



TO: Mayor and Council

FROM: Howard S. Lazarus, City Administrator

CC: Tom Crawford, CFO
Derek Delacourt, Community Services Area Administrator
Teresa Gillotti, Interim Director, OCED
Karen Lancaster, Finance Director
Craig Hupy, Public Services Area Administrator
Susan Pollay, Executive Director, DDA
Marti Praschan, Chief of Staff, Public Services

SUBJECT: Council Agenda Responses

DATE: June 18, 2018

CA-9 – Resolution in Support of Fiscal Responsibility to Save Michigan’s Communities

Question: Regarding CA-9, the resolution mentions 2002 a couple of times. Is that the first year the state did not fully fund the statutory revenue sharing? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Response: 2002 is the year the State started meaningfully reducing the City’s State Shared Revenue and is the date www.savemicity.org (supported by the MML) utilizes to estimate the impact to each local community.

CA-10 - Resolution to Amend Ann Arbor City Budget for Fiscal Year 2018 (8 Votes Required)

Question: Please update me regarding the fund balance after the Y-Lot purchase and the expenditure of the \$1,180,000 in this resolution. (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: General Fund unassigned fund balance is projected to be \$13.1 million (which includes a reduction of \$4.2 million for quiet title to the 350 S. Fifth Ave, but does not include \$1 million legal settlement which will be expended in FY2019). If the approved bond is issued In FY2019 as planned, this will restore approximately \$5.5 million to fund balance.

Question: Q1. The City Attorney's Office overrun of \$165K is about 8% of the FY18 expense budget for the department. The attachment lists items contributing to the budget overrun including "office construction, office furniture, and staff salary adjustments". How much was spent on office construction and office furniture and weren't the staff salary adjustment included in the budget? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The office construction (Mr. McDonald's office) was \$6,000 and office furniture of \$7,400. The salary staff adjustments were not in the budget as they arose during the hiring of 4 new attorneys; they were completed as the overhire process progressed. Moreover, the salary increase and lump sum of the City Attorney in March, 2018 was not included in the budget (and is usually not budgeted for).

Question: Q2. Non-retirement severances were listed a couple of times in the explanations. How much will non-retirement severances be for the year and can you please remind me what our non-retirement severance policy is? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Through May 31, 2018, non-retirement severances were \$66k. When employees leave the organization prior to retirement, they are paid-out for their unused vacation, personal, and comp-time balances.

Question: Q3. As the FY18 fiscal year is almost over, what is your forecast for the year for the General Fund (revenues, expenses and fund balance)? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The General Fund is forecasted to finish 2018 with revenues of \$102.2 million, expenditures with \$101.1 million, for a net contribution to unassigned fund balance of \$1.1 million. Unassigned fund balance is projected to be \$13.1 million (which includes a reduction of \$4.2 million for quiet title to the 350 S. Fifth Ave, but does not include \$1 million legal settlement which will be expended in FY2019).

CA-14 – Resolution to Approve Street Closures for University of Michigan Football Games for the 2018 Season

Question: Regarding CA-14, this appears to be the same closure plan that's been utilized the last couple of years, but if not, can you please describe what the changes are? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The street closures remain exactly the same. There will be some additional safeguards that will not change the plan or closure.

CA-20 - Resolution to Ratify Emergency Contract with United Lawnscape, LLC for Seasonal Mowing and Trimming (\$44,940.00)

Question: Please provide me with information regarding the scheduled frequency for mowing, (1) parks, and (2) boulevard islands and other city-owned right of ways. (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Parks, medians and other City-maintained right of ways are on a 14-day mowing schedule. Wet or dry conditions can impact this schedule. The spring wet conditions and the withdrawal of a contractor with no notice caused the spring mowing to be delayed. A replacement contractor has been secured and mowing is occurring.

