



CABAZON
WATER DISTRICT

CABAZON WATER DISTRICT

Final Report

User Fee Study

January 14, 2020

Prepared by:



nbsgov.com

Corporate Headquarters
32605 Temecula Parkway, Suite 100
Temecula, CA 92592
Toll free: 800.676.7516

TABLE OF CONTENTS

1. Executive Summary	2
1.1 Findings	2
1.2 Report Format	3
2. Introduction and Fundamentals	4
2.1 Scope of Study	4
2.2 Methods of Analysis	4
3. Water District	9
3.1 Cost of Service Analysis	9
3.2 Fee Establishment	9
3.3 Cost Recovery Evaluation	10
4. Conclusion	12

Appendices

Fully Burdened Hourly Rate Calculation	Appendix A
Cost of Services (Fee Analysis)	Appendix B
Comparative Fee Survey	Appendix C

1. EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

NBS performed a User Fee Study (Study) for the Cabazon Water District (District). The purpose of this report is to describe the Study’s findings and recommendations, which intend to defensibly update and establish user and regulatory fees for service for the Cabazon Water District.

Special districts in California can impose user fees and regulatory fees for services and activities they provide through provisions of the State Constitution. Under Article XIII C, Section 1, a fee may not exceed the estimated reasonable cost of providing the service or performing the activity. For a fee to qualify as such, it must relate to a service or activity under the control of the individual/entity on which the fee is imposed. For example, a request to install a meter, set up a new water account, perform a plan review, or test a meter for accuracy would require the District to perform specific activities related to each individual request. In this manner, the service or the underlying action causing the District to perform the requested service is either discretionary and/or is subject to regulation. As a discretionary service or regulatory activity, the user fees and regulatory fees considered in this Study fall outside requirements for imposition of taxes, special taxes, or fees imposed as incidences of property ownership.

The District’s chief purposes in conducting this Study were to ensure that its existing fees do not exceed the costs of providing services, and to provide an opportunity for the District’s Board of Directors to align fee amounts with local cost recovery policies.

1.1 Findings

This Study compares the current fee charged for each service charged by the District to the total estimated cost of providing each service. NBS concludes that, on average, the District’s current fees under-recover the costs of services provided. As shown in the following table, the Study identified approximately \$19,000 currently collected per year from fees for service, versus \$37,000 of eligible costs for recovery from fees for service.

TABLE 1. REPORT SUMMARY

Department / Division	Estimated Annual Current Fee Revenue	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Cost Recovery Surplus / (Deficit)	Current Cost Recovery %	Estimated Annual Recommended Fee Revenue	Recommended Cost Recovery %
Water District	\$ 19,465	\$ 37,132	\$ (17,667)	52%	\$ 33,442	90%

The District is currently recovering approximately 52% of the total costs associated with providing fee related services. Should the Board adopt fee levels at 100% of the calculated full cost recovery fee amounts determined by this Study, an additional \$18,000 in costs could be recovered.

However, as discussed in Section 1 of this report, there may be reasons why policy makers chose to adopt fees at less than the calculated full cost recovery amount. As such, District staff provided initial recommended fee amounts for the Board’s consideration. At District staff’s initial recommended fee amounts, an additional \$14,000 in costs could be recovered, for a cost recovery rate of 90%.

1.2 Report Format

This report documents analytical methods and data sources used throughout the Study, presents findings regarding current levels of cost recovery achieved from user and regulatory fees, and discusses recommended fee amounts.

- ▮ Section 2 of the report outlines the foundation of the Study and general approach
- ▮ Section 3 discusses the results of the cost of service analysis
- ▮ Section 4 provides the grand scope conclusions of the analysis
- ▮ Appendices to this report include additional details supporting the fully burdened hourly rate calculation, the cost of providing each fee for service, and a comparison of similar fees charged by neighboring or comparable agencies.

2. INTRODUCTION AND FUNDAMENTALS

2.1 Scope of Study

The following is a summarized list of fees studied for the District:

- Meter Account Set-up Fee
- Meter Accuracy Testing
- Backflow Testing and Protection Device Installation
- Plan Check, Inspection, and Processing Fees
- Reconnection Charge
- Door Hangar Fees
- Lien Fee
- Lab Water Test Fee

The fees examined in this Study specifically excluded development impact fees, utility rates, and any special tax assessments, all of which fall under distinct analytical and procedural requirements different from the body of user/regulatory fees analyzed in this effort. Additionally, this Study excluded facility and equipment rental rates, as well as most of fines and penalties imposed by the District for violations to its requirements or codes.

2.2 Methods of Analysis

There are three phases of analysis completed for the District fees studied:

1. Cost of service analysis
2. Fee establishment
3. Cost recovery evaluation

2.2.1 COST OF SERVICE ANALYSIS

This cost of service analysis is a quantitative effort that compiles the full cost of providing governmental services and activities. There are two primary types of costs considered: direct and indirect costs. Direct costs are those that specifically relate to an activity or service, including the real-time provision of the service. Indirect costs are those that support provision of services in general, but cannot be directly or easily assigned to a singular activity or service.

Components of the full cost of service include direct labor costs, indirect labor costs, specific direct non-labor costs where applicable, allocated non-labor costs, and allocated overhead. Definitions of these cost components are as follows:

- ¶ **Labor costs** – Salary, wages and benefits expenses for District personnel specifically involved in the provision of services and activities to the public.
- ¶ **Indirect labor costs** – Personnel expenses supporting the provision of services and activities. This can include line supervision and district management, administrative support, and staff involved in technical activities related to the direct services provided to the public.
- ¶ **Specific direct non-labor costs** – When applicable, discrete expenses incurred due to a specific service or activity performed, such as contractor costs, third-party charges, and very specific materials used in the service or activity.
- ¶ **Allocated indirect non-labor costs** – Expenses other than labor for provision of services. In most cases, these costs are allocated across all services provided, rather than directly assigned to fee categories.
- ¶ **Allocated indirect organization-wide overhead** – These are expenses, both labor and non-labor, related to agency-wide support services. Support services include general administrative services such as finance, human resources, information technology, etc. An agency’s support services assist the direct providers of public services. The amount of costs attributable to the District exist within the budgeted expenditures and have been included in this Study.

All cost components in this Study use annual (or annualized) figures, representing a twelve-month cycle of expenses incurred by the District in the provision of all services and activities agency-wide.

