Members of the public may view and participate in the meeting via:

- In person at the Village Hall 1st Floor Conference Room, 40 E. Center Ave.
- Online: lakebluff.org/VirtualMeeting
- Dial-in: (312) 626-6799. Enter meeting ID 825 0751 5127. Press # when prompted for a Participant ID.

AGENDA

I. Call to Order – Roll Call

II. Approval of Minutes – May 9, 2022

III. Non-Agenda Items and Visitors
The Finance Committee allocates fifteen (15) minutes at this time for those individuals who would like the opportunity to address the Committee on any matter not listed on the agenda.

IV. Business Discussion Items

   A. Continued Discussion Regarding Alternative Revenue Sources for Stormwater Infrastructure (Storm Water Utility)

V. Adjournment

The Village of Lake Bluff is subject to the requirements of the Americans with Disabilities Act. Individuals with disabilities who plan to attend this meeting and who require certain accommodations in order to allow them to observe and/or participate in this meeting, or who have questions regarding the accessibility of the facilities, are requested to contact R. Drew Irvin at (847) 234-0774 or TDD number (847) 234-2153 promptly to allow the Village of Lake Bluff to make reasonable accommodations.
I. Call to Order – Roll Call

The Finance Committee of the Village of Lake Bluff was called to order on Monday, May 9, 2022 at 5:00 PM in the Village Hall Board Room, 40 E. Center Ave., Lake Bluff, Illinois.

Members Present: Trustee Barbara Ankenman, Chair
Trustee Susan Rider, Member
Trustee Steve Rappin, Member

Others Present: Regis Charlot, Village Board President
Kate Briand, Village Trustee
Taryn Fisher, Village Trustee
R. Drew Irvin, Village Administrator
Bettina O’Connell, Finance Director
Glen Cole, Assistant to the Village Administrator
Jeff Hansen, Village Engineer
Jake Terlap, Public Works Superintendent

II. Approval of Minutes – February 14, 2022

Chair Ankenman made a motion to approve the February 14, 2022 meeting minutes; seconded by Member Rider and approved unanimously on a Roll Call Vote. Village Administrator Irvin pointed out a typo to be corrected.

III. Non-Agenda Items and Visitors

Chair Ankenman said the Finance Committee allocates fifteen (15) minutes at this time for those individuals who would like the opportunity to address the Committee on any matter not listed on the agenda.

There were no requests to address the committee.

IV. Business Discussion Items

I. Continued Discussion Regarding Alternative Revenue Sources for Stormwater Infrastructure (Storm Water Utility)

Village Administrator Irvin presented a review of the discussion regarding alternative revenue sources for stormwater infrastructure. He presented the project timeline and noted it is ahead of schedule; he suggested moving a few action items shown in Q2 of the plan into Q3 at the discretion of the Finance Committee.

Responding to a question about the project’s timeline, Village Administrator Irvin clarified the construction of the project’s Phase 3 would take about two years to build, after the completion of Phases 1 and 2, which may overlap. Village Engineer Hansen explained how the State’s review of the project impacts the progression through the phases. He described how the variability of the process of land acquisition makes it difficult to put a firm timeline on these phases. Village Administrator Irvin added the timeline is also impacted by the financial partners of the Village, whether it is the federal, state and/or county governments.
Finance Director O’Connell shared an update to estimated bond payment prices which reflect changes in interest rates. Member Rider asked about the prices reflecting only the trunk project, not the other related issues. Village Administrator Irvin described how the Village would seek out other funding sources for the related issues to reduce borrowing while still seeing the completion of the entire project.

Village Engineer Hansen said Area 1, Area 3, and the trunk project are scaled at $30 million, but there has been $46 million in projects identified. Member Rappin inquired about the funding for the additional $15-20 million needed; Village Administrator Irvin explained this funding would be paced in accordance with the Village’s long-term capital plan.

Member Rappin asked about the resulting tax increases from paying back on the bonds. Finance Director O’Connell responded the bonds would be abated and payment made through the General Fund revenues generated by a potential stormwater utility fee. Village Administrator Irvin added that the utility fee is intended to cover the debt service. Finance Director O’Connell said the burden would be relatively minimal, about $109 annually per household to cover $620K in debt service or $115-120 annually per household to cover $704K in debt service. Village Administrator Irvin pointed out this cost would still be lower than most neighboring communities.

Using the draft stormwater utility fee program, Village Administrator Irvin presented the estimated annual fee for certain large recreational, institutional, and commercial users.

Trustee Briand asked if there was a different multiplier between commercial and residential properties. Village Engineer Hansen responded that the consultant group, Christopher Burke Engineering, calculated the impervious surfaces of parcels within a sampling of zoning districts and found more percentage impervious in their L-1 and L-2 samplings. He explained the Village may ultimately end up measuring each L-1 and L-2 parcels, but that residential and CBD multipliers would be determined by sampling.