CA-21 - Resolution Approving a Contract with the Shelter Association of Washtenaw County for the 2017-18 Winter Emergency Shelter and Warming Center (\$72,000.00)

Question: Regarding CA-21, I was a bit confused by the whereas clause reference to the county's authorizing an expenditure of \$20K. Is that in addition to the \$83K they had budgeted? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The City is one of three groups funding this effort. Washtenaw County contributed \$83,540

- The Shelter Association of Washtenaw County (SAWC) contributed \$20,000 – this is an individual non-profit executing the program, not the County.
- City of Ann Arbor is contributing \$72,000.00

CA-23 - Resolution to Approve a Contract with Ann Arbor SPARK for Economic Development Services (\$75,000.00)

Question: Regarding CA-23, Exhibit D of the agreement includes the metrics that had been established and the requirement for semi-annual reporting to the City Administrator on the metrics. Can you please provide the most recent semi-annual report? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The most recent semi-annual report is July 1 – December 31, 2017 and has been included as a Clerk's Report item on the June 18 City Council agenda.

CA-25 - Resolution to Approve Amendment No. 6 to the Carlisle/Wortman Professional Services Agreements for Building Official Services, Amend the FY18 Budget and Appropriate Necessary Funds to Conclude the Current Service Contract (8 Votes Required).

Question: Please provide an accounting of the cost of contracting for building officials since January 2015 when Ralph Welton resigned. (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The total amount paid to Carlisle Wortman since 2014 is \$1,431,420.00, total amount with the current request of \$39,325.00 is \$1,441,745.00. Approximately \$900,000.00 of the total has gone to plan review services with the rest going to fill gaps in staffing. All cost associated with the contract and subsequent amendment have been fully recovered.

Question: Q1. The cover memo references an original \$200K amount in May 2016 and \$500K in contract extensions while the 3rd whereas clause suggests \$500K is the total. Can you please provide the total amount Carlisle/Wortman will have been paid (assuming the \$39K is approved) for all the work they have done for the City (both building and planning related) since they were engaged a few years ago? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Please see the response above.

Question: Q2. The cover memo indicates that “it has been determined that a third party plan review service is necessary to complete large commercial projects and new single-family home review”. The cover memo goes on to say that “we have completed and published an RFP to secure third party services on a three-year contract.” What does that RFP contemplate for scope and hours worked? Is the outside service required because of lack of in-house expertise or just volume/workload? Also, can you please provide the FTE history for Building Services and Planning over the last 5-7 years or so? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Services under the proposed contract will be provided on an as needed basis with the majority continuing to be plan review, it is anticipated that approximately 25-30 hours a week in commercial plan review and support will be necessary. By using on-call plan review services the City has made significant progress in service delivery, decreasing inspection wait times from five days to two, improving the plan review turnaround times from six to two weeks and improving permit issuance times. This service allows us the adaptability to increase capacity in heavy volume times ensuring no reduction in service. Staff continues to meet with the Builder's Association regarding the best way to provide service and keep fees down, this as necessary service allows us to do just that. Over the last 5-7 years Building services has added four additional inspectors, a Deputy Building Official, a Management Assistant to facilitate issuance of Certificates of Occupancy and an additional administrative staff person.

Question: Q3. It appears this \$39K is to pay for services rendered in April and May. Obviously the City will pay for work done by vendors, but why was an amendment not requested in advance, before the costs were incurred? Also, it sounds that this is the last payment for work done and that Carlisle/Wortmann is no longer doing any work for the City. Is that correct? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: At this time we have asked Carlisle Wortman to conclude services until a contract for continued service through the comparative bid has been approved. Building encountered an unexpected increase in services at the end of 2017 into the first part of 2018 that required us to use Carlisle Wortman's services more than we planned. The unanticipated increase in plan review volume was not identified until the costs had been incurred. As soon as they were realized all review was brought back in house however, that did create an immediate decrease in our level of service provision.

