

**City of Fayetteville  
Fiscal Year 2015 Budget Questions  
Group 2**

Peer City Comparisons

**13. What are the election cycles for the City Councils in the nine peer cities?**

A. The chart below summarizes the election cycles for the peer cities.

	<b>Terms</b>	<b>Concurrent</b>	<b>Staggered</b>
Fayetteville	2 yrs.	X	
Charlotte	2 yrs.	X	
Raleigh	2 yrs.	X	
Greensboro	2 yrs.	X	
Durham	4 yrs.		X
Winston-Salem	4 yrs.	X	
Cary	4 yrs.		X
Wilmington	4 yrs.		X
High Point	2 yrs.	X	
Asheville	4 yrs.		X

**14. Please provide tax revenue comparisons including county taxes as well as municipal taxes for the nine peer cities.**

A. The table below provides municipal and county tax revenue per capita comparisons based upon data reported to the NC State Treasurer on fiscal year 2012 Annual Financial Information Reports. The mean (average) of the total combined tax revenues was \$1,205.22.

	<b>FY2012 Municipal Taxes Per Capita</b>	<b>FY2012 County Taxes Per Capita*</b>	<b>Total FY2012 Municipal/County Tax Revenues Per Capita</b>
Fayetteville	\$288.24	\$501.24	\$789.48
Charlotte	497.87	987.00	1,484.87
Raleigh	459.57	697.65	1,157.22
Greensboro	527.86	709.49	1,237.35
Durham	556.80	822.70	1,379.50
Winston-Salem	434.96	662.55	1,097.51
Cary	505.23	699.20	1,204.43
Wilmington	488.03	761.32	1,249.36
High Point	578.25	694.92	1,273.17
Asheville	545.32	633.96	1,179.28

\* A weighted average based upon population was used for municipalities located in multiple counties.

**15. Please provide comparisons of income per capita for the nine peer cities.**

A. The table below provides comparative data for per capita and household income for Fayetteville and the nine peer cities. The source of the data is the US Census Bureau QuickFacts data for 2012.

	<b>2012 Per Capita Income</b>	<b>2012 Median Household Income</b>
Fayetteville	\$23,413	\$44,756
Charlotte	31,653	52,916
Raleigh	30,306	53,699
Greensboro	25,757	41,556
Durham	27,748	48,241
Winston-Salem	24,569	40,869
Cary	42,332	91,349
Wilmington	28,482	41,428
High Point	22,729	44,367
Asheville	26,993	42,333

**16. Please provide comparisons of crime rates for the nine peer cities.**

A. The data provided below reports 2012 violent and property crimes per 100,000 of population for the nine peer cities.

2012 Crimes per 100,000 of Population

	<b>Violent Crimes</b>	<b>Property Crimes</b>	<b>Total Part I Crimes</b>
Fayetteville	576	6,394	6,969
Charlotte	664	4,128	4,792
Raleigh	443	3,432	3,875
Greensboro	585	4,540	5,126
Durham	761	4,569	5,330
Winston-Salem	688	6,063	6,751
Cary	82	1,355	1,437
Wilmington	583	5,584	6,167
High Point	526	4,185	4,711
Asheville	502	5,808	6,310

Revenues

**17. Are there any other opportunities for Council to secure additional support from PWC resources?**

A. The city manager will be preparing a response to this question to be discussed at a future work session.

**18. Please provide comparative data for the City’s proposed development fee revisions.**

- A. The document attached as Item A provides comparative fee information compiled by the Development Services department. This data is also being presented at the May 14<sup>th</sup> budget work session.

Compensation Questions

**19. Does the City Manager’s recommended budget contain additional salary range increases or just a recommended salary increase (%) for all personnel that meet or exceed expectations?**

- A. Excluding the Police Officer Step Plan, salary ranges were last adjusted effective February 25, 2013 as part of the completion of the compensation study. The recommended budget does not include additional adjustments to these salary ranges.

**20. How much funding was reduced from the recommended budget due to the revisions in the police step plan?**

- A. Approximately \$129,000 was reduced from the budget for the originally proposed police step plan modification, reflecting 95.3% of the total projected reduction of \$135,000 due to anticipated vacancy savings reductions. The city manager has now announced that the police step plan will not be modified in fiscal year 2015 and staff is reviewing options to fund the additional \$129,000.