Regarding the estimated annual fee of key users, Trustee Markee pointed out that key users like the schools or library are funded through property tax and raised a question about how these institutional users will pay this new Village fee without raising property taxes. Village Administrator Irvin responded the Village has not discussed specifics with these users.

President Regis emphasized the tradeoff between a small stormwater utility fee and the higher costs associated without stormwater infrastructure, such as basement flooding. Member Markee said the installation of this fee should be well thought out because it that is important to keep Lake Bluff accessible and affordable for community members.

Member Rider inquired about fee collection, specifically making the fee a tax, subject to taxing bodies, since institutional taxes are paid as debt service. She summarized three potential options to collecting the revenues need to fund the bond payment for stormwater improvements, including: through the property tax system; creating a transfer tax system; or creating proposed fees based on impervious surface calculations. Trustee Briand mentioned that neighboring communities have sunset provisions which sets a length of time on the revenue collected for debt service. She also discussed the potential for stormwater mitigation credits that would encourage homeowners to make mitigation efforts themselves. She emphasized the substantial need to build stormwater infrastructure and to help community members understand this better to embrace the changes.
Chair Ankenman added the sunset provision would be tied to the final payment of the bond. She confirmed it would be a 20-year bond. A brief discussion followed. Village Administrator Irvin stated that this funding is for new infrastructure that has not been built yet. At Member Rappin’s request, he reiterated the point of tonight’s discussion was to introduce how implemented methodology would impact key fee users and a possible mitigation credit policy.

Village Engineer Hansen presented the potential credit policy, which is drawn from Libertyville’s credit policy. He explained a “drainage credit” would reduce the fee by 50% if the parcel owner could prove the stormwater from the property does not enter the Village’s stormwater system, and a “sampling credit” would reduce the fee if a parcel owner could prove stormwater does not enter a watershed managed and sampled by the Village; a parcel owner can only receive one type of credit. In response to Chair Ankenman, he explained the Village could map and identify which households would drain into the Village’s system, making them eligible for a drainage credit. He discussed the impact of the credit on revenue for different zoning districts.

Village Attorney Friedman described pending litigation in Peoria, IL regarding their stormwater utility program and how credits helped defend the fee system.

Chair Ankenmen responded that this credit system is largely geography based.

Village Engineer Hansen explained that credit programs increase the administrative burden of the program, because now someone needs to certify the mitigation efforts at the household level.

Trustee Briand raised a question about accounting for changes in impervious surfaces, like double lots being sold and developed in a way that largely increases a property’s stormwater runoff, and the provisions to respond to this. Village Administrator Irvin responded that existing Village zoning code regulations are codified to manage impervious surface area. Trustee Markee expressed her support for a credit that rewards a homeowner’s attempt to mitigate stormwater.

Chair Ankenmen questioned the credit’s ability to change homeowners’ behavior beyond adding another administrative process. Village Administrator Irvin spoke about a permit-level incentive program, like the Village’s electric vehicle program, which could incentivize specific behaviors related to mitigation.

President Regis described his experience with backyard flooding and asked about the tradeoff between administrative costs and an equitable system. Chair Ankenman responded that the proposed process would trigger financial changes in credit at the same time of physical changes, like an addition or demolition.

Trustee Briand proposed not offering any credits on the basis of equity as to not credit property owners’ whose geography benefits them while not crediting proactive mitigation by others.

At the request of Member Rappin, Village Attorney Friedman explained that not having any credits has not been litigated and may be lawful, but by having credits, the Village is able to more easily defend the fee. Trustee Briand commented that, for example, a viaduct would improve fire response times, so community members that do not contribute to stormwater still see a benefit of mitigation.

Chair Ankenmen asked about the threat of litigation and if a fee policy that avoids litigation is really the primary goal of the policy. Village Attorney Friedman responded that Winnetka and Peoria have both been sued, by residents and commercial owners respectively.
Member Rappin asked if there was a legal advantage to the form of a fee rather than tax. Village Attorney Friedman responded that the legal framework is entirely different for taxes as compared to fees. Member Rider asked if it was common for entities to not extend taxes to pay for debt service. Village Administrator Irvin responded that it is situational, but entities can rely on other revenue sources.

Chair Ankenmen proposed that Village Staff come up with more ideas that consider the bigger picture of impact. Financial Director O’Connell added that abatement enables the Village to have more freedom on their resource allocation since the fee is not on the tax bill if it is abated.

Village Administrator Irvin announced the Finance Committee would meet again in June to continue this discussion and review various credit programs.