B-2 - An Ordinance to Amend Sections 2:61 through 2:64, and 2:69, and to Repeal Section 2:73 of Chapter 29 (Change Water, Sewer, and Stormwater Rates) of Title II of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor (Ordinance No. ORD-18-12)

Question: Q1. In Madison, they have five residential usage-based water rate tiers and the top per gallon rate is not quite double the bottom rate (actually 77% higher). In Ann Arbor, the proposed top residential rate is almost 8 times the bottom rate (actually 795% higher). In other words, Ann Arbor's penalty for increased usage is (at its maximum) 10 times more than Madison. What causes this major disparity? Does Madison have a dramatically different cost structure than Ann Arbor? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Although Madison has an inclining block structure similar to Ann Arbor, they have a different regulatory environment. Their current rates were established in September of 2015. In the State of Wisconsin, all municipal utilities are regulated by a public services commission. Madison currently has a rate case with the Public Service Commission on file to increase the charges between the first tier and the fifth tier in the residential class. Data is leading them in a similar direction as Ann Arbor. Their fifth tier is currently priced at \$5.07 and their new proposal is to have it priced at \$9.25. The data, customer usage patterns and cost to serve vary in every community creating the differences in pricing.

Question: Q2. In Madison, the multi-family water rate is about the same as the commercial and industrial rates. In Ann Arbor, the commercial rate is almost double the multi-family rate (80% higher). What causes this large disparity? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Like Ann Arbor, Madison's rates are determined based on the cost to serve. The difference results from different ways in which the customers from Madison and Ann Arbor use water. The proposed pricing in Ann Arbor is based on the information discovered during the cost of service study. Similarly, Madison's rate

structure includes a flat rate for both Multi-Family and Commercial. Madison enacted the multi-family class in 2014. In Wisconsin, customer classes are defined by the Public Service Commission.

Question: Q3. Madison has a “public authority” rate class and the rates are about 25% higher than for commercial, industrial and multi-family. What is that “public authority” customer classification? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Customer classes are defined by the Wisconsin Public Service Commission. Public Authority is defined as: “Public Authority customers includes any department, agency, or entity of local, state, or federal government, including public schools, colleges, and universities.”
<https://psc.wi.gov/Pages/ForUtilities/Water/Conventional-Rate-Case.aspx>

Question: Q4. Also in the response to my benchmarking question, it was stated that Ann Arbor “in recent history, has had a progressive view on rate making.” Please elaborate on what that means? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Progressive in rate making was intended to mean Ann Arbor is innovative and takes steps to implement new rate structures, when such rate structures are based on data and contribute to a sustainable water system. Installing Automated Meter Infrastructure 15+ years ago, which not only facilitates more accurate and efficient billing, but also collects the data that enables better design of rate structures to cover properly the costs to serve different categories of customers and usage patterns was progressive and still is for the State of Michigan.

Question: Q5. Unfortunately, you still did not answer the question I’ve asked several times now which is what causes the Summer peaking in commercial usage. The answer this time is that there are too many accounts to figure it out. What is clear is that the data clearly shows that the summer peaking volume (e.g., the difference between July and February) for commercial is larger on an absolute basis and on a percentage basis than the summer peaking volume (July vs. February) for residential customers. Certainly, a portion of that commercial summer peaking – I’d suspect the majority - results from the same behavior (outdoor usage) we charge residential customers extra for. Please provide your best professional assessment of who and what causes the commercial summer peaking? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Summer peaking in the commercial or non-residential class is the cumulative effect of 4,000+ accounts. To see which customers’ usage patterns change in the peak month (or in another month for some) would require looking at each of the 4,000 accounts individually. It is the professional opinion of staff that any customer who has water usage greater in July than February, contributes to the system peak. Commercial customers to some degree use more water in the summer months for a wide variety of reasons, some being outdoor irrigation or some being consumption of more water inside due to hotter temperatures and less rainfall. Other rationales could be some customers such as neighborhood centers have a shift in building activities that

relies more heavily on water use in the summer month. There is a wide variety of activities that are supported by water usage in the non-residential class; therefore, individual account analysis would need to be performed. Without looking at each account to see how much more water a particular commercial customers uses in July than in February, it is not possible to identify which customers, or even categories of customers, are using more. Because of the variation, creation of an algorithm to calculate a “peak rate” for a commercial user that would be based on their average day use and then triggered if the customer has a certain percentage increase on any day over their daily average, would be very difficult, would require a unique calculation for each customer, and might not be possible to program into the billing system. Tiered rates based simply on volume of usage would not be an accurate rate for large but non-peaking customers.

