

SOLEBURY TOWNSHIP BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

August 16, 2022 – 6:00 P.M.

Hybrid Meeting

MEETING MINUTES

Attendance: Mark Baum Baicker, Chair, John S. Francis, Vice-Chair, Hanna Howe, Robert McEwan, Kevin Morrissey, Christopher Garges, Township Manager, Michele Blood, Assistant Manager, and Catherine Cataldi, Secretary. Mark L. Freed, Township Solicitor was also in attendance.

The recording device was turned on.

I. The meeting was called to order followed by the Pledge of Allegiance.

II. Approval of Bills Payable – July 21, 2022 and August 4, 2022

Res.2022-106 – Upon a motion by Mr. McEwan, seconded by Ms. Howe, the list of Bills Payable dated July 21, 2022 and August 4, 2022 were unanimously approved as prepared and posted.

III. Approval of Meeting Minutes – June 21, 2022 and July 19, 2022

The July 19, 2022 meeting minutes were postponed until the September 6, 2022 Board of Supervisors' meeting.

Res.2022-107 – Upon a motion by Mr. Morrissey, seconded by Mr. McEwan, the Minutes of the June 21, 2022 Meeting were unanimously approved as prepared and posted.

IV. Announcements/Resignations/Appointments

Executive Session

The Board announced the Executive Session held August 16,2022 prior to the meeting dealing with Acquisition and Legal Matters.

V. Supervisor Comment

- Mr. Baum Baicker expressed gratitude to and applauded the Solebury Township and Dudley Rice for a successful National Night out.

VI. Presentation

Solebury Township HVAC System Assessment – Building Systems Engineering Group

James Dunne, Mechanical Engineer, BSEG, LLC presented a brief overview of the June 6, 2022 Solebury Township HVAC Assessment Report. The report includes an outline of the existing equipment, condition of the equipment and solutions for heating and cooling the Township building for the future.

Mr. Baum Baicker questioned if updating the existing system would be significantly more energy efficient or would the Township need to go with one of the other options notated in the report. Mr. Dunne stated that the existing system is pretty efficient now and by updating the existing system it would significantly gain energy efficiency. Mr. Dunne commented that if efficiency is the driving decision then Geothermal and Variable Refrigerant Flow can be explored but from a cost vs efficiency standpoint updating the Fan coil system is the best option. Mr. Baum Baicker asked how we can best

compare the efficiencies of the various options quantitatively. Mr. Dunne advised that an energy analysis would need to be performed on each system, which BSEG, LLC can do.

Mr. Baum Baicker and Mr. Dunne discussed the need to relocate Township employees if the options of geothermal and variable refrigerant flow were chosen.

Mr. Baum Baicker questioned the costs associated with the fifteen geothermal wells notated in the report. Mr. Dunne advised that the cost range is six thousand dollars to sixteen thousand dollars per well as many factors affect the cost of the wells.

Mr. Francis questioned if the assessment was done on the HVAC for all three buildings at the Township or if it was done on the HVAC for just the Municipal building. Mr. Dunne advised that HVAC system of the other building were relatively new, so the assessment was only done on the Municipal building.

Mr. Francis expressed interest in the Township researching the long-term benefits of any modifications and costs over a long period of time. Mr. Francis questioned how to get a cost comparison and efficiency for each option. Mr. Dunne explained the load analysis program that is used by BSEG, LLC and that a test well is preformed to analysis geothermal.

Mr. Francis questioned the depth of the geothermal wells. Mr. Dunne advised that the wells are for hundred to five hundred feet deep. Discussion ensued on horizontal piping for geothermal wells.

Mr. Francis questioned the anticipated fuel source for each system. Mr. Dunne advised that the existing system uses electric and natural gas; the variable refrigerant flow uses all electric and the ground source uses electric and possibly natural gas. Mr. Francis questioned how solar could play into any of the HVAC systems. Mr. Dunne commented that solar could offset the amount of electric used.

Mr. Baum Baicker question if a bigger generator would be needed for an all-electric system. Mr. Dunne commented that it depends on if the complete system is to be on the generator.

Mr. McEwan questioned how much space is needed for the vertical and horizontal wells.