II. Adjournment

Member Rider made a motion to adjourn the meeting at 7:04 PM; seconded by Member Rappin and the motion passed on a unanimous roll call vote.

Respectfully submitted,

Bettina K O’Connell  
Finance Director
Stormwater Utility Fee Discussion

Village of Lake Bluff Finance Committee
June 13, 2022
Topics

1. Review of Village Stormwater Draft Utility Credit Program
2. Presentation of Credit Programs
3. Question & Answer
Common Stormwater Utility Credits

Credits That Lessen the Demand for Municipal Storm Sewer Capacity

❑ Properties that have stormwater Best Management Practice (BMP) that meets or exceeds the standards for new development in the Lake County Watershed Development Ordinance

❑ Properties with on-site stormwater storage

❑ Properties that do not discharge to the communities stormwater system (either directly to a waterway to runoff infiltrates on the property)

How to Qualify

❑ Application must be filed by the owner requesting a credit

❑ Supporting calculations/documents must be submitted. Typically requires a P.E. signature

❑ Annual reports must be filed showing maintenance to continue to receive credits

❑ Owner must reapply for credits every 3-5 years
Less Common Stormwater Utility Credits

Credits that **DO NOT** Lessen the Demand for Municipal Storm Sewer Capacity:

- Rain barrels
- Rain gardens
- Permeable pavers
- Conservation landscaping
- Green roofs

Process:

- Application must be filed by the owner requesting a credit
- Supporting calculations/documents must be submitted
- Annual reports must be filed showing maintenance to continue to receive credits
- Owner must reapply for credits every 3-5 years
Other Credits Offered

• Champaign offers $5 per student credit at schools that educate students on stormwater

• Wilmette offers a 25% credit for all 501(c)(3) entities located within institutional zoning districts

• Wilmette caps the total amount of credits in a year to $70,000. Eligible property owners then are placed on a waiting list for credits

• Downers Grove pays a flat fee from $25-$300 for residential BMPs when they are installed in lieu of annual credits
Questions?

Thanks!
Background Materials
Overview

1. Utility Fee Timeline

2. Continuously Seeking Grants for Deep Tunnel Project (Phase 1 & All other Phases) Most Projects with Federal Funding go through Three Phase Process:

- **Phase 1** SMC / Lake Bluff Agreement Executed to Fund Phase 1 Engineering. Phase 1 Defines Project Layout, Environmental Concerns, and any needed Land Acquisition (Approximately 18 months)

- **Phase 2** Engineering includes Land Acquisition and Preparation of Construction Plans and Bid Documents (duration dependent upon need for land acquisition)

- **Phase 3** Construction (24-30 months for Deep Tunnel Project)
Possible Stormwater Utility Fee Timeline

**Q4 2021**
- Policy Considerations
  - Discuss Feasibility & Rate Study
  - Determine Revenue Requirements
  - Fee Methodology
  - Billing Rate

**Q2 2022**
- Public Information Program
  - Identify Key Users
  - Advisory Committee?
  - Website / Printed Brochures
  - Determine a Credit Program
  - Community Hearing/Meetings

**Q3 2022**
- Billing Implementation
  - Collect User / Parcel Data
  - Create Billing Codes
  - Modify Billing
  - Test Process
  - Consider Bi-monthly Billing
  - Customer Service Training

**Q4 2022**
- Ordinance
  - Introduce Rate Ordinance
  - Adopt Rate Ordinance
  - Fee Effective Date

**Q1 2023**
- Fee Implementation
  - Notice Customers of Fees Change
  - Establish Point of Contact for Resident Concerns

Village Of Lake Bluff/ STORMWATER UTILTY FEE TIMELINE
Revenue/Project Funding

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Annual Bond Payment</th>
<th>Percentage of Funding to Complete Trunk Project</th>
<th>Area 1 East Terrace north of Sheridan Pl</th>
<th>Area 3 E Blodgett, E Washington, E Woodland E Scranton</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$10 Million Bond Issuance</td>
<td>704k</td>
<td>60% ✓</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$15 Million Bond Issuance</td>
<td>1.055 mil</td>
<td>89% ✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$20 Million Bond Issuance</td>
<td>1.407 mil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$30 Million Bond Issuance</td>
<td>2.111 mil</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Debt Service Calculator (speerfinancial.com)
Utility Fee Methodology
Stormwater Utility Methodology

Comparison is based on a residential customer with 3,800 sq. ft. of impervious area (1.0 ERU). The values in parentheses are the respective towns annual revenues generated in millions.

Annual Stormwater Residential Bill Comparison

Average = $109

Without credits, Lake Bluff’s Annual Revenue is ~$620,000 when community average ($109/ERU) utilized.

* Excerpt from the 2020 Village of Libertyville Stormwater Feasibility Study
Estimated Annual Fee of Key