**21. (a) Based on the recommended FY 15 budget, please provide the salaries for each of our city’s senior staff members, including the City Manager, City Attorney, and anyone serving in positions assigned to pay grades 219, 220, 221, 403, 404, 406, 407, and 407S, the executive pay band and the senior executive pay band.**

<b>Pay Grade</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>FY15 Budgeted Compensation* (Including Base, longevity and executive compensation)</b>
N/A	City Manager	\$208,080
N/A	City Attorney	175,096
Sr. EPB	Deputy City Manager (Operations)	174,391
Sr. EPB	Deputy City Manager (Community Investment)	170,903
EPB	Assistant City Manager (Support Services)	121,740
EPB	Human Resources Dev. Director	125,000
EPB	Human Relations Director	97,851

<b>Pay Grade</b>	<b>Position</b>	<b>FY15 Budgeted Compensation* (Including Base, longevity and executive compensation)</b>
EPB	Corporate Communications Director	\$97,410
EPB	Special Projects Director/Economic & Business Development Director	106,487
EPB	Engineering/Infrastructure Director	118,057
EPB	Community Development Director	123,050
EPB	Environmental Services Director	124,791
EPB	Airport Director	123,985
EPB	Transit Director	116,967
EPB	Parks/Rec/Maintenance Director	126,339
EPB	Fire Chief	132,154
EPB	Chief Information Officer	128,180
EPB	Development Services Director	128,432
EPB	Chief Financial Officer	149,137
EPB	Police Chief	150,858
221	City Engineer	93,914
221	City Traffic Engineer	88,548
221	Police Attorney	103,413
220	Assistant City Attorney	88,542
220	Assistant City Attorney	88,758
220	Assistant City Attorney	79,528
220	Chief Technology Officer	101,902
220	Stormwater Manager	100,330
219	Assistant Airport Director	89,489
219	City Clerk	67,459
219	Construction Manager	86,992
219	Engineer III	80,044
219	Planning & Zoning Division Manager	96,495
219	Strategic Initiatives Manager	76,416
407	Assistant Police Chief	125,428
407	Assistant Police Chief	127,317
407	Assistant Police Chief	108,707
406	Police Captain	97,518
406	Police Captain	104,315
406	Police Captain	97,702
406	Police Captain	97,702
406	Police Captain	97,329
406	Police Captain	91,355
406	Police Captain	97,702
406	Police Captain	94,136
404	Deputy Fire Chief	88,109
404	Deputy Fire Chief	88,109
403	Assistant Fire Chief	92,193
403	Assistant Fire Chief	78,933
403	Assistant Fire Chief	86,371

\* Assumes 2% performance pay increases in Fiscal Year 2015

**(b) Based upon the FY2014-2015 recommended budget, please provide the number of FTEs and the total budget that each of the positions in the executive pay band oversee.**

A. Please see the summary list below:

Pay Grade	Position	FY15 Budgeted Compensation* (Including Base, longevity and executive compensation)	Total FTEs Supervised	FY15 Recommended Budget Supervised**
EPB	Corporate Communications Director	\$97,410	13.0	\$988,456
EPB	Human Relations Director	97,851	2.0	293,045
EPB	Economic & Business Devel. Director	106,487	3.0	654,780
EPB	Transit Director	116,967	101.5	8,009,215
EPB	Engineering/Infrastructure Director	118,057	108.0	20,751,753
EPB	Community Development Director	123,050	11.0	457,443
EPB	Airport Director	123,985	21.0	4,480,113
EPB	Environmental Svcs. Director	124,791	72.5	10,833,161
EPB	Human Resources Dev. Director	125,000	18.0	16,387,214
EPB	Parks/Rec/Maintenance Director	126,339	161.0	18,621,313
EPB	Chief Information Officer	128,180	25.0	5,043,635
EPB	Development Services Director	128,432	51.0	4,349,171
EPB	Fire Chief	132,154	324.0	24,425,396
EPB	Chief Financial Officer	149,137	22.0	6,247,239
EPB	Police Chief	150,858	607.7	52,131,645