Ms. Howe questioned the life expectancy of each system. Mr. Dunne commented that most systems have a life expectancy of fifteen to twenty years and that geothermal would be a little less due to the compressors.

John DeAndrea, resident, questioned if the existing system was insulated. Mr. Dunne notated that sections of the piping were not insulated. Mr. DeAndrea questioned the tons for the cooling system and if it was one unit. Mr. Dunne confirmed that the unit is made of one cooled air chiller and the unit is forty tons. Mr. DeAndrea questioned if the system was a R410, if the unit was newer and if the unit was a double or single compressor. Mr. Dunne commented that the chiller was newer, dual compressor, variable speed and three phase. Mr. DeAndrea commented on the electric used by the Township. Mr. Dunne commented on the different systems and the fuel sources.

Shannon Pendleton, resident questioned if the report will be available for view by the public. The Board expressed interest in posting the report and getting resident feedback. Ms. Pendleton questioned if BSEG has done a zero-energy system and if so was BSEG the lead consultant. Mr. Dunne advised that BSEG has not done a zero-energy system but has done a few passive house projects. Ms. Pendleton questioned: what services were included in the scope of the energy analysis; whether BSEG does their own energy modeling or does BSEG engage or works in tandem with energy modelers; and does BSEG

have feasibility studies that show efficiency return on investment, indoor air quality, etc. Ms. Pendleton commented on the on the HVAC equipment, the building envelope and brining in an energy modeler.

Conversation ensued between the Board. The Board requested the administration post the report to the Township website soliciting resident feedback. BSEG, LLC is to submit a proposal on the breakeven analysis and the Board is to revisit at a future meeting.

VII. Public Hearing

Historical Architectural Review Board (HARB) – Certificate of Appropriateness – Mark Worth (2610 River Road, TMP # 41-030-002)

Upon a motion by Scott Minnucci, seconded by CL Lindsay, it was (unanimously) agreed to recommend issuance of a Certificate of Appropriateness to TMP# 41-030-002 as follows:

- 1. The demolition of the existing greenhouse has been approved.*
- 2. The demolition of the cinderblock exterior chimney has been tabled until more information is provided.*
- 3. The information requested is as follows: the dating of the chimney, classification of construction, and any photographs and documentation that may be applicable.*
- 4. It has also been requested that the applicant provide a proposal of the restoration of the exterior stone wall after the chimney has been removed.*

Res.2022-108 - Upon a motion by Ms. Howe, seconded by Mr. Morrissey, it was unanimously agreed to issue a Certificate of Appropriateness to TMP # 41-030-002, 2610 River Road as recommended by the Historical Architectural Review Board. Issuance of the Certificate of Appropriateness does not relieve the applicant from obtaining any and all applicable permits prior to commencement of work.

VIII. New Business

Historical Architectural Review Board – Consideration of Recommendation – Zoning Ordinance Amendment Concealing Commercial Dumpsters

Scott Minnucci gave an overview of the HARB recommendation.

Upon a motion by Nancy Ruddle, seconded by Steve Young, it was (unanimously) agreed to move forward to the Board of Supervisors the amendment to concealing commercial dumpsters. It is agreed upon as follows:

- 1. Wooden fences and stone walls or other appropriate screening materials would be acceptable materials for concealing dumpsters.*
- 2. If the enclosure is damaged, it is to be replaced or fixed.*
- 3. The doors to the enclosure must remain closed when not in use.*
- 4. The enclosure must be large enough for the doors to close.*

Ms. Pendleton questioned the use of simulated wood. Mr. Minnucci commented that the Historical Architectural Review Board does recommend natural products, but simulated products have been approved as long as they do not appear simulated.

Mr. Baum Baicker questioned if the concealment of commercial dumpsters applies to long-term or temporary dumpsters. Mr. Minnucci confirmed that the concealment of commercial dumpsters is regarding permanent dumpsters or long-term dumpsters.

Res.2022-109 – Upon a motion by Mr. Francis, seconded by Ms. Howe, it was unanimously agreed to authorize the Township Solicitor to draft an amendment to the ordinance based on the recommendations by the Historical Architectural Review Board.