We are aware of at least one city that attempted to do this, creating more than 30 sub-classes of commercial customers to try to tailor rates to the patterns of use by members of each sub-class. Despite their efforts, they could not define rate structures for those sub-classes that were accurate and manageable.

The costs to provide service when the commercial class, as a whole, peaks in its usage are incorporating into the calculation of the flat rate for commercial customers. Those costs are fully recovered and not passed on to members of other classes. Use of a flat commercial rate is an accepted, industry practice for commercial customers.

In addition, fundamental to understanding the proposed rates is that any change in the structure of one class of customers, has no impact on the pricing or structure of another class.

Question: Q6. Previous responses have stated that the multi-family rate was not developed as a rate for low-income customers, but multi-family properties were identified as a property class that served a number of low income residents. What other new property classes (or customer classes) were examined or was multi-family the only one? If other new property classes (or customer classes) were analyzed, please summarize the findings on why they were rejected?
(Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Multi-family was the only additional class that was examined.

C-3 – An Ordinance to Replace Previously Repealed Chapter 9 (Model Neighborhood Policy Board) of Title I of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor with a New Chapter, Which New Chapter Shall be Designated as Chapter 9 (City Seal and Flag) of Title I of the Code of the City of Ann Arbor

Question: Regarding C-3, is it typical for cities to have ordinances like this regarding their flags/seals and are violations typically civil infractions with fines of this magnitude?
(Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Surveying a handful of cities, it appears flag- and seal-protection ordinances are not typical, although that may be due to a lack of sophistication on the part of other cities. In Michigan, Grand Rapids, Lansing, Detroit, Flint, and East Lansing, for example, have not adopted such ordinances. Beyond Michigan, the same goes for Madison, Boulder, Austin, Pittsburgh, and Seattle, again for example. In contrast, Warren, Michigan, Houston, Texas, and Tulsa, Oklahoma, for example, all protect their seals and flags by ordinance. We are aware anecdotally of one or more cities that have sought trademark protection from the federal Patent and Trademark Office, but have been rejected because city flags and seals cannot be registered; protecting against misuse of a city seal or flag must be done by local ordinance.

In terms of consequences, the cities in this limited sample that regulate use of their flags and seals treat misuse as a crime, a misdemeanor rather than a civil infraction. Downsides of that approach for the City are that prosecuting companies (as opposed to individuals) can be difficult, treating misuse as a crime might not receive a sympathetic ear in the court, treating misuse as a crime caps the fine at \$500 under state law, and civil infractions are easier to administer than criminal sanctions and better allow the penalty to be tailored to the violation. Please note the \$10,000 fine is only the proposed maximum. The actual amount would be set by the Court, although the City Attorney's Office would be request an amount based on the circumstances of a particular violation.

DB-2 - Resolution to Adopt the City's Legislative Agenda for FY2019

Question: Has the Policy Agenda Committee considered lobbying for a uniform statewide pedestrian crosswalk law, such as the one currently pending in the State Legislature? (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: The Transportation Commission has reviewed the City's crosswalk ordinance at Council's request and presented its recommendation to retain the current language to Council. The Policy Agenda Committee has not taken any subsequent action.

DC-5 - Resolution to Approve Third Amendment to Professional Services Agreement with Bodman, PLC, for Legal Services Relative to 1,4-Dioxane from Gelman Sciences, Inc., dba Pall Life Sciences (\$150,000.00) and to Appropriate Funds (\$150,000.00) (8 Votes Required)

DC-7 - Resolution to Approve the First Amendment to Professional Services Agreement with Butzel Long for Legal Services Related to the Sale of the Above Ground Development Rights of 319 S. Fifth Ave. (\$75,000.00 amendment/NTE total \$100,000.00)

Question: Regarding DC-5 and DC-7, the two resolutions combined request approval of \$225K in outside legal counsel fees. Can you please provide detail on how much the City has spent in outside legal counsel fees over the last 5 years or so and for the major expenditures, what the services were for?