Nearly all of the fees under review in this Study require specific actions on the part of District staff to provide the service or conduct the activity. Because labor is the primary underlying factor in these activities, the Study expresses the full cost of service as a fully burdened cost per labor hour. NBS calculates a composite, fully burdened, hourly rate for the District as applicable to the specific organization and its needs. The rate serves as the basis for further quantifying the average full cost of providing individual services and activities.

Deriving the fully burdened hourly rate requires two figures: the full costs of service and the number of hours available to perform those services. The full costs of service are quantified through the earlier steps described in this analysis. NBS derives the hours available from a complete listing of all District employees and, when applicable, hours of service available from contracted professionals.

The District has supplied NBS with the total number of paid labor hours for each function/service. These available hours represent the amount of productive time available for providing both fee-recoverable and non-fee recoverable services and activities. The productive labor hours divided into the annual full costs of service equals the composite fully burdened hourly rate. Some agencies also use the resulting rates for other purposes than setting fees, such as when the need arises to calculate the full cost of general services or structure a cost recovery agreement with another agency or third party.

The fully burdened hourly rate applied at the individual fee level estimates an average full cost of providing each service or activity. This step required the development of staff time estimates for the services and activities listed in the District’s fee schedule. For all fee programs studied, time tracking records (if available) were useful in identifying time spent providing general categories of service (e.g. processing, plan review, inspection, etc.). However, the District does not systematically track activity

service time for all individual fee-level services provided. Consequently, interviews and questionnaires were used to develop the necessary data sets describing estimated labor time. In many cases, the District estimated the average amount of time (in minutes and hours) it would take to complete a typical occurrence of each service or activity considered.

It should be noted that the development of these time estimates was not a one-step process: estimates received were carefully reviewed by both NBS and District management to assess the reasonableness of such estimates. Based on this review, the District reconsidered its time estimates until both parties were comfortable that the fee models reasonably reflected the average service level provided by the District. Then, time estimates were applied to the appropriate fully burdened labor rate to yield an average total cost of the service or activity.

2.2.2 FEE ESTABLISHMENT

Establishing fee names and categories includes a range of considerations. The Study's process provided the District the opportunity to propose additions and deletions to their fee schedules, as well as rename, reorganize, and clarify fee names and categories. Fee categories and fee names were simplified or re-structured to increase the likelihood of full cost recovery, or to enhance the fairness of how the fee applies to various types of fee payers.

Many such revisions better conform fees to current practices, as well as improve the calculation of fees owed by an individual, the application of fees, and the collection of revenues. Beyond this, some additions to the fee schedule were simply identification of existing services or activities performed by District staff for which no fee is currently charged.

The District's fee schedule should also list the full burdened hourly rate(s) developed by the Study. Documenting these rates in the fee schedule provides an opportunity for the Board to approve rates for cost recovery under a "time and materials" approach, where applicable. It also provides clear publication of those rates, so fee payers of any uniquely determined fee can reference the amounts. The fee schedule should provide language that supports special forms of cost recovery for activities and services not contemplated by the adopted master fee schedule. These rare instances use the published rates to estimate a flat fee, or bill on an hourly basis, at the discretion of the District.

2.2.3 COST RECOVERY EVALUATION

The NBS fee model compares the existing fee for each service or activity to the average total cost of service quantified through this analysis. A cost recovery rate of 0% identifies no current recovery of costs from fee revenues (or insufficient information available for evaluation). A rate of 100% means that the fee currently recovers the full cost of service. A rate between 0% and 100% indicates partial recovery of the full cost of service through fees. A rate greater than 100% means that the fee exceeded the full cost of service.

User fees and regulatory fees examined in this Study should not exceed the full cost of service. In other words, the cost recovery rate achieved by a fee should not be greater than 100%. In most cases, charging a fee above this threshold could require the consensus of the voters.

NBS also assists with modeling the "recommended" or "targeted" level of cost recovery for each fee, always established at 100%, or less, than the calculated full cost of service. Targets and recommendations always reflect agency-specific judgments linked to a variety of factors, such as existing

policies, agency-wide or district revenue objectives, economic goals, community values, market conditions, level of demand, and others.

A general means of selecting an appropriate cost recovery target is to consider the public and private benefits of the service or activity in question.

- ¶ To what degree does the public at large benefit from the service?
- ¶ To what degree does the individual or entity requesting, requiring, or causing the service benefit?

When a service or activity completely benefits the public at large, there is generally little to no recommended fee amount (i.e., 0% cost recovery), reflecting that a truly public-benefit service is best funded by the general resources of the District, such as General Fund revenues (e.g., taxes). Conversely, when a service or activity completely benefits an individual or entity, there is generally closer to or equal to 100% of cost recovery from fees, collected from the individual or entity. An example of a completely private benefit service may be a request for exemption from a District regulation or process.

In some cases, a strict public-versus-private benefit judgment may not be sufficient to finalize a cost recovery target. Any of the following other factors and considerations may influence or supplement the public/private benefit perception of a service or activity:

- ¶ If optimizing revenue potential is an overriding goal, is it feasible to recover the full cost of service?
- ¶ Will increasing fees result in non-compliance or public safety problems?
- ¶ Are there desired behaviors or modifications to behaviors of the service population helped or hindered through the degree of pricing for the activities?
- ¶ Does current demand for services support a fee increase without adverse impact to the citizenry served or current revenue levels? (In other words, would fee increases have the unintended consequence of driving away the population served?)
- ¶ Is there a good policy basis for differentiating between type of users (e.g., residents and non-residents, residential and commercial, non-profit entities and business entities)?
- ¶ Are there broader District objectives that inform a less than full cost recovery target from fees, such as economic development goals and local social values?

Because this element of the Study is subjective, NBS provides each fee calculation at 100% full cost recovery as well as the framework for the District to adjust recommended fee amounts in accordance with the District's goals as pertains to code compliance, cost recovery, economic development, and social values.

2.2.4 DATA SOURCES

The following data sources were used to support the cost of service analysis and fee establishment phases of this Study:

- ▮ The Cabazon Water District's Adopted Budget for Fiscal Year 2018-2019
- ▮ A complete listing of all District personnel, salary/wage rates, regular hours, paid benefits, and paid leave amounts.
- ▮ Various correspondences with the District staff supporting the adopted budgets and current fees, including budget notes and expenditure detail not shown in the published document.
- ▮ The District's prevailing fee schedule.
- ▮ Annual workload data from the prior fiscal year provided by the District.