Motion to Take Action on Stipulation of Settlement Agreement on Zoning Hearing Board Appeal of Carversville Inn

Mr. Freed gave an overview of the topic. A neighboring party, Dr. Howard Barsky filed an appeal to the Bucks County Court of Common Pleas regarding the Zoning Hearing Board decision. Discussion has ensued regarding a possible settlement.

Res.2022-110 – Upon a motion by Mr. Baum Baicker, seconded by Mr. McEwan, it was unanimously agreed to authorize the Township Solicitor to enter into discussions with representatives of the owners of the Carversville Inn, Dr. Howard Barsky and the Solebury Township Zoning Hearing Board to potentially resolve the appeal of the decision of the Zoning Hearing Board in this matter.

Resolution – Opposing Sale of Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority

The Board announced the notification of Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority’s proposal to sell sewer operations to Aqua Pennsylvania at their July meeting. Mr. McEwan gave an overview of the meetings held by Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority and outstanding questions.

Mr. Morrissey expressed opposition of the proposed sale of sewer operations to Aqua Pennsylvania.

Mr. Baum Baicker gave an overview of the resolution (copy of which is attached).

Ms. Pendleton expressed opposition of the proposed sale of Sewer to Aqua Pennsylvania

Mr. DeAndrea questioned the number of households with sewer. Mr. Baum Baicker commented about one thousand (1,000). Mr. DeAndrea questioned the legal resources.

Res.2022-111 – Upon a motion by Mr. Baum Baicker, seconded by Mr. Francis, it was unanimously agreed to approve the resolution to oppose the proposed sale and urges the Bucks County Commissioners to take all reasonable and necessary steps to compel the Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority to abandon its negotiations and continue to operate as an independent non-profit agency.

Non-Discrimination Ordinance – Authorization to Advertise

Mr. Baum Baicker gave an overview of the ordinance. The proposed ordinance contains two parts: 1) Establishment of the Solebury Township Human Relations Commission; and 2) Amend and Supplement the Solebury Code of Ordinance by adding a new Chapter 3 to ensure that all persons, regardless of actual or perceived race, color, sex, religion, ancestry, genetic information, national origin, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, familial status, marital status, mental or physical disability, use of guide or support animals and/or mechanical aids enjoy the full benefits of citizenship and are afforded equal opportunities for employment, housing and the use of public accommodations, and to have equal access to educational institutions, it is necessary that appropriate legislation be enacted.

Mr. Francis questioned the costs associated with the Solebury Township Human Relations Commission.

Barbara Zietchick, resident, questioned how a resident would file a complaint.

Tom Lyons, resident, expressed gratitude to the Board and support for the ordinance.

Res.2022-112 – Upon a motion by Mr. Baum Baicker, seconded by Mr. Morrissey, it was unanimously agreed to advertise the Non-Discrimination Ordinance.

Consideration of Waiving Permit Fees for Alternative Energy Projects

Mr. McEwan presented a recommendation to waive Township permit fees for alternative energy project (Copy of motion and comments attached).

The motion lower many of the Township permit fees associated with solar, geo-thermal and EV charging stations was introduced by Mr. McEwan, seconded by Mr. Francis, Vote 2-3; Motion Failed

In Favor: Mr. McEwan and Mr. Francis

Opposed: Mr. Baum Baicker, Ms. Howe and Mr. Morrissey

Authorization to Sell on Municibid – 2002 John Deere 310 SG Backhoe

Res.2022-113 – Upon a motion by Mr. Baum Baicker, seconded by Ms. Howe, it was unanimously agreed to authorize the Administration to sell the 2002 John Deere 310 SG Backhoe on Municibid.

IX. Public Comment

- John DeAndrea, resident, commented on the deer management.

X. Adjournment

The meeting was adjourned at 7:55 p.m.