\* Assumes 2% performance pay increases in Fiscal Year 2015

\*\* Does not include grant funding budgeted in Special Revenue Funds

**Community Investment Portfolio:**

**22. General Fund Functional Revenues for this portfolio have declined nearly 13.2% and the Other General Fund contribution has increased by 18.1%. Please explain the decline in the functional revenues/fees. Does this indicate that the General Fund is being used at a greater level to support these services?**

A. The decline in functional revenues reported for the Community Investment portfolio is primarily attributable to declines in building permit and inspection revenues which are projected to be \$426,500 less in fiscal year 2015 than originally budgeted for fiscal year 2014. Additionally, lease payments from tenants in the Festival Plaza building are projected to be \$130,253 less than originally budgeted for fiscal year 2014. As revenues generated from services provided decline and/or expenditure budgets increase, additional funding from general revenues in the General Fund are needed to fund the department budget.

### Community Development

**23. Central Business Tax District: Please provide a comparison between the revenues and expenditures for this municipal service district over the last 2 years. The budget document shows that contributions have declined. Has City spending in this district declined as well?**

A. There is a fund summary for the Central Business Tax District on page D – 4 of the budget document. That summary includes FY2013 actual data and current fiscal year budget and year-end projections for revenues and expenditures for the fund. The fund has not received funding from the General Fund in these fiscal years.

### Development Services

**24. The budget shows a decline in functional revenues and an increase in General Fund contribution. Does this inverse relationship mean that we are not collecting adequate fees for service?**

A. As noted in a previous question, the decline in functional revenues reported for the Development Services primarily reflects the decline in building permit and inspection revenues which are projected to be \$426,500 less in fiscal year 2015 than originally budgeted for fiscal year 2014. The expenditure budget for the department was not projected to be fully funded by revenues generated from services in fiscal year 2014 or for fiscal year 2015.

**25. Please explain the \$52,343 personnel adjustment referred to in this section.**

A. The \$52,343 increase for personnel is the projected cost to provide 2% performance pay increases for department employees.

### Economic and Business Development

**26. Of the \$654,780 allocated for this department, \$238,708 is for existing grant back agreements and \$100,000 is for the agreement with the Fayetteville Regional Chamber. Does this mean that the remaining amount is additional costs associated with the enhancements?**

A. No, because the salary for the special projects director position that is being reclassified to serve as the economic and business development director and associated operating costs were projected with the base budget request for the department. The additional costs funded as a part of the enhancement tax increase total \$151,290 for fiscal year 2015.

### Engineering & Infrastructure

**27. Have we ever considered parking meters, like other cities? If so could they be managed by existing staff?**

- A. Most Cities have moved away from parking meters and are implementing pay by space meters. Staff has considered pay by space meters that would be placed on each block and control approximately 15-20 spaces. The average cost per unit is \$7,500, with \$50 per month for internet and credit card fees. Installation of the meters, electrical and internet access would be additional. We could not manage with staff and would contract these services to a parking management firm.

**Operations Portfolio:**

Parks, Recreation & Maintenance

**28. What is included in the funding proposed for temporary employee wages and temporary agency services in the Parks, Recreation and Maintenance budget?**

- A. There is \$425,555 included in the proposed budget for temporary/seasonal pay which provides funding for staff that are employed and paid by the City. The types of temporary positions authorized for the Parks, Recreation and Maintenance Department include:
  - Field Supervisor
  - Gym Supervisor
  - Mini-Bus Operator
  - Pool Cashier
  - Recreation Assistant
  - Recreation Program Assistant
  - Score/Time Keeper

A total of \$462,336 is included in the proposed budget for staffing services provided through temporary employment agencies. That funding is allocated across cost centers as follows:

County Parks District Administration	\$	12,344
County Parks District Facilities		60,789
Parks Facilities		273,205
Right-of-Way Maintenance		115,998
	\$	462,336

Police Department

**29. What requests by the Police Department were not funded in the FY15 recommended budget?**

- A. The lists below provide a summary of items reduced from the Police Department’s base budget request and new initiative requests not funded in the recommended budget due to funding limitations. Details of the new initiative requests were provided in the materials for the March 29, 2014 budget workshop.