The District's adopted budget is the most significant source of information affecting cost of service results. NBS did not audit or validate the District's financial management and budget practices, nor was cost information adjusted to reflect different levels of service or any specific, targeted performance benchmarks. This Study has accepted the District's budget as a legislatively adopted directive describing the most appropriate and reasonable level of District spending. Consultants accept the Board's deliberative process and ultimate acceptance of the budget plan and further assert that through that legislative process, the District has yielded a reasonable expenditure plan, valid for use in setting cost-based fees.

Original data sets also support the work of this Study: primarily, estimated or tracked time at various levels of detail. To develop these data sets, consultants prepared questionnaires and conducted interviews with the District. In the fee establishment phase of the analysis, the District supplied estimates of average time spent providing a service or activity corresponding with an existing or new fee. NBS and District management reviewed and questioned responses to ensure the best possible set of estimates.

3. WATER DISTRICT

The Cabazon Water District provides safe, reliable drinking water, and reclamation services to its customers in a prudent and sustainable manner. Aside from its primary focus on operation and maintenance of the water system and infrastructure, the District charges a number of fees for services pertaining to account management, installation and removal of meters, meter testing, development review, and other miscellaneous service requests.

3.1 Cost of Service Analysis

To evaluate the cost of providing individual fee related services, NBS first developed a composite fully-burdened hourly rate for the Water District, as shown in the table below:

TABLE 2. FULLY BURDENED HOURLY RATE CALCULATION

Cost Element	District Direct Services
Labor	\$ 394,274
Recurring Non-Labor	117,531
Districtwide Overhead Costs	109,288
District Admin	306,388
Division Total	\$ 927,482
Fully Burdened Hourly Rate	\$ 122
<i>Reference: Direct Hours Only</i>	7,629

The total annual cost of the Water District per year is approximately \$927,000. All subsequent cost of service calculations at the individual fee level assume a fully burdened hourly rate of **\$122** for Water District support.

Section 2.2.1, *Cost of Service Analysis*, provides descriptions of each “Cost Element” noted in the table above, as well as further explanation of the approach and methodology used in the fully burdened hourly rate calculation. Approach to development of this rate involved an analysis of both direct and indirect costs of providing services. Careful attention was paid to the types of costs included in development of the fully burdened hourly rate. Costs clearly designated for system maintenance or improvements were excluded, while costs that generally support staff’s role in provision of service delivery and daily operations were included. The hourly rate of \$122 per hour was subsequently applied toward establishment of the full cost of providing the user and regulatory fee services studied.

Appendix A provides the detailed analysis supporting this fully burdened hourly rate calculation.

3.2 Fee Establishment

The following is a summary of overall changes made to the District’s fee schedule:

- Deletion of the Special Equipment fee as this is no longer used.

- ¶ Reorganization of fee categories or clarification of fee names to create a more user-friendly fee structure, such as:
 - Meter Accuracy Testing – Split fees by meter size and renamed various fee categories
 - District Administration Processing – Restructured this fee from being charged as 15% on top of contractor costs to being charged as a flat / fixed admin fee.
 - Backflow Testing Charge – Renamed various fee categories
 - Backflow Protection Device Installation – Relocated the position of this fee closer to Backflow Testing Charge in the fee list
 - Meter - Request for Removal, Replacement, Relocation, or Change in Meter Size – Consolidated multiple fees into a single category
 - Door Hangar Fee – Split Fee between yellow and red tags

- ¶ Addition of a new fee category, Lab Water Test, notated as “New” in Appendix B.

Section 2.2.3, *Fee Establishment*, provides additional discussion on the Study’s approach to adding, deleting, and revising fee categories.

3.3 Cost Recovery Evaluation

Appendix B presents the results of the detailed cost recovery analysis for the Water District fees. In the Appendix, the “Cost of Service per Activity” column establishes the maximum adoptable fee amount for the corresponding service identified in the “Fee Name” list. The Cost of Service Per Activity for each fee item is compared to the District’s current fee for each service, and the “Existing Cost Recovery %” shows whether each fee is under, over, or approximately equal to the cost of providing the service.

The District fees currently recover approximately 52% of the total annual cost of providing services. As shown in the following table, the District collects approximately \$19,000 per year in revenues at current fee amounts. At full cost recovery, the same demand for these services would recover approximately \$37,000. Should the Board of Directors adopt all fees at 100% of the Cost of Service per Activity amounts shown, an additional \$18,000 could be recovered.

TABLE 3. COST RECOVERY OUTCOMES

Department / Division	Estimated Annual Current Fee Revenue	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Cost Recovery Surplus / (Deficit)	Current Cost Recovery %	Estimated Annual Recommended Fee Revenue	Recommended Cost Recovery %
Water District	\$ 19,465	\$ 37,132	\$ (17,667)	52%	\$ 33,442	90%

NBS provided the full cost of service information and the framework for considering fees, while those closest to the fee-paying population, District staff, considered appropriate cost recovery levels at or below that full cost. The “Recommended Fee Level / Deposit” column in Appendix B displays staff’s initial

recommended fee amounts. With staff's recommended adjustments, Water District fees are projected to recover 90% of the costs of providing services.

For more discussion on NBS' overall approach to the Cost Recovery Evaluation, consult section 2.2.3 of the Report.

4. CONCLUSION

Based on the Cost of Service Analysis, Fee Establishment, and Cost Recovery Evaluation outcomes presented in this Study, the proposed Schedule of Fees has been formatted for implementation and included in the District's accompanying Staff Report.

As discussed throughout this report, the proposed fee schedule intends to improve the District's recovery of costs incurred to provide individual services, as well as to adjust fees downward where fees charged exceed the average costs incurred. Predicting the amount to which any adopted fee increases will affect District revenues is difficult to quantify. For the near-term, the District should not count on increased revenues to meet any specific expenditure plan. Experience with the revised fee amounts should be gained first before revenue projections are revised. However, unless there is some significant, long-term change in activity levels at the District, proposed fee amendments should enhance the District's cost recovery performance, over time, providing it the ability to stretch other resources further for the benefit of the public at large.