Respectfully submitted,
Catherine Cataldi
Secretary

**RESOLUTION OPPOSING THE SALE OF BUCKS COUNTY WATER AND SEWER
AUTHORITY'S ASSETS TO AQUA PENNSYLVANIA**

WHEREAS, Bucks County Water and Sewer Authority (BCWSA) provides services to about 100,000 households, nearly one-third of the County population, in 31 municipalities and is the largest single provider of water and sewer services in the County;

WHEREAS, BCWSA is considering an offer from Aqua to purchase its assets for \$1.1 billion dollars;

WHEREAS, Aqua's rates are set through rate-making procedures before the Pennsylvania Public Utility Commission and Aqua has a history of increasing its sewer rates substantially, including those municipalities which sold their private wastewater systems to Aqua including Limerick Township whose rates increased 82%, East Bradford Township whose rates increased 64%, Cheltenham Township whose rates increased 65%, East Norriton Township whose rates increased 57% and New Garden Township whose rates increased 53%;

WHEREAS, Aqua in May of 2019 offered to purchase the wastewater system owned by Warrington Township for \$40,200,000, and anticipated a rate increase of 66% when Aqua next appeared before the PUC;

WHEREAS, in September of 2019 Warrington Township sold its wastewater system to BCWSA for a base price of \$16,150,000- far less than half of what it could have received from Aqua based on its belief that BCWSA had no intention of selling its system to a private utility;

WHEREAS, the Public Utility Commission recently approved a rate increase of 59% for Aqua's wastewater customers, less than the increase that Aqua requested;

WHEREAS, at a time when costs are increasing for all Bucks County residents, through no fault of our local elected officials, residents can scarcely afford an increase in sewer fees;

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors of Solebury Township believes it is unconscionable for BCWSA to sell its assets to Aqua as the long-term financial impacts that major increases in sewer rates will have on the residents and businesses being served and on Bucks County in general;


WHEREAS, Wastewater services such as those provided by BCWSA are essential to protecting the environment and it is imperative that those services be provided at cost-effective and reasonable fee structures; and

WHEREAS, privatization of BCWSA's assets ultimately results in negative impacts for local municipalities and their residents.

NOW, THEREFORE, be it resolved that the Board of Supervisors of Solebury Township is opposed to the sale of BCWSA's assets to Aqua, Pennsylvania, and implores BCWSA to abandon negotiations with Aqua and to continue to operate as an independent, non-profit agency.

FURTHER, the Board of Supervisors of Solebury Township respectfully implores the County Commissioners to take all reasonable and necessary steps to compel BCWSA to abandon its negotiations and to continue operating as an independent, non-profit agency, as intended when it was created in 1962 by the Bucks County Commissioners. If there is no other recourse, we believe the County should disband the BCWSA and take over the assets and operation of the sewer system until a public entity is found to sell the system to.

Resolved and enacted by the Board of Supervisors of Solebury Township at a public meeting on this 16th day of August, 2022.




Mark Baum Baicker, Chair


John S. Francis, Vice-Chair



Kevin Morrissey, Member



Robert McEwan, Member



Hannah Howe, Member

Attest:



Catherine Cataldi, Township Secretary

Robert McEwan's Comments & Motion to BOS & Residents regarding Permit Fee reductions RAM 8/12/2022

The topic is a proposed Motion for Solebury's Board of Supervisors (BOS) to lower permit fees for a specific list of what are officially referred to, and found on the Web Site, under Permit fees, Exhibition "C." This list of fees dated December 15, 2021 were approved for 2022 by the BOS. The motion, if passed, would amend the permit fee list for EV Charging Stations, Solar and Geo-Thermal installations as noted below.

The overriding intention of lowering select fees is to promote and encourage continued attention to decreasing fossil fuels and their Carbon production via incremental mitigation steps.

MOTIVATION: A key learning of PC, EAC & BOS members from their studies and meetings with other EAC's is the need to constantly bring residents ideas for taking action at their own homes to join the worldwide effort to switch to renewable energy sources. This of course will lead to cleaner air in our neighborhoods. Tonight's proposal was endorsed by both the EAC and the Planning Commission during their July meetings.

OPTIMIZING specific building fees to incentivize resident and commercial owners is not a new idea. Indeed Solebury Township's residents and consultants have endorsed and promoted the concept since 2014 as follows:

Solebury Township's 2014 Comprehensive Plan recommends under "Energy Conservation, Building and Development" page 139 states: "Provide incentives (such as reduced building permit fees.)"