**Base Budget Request Reductions:**

Overtime Reduced to FY14 Original Budget	\$240,527
Confidential Funds Reduced to FY14 Original Budget	20,000
Training Request	80,000
Vehicle Replacement Reduction	524,500
	<hr/>
	\$865,027

**New Initiative Requests Not Funded:**

Forensic Quality Service and Specialist Pay	\$11,320
Training (Verbal Judo, Reality Based High-Risk Search and Forensics)	76,940
Firearms Examiner Training	75,000
Crime Prevention	23,575
Crime Scene Vehicles	107,623
	<hr/>
	\$294,458

**Total Unfunded Requests for FY15** \$1,159,485

**30. During the March 29, 2014 budget workshop, staff presented three potential implementation plans to hire 68 new positions for our police department and 4 additional department support staff positions: Aggressive; two year; and three year. It appears that staff is recommending the "Aggressive" plan. Has the collective council agreed on pursuing this "Aggressive" plan over the other two plans for our upcoming recommended budget?**

A. Council has not taken a position on the implementation strategy presented on March 29th. As you may recall, the three implementation alternatives all required about the same revenue support by year 3, but the less "Aggressive" plans had revenue requirements that were less in the first year and higher in the second year. Staff has made a recommendation based on the alternative that has the most consistent revenue requirement and provides the opportunity for the fastest application of additional resources.

**31. Does the Police Chief believe that the department can realistically fill all current vacancies and projected vacancies (average historical vacancies) in the next year in addition to the 56 positions to be added in FY15 and the 12 additional in early FY16?**

A. It will be a challenge, but we are optimistic to be able to recruit and hire for all of our recommended new positions (56) and our projected historical vacancies in the next year. Our next academy is scheduled to begin in July of 2014, which will allow us to hire for 7 current vacancies. Last year the department had 27 officers leave the City, which has been consistent for the prior two years. We start academies in July and February and have tentatively scheduled mini academies to orient new officers hired as laterals. We will be able to give a better projection of hiring when the number of budgeted officers is confirmed by Council. The possibility of hiring the first group of laterals (15) officers is now in the second quarter of FY15, and 15 more laterals in the third quarter of FY15.



**32. New capital expenditures include 51 new vehicles (not replacements) for a total of \$2,171,500 in FY15: 45 full-size sedans with cameras, 4 mid-size sedans and 2 cargo vans. These are in addition to \$957,000 for 22 routine replacement vehicles and 20 refurbished full-size sedans in FY15. Is the \$2,171,500 a realistic expenditure for FY15 if the police department will be unable to fill all projected/historical vacancies in FY15 in addition to the 56 additional hires identified in the recommended budget?**

A. As admitted during the presentation on March 29th, the projections for filling positions are optimistic. It is within the capabilities of our purchasing, fleet, and equipment staffs to bring on the vehicles identified above. If they are not funded, then we may not have the equipment ready to put new officers into operation should our recruiting goals be met. The lead time for acquisition and equipping vehicles is significant and built into the implementation strategy. If we fall short of our recruitment goals, then the delay in bringing staff on should not exceed six months. Funding the proposed vehicle acquisition plan ensures that implementation will not be stalled due to a lack of equipment. Having a few extra vehicles for a few months is believed to be less problematic than having officers on the payroll without vehicles.

**33. How many officers are expected to be hired and funded in FY15 and how much of this amount is eligible for grant funding?**

A. With the police staffing enhancements, a total of 56 positions are projected to be hired during fiscal year 2015, including 28 officers, 15 detectives, and 2 sergeants and 11 non-sworn police department positions. Grant funding of \$388,372 is anticipated to fund 4 of the 28 officers.

**34. What is the Automatic Vehicle Locator system? What is currently being utilized in this regard?**

A. An Automatic Vehicle Locator (AVL) system reports the physical location of vehicles on a routine basis. The City has, for example, an AVL system on its buses and this is used to provide supervisors and dispatchers with information to track route compliance, dispatching, and, in the future, automated timing information for riders. We are also in the process of placing a system with this capability on sanitation trucks in order to track and route those vehicles. The police fleet, which is significantly larger than either that of Transit or Environmental Services, does not have AVL capability. Adding that capability would allow dispatchers to have real time information regarding the location of units on the street and so the closest unit could be dispatched to calls for service. This technology is in flux. The project for adding this capability has been started and stopped due to funding and integration challenges. It is expected that simpler and less expensive options for providing this capability are in development and staff is proposing to time the project with those emerging technologies.