The District's Fee Schedule should become a living document but handled with care:

- A fundamental purpose of the fee schedule is to provide clarity and transparency to the public and to staff regarding fees imposed by the District. Once adopted by the Board, the fee schedule is the final word on the amount and manner in which fees should be charged. Old fee schedules should be superseded by the new master document. If the master document is found to be missing fees, those fees need eventually to be added to the master schedule and should not continue to exist outside the consolidated, master framework.
- The District should consider adjusting these user fees and regulatory fees on an annual basis to keep pace at least with cost inflation. For all fees and charges, the District could use either a Consumer Price Index adjustment or a percentage of Labor Cost increase, and that practice would be well applied to the new fee schedule. Conducting a comprehensive user fee Study is not an annual requirement; it becomes worthwhile only over time as significant shifts in organization, local practices, legislative values, or legal requirements change.

As a final note in this Study, it is worth acknowledging the path that fees in general have taken in California. The public demands ever more precise and equitable accounting of the basis for governmental fees and a greater say in when and how they are charged. It is inevitable in the not too distant future, that user fees and regulatory fees will demand an even greater level of analysis and supporting data to meet the public's evolving expectations. Technology systems will play an increased and significant role in an agency's ability to accomplish this. Continuous improvement and refinement of time tracking abilities will greatly enhance the District's ability to set fees for service and identify unfunded activities in years to come.

Disclaimer: In preparing this report and the opinions and recommendations included herein, NBS has relied on a number of principal assumptions and considerations with regard to financial matters, conditions and events that may occur in the future. This information and assumptions, including the District's budgets, time estimate data, and workload information from District staff, were provided by sources we believe to be reliable; however, NBS has not independently verified such information and assumptions. While we believe NBS' use of such information and assumptions is reasonable for the purpose of this report, some assumptions will invariably not materialize as stated herein and may vary significantly due to unanticipated events and circumstances. Therefore, the actual results can be expected to vary from those projected to the extent that actual future conditions differ from those assumed by us or provided to us by others.

APPENDIX A

Fully Burdened Hourly Rate Calculation

LABOR EXPENDITURES AND STATISTICS [1]

Expenditure or Statistic	Notes	Cost Allocation to Each Function / Activity				
		2018-19 Budget	Adjustments	Net Expenditures to be Allocated	District Admin	District Direct Services
<i>Labor Cost Allocation Distribution</i>						
Salaries	[2]	\$ 365,200		100%	33.03%	66.97%
Director's Fee Adjustment			(20,000)			
Water Technician II Salary Adjustment			13,853			
Subtotal		\$ 365,200	\$ (6,147)	\$ 359,053	\$ 118,611	\$ 240,442
Benefits		\$ 204,800				
Water Technician II Benefit Adjustment		-	24,919			
Subtotal		\$ 204,800	\$ 24,919	\$ 229,719	\$ 75,886	\$ 153,833
Subtotal		\$ 570,000	\$ 18,772	\$ 588,772	\$ 194,497	\$ 394,274
Functional "Productive" Labor Hours		10,526	-	10,526	2,897	7,629

RECURRING NON-LABOR EXPENDITURES

Operating Expenditures By Budget Unit	N o t e s	2018-19 Budget	Adjustments	Net Expenditures to be Allocated	Cost Allocation to Each Function / Activity	
					District Admin	District Direct Services
Cabazon Water District						
Facilities, Wells, T&D						
Lab Fees		\$ 7,500	\$ (7,500)	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
Site Landscaping & Maint		700	(700)	-	-	-
Meters		4,600	(4,600)	-	-	-
Generator Service Contractor		1,300	(1,300)	-	-	-
Utilities - Wells		126,100	(126,100)	-	-	-
SCADA		300	(300)	-	-	-
Line R&M Contractor		12,500	(12,500)	-	-	-
Line R&M Materials		60,000	(60,000)	-	-	-
Well Maintenance		36,200	(36,200)	-	-	-
Security		18,400	(18,400)	-	-	-
Engineering Services		33,600	(33,600)	-	-	-
Chlorinators		100	(100)	-	-	-
Facilities, Wells, T&D - Other		10,000	(10,000)	-	-	-
Utilities - Office						
Electricity		15,900	-	15,900	5,252	10,648
Gas		710	-	710	235	475
Telephone		9,500	-	9,500	3,138	6,362
Trash Pickup & Office Cleaning		4,400	-	4,400	1,454	2,946
Office Expenses						
Water Billing System		2,100	-	2,100	694	1,406
Supplies & Equipment		9,700	-	9,700	3,204	6,496
Copier and Supplies		6,000	-	6,000	1,982	4,018
Dues & Subscriptions		1,700	-	1,700	562	1,138
Postage		7,700	-	7,700	2,544	5,156
Printing & Publications		6,100	-	6,100	2,015	4,085
Leases & Rents		300	-	300	99	201
Computer Services		36,800	-	36,800	12,157	24,643
Office Storage		6,200	-	6,200	2,048	4,152
Air Conditioning Servicing		4,600	-	4,600	1,520	3,080
Fire Alarm System Servicing		700	-	700	231	469
Office Expenses - Other		1,300	-	1,300	429	871

Cabazon Water District
 User Fee Study Fiscal Year 2019
 Fully Burdened Hourly Rate Calculation

Appendix A

Operating Expenditures By Budget Unit	Notes	2018-19 Budget	Adjustments	Net Expenditures to be Allocated	Cost Allocation to Each Function / Activity	
					District Admin	District Direct Services
Cabazon Water District						
Support Services	[2]					
Temporary Labor		10,000	(10,000)	-	-	-
Financial Audit		22,100	(22,100)	-	-	-
Accounting		30,000	(30,000)	-	-	-
Legal Services		53,600	(53,600)	-	-	-
Bank Service Charges		700	(700)	-	-	-
Payroll Service		4,100	(4,100)	-	-	-
Website Support		1,700	(1,700)	-	-	-
General Liability Insurance		21,000	(21,000)	-	-	-
Office Radio		500	(500)	-	-	-
Training/Travel		8,000	-	8,000	2,643	5,357
Other Fees/SWRCB		6,200	(6,200)	-	-	-
Service Tools & Equipment						
Shop Supplies and Small Tools		21,100	-	21,100	6,970	14,130
Vehicle Fuel		12,800	-	12,800	4,228	8,572
Employee Uniforms		1,500	-	1,500	496	1,004
Safety		500	-	500	165	335
Tractor Expenses		1,000	-	1,000	330	670
Equipment Rental		2,100	-	2,100	694	1,406
Service Trucks - R&M		13,900	-	13,900	4,592	9,308
Water Ops Phone & Internet		900	-	900	297	603
NON-OPERATING EXPENSES						
Grant & Loan Processing Fee		1,600	(1,600)	-	-	-
DWR Interest Expense		10,300	(10,300)	-	-	-
DHPO Interest Expense		9,800	(9,800)	-	-	-
Bad Debt Expense		1,200	(1,200)	-	-	-
Miscellaneous		1,600	(1,600)	-	-	-
Depreciation Expense		266,300	(266,300)	-	-	-
TOTAL RECURRING NON-LABOR EXPENDITURES		\$ 927,510	\$ (752,000)	\$ 175,510	\$ 57,979	\$ 117,531

