


Andrew Klein

FROM	NAME & TITLE	Andrew Klein, Chief	CITY of BALTIMORE MEMO	
	AGENCY NAME & ADDRESS	Bureau of Budget and Management Research City Hall 469 (410)396-4941		
	SUBJECT	City Council Bill No.12-0102 Residential Parking Permit Program		

TO

DATE:

August 2, 2012

Honorable President and
Members of the City Council
C/O Karen Randle
Room 409, City Hall

City Council Bill #12-0102, Residential Permit Parking Program modifies the procedures and requisites for Residential Permit Parking Areas; modifies the procedures for amending a Residential Permit Parking Plan; adds certain vehicle types to those eligible for parking permits in a Residential Permit Parking Area; qualifies permit eligibility for residents of dwelling units added to an existing Residential Permit Parking Area; limits parking durations for non-permit holders; establishes progressive fines for parking, stopping, or standing in violation of Residential Parking Area restrictions; modifies the composition of the Residential Permit Parking Advisory Board; provides for the election of Advisory Board officers; defines certain terms; prohibits certain conduct; corrects, clarifies, and conforms related provisions.

Analysis

In concept, the Department of Finance supports CCB12-0102 Residential Parking Permit Program, however, from an operational perspective it would be very difficult, very timely, and exceptionally expensive to implement in a manner that would ensure accurate fines.

More specifically, section 36-09 of the law requires a tiered fine structure for multiple offenders. This presents several problems from an operational point of view. Overcoming these problems would be prohibitively expensive and would not achieve a comprehensive solution.

First, with the existing system, there is no way to know if the fine is the first, second or third occurrence. In order to determine the rate tier, the person writing the fine would need the ability to look up the number of times the vehicle in violation has been fined for this infraction. This would require two-way, real-time communications with a centralized database.

Second, not all persons who write fines carry handheld devices. Such devices would be required to facilitate real-time look-up of previous infractions. Additional devices would need to be acquired.

Third, it is uncertain if it would be advantageous for police officers or other enforcement officers, who only write occasional parking citations, should be burdened with carrying an additional handheld device. Providing all such personnel with such devices would be costly in relation to the additional dollars generated.

F/A

Fourth, the current computer software system is not capable of tracking tier rate fines. It would require substantial re-programming of the system to accomplish this feat and possibly a new system. In addition, the City would incur costs for additional handhelds, programming of hand held computers, disposal of citation books, substantial re-training, and communication costs. If the City were to implement such a system, the costs to the City would likely be in the millions dollars. Until an RFP were developed and issued, the actual costs are not readily determined.

Finally, it is not possible to make the required changes within the specified period for enactment.

In light of these facts, the Department of Finance recommends the following amendment be made to page 14.

- 1) Retain lines 17, 18 and 19
- 2) Delete lines 20-28

Fiscal Impact

An analysis of revenue would suggest that there is not significant revenue gain in a tiered system of fines versus a flat fine. Currently total fines for FY2013 are projected at \$1.2M. If fines were tiered, revenue would increase to \$1.5M. However, if all fines were set to \$50 instead of \$42, the City would still receive just a little under \$1.5M. The tiered fine schedule is estimated to bring in about \$41K over a flat \$50 per occurrence fine.

Violation	Citations	Proposed Fines	Fines @ Rate
1st Violation	28,396	\$50	\$1,419,805
2nd Violation	589	\$70	\$41,196
3rd Violation	294	\$100	\$29,426
4th Violation	147	\$150	\$22,070
Proposed Legislation Revenue	29,426		\$1,512,496
Legislation w/ Amendment	29,426	\$50	1,471,300
Current Projected Revenue	29,426	42	\$1,235,892
Diff. Proposed to Current			\$276,604
Diff. Amendment From Current			\$235,408
Difference from Proposed			\$41,196

Recommendation

The Finance Department supports CC Bill 12-0102 with the above amendments.

CC: Harry Black
 Angela Gibson
 William Voorhees