**35. Has the department considered other crime prevention programs?**

- A. The department is always researching and looking for opportunities to partner with other organizations in crime prevention. We are adding Operation Cease fire Educating Kids about Guns (EKG), the Police Athletic League (PAL), and the Police Explorer Program to our current list of outreach programs.

Capital Improvement Plan

**36. Cape Fear River Trail: In the February CIP summary it shows \$500,000 for FY15. In the recommended budget it shows \$800,000 for FY15. Why the \$300,000 increase?**

- A. The CIP as planned in February, projected additional appropriations of \$1 million in the current fiscal year and \$500,000 in fiscal year 2015 for this project. At the April 7, 2014 Council work session, staff presented an update of this project to advise that an additional \$900,000 would be needed for this project in the current fiscal year and that the CIP for fiscal year 2015 would be revised to include a \$600,000 grant secured through the Fayetteville Area Metropolitan Planning Organization, along with a \$200,000 local match for a total of \$800,000 for FY15. The revised project budget was impacted by new design and environmental standards, and updated requirements for the structures. Also, the realignment of the trail to go around the water plant and through the Texfi property lengthened the trail by 0.3 mile and added approximately \$300,000 to projected costs.

**37. NC Veterans Park: Is the \$1,235,942 proposed for this park grant-funded or general fund requested? If it is not grant-funded, what would the requested amount be used for?**

- A. The NC State Veterans Park is funded by a grant from the State of North Carolina.

**38. Stormwater Drainage Projects: In the February CIP summary it shows \$660,570 for FY15. In the recommended budget it shows \$2,199,842 in FY15. Why the \$1,539,272 increase? I understand should council approve the \$6 annual increase it will bring an additional \$917,100 compared to FY14 projection on page J-15.**

- A. The additional funding to be generated in FY15 and beyond from the \$0.50 fee increase allowed for the addition of funding for the Bonnie Doone Area 5 project in FY15. This project is projected to cost \$1,539,272.

**39. Multi-Modal Center - Phase 1: In the February CIP summary it shows \$7,514,064 for FY15 and nothing for FY16-19. Total project funding of \$13,912,625. In the recommended budget it shows \$8,395,314 for FY15 and \$1,250,000 in FY16 for a new total project funding of \$16,043,875. Why the \$2,131,250 increase? Where is this extra money coming from?**

- A. Project costs for the Multi-Modal Center construction have been increased by \$881,250 in FY15 and \$1,250,000 in FY16 to cover anticipated construction cost increases. These construction costs are eligible for 80% federal capital grant funding from FY14 and FY15 grants. The local match for these grants is funded through use of funds designated at June 30, 2013 and carried forward to fund transit enhancements.

**40. Multi-Modal Center: Is it planned to fully fund the Multi-modal Center in FY15 although construction is expected to last a few years correct? Can any of this \$8,395,314 be funded in FY16?**

- A. The City appropriates funding for projects, including local matches, at the time grants for projects are executed by the grantor agencies. Additionally, the City must have an available budget appropriation sufficient to fund the full amount of a construction contract at the time of contract execution.

**41. (a) NC Civil War Center and Museum Contribution: In the February CIP summary there is no mention of this project. In our budget packet it shows \$500,000 in FY17 and \$500,000 in FY18. Why this \$1,000,000 new project and when did the collective council agree to have this item added to our CIP?**

**(b) Farmers Market Contributions: In the February CIP summary there is no mention of this project. In the recommended budget it shows \$300,000 in FY16 and \$300,000 in FY17. Why this \$600,000 new project and when did the collective council agree to have this item added to our CIP?**

- A. As discussed with Council Members who attended the small group briefings, these funds are not scheduled in FY15, and therefore, are not part of the FY15 budget. They are inserted as a "planning hold" for Council's consideration. If the CIP is adopted, that signals Council's interest in funding these items in future years. Council may choose to keep, modify or delete the items. Budget guidelines require me to call such amendments to Council's attention.

The Farmers Markets are related to a specific plan item in the Downtown Renaissance Plan and a more general Murchison Road economic development plan.

The Civil War History Center is a major heritage tourism project gaining considerable community momentum. City participation will demonstrate community support that will leverage additional public and private dollars from within and outside our community. The operating costs will be state funded, which makes this project particularly lucrative with a low City investment, no operating cost, and high tourism impact.

**42. Murchison Road Development: Please identify what specific projects are being planned with \$550,000 in FY15, \$545,000 in FY16, \$350,000 in FY17 and \$300,000 in FY18. Total: \$1,745,000. I understand \$200,000 will come from CDBG funds between FY15-18 at \$50,000 a year.**

A. These funds are proposed for the acquisition and demolition activities in the Murchison Road Redevelopment Plan area for Catalyst Site 1 and 1A. The following is a breakdown of the activities:

- \$550,000 in FY15: Property acquisition - \$500,000 and Demolition - \$50,000
- \$545,000 in FY16: Property acquisition - \$495,000 and Demolition - \$50,000
- \$350,000 in FY17: Property acquisition - \$300,000 and Demolition - \$50,000
- \$300,000 in FY18: Property acquisition - \$250,000 and Demolition - \$50,000

To date 43 of the 73 parcels in Catalyst Site 1 have been acquired. There are 9 parcels to acquire in Catalyst Site 1A.

**43. Enhanced Resurfacing and Sidewalks: Please identify what specific projects are being planned with \$2,500,000 for FY's 16-19. Total \$10,000,000 in bonds. When did the collective council agree to these bonds?**

A. At the February presentation of the recommended CIP, staff presented these bond-funded enhancements as an option for council consideration. The additional funding would support the resurfacing of approximately 42 miles of roads or 140 additional streets, the addition of 12 miles of sidewalk, 110 miles of multi-use lane markings, and a variety of traffic calming devices.

There is no funding included in the FY15 budget related to these projects. They were provided for Council's consideration, and Council may choose to keep, modify or delete the projects. If the CIP is adopted, that would signal Council's interest in funding these projects in future years.

**44. Public Street Development (incl. Soil Streets): Please identify what specific projects are being planned with \$250,000 for FY's 15-18. Total \$1,000,000.**

A. Staff has not yet completed our private streets study to identify possible streets for improvement and acceptance.

**45. Intersection Improvements: Please identify what specific projects are being done with \$25,000 in FY16, \$125,000 in FY17, \$350,000 in FY18 and \$2,885,000 in FY19.**

A. For FY16, \$25,000 is for design and right-of-way for a traffic signal at Purdue and Breezewood. For FY17, \$125,000 is for the construction of the traffic signal at Purdue and Breezewood. For FY18, \$350,000 is for the design of various metal pole signalized intersections and turn lanes. Finally, for FY19, \$2,885,000 is for the construction of the metal pole signalized intersection and turn lanes designed in FY18.

**46. Powell Bill Funds: Please explain how the projected FY15 Powell Bill Funds of \$5,536,578 are programmed to be spent in FY15.**

A. Preliminary projections for the use of Powell Bill funding include:

Paving & Resurfacing	\$ 3,725,000
Debt Service for Street/Sidewalk Bonds	1,396,862
Sidewalks & Other Powell Bill eligible street maintenance and improvements	414,716
	<hr/>
	\$ 5,536,578

## **ITEM A**

### **FEE COMPARISONS – DEVELOPMENT SERVICES**

Building permit and planning and zoning fees are extremely variable by community, making benchmark comparisons difficult. In most NC communities, building permit fees are generally intended to reflect a cost recovery basis while planning and zoning fees seldom result in anything approaching full cost recovery. It is not clear why there is a general distinction between the cost recovery philosophies for these fee types. Perhaps it is related to potential development (planning and zoning fees) versus actual development (building permit fees).

The attached tables provide comparative information about Fayetteville's fees in relationship to other communities. The tables fully illustrate fee variability and indicate that Fayetteville's fees are not at the extreme end of either spectrum.

Fayetteville's building permit fees were changed twice in the past three budget cycles. One of these changes was intended to modernize a fee schedule not changed significantly in many years. However, it proved so complex (there were nearly 30 different construction category fees, many differing only by a few dollars) that a more simple fee system was adopted with input from the development community. This current fee structure makes it easy for contractors and builders to "pre-calculate" their fees, enabling accuracy in bidding jobs and in other cost management functions. It has proved popular with the local development community.

Our current system does not differentiate between new commercial construction and new residential construction. The proposed fees attempt to make that distinction, charging more for the more difficult to inspect category (commercial) and leaving residential unchanged. Members of our stakeholder group suggested making this fee adjustment in this fashion.

The proposed changes are an attempt to recover the cost of the additional building inspectors and partially recover the cost of the development advocate position proposed in the manager's recommended budget. Since fee revenue is not predictable for development activities, we can only indicate that we are in the ballpark of achieving such recovery with the proposed adjustments.

### **BUILDING PERMIT FEES**

These fees are highly variable by community. Some charge by square foot, some by project value, some by unit cost, some by type of permit; all use a blended approach for practical reasons. For example, a per square foot fee might work well for new construction, but it is useless for a remodel project that adds no additional floor area. Consequently, these fees are complicated to calculate and to compare.

To attempt to put these fees in proper comparative perspective, real life examples are used in the following table. Please note that Fayetteville's fees are generally lower than the peer communities except that the large project fee is higher; since it was too complicated to accurately calculate the total cost (all trades) in the other communities, we don't know what the full costs are.

## **BUILDING PERMIT FEES BY PROJECT TYPE**

<b>PROJECT</b>	<b>FAYETTEVILLE CURRENT/PROPOSED</b>	<b>WINSTON- SALEM</b>	<b>RALEIGH</b>	<b>CARY</b>	<b>DURHAM</b>	<b>CHAR/MECK</b>
1,500 sf apartment (\$100,000 value)	\$590/646	\$1,398	\$1,512	\$981	\$456	\$966
2,500 sf retail (\$350,000 value)	890/975	1,213	1,226	1,235	1,866	2,474
80,000 sf grocery store (\$8.35M value)*	24,000/25,600	18,816	35,010	17,880	13,123	24,033
Water heater replacement	21/30	65	65	80	65	63
HVAC unit replacement	81.25/81.25	156	177	80	177	126
300 sf storage shed with electrical (\$15,000 value)	114/114	124	121	138	121	126
Minimum fee	21/30	65	65	80	65	63

\*Calculating all trades in these communities was so difficult that we only used the building trade fee for this project

## **PLANNING AND ZONING FEES**

These fees are somewhat less complicated than building permit fees so we have provided tables that reflect fee amounts instead of by project. Please note the Fayetteville's fees are in the middle of the pack of our peer communities.

## **SITE PLANS / SUBDIVISIONS**

<b>City</b>	<b>FEES</b>
<b>Asheville</b> Level 1 includes several things we don't charge for (cell co-locations, use change to higher impact, dev. under 1,500 sf...) Levels 2 / 3: modest / large projects, by type (resid/comm'l) and size. Both seem to require a final \$104 TRC Review.	Residential: \$468 / 572 Commercial: \$572 / 1300  PLUS \$104 final TRC Review
<b>Cary</b> Two options (unclear if you can skip one or the other): sketch or "full plan", and each has 2 sizes (subdivisions < 5 ac or ≥ 5 ac; buildings < 20,000 sf or ≥ 20000 sf)	Sketch: \$250 - 500 subdiv \$500 – 750 site Full: \$900 – 1,400 subdiv \$1,000 – 2,000 site

City	FEES
<p><b>Durham</b></p> <p>4 Administrative levels: from a base of \$156 for minimal changes or addition of streetscape to \$1040 for <math>\geq 200</math> sf impervious area up to a Level 3 that involves new/changed stormwater facilities and Level 4 that requires a TIA.</p> <p>Subdivisions start at \$3,400 PLUS \$25/lot + 4% tech charge + \$100 if letter notice is required. Also a FINAL PLAT fee \$700 + \$25/lot + 4% tech charge.</p> <p>They also charge for architectural and for landscape reviews (generally \$156 – 312), and \$75 per inspection.</p> <p>They charge up to \$6,240 for TIAs and \$2,489 for ‘major’ special use permit applications and \$3674 + \$5000 consultant review fee for wireless telecommunications facilities.</p>	<p>Administrative Level 3 or Level 4 or Major Plan \$2,500.00 or 3,500 or 4,000 Base Fee +\$25 per 1,000 sf gross building area (rounded up), and/or +\$25 per lot, and/or +\$25 per attached dwelling unit + 4% Technology Surcharge on above</p> <p>(add \$100 for letter notices for Major Site Plan-projects requiring governing body approval)</p>
<p><b>Gastonia</b></p> <p>3 levels of subdivisions and site plans, by size. Review more than 2 times triggers additional full fee (most communities are <math>\frac{1}{2}</math> original for additional reviews and for revisions). Also charge a site plan inspection from \$50 - \$100.</p>	<p>\$175 to 400</p>
<p><b>Greensboro</b></p> <p>Two primary types (SF residential subdiv; multifamily and all non-residential); based on size.</p>	<p>SF Residential: \$325 + 40/lot + \$140 final plat Other: \$500 + 50/1000 sf or 25/du</p>
<p><b>Greenville</b></p> <p>Separate subdiv. fees for prelim and final plats There are inspection fees for landscape plans of \$110 + 25/ac</p>	<p>Subdiv: \$550 + 50/ac [600 min.] Subdiv. final: \$440 + 50/ac</p>
<p><b>Jacksonville</b></p> <p>\$1000 for TIA scoping (non-refundable) credited to total TIA fee.</p>	<p>Subdiv: from \$200 or \$500 + \$5/lot + \$200 Final Site: from \$900 - 1200</p>
<p><b>Raleigh</b></p> <p>Fees based on size (&lt; 2 ac; 2-4 ac.; &gt; 4 ac.) (also has separate Infill Subdivision fees \$333 &lt; 4 lots or \$612 <math>\geq</math> 4 lots)</p>	<p>Subdiv or Site Plans: \$333 – 1,727 + from \$112 – 223 for final Maps/Plat recordations</p>
<p><b>Wilmington</b></p> <p>Fees based on size (# du’s or lots, or <math>\leq</math> 10,000 sf; 10,001 to 40,000 sf; &gt; 40,000)</p>	<p>Subdiv: \$800 + \$10/lot or du + \$100 for TRC concept review; + Final \$15/lot or per “log” Site: \$250 – 1,000 + \$20/1000 gfa</p>
<p><b>Winston-Salem</b></p> <p>Fees based on acreage: <math>\leq</math> 2; 2.1-10; 10.1-25; 25.1-50; 50.1-100</p>	<p>Subdiv: \$1,000 – 2,250 + charge/du or lot Site: 1,000 – 3,000 + charge/sf or acre</p>
<p><b>Fayetteville</b></p>	<p>Subdiv: \$400 + \$20/lot + \$50 Final Plat Site: \$500 + \$20/1000 sf or \$20/du or lot</p>



## ZONING/CONDITIONAL

City	FEES
Asheville Fees based on acreage:	1 lot – less than 1 acre - \$364 2-4 lots or 1-3 acres - \$468 4-9 acres - \$572 10-25 acres - \$780 25+ acres - \$988
Cary	\$700 (\$1000 for conditional zoning)
Durham Fees range from \$750 for SF 1 acre or less to \$4000 for most office, commercial, MU, industrial PLUS the other charges	\$ 750.00 Application Fee +\$ 30.00 Technology Surcharge +\$ 655.00 Notification Surcharges* =\$1,435.00 TOTAL FEE  A total of: \$4,000.00 Base Fee +\$ 65.00 Per Acre (rounded up) + 4% Technology Surcharge on above +\$ 655.00 Notification Surcharges*
Gastonia	[no info]
Greensboro Fees based on acreage: from < 1 acre to ≥ 5 ac. Request for an overlay district is \$313.	\$470 to \$1500
Greenville	\$550 + 50/acre or add'l fraction [\$600 min.]
Jacksonville	\$500
Raleigh	\$558 (\$1115 Conditional Use)
Wilmington Fee based on both acreage and type (4 groups of zoning districts, from residential through downtown, mixed...)	\$400 – 800 + \$20/acre
Winston-Salem Fees based on acreage: ≤ 2; 2.1-10; 10.1-25; 25.1-50; 50.1-100 I'm guessing their Special Use Zoning is similar to Cond'l, which they don't list, and it is not SUP.	General rezoning: \$1000 – 1500 + per acre charge Special Use Zoning (not SUP): \$1000 – 3,500 + per acre charge
Fayetteville Note: We do not charge for initial zonings for annexing properties.	\$700 (plus site plan review fee if required)