DISTRICTWIDE OVERHEAD COSTS

Allocated Indirect/Support Services	Notes	2018-19 Budget	Adjustments	Net Expenditures to be Allocated	Cost Allocation to Each Function / Activity	
					District Admin	District Direct Services
Directors salaries	[2]	\$ 20,000	\$ -	\$ 20,000	\$ 6,607	\$ 13,393
Support Services	[2]	143,200	-	143,200	47,305	95,895
TOTAL DISTRICTWIDE OVERHEAD COSTS		\$ 163,200	\$ -	\$ 163,200	\$ 53,912	\$ 109,288

SUMMARY OF LABOR, NON-LABOR, & OVERHEAD COSTS

Cost Element	Notes	Established Cost	Cost Allocation to Each Function / Activity	
			District Admin	District Direct Services
Labor		\$ 588,772	\$ 194,497	\$ 394,274
Recurring Non-Labor		175,510	57,979	117,531
Districtwide Overhead Costs		163,200	53,912	109,288
TOTAL LABOR, NON-LABOR, & OVERHEAD COST		\$ 927,482	\$ 306,388	\$ 621,093

ALLOCATION OF COMMON ACTIVITIES COSTS

Cost Element	Notes	Established Cost	Cost Allocation to Each Function / Activity
			District Direct Services
District Admin		\$ 306,388	\$ 306,388
Total		\$ 306,388	\$ 306,388

FULLY-BURDENED HOURLY BILLING RATE FOR RECOVERY IN FEES

Cost Element	Notes	District Direct Services
Labor		\$ 394,274
Recurring Non-Labor		117,531
Districtwide Overhead Costs		109,288
District Admin		306,388
Division Total		\$ 927,482
Fully Burdened Hourly Rate		\$ 122
<i>Reference: Direct Hours Only</i>		7,629

Notes

- [1] Budget information sourced from "Cabazon Budget FY 18-19 Approved Budget.xlsx" provided by Cabazon Water District staff.
- [2] Expenses reclassified as District-wide overhead

APPENDIX B

Cost of Service Analysis

Fee No.	Fee Name	Fee Unit / Type	Notes	Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis				Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis			
				Total - Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	FBHR	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee / Deposit	Existing Cost Recovery %	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	Recommended Cost Recovery %	Estimated Volume of Activity	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
1	Metered Account Set-up Fee	Flat		0.17	\$ 122	\$ 20	\$ 20	99%	\$ 20	100%	76	\$ 1,520	\$ 1,540	\$ 1,540
2	Meter Accuracy Testing Fee - 2" or smaller		[2]											
	District Administrative Processing	Flat		0.25	\$ 122	\$ 30	\$ 10	33%	\$ 30	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	District Field Services	Flat		1.25	\$ 122	\$ 152	\$ 65	43%	\$ 152	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Testing (3rd Party)	Flat	[4]	n/a	n/a	n/a	Actual Cost	100%	Actual Cost	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Meter Accuracy Testing Fee - Larger than 2"		[2]											
	District Administrative Processing	Flat		0.25	\$ 122	\$ 30	15% on top of Contractor Charge	%	\$ 30	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	District Field Services	hourly - Minimum 1 hour		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 65	53%	Actual Cost / hourly	%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Testing (3rd Party)	Flat	[4]	n/a	n.a	n/a	Actual Cost	100%	Actual Cost	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
3	Backflow Testing Charge													
	District - Annual Monitoring Fee	Flat		0.25	\$ 122	\$ 30	\$ 50	165%	\$ 30	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	District Review of Test Results Performed by Third Party			n/a	\$ 122	n/a	no charge / included	%	no charge / included	%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Field Test Performed by District	Actual Cost / Hourly		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	Actual Cost / hourly	%	\$ 122	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
4	Backflow Protection Device Installation													
	District Administrative Processing	Flat		0.25	\$ 122	\$ 30	15% on top of Contractor Charge	%	\$ 30	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	District Field Services	hourly - Minimum 1 hour		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 65	53%	Actual Cost / hourly	%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Install (3rd Party)	Flat	[4]	n/a	n.a	n/a	Actual Cost	100%	Actual Cost	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
5	Cabazon Water System Damage Fee													
	Normal Business Hours	hourly - Minimum 1 hour		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 70	58%	\$ 122	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	After Normal Business Hours (3 hours min.)	Hourly - minimum 3 hours		1.00	\$ 137	\$ 137	\$ 250	182%	\$ 300	218%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
7	Meter - Request for Removal, Replacement, Relocation, or Change in Meter Size													
	5/8" to 2" Meter	Hourly - minimum 1 hour		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 65	53%	\$ 122	100%	1	\$ 65	\$ 122	\$ 122
	Larger than 2" Meter	Hourly - minimum 1 hour		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 80	66%	\$ 122	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Plus Meter Cost	Actual Cost		n/a	n/a	n/a	Actual Cost	n/a	Actual Cost	n/a	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Fee No.	Fee Name	Fee Unit / Type	Notes	Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis				Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis			
				Total - Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	FBHR	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee / Deposit	Existing Cost Recovery %	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	Recommended Cost Recovery %	Estimated Volume of Activity	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
8	Plan Check, Inspections, and Processing Fees													
	Single Family													
	Administrative Processing Fee	Flat		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 225	185%	\$ 122	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Contractor Costs	Deposit		n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 5,000	n/a	\$ 5,000	n/a	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	All Other													
	Administrative Processing Fee	Flat		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 225	185%	\$ 122	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Contractor Costs	Deposit		n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 5,000	n/a	\$ 5,000	n/a	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
9	Delinquent Account Service Charge	Flat	[1]				10% + 1.5% per month on unpaid balance		10% + 1.5% per month on unpaid balance					
10	Reconnection Charge													
	Reactivation During Normal Business Hours	Flat		0.67	\$ 122	\$ 81	\$ 50	62%	\$ 50	62%	101	\$ 5,050	\$ 8,186	\$ 5,050
	Reactivation During Non-Business Hours / Week Nights Between 4:30PM - 10:00PM	Flat		3.17	\$ 137	\$ 435	\$ 195	45%	\$ 150	34%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Reactivation During Late Week Nights (10:01PM - 8:30AM) / Weekends (Any Time) / Holidays (Any Time)	Flat		3.17	\$ 137	\$ 435	\$ 250	57%	\$ 150	34%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
11	Door Hangar Fee													
	Yellow Tag	per tag		0.14	\$ 122	\$ 17	\$ 10	59%	\$ 17	100%	936	\$ 9,360	\$ 15,930	\$ 15,930
	Red Tag	per tag		0.40	\$ 122	\$ 49	\$ 10	21%	\$ 49	100%	181	\$ 1,810	\$ 8,802	\$ 8,802
12	Private Fire Service		[1]											
	4"	Monthly					\$ 46		\$ 46					
	6"	Monthly					\$ 98		\$ 98					
	8"	Monthly					\$ 108		\$ 108					
	10"	Monthly					\$ 120		\$ 120					
	12"	Monthly					\$ 144		\$ 144					
13	Customer Valve Installation Fee	Hourly		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 65	53%	\$ 122	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
14	Will Service Letter Charge (Fire Flow)													
	Fire Flow Charge	Actual Cost		n/a	\$ 122	n/a	Actual Cost	%	Actual Cost	%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Administrative Processing Fee	Flat		0.33	\$ 122	\$ 41	\$ 30	74%	\$ 41	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Re-Test Fee; By Customer Request	Flat		1.83	\$ 122	\$ 223	\$ 35	16%	\$ 223	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Report of Site/Parcel Inspection To Determine Existing Or Potential Water Service	Flat		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 65	53%	\$ 122	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
15	Returned Check Fee	Flat	[3]	0.50	\$ 122	\$ 61	\$ 30	49%	\$ 30	49%	18	\$ 540	\$ 1,094	\$ 540
16	Fax Or Photo Copy Charges		[1]											
	10 Sheet Maximum	Per Sheet					\$ 0.25		\$ 0.25					
	District Form 700 Copies	Per Article					\$ 0.10		\$ 0.10					
	Any Other Document Per Customer/ Public Records Act Request	Per Copy					\$ 0.20		\$ 0.20					