Response: For 5 fiscal years, July 1, 2013 to present, the legal fees paid to outside firms and approximate percentages of larger matters are as follows:

Bodman PLC \$295,302.07

96% Gelman litigation (June 2016 to present)

Butzel Long \$36,709

64% Library Lot (April 2016 to present)

32% Pension issues (August 2016 to April 2017)

Dykema \$144,988

34% Sewage and Water Bond Service (2013)

31% IRS Audit BAB (2017)

15% Misc. bond issues (2014)

13% Appellate advice/FDD case

Varnum \$231,951

82% WWTP NPDES Permitting Services and Permit Dispute and NPDES Permit Dispute

18% Michigan Public Services Commission Rate case involving DTE/Hydro

Johnson Rosati \$14,047

85% FDD legal advice

Stevenson Keppleman \$5,816

100% Pension advice

Question: Q1. How much does the City now owe for services rendered to date by Butzel Long on the Library Lot transaction? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The City currently owes \$29,603 to Butzel Long.

Question: Q2. This is now the second time in the last three months that the City has used the Administrator's Contingency to fund an overrun-related expenditure on an existing council-approved project or contract. The first was to pay for an overrun to the local dollar spending authorization for train station studies (\$69K in April) and now this \$75K for an amendment to the Library Lot legal services agreement. Q2A. In the response to my question previously on the Train Station \$69K and whether Administrator's Contingency had ever been used before to pay for spending in excess

of the amount council authorized on a project, the answer was no - the train station funding action was a first. I now would like to know if this Library Lot-type of funding action (using Administrator's Contingency to pay for an amendment to an existing General Fund funded contract) has ever been done before, and if so when? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: No.

Question: Q2B. Can you please explain why it was decided to use Administrator's contingency for these two specific items, but not for the many other items where council authorizes the use of GF fund balance? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Many other items are new initiatives, but this project already has Council approval. Since there are forecasted funds available in the City Administrator's 2018 area, those funds are being used for this contract.

Question: Q2C. The practical effect of using Administrator's Contingency for the train station \$69K was to eliminate the requirement of a council discussion/vote altogether, and the effect of using Administrator's Contingency for this Library Lot expenditure is to create a 6-vote requirement rather than the typical 8 vote requirement for fund balance usage. Can you please speak to why you believe these two selective applications of this Contingency approach were/are appropriate? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: See above response.

Question: Q3. Please provide the line-item detail of the actual Administrator Contingency account expenditures for FY18. (Councilmember Lumm)

Response:

(38,462) – GARE Training
(9,000) – Economic Summit
(1,841) – Economic Summit
(2,000) – GARE Video
(500) – Additional Training
(16,771)-Third Floor Improvements
(69,200)-Train Station
(11,572)-City Administrator Office Furniture

Question: Q4. Please provide the original budget, amended budget, and currently available FY18 Administrator's Contingency budget balance and the amount that will be paid to Butzel Long in FY18? Also, for FY19, how much is anticipated to be "available in the City Administrator's expenditure budget from temporary unfilled, budgeted positions" that could be used to pay Butzel Long for Library Lot legal services? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response:

\$250,000 – Starting Balance
\$100,654 – Remaining Balance

2018 Payments to Butzel Long will only be for services rendered during the fiscal year. We anticipate significant work being completed prior the end of 2018 on additional documents necessary for the transaction, including work on the condominium master deed and parking agreement. Anticipated expenditures include incurred costs of \$29,603, and estimated additional costs of \$15,000 through the end of the month. In 2019, \$35k is estimated to be available in the City Administrator's budget due to vacant budgeted positions.

DS-1 - Resolution to Update and Adjust Parking Fine Schedule

Question: Is it true that parking structure fees are charged by the hour, with each hour being charged from the beginning of the new hour? For example, if a driver parks for 59 minutes, she is charged for one hour but if that driver parks for 61 minutes, she is charged for two hours. (Councilmember Eaton)

Response: Yes, parking structure fees are charged by the hour or any portion thereof. However all facilities have a 10 minute grace period built in so that a parking patron would not have the additional hour added until they have been in a parking facility for at least 70 minutes.

Question: Q1 The discussion on the expired meter fines (relative to benchmarks, hourly rates, and other types of violations) is a bit different depending on whether you focus on the normal fine or the discounted/within one-day fine. For expired meters, roughly what percentage of the fines are paid at the discount/within one day rate? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Approx. 50% of tickets are paid at the discount rate.

Question: Q2. Also related to discounting, the rationale for raising the expired meter is "to ensure it's not less expensive for someone to accept a ticket rather than park legally in a parking structure." Although we don't have any data or evidence beyond anecdotal that happens at any frequency, for the folks who do that, they need to pay at the discount rate to "beat the system".

Given that, would it make more sense to just eliminate the discount (\$20 fine for everyone as long as pay within 14 days) to accomplish the objective rather than raise the discount rate to \$20 and the standard rate to a level (\$35) that could result in just irritating people. (It's worth noting that more than half of the benchmark cities provided,

including Boulder, Madison, and Grand Rapids, do not have discounted fines.)
(Councilmember Lumm)

Response: The discounted rate helps incentivize people to pay their fines, which in turn helps keep the city's collection efforts/costs down. In addition, for individuals who are not aware of the parking regulations (such as some visitors), the discounted rate is a way to mitigate the negative perception of their experience (for not complying with the signed parking terms).

Question: Q3. At the June 4th meeting, there seemed to be some confusion about the DDA's plans for hourly rate increases (meters and structures) over the next five years or so. Can you please clarify what the DDA plan actually is? Also, can you please clarify whether there will be a recommendation to extend collection hours and if so, when will that recommendation likely will come forward? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: Please see the attached DDA parking rate plan. At this time there is no specific recommendation to extend parking operations at the street meters beyond 6pm.

Question: Q4. Were we able to obtain any input from the downtown business community or associations (Main Street, State Street, South University) on the proposal and if so, what was the gist of the feedback?

Response: Please see staff memo from Mr. Crawford that has been attached to this agenda item.

DS-2 – Resolution No. 4 - Confirming the Federal Commerce Green Road Sidewalk Special Assessment

Question: Regarding DS-2, is it still expected that the Green Road sidewalk construction will begin August 20 and be completed in November? (Councilmember Lumm)

Response: It is still anticipated that the Green Rd sidewalk construction will begin in August and be completed by the end of November.