The Bucks County Planning Commission's 2020 draft "Model Alternative Energy Ordinance" (see items #6, page 13: Bonus Provisions:) recommends a formula for lower permit fees. This draft ordinance is under active review by Solebury Township's Planning Commission and we hope to see it at a BOS meeting soon.

Solebury's draft Energy Transition Plan (ETP) which was presented at the March 16, 2021 Supervisors meeting, and the recently an updated draft was distributed to several committees for review and comment. The ETP specifically notes the following action, among others, could help transition to renewable energy: * Review processes to discover impediments to businesses and residents, *Remove roadblocks, *Conceive of and identify incentives, *Encourage Investment of Sustainable dollars and Forward thinking Policies." All of these speak to reducing the Township's Zoning fees to promote clean energy generation.

Resolution #2020-98, titled "READY FOR 100," was passed by the Supervisors July 21, 2020 It commits the Township to reduce our carbon footprint, via all possible means, by 2050.

Assuming this fee change is enacted, the Township will advertise the incentives to residents and commercial builders, architects, contractors, and other townships EAC's via as many social media outlets as possible and, of course, at the Township's permit counter.

With these points in mind I would like to make the motion to lower many of our permit fees associated with solar, geo-thermal and EV charging stations as specified in an amended list effective immediately. Please note the motion is to reduce the permit fees not the inspection fees involved in each permitted action. These incentives would be reviewed in December 2023, along with the normal fee schedule, in the budgeting process for fiscal year 2024. The funding,

if necessary, to pay for any large shortfall in fees that support out Zoning Office, would come from the funds we have established for Sustainability Professional Services, \$20,000, of which we have used zero to date.

The following list of permit fees would be reduced to \$0.
List here.

Applicable Fee	Amount
New Solar (Residential)	
Building Review Fee	\$27.50
New Residential Construction including additions and accessory buildings (Single Family, Multiple Unit and Mobile Home)	
Less than 1,000 sq. feet	\$400 plus \$.45 per Sq. Foot
1,000 sq. feet or greater	\$1,200 plus \$.45 per sq. ft.
Alternative Energy Solar, Wind, Etc.	
Up to 100 kW	\$200
11-100 kW	\$20 per kW
101-500 kW	\$15 per kW
Over 500 kW	\$10 per kW
Reinspections	\$36
Certificate of Occupancy	\$100
Zoning Review Fee	\$35
Electrical Plan Review Fee	\$25
State UCC Fee	\$4.50
Feeders and Subpanels	
Over 30 thru 200 Amps	\$85
Over 200 thru 400 Amps	\$100
Over 400 thru 600 Amps	\$125
Over 600 thru 1200 Amps	\$156
Over 1200 Amps	\$210
Services exceeding one meter (in addition to above)	\$6 per meter
Services, Equipment and Metering	
Single Meter 30 thru 200 Amps	\$150
Single Meter over 200 thru 400 Amps	\$175
Single meter over 400 thru 1200 Amps	\$200
Services exceeding one meter (in addition to above)	\$6 per meter

NOTE: FEES ABOVE MAY BE APPLICABLE. NOT ALL FEES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH A SOLAR PROJECT. BOLD TITLES ARE LINE ITEMS FROM FEE SCHEDULE

Applicable Fee	Amount
Solar Installation (Existing Residential)	
Building Review Fee	\$27.50
Alterations, Renovations, and Repairs	\$75 plus \$15 per \$1000 of construction Cost
Alternative Energy Solar, Wind, Etc.	
Up to 100 kW	\$200
11-100 kW	\$20 per kW
101-500 kW	\$15 per kW
Over 500 kW	\$10 per kW
Reinspections	\$36
Certificate of Occupancy	\$25
Zoning Review Fee	\$35
Electrical Plan Review Fee	\$25
State UCC Fee	\$4.50
Feeders and Subpanels	
Over 30 thru 200 Amps	\$85
Over 200 thru 400 Amps	\$100
Over 400 thru 600 Amps	\$125
Over 600 thru 1200 Amps	\$156
Over 1200 Amps	\$210
Services exceeding one meter (in addition to above)	\$6 per meter
Services, Equipment and Metering	
Single Meter 30 thru 200 Amps	\$150
Single Meter over 200 thru 400 Amps	\$175
Single meter over 400 thru 1200 Amps	\$200
Services exceeding one meter (in addition to above)	\$6 per meter

NOTE: FEES ABOVE MAY BE APPLICABLE. NOT ALL FEES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH A SOLAR PROJECT. BOLD TITLES ARE LINE ITEMS FROM FEE SCHEDULE.