Fee No.	Fee Name	Fee Unit / Type	Notes	Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis				Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis			
				Total - Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	FBHR	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee / Deposit	Existing Cost Recovery %	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	Recommended Cost Recovery %	Estimated Volume of Activity	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
17	Basic Facility, Distribution System, And Service Connection Installation Charges		[5]											
	5/8" x 3/4" Meter Size													
	Basic Facilities Charge	Flat					\$ 3,650		\$ 3,650					
	Distribution System Charge	Flat					\$ 3,200		\$ 3,200					
	Service Connection Charge	Flat					\$ 1,170		\$ 1,170					
	3/4" Meter Size													
	Basic Facilities Charge	Flat					\$ 5,450		\$ 5,450					
	Distribution System Charge	Flat					\$ 3,200		\$ 3,200					
	Service Connection Charge	Flat					\$ 1,180		\$ 1,180					
	1" Meter Size													
	Basic Facilities Charge	Flat					\$ 9,050		\$ 9,050					
	Distribution System Charge	Flat					\$ 3,200		\$ 3,200					
	Service Connection Charge	Flat					\$ 1,240		\$ 1,240					
	1-1/2" Meter Size													
	Basic Facilities Charge	Flat					\$ 18,150		\$ 18,150					
	Distribution System Charge	Flat					\$ 3,200		\$ 3,200					
	Service Connection Charge	Flat					\$ 1,900		\$ 1,900					
	2" Meter Size													
	Basic Facilities Charge	Flat					\$ 29,000		\$ 29,000					
	Distribution System Charge	Flat					\$ 3,200		\$ 3,200					
	Service Connection Charge	Flat					\$ 2,000		\$ 2,000					
18	Incident Fees		[1]											
	Normal Business Hours	Flat					\$ 70		\$ 70					
	After Normal Business Hours	Flat					\$ 250		\$ 250					
19	Lien Fees	Flat		2.00	\$ 122	\$ 243	\$ 100	41%	\$ 243	100%	6	\$ 600	\$ 1,459	\$ 1,459
20	Construction Meter / Hydrant Meter Charges													
	Refundable Deposit for Construction/ Hydrant Meters	Deposit		n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,000	n/a	\$ 1,000	n/a	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Monthly Meter Service Charge	Monthly	[1]				\$ 287		\$ 287					
	One-Time Account Set-Up Fee	Flat		n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 65	n/a	see account set up fees	n/a	8	\$ 520	\$ -	\$ -
	Water Quantitative Charge	Per Hundred Cubic Feet	[1]				\$ 2.75		\$ 2.75					
	Meter Recalibration Fee													
	District Administrative / Field Services Fee	Flat		1.25	\$ 122	\$ 152	\$ 200	132%	\$ 152	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Testing (3rd Party)	Flat	[4]	n/a	n.a	n/a	Actual Cost	100%	Actual Cost	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -

Cabazon Water District
 User Fee Study Fiscal Year 2019
 Cost of Service Estimate for Fee Related Services and Activities

