and white xerographic maps: $\$ .50$ to $\$ 3.50$.
$>$ Color line geographic info maps: $\$ .75$ to $\$ 5.00$.
$>$ Full color geographic info maps: $\$ 1.00$ to $\$ 7.50$.

## Williamson County, Tennessee:

$>$ GIS info: $\$ 35$ per panel with aerial photography and topographic map included.
$>\$ 5.00$ for each additional coverage added (eg. Floodplain, zoning).


[^0]:    2004
    Metro Planning Department

[^1]:    G \& A Distribution \%