Rate Change Summary By Type and Facility
Approved February 2018

		4/1/18	1/1/19	7/1/19	7/1/20	7/1/21	7/1/22
Facility/Type of Income		Current Rate	New Rates	New Rates	New Rates	New Rates	New Rates
Structures							
Washington & Fourth							
Transient	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.
Permit	\$155/Mo	\$165/Mo	\$170/Mo	\$180/Mo	\$185/Mo	\$195/Mo	\$200/Mo
Washington & First							
Pre-Pay After 3 & W. Ends	\$5/Entry	\$5/Entry	\$5/Entry	\$5/Entry	\$5/Entry	\$5/Entry	\$5/Entry
Permit	\$155/Mo	\$165/Mo	\$170/Mo	\$180/Mo	\$185/Mo	\$195/Mo	\$200/Mo
Maynard							
Transient	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.
Permit	\$165/Mo.	\$165/Mo	\$170/Mo	\$180/Mo	\$185/Mo	\$195/Mo	\$200/Mo
Premium Permits	\$220/Mo.	\$230/Mo.	\$240/Mo.	\$250/Mo.	\$260/Mo.	\$270/Mo.	\$280/Mo.
Forest							
Transient	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.
Permit	\$155/Mo	\$165/Mo	\$170/Mo	\$180/Mo	\$185/Mo	\$195/Mo	\$200/Mo
Fourth & William							
Transient	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.
Permit	\$150/Mo	\$165/Mo	\$170/Mo	\$180/Mo	\$185/Mo	\$195/Mo	\$200/Mo
Premium Permits	\$205/Mo.	\$230/Mo.	\$240/Mo.	\$250/Mo.	\$260/Mo.	\$270/Mo.	\$280/Mo.
Liberty Square							
Transient	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr	\$1.20/Hr	\$1.20/Hr	\$1.20/Hr	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.
Pre-Pay After 3 & W. Ends	\$3/Entry	\$3/Entry	\$4Entry	\$4Entry	\$4Entry	\$5/Entry	\$5/Entry
Permit	\$165/Mo	\$165/Mo	\$170/Mo	\$180/Mo	\$185/Mo	\$195/Mo	\$200/Mo
Premium Permits	\$220/Mo.	\$230/Mo.	\$240/Mo.	\$250/Mo.	\$260/Mo.	\$270/Mo.	\$280/Mo.
Ann & Ashley							
Transient	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.
Pre-Pay After 3 & W. Ends	\$3/Entry	\$3/Entry	\$4Entry	\$4Entry	\$4Entry	\$5 Entry	\$5 Entry
Permit	\$155/Mo	\$165/Mo	\$170/Mo	\$180/Mo	\$185/Mo	\$195/Mo	\$200/Mo
Premium Permits	\$205/Mo.	\$230/Mo.	\$240/Mo.	\$250/Mo.	\$260/Mo.	\$270/Mo.	\$280/Mo.
Library Lane							
Transient	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.	\$1.20/Hr.
Permit	\$155/Mo	\$165/Mo	\$170/Mo	\$180/Mo	\$185/Mo	\$195/Mo	\$200/Mo
Promotional Permit	\$115/Mo.	\$140/Mo	\$170/Mo	\$180/Mo	\$185/Mo	\$195/Mo	\$200/Mo
Lots							
South Ashley							
Transient-1st 3 Hours	\$1.50/Hr.	\$1.60/Hr.	\$1.60/Hr.	\$1.70/Hr.	\$1.70/Hr.	\$1.80/Hr.	\$1.80/Hr.
-After 3 Hours	\$1.70/Hr.	\$1.80/Hr.	\$1.80/Hr.	\$1.90/Hr.	\$1.90/Hr.	\$2.00/Hr.	\$2.00/Hr.
First & William							
Permit	\$115/Mo	\$125/Mo	\$130/Mo	\$140/Mo	\$145/Mo	\$155/Mo	\$160/Mo
415 W. Washington							
Transient	\$4/entry	\$4/entry	\$4/entry	\$4/entry	\$5/entry	\$5/entry	\$5/entry
Permit	\$90/Mo	\$100/Mo	\$105/Mo	\$115/Mo	\$120/Mo	\$130/Mo	\$135/Mo
System Wide							
Special Event	\$5/Entry	\$5-\$15/Entry	\$5-\$15/Entry	\$5-\$15/Entry	\$5-\$15/Entry	\$5-\$15/Entry	\$5-\$15/Entry
Art Fair							
- Before 5PM	\$15/Entry	\$15/Entry	\$18/Entry	\$18/Entry	\$18/Entry	\$18/Entry	\$18/Entry
- After 5pm	\$7/Entry	\$7/Entry	\$9/Entry	\$9/Entry	\$9/Entry	\$9/Entry	\$9/Entry
- Weekly Pass	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100	\$100
Limited Overnight Permit- Overstay Fees	Current Facility- Rates	\$20/Overstay	\$20/Overstay	\$20/Overstay	\$20/Overstay	\$20/Overstay	\$20/Overstay
Meters							
Regular Meters	\$1.60/Hour	\$1.70/Hour	\$1.80/Hour	\$1.90/Hour	\$2.00/Hour	\$2.10/Hour	\$2.20/Hour
EV Charging Station Meters		\$2.00/Hour	\$2.10/Hour	\$2.20/Hour	\$2.30/Hour	\$2.40/Hour	\$2.50/Hour
Meter Bags	\$20/Day	\$25/Day	\$25/Day	\$25/Day	\$25/Day	\$25/Day	\$25/Day
Sun. & Holiday Meter Bag Fees:							
1-99 Meter Bags	\$160	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200	\$200
100 Meter Bags-and Beyond	\$320	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$400	\$400