Appendix B

Fee No.	Fee Name	Fee Unit / Type	NOTES	Activity Service Cost Analysis			Cost Recovery Analysis				Annual Estimated Revenue Analysis			
				Total - Estimated Average Labor Time Per Activity (hours)	FBHR	Cost of Service Per Activity	Current Fee / Deposit	Existing Cost Recovery %	Recommended Fee Level / Deposit	Recommended Cost Recovery %	Estimated Volume of Activity	Annual Estimated Revenues at Current Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Full Cost Recovery Fee	Annual Estimated Revenues at Recommended Fee
21	Load Count Charge													
	Refundable Deposit for Construction/ Hydrant Meters	Deposit		n/a	n/a	n/a	\$ 1,000	n/a	\$ 1,000	n/a	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Monthly Meter Service Charge	Monthly	[1]				\$ 148		\$ 148					
	One-Time Account Set-Up Fee	Flat		n/a	n.a	n/a	\$ 65	n/a	see account set up fees	n/a	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Water Quantitative Charge (min. of 100 cubic feet on the first load)	Per Cubic Foot	[1]				\$ 0.10		\$ 0.10					
	Required District Employee Supervision (regular business hours - min. 1 hour)	Hourly - minimum 1 hour		1.00	\$ 122	\$ 122	\$ 65	53%	\$ 122	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Required District Employee Supervision (non-business, weekend, or holiday hours - min. 3 hours)	Hourly - minimum 3 hours		1.00	\$ 137	\$ 137	\$ 65	47%	\$ 137	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
new	Lab Water Test Fee		[2]											
	District Administrative Processing	Flat		0.50	\$ 122	\$ 61	new	%	\$ 61	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	District Field Services	Flat		1.50	\$ 122	\$ 182	new	%	\$ 182	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
	Testing (3rd Party)	Flat	[4]	n/a	n/a	n/a	Actual Cost	100%	Actual Cost	100%	-	\$ -	\$ -	\$ -
TOTAL											\$ 19,465	\$ 37,132	\$ 33,442	

[Notes]

- [1] NBS did not evaluate
Only charged when meter tested is within specifications. If the meter does not meet current specifications, there will be no charge for testing, labor, or shipping and handling.
- [3] At the discretion of the District's Customer Accounts Department (CAD), customers that provide habitual NSF checks may be placed on a one (1) year probationary period of cash/cashier's check/money order only status, or, by way of memorandum from the CAD and with the approval of the Administrative Assistant or Manager, a customer may be placed on permanent cash/cashier's check/money order only status.
- [4] Fee amount is subject to change depending on actual amount charged by District's vendor for testing services
- [5] Connection fees per AB 1600/Mitigation Fee Act. NBS did not evaluate

APPENDIX C

Comparative Fee Survey

Cabazon Water District
 User Fee Study Fiscal Year 2019
 Comparison of Charges for Fee Related Activities and Services

Appendix C

Fee No.	Fee Description	Cabazon			Comparative Agencies						
		Fee Unit / Type	Current Fee	Recommended Fee	High Valleys Water District	Mission Springs Water District	Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District	East Valley Water District	Banning City Water Department	Hi-Desert Water District	Desert Water Agency
1	Metered Account Set-up Fee	Flat	\$ 20	\$ 20	\$ 25	\$ 82	No Comparison	\$ 30	No Comparison	\$ 25	\$ 30
2	Meter Accuracy Testing Fee - 2" or smaller										
	District Administrative Processing	Flat	\$ 25	\$ 30	No Comparison	\$ 112	In-House: 5/8" - 1" meters: \$30 1 1/2" - 2" meters: \$200 Third-Party: 5/8" - 1" meters: \$50 1 1/2" - 2" meters: \$250	\$ 75	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison
	District Field Services	Flat	\$ 50	\$ 152							
	Testing (3rd Party)	Flat	Actual Cost	Actual Cost							
	Meter Accuracy Testing Fee - Larger than 2"										
	District Administrative Processing	Flat	15% on top of Contractor Charge	\$ 30	No Comparison	\$ 112	No Comparison	\$ 75	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison
	District Field Services	hourly - Minimum 1 hour	\$ 65	Actual Cost / hourly							
	Testing (3rd Party)	Flat	Actual Cost	Actual Cost							
3	Backflow Testing Charge										
	District - Annual Monitoring Fee	Flat	\$ 50	\$ 30	No Comparison	Monthly Service Charge: 3/4": \$6.67 1": \$7.50 1 1/2": \$8.33 2": \$8.33 3": \$12.50 4": \$12.50 6": \$15.00 8": \$15.00	\$40 per year	\$20 per device	No Comparison	No Comparison	Monthly Backflow Charges to cover testing and minor repairs: 3/4": \$3.00 1"-3": \$3.50 4"-6": \$5.80 8"-12": \$7.00
	District Review of Test Results Performed by Third Party		no charge / included	no charge / included							
	Field Test Performed by District	Actual Cost / Hourly	Actual Cost / hourly	\$ 122							

Cabazon Water District
 User Fee Study Fiscal Year 2019
 Comparison of Charges for Fee Related Activities and Services

Appendix C

Fee No.	Fee Description	Cabazon			Comparative Agencies							
		Fee Unit / Type	Current Fee	Recommended Fee	High Valleys Water District	Mission Springs Water District	Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District	East Valley Water District	Banning City Water Department	Hi-Desert Water District	Desert Water Agency	
4	Backflow Protection Device Installation											
	District Administrative Processing	Flat	15% on top of Contractor Charge	\$ 30	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	Actual Cost	No Comparison	No Comparison	Double Check: 5/8x3/4 inch: \$647 1 inch: \$812 1-1/2 inch: \$1,480 2 inch: \$1,870 Reduced Pressure 5/8x3/4 inch: \$843 1 inch: \$1,005 1-1/2 inch: \$1,689 2 inch: \$2,053	
	District Field Services	hourly - Minimum 1 hour	\$ 65	Actual Cost / hourly								
	Install (3rd Party)	Flat	Actual Cost	Actual Cost								
5	Cabazon Water System Damage Fee											
	Normal Business Hours	hourly - Minimum 1 hour	\$ 70	\$ 122	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	
	After Normal Business Hours (3 hours min.)	Hourly - minimum 3 hours	\$ 250	\$ 137				\$80 after-hours charge regardless of which service is being provided				
6	Meter Request for Removal/ Replacement/ Relocate/ Change in Meter Size											
	5/8" to 2" Meter	Hourly - minimum 1 hour	\$ 65	\$ 122	No Comparison	No Comparison	Actual Cost - Time & Materials	No Comparison	No Comparison	Removal: \$20 Reinstallation: \$20	\$ 70	
	Larger than 2" Meter	Hourly - minimum 1 hour	\$ 80	\$ 122			Relocation Costs Determined by Board					
	Plus Meter Cost	Actual Cost	Actual Cost	Actual Cost			3/4" meter: \$268					Actual Cost