Applicable Fee	Amount
New Geothermal Well Installation (Residential)	
Mechanical Plan Review Fee	\$27.50
Mechanical New Installation	\$75 plus \$15 per \$1000 of construction Cost
First \$1,000 of installation cost or fraction thereof	\$90
Each additional \$1,000 of installation cost or fraction thereof up to \$5,000	\$30
Each additional \$1,000 of installation cost or fraction thereafter	\$20
Residential Addition/Alteration/Renovation (incl. rough & final inspection)	\$150
Reinspections	\$36
Certificate of Occupancy	\$25
Zoning Review Fee	\$35
Electrical Plan Review Fee	\$25
State UCC Fee	\$4.50
Feeders and Subpanels	
Over 30 thru 200 Amps	\$85
Over 200 thru 400 Amps	\$100
Over 400 thru 600 Amps	\$125
Over 600 thru 1200 Amps	\$156
Over 1200 Amps	\$210
Services exceeding one meter (in addition to above)	\$6 per meter
Services, Equipment and Metering	
Single Meter 30 thru 200 Amps	\$150
Single Meter over 200 thru 400 Amps	\$175
Single meter over 400 thru 1200 Amps	\$200
Services exceeding one meter (in addition to above)	\$6 per meter

NOTE: FEES ABOVE MAY BE APPLICABLE. NOT ALL FEES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH A GEOTHERMAL PROJECT. BOLD TITLES ARE LINE ITEMS FROM FEE SCHEDULE.

Applicable Fee	Amount
Replacement Geothermal Well Installation (Residential)	
Mechanical Plan Review Fee	\$27.50
Mechanical Replacement	\$75
Residential Addition/Alteration/Renovation (incl. rough & final inspection)	\$150
Reinspections	\$36
Certificate of Occupancy	\$25
Zoning Review Fee	\$35
Electrical Plan Review Fee	\$25
State UCC Fee	\$4.50
Feeders and Subpanels	
Over 30 thru 200 Amps	\$85
Over 200 thru 400 Amps	\$100
Over 400 thru 600 Amps	\$125
Over 600 thru 1200 Amps	\$156
Over 1200 Amps	\$210
Services exceeding one meter (in addition to above)	\$6 per meter
Services, Equipment and Metering	
Single Meter 30 thru 200 Amps	\$150
Single Meter over 200 thru 400 Amps	\$175
Single meter over 400 thru 1200 Amps	\$200
Services exceeding one meter (in addition to above)	\$6 per meter

NOTE: FEES ABOVE MAY BE APPLICABLE. NOT ALL FEES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH A GEOTHERMAL PROJECT. BOLD TITLES ARE LINE ITEMS FROM FEE SCHEDULE.

Applicable Fee	Amount
Car Charging Station	
Reinspections	\$36
Certificate of Occupancy	\$25
Zoning Review Fee	\$35
Car Charging Station/Solar Battery	\$125
State UCC Fee	\$4.50
Feeders and Subpanels	
Over 30 thru 200 Amps	\$85
Over 200 thru 400 Amps	\$100
Over 400 thru 600 Amps	\$125
Over 600 thru 1200 Amps	\$156
Over 1200 Amps	\$210
Services exceeding one meter (in addition to above)	\$6 per meter
Services, Equipment and Metering	
Single Meter 30 thru 200 Amps	\$150
Single Meter over 200 thru 400 Amps	\$175
Single meter over 400 thru 1200 Amps	\$200
Services exceeding one meter (in addition to above)	\$6 per meter

NOTE: FEES ABOVE MAY BE APPLICABLE. NOT ALL FEES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH A SOLAR PROJECT. BOLD TITLES ARE LINE ITEMS FROM FEE SCHEDULE.

Building Review Fee

15% of the total permit cost

Commercial Alterations, Renovations, and Repairs**Less than 1,000 sq. Ft.**

\$100

1,000 sq. ft. or greater

\$100 plus \$20 per \$1,000 of construction cost

Non-Residential Electric (based upon total cost of electrical portion of

up to \$6,000

\$150

From \$6,001 to \$10,000

\$175

From \$10,001 to \$15,000

\$200

From \$15,001 to \$20,000

\$250

From \$20,001 to \$30,000

\$300

From \$30,001 to \$40,000

\$350

From \$40,001 to \$50,000

\$400

From \$50,001 to \$60,000

\$450

From \$60,001 to \$70,000

\$500

From \$70,001 to \$80,000

\$550

From \$80,001 to \$90,000

\$600

From \$90,001 to \$100,000

\$650

From \$100,001 to \$150,000

\$725

From \$150,001 to \$200,000

\$800

From \$200,001 to \$250,000

\$875

From \$250,001 to \$300,000

\$950

From \$300,001 to \$350,000

\$1,025

From \$350,001 to \$400,000

\$1,100

From \$400,001 to \$450,000

\$1,175

From \$450,001 to \$500,000

\$1,250

From \$500,001 to \$550,000

\$1,325

From \$550,001 to \$600,000

\$1,400

From \$600,001 to \$650,000

\$1,475

From \$650,001 to \$700,000

\$1,550

From \$700,001 to \$750,000

\$1,625

From \$750,001 to \$800,000

\$1,700

From \$800,001 to \$850,000

\$1,775

From \$850,001 to \$900,000

\$1,850

From \$950,001 to \$1,000,000

\$1,925

Reinspections

\$36

Commercial Use and Occupancy Permits

\$300

Zoning Review Fee

\$125

Electrical Plan Review Fee

15% of the total permit cost

State UCC Fee

\$4.50

NOTE: FEES ABOVE MAY BE APPLICABLE. NOT ALL FEES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH A SOLAR PROJECT. BOLD TITLES ARE LINE ITEMS FROM FEE SCHEDULE

Geothermal Well Installation**Mechanical Review Fee**

15% of the total permit cost

Commercial Mechanical Fees

First \$1,000 of installation cost or fraction thereof \$150

Each additional \$1,000 of installation cost or fraction thereof up to \$5,000 \$50

Each additional \$1,000 of installation cost or fraction thereafter \$25

Non-Residential Electric (based upon total cost of electrical portion of construction)

up to \$6,000 \$150

From \$6,001 to \$10,000 \$175

From \$10,001 to \$15,000 \$200

From \$15,001 to \$20,000 \$250

From \$20,001 to \$30,000 \$300

From \$30,001 to \$40,000 \$350

From \$40,001 to \$50,000 \$400

From \$50,001 to \$60,000 \$450

From \$60,001 to \$70,000 \$500

From \$70,001 to \$80,000 \$550

From \$80,001 to \$90,000 \$600

From \$90,001 to \$100,000 \$650

From \$100,001 to \$150,000 \$725

From \$150,001 to \$200,000 \$800

From \$200,001 to \$250,000 \$875

From \$250,001 to \$300,000 \$950

From \$300,001 to \$350,000 \$1,025

From \$350,001 to \$400,000 \$1,100

From \$400,001 to \$450,000 \$1,175

From \$450,001 to \$500,000 \$1,250

From \$500,001 to \$550,000 \$1,325

From \$550,001 to \$600,000 \$1,400

From \$600,001 to \$650,000 \$1,475

From \$650,001 to \$700,000 \$1,550

From \$700,001 to \$750,000 \$1,625

From \$750,001 to \$800,000 \$1,700

From \$800,001 to \$850,000 \$1,775

From \$850,001 to \$900,000 \$1,850

From \$950,001 to \$1,000,000 \$1,925

Reinspections \$36**Commercial Use and Occupancy Permits** \$300**Zoning Review Fee** \$125**Electrical Plan Review Fee** 15% of the total permit cost**State UCC Fee** \$4.50

NOTE: FEES ABOVE MAY BE APPLICABLE. NOT ALL FEES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH A SOLAR PROJECT. BOLD TITLES ARE LINE ITEMS FROM FEE SCHEDULE

Applicable Fee	Amount
New Solar (Commercial)	
Building Review Fee	15% of the total permit cost
Commercial Industrial, Shopping Center, Professional, Including all Buildings and Additions	\$1,200 plus \$.75 per sq. ft.
Non-Residential Electric (based upon total cost of electrical portion of construction)	
up to \$6,000	\$150
From \$6,001 to \$10,000	\$175
From \$10,001 to \$15,000	\$200
From \$15,001 to \$20,000	\$250
From \$20,001 to \$30,000	\$300
From \$30,001 to \$40,000	\$350
From \$40,001 to \$50,000	\$400
From \$50,001 to \$60,000	\$450
From \$60,001 to \$70,000	\$500
From \$70,001 to \$80,000	\$550
From \$80,001 to \$90,000	\$600
From \$90,001 to \$100,000	\$650
From \$100,001 to \$150,000	\$725
From \$150,001 to \$200,000	\$800
From \$200,001 to \$250,000	\$875
From \$250,001 to \$300,000	\$950
From \$300,001 to \$350,000	\$1,025
From \$350,001 to \$400,000	\$1,100
From \$400,001 to \$450,000	\$1,175
From \$450,001 to \$500,000	\$1,250
From \$500,001 to \$550,000	\$1,325
From \$550,001 to \$600,000	\$1,400
From \$600,001 to \$650,000	\$1,475
From \$650,001 to \$700,000	\$1,550
From \$700,001 to \$750,000	\$1,625
From \$750,001 to \$800,000	\$1,700
From \$800,001 to \$850,000	\$1,775
From \$850,001 to \$900,000	\$1,850
From \$900,001 to \$1,000,000	\$1,925
Reinspections	\$36
Commercial Use and Occupancy Permits	\$300
Zoning Review Fee	\$125
Electrical Plan Review Fee	15% of the total permit cost
State UCC Fee	\$4.50

NOTE: FEES ABOVE MAY BE APPLICABLE. NOT ALL FEES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH A SOLAR PROJECT. BOLD TITLES ARE LINE ITEMS FROM FEE SCHEDULE

Car Charging Station

Non-Residential Electric (based upon total cost of electrical portion of construction)

up to \$6,000	\$150
From \$6,001 to \$10,000	\$175
From \$10,001 to \$15,000	\$200
From \$15,001 to \$20,000	\$250
From \$20,001 to \$30,000	\$300
From \$30,001 to \$40,000	\$350
From \$40,001 to \$50,000	\$400
From \$50,001 to \$60,000	\$450
From \$60,001 to \$70,000	\$500
From \$70,001 to \$80,000	\$550
From \$80,001 to \$90,000	\$600
From \$90,001 to \$100,000	\$650
From \$100,001 to \$150,000	\$725
From \$150,001 to \$200,000	\$800
From \$200,001 to \$250,000	\$875
From \$250,001 to \$300,000	\$950
From \$300,001 to \$350,000	\$1,025
From \$350,001 to \$400,000	\$1,100
From \$400,001 to \$450,000	\$1,175
From \$450,001 to \$500,000	\$1,250
From \$500,001 to \$550,000	\$1,325
From \$550,001 to \$600,000	\$1,400
From \$600,001 to \$650,000	\$1,475
From \$650,001 to \$700,000	\$1,550
From \$700,001 to \$750,000	\$1,625
From \$750,001 to \$800,000	\$1,700
From \$800,001 to \$850,000	\$1,775
From \$850,001 to \$900,000	\$1,850
From \$950,001 to \$1,000,000	\$1,925
Reinspections	\$36
Commercial Use and Occupancy Permits	\$300
Zoning Review Fee	\$125
Electrical Plan Review Fee	15% of the total permit cost
State UCC Fee	\$4.50

NOTE: FEES ABOVE MAY BE APPLICABLE. NOT ALL FEES ARE ASSOCIATED WITH A SOLAR PROJECT. BOLD TITLES ARE LINE ITEMS FROM FEE SCHEDULE