Cabazon Water District
 User Fee Study Fiscal Year 2019
 Comparison of Charges for Fee Related Activities and Services

Appendix C

Fee No.	Fee Description	Cabazon			Comparative Agencies						
		Fee Unit / Type	Current Fee	Recommended Fee	High Valleys Water District	Mission Springs Water District	Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District	East Valley Water District	Banning City Water Department	Hi-Desert Water District	Desert Water Agency
7	Plan Check, Inspections, and Processing Fees Single Family										
	Administrative Processing Fee	Flat	\$ 225	\$ 122	No Comparison	No Comparison	Inspections: Actual Cost	Engineering Service Charges: 10% of Engineer's estimated project cost	No Comparison	Inspections: Actual Cost - Deposit of 2% of costs with a minimum of \$500	\$140 plus \$0.10 per linear foot of public main or a flat of \$140 if there is no main or if it is for a landscape plan check.
	Contractor Costs	Deposit	\$ 5,000	\$ 5,000							
	All Other						Plan Check: \$5,000 Deposit			Preliminary Design & Plan Check: \$20/lot - Deposit of \$700	
	Administrative Processing Fee	Flat	\$ 225	\$ 122	No Comparison	No Comparison			No Comparison	Landscape Plan Check: Actual Cost - Deposit of \$300	
	Contractor Costs	Deposit	\$ 10,000	\$ 5,000							
8	Reconnection Charge										
	Reactivation During Normal Business Hours	Flat	\$ 50	\$ 50	\$ 25	Up to 1": \$50 1 1/2" - 2": \$78 Over 2": \$140 \$140 regardless of meter size	Actual Cost - Time & Materials	\$ 70	Next Day Reconnection: \$30	Disconnection Fee: \$40 Reconnection Fee: \$20	\$ 70
	Reactivation During Non-Business Hours / Week Nights Between 4:30PM - 10:00PM	Flat	\$ 195	\$ 150				\$ 150			Same Day Reconnection: \$43
	Reactivation During Late Week Nights (10:01PM - 8:30AM) / Weekends (Any Time) / Holidays (Any Time)	Flat	\$ 250	\$ 150							
9	Door Hangar Fee										
	Yellow Tag	per tag	\$ 10	\$ 17	\$ 15	No Comparison	No Comparison	\$ 23	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison
	Red Tag	per tag	\$ 10	\$ 49	\$ 15	No Comparison	No Comparison	\$ 23	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison
10	Customer Valve Installation Fee										
	Labor	Hourly	\$ 65	\$ 122	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	Valve Can Deposit: \$500 per valve can	No Comparison	No Comparison	1": \$360 1-1/2": \$370 2": \$435

Cabazon Water District
 User Fee Study Fiscal Year 2019
 Comparison of Charges for Fee Related Activities and Services

Fee No.	Fee Description	Cabazon			Comparative Agencies						
		Fee Unit / Type	Current Fee	Recommended Fee	High Valleys Water District	Mission Springs Water District	Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District	East Valley Water District	Banning City Water Department	Hi-Desert Water District	Desert Water Agency
11	Will Service Letter Charge (Fire Flow)										
	Fire Flow Charge	Flat	Actual Cost	Actual Cost	No Comparison	\$191 per hydrant	No Comparison	Actual Cost	No Comparison	Fire Flow Fee: \$200 Will Serve Letter: \$40/lot Will Serve Letter Subdivisions - Minor Subdivision: \$100 (5 lots or less) - Major Subdivision: Actual Cost - Deposit of \$250 (greater than 5 lots)	\$140 for administrative services including will-serve letters
	Administrative Processing Fee	Flat	\$ 30	\$ 41		No Comparison					
	Re-Test Fee; By Customer Request	Flat	\$ 35	\$ 223		No Comparison		\$ 75			
	Report of Site/Parcel Inspection To Determine Existing Or Potential Water Service	Flat	\$ 65	\$ 122		No Comparison					
12	Returned Check Fee	Flat	\$ 30	\$ 61	No Comparison	\$50 per check	No Comparison	\$ 20	\$ 25	\$25 per check	\$ 35
13	Lien Fees	Flat	\$ 100	\$ 243	No Comparison	Lien Released by MSWD: \$49 Lien Released by Escrow/ Customer: \$36	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison

Cabazon Water District
 User Fee Study Fiscal Year 2019
 Comparison of Charges for Fee Related Activities and Services

Appendix C

Fee No.	Fee Description	Cabazon			Comparative Agencies						
		Fee Unit / Type	Current Fee	Recommended Fee	High Valleys Water District	Mission Springs Water District	Beaumont-Cherry Valley Water District	East Valley Water District	Banning City Water Department	Hi-Desert Water District	Desert Water Agency
14	Construction Meter / Hydrant Meter Charges										
	Refundable Deposit for Construction/ Hydrant Meters	Deposit	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	No Comparison	No Comparison	\$ 2,200	Construction Inspection: \$900 Manhole Deposit: \$1,500 per manhole	\$ 500	Actual Cost	Deposit: \$964 Monthly Charge: \$163.14 Installation/Removal: \$140 Relocation: \$70
	One-Time Account Set-Up Fee	Flat	\$ 65	see account set up fees	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	\$ 30	No Comparison	No Comparison
	Meter Recalibration Fee										
	District Administrative / Field Services Fee	Flat	\$ 200	\$ 152	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison
	Testing (3rd Party)	Flat	\$ 50	Actual Cost							
15	Load Count Charge										
	Refundable Deposit for Construction/ Hydrant Meters	Deposit	\$ 1,500	\$ 1,500	\$100 per load plus a one time mandatory deposit of \$500	No Comparison	\$ 2,200	No Comparison	No Comparison	Actual Cost	No Comparison
	One-Time Account Set-Up Fee	Flat	\$ 65	see account set up fees	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison
	Required District Employee Supervision (regular business hours - min. 1 hour)	Hourly - minimum 1 hour	\$ 65	\$ 122	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison
	Required District Employee Supervision (non-business, weekend, or holiday hours - min. 3 hours)	Hourly - minimum 3 hours	\$ 65	\$ 137	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison	\$80 after-hours charge regardless of which service is being provided	No Comparison	No Comparison	No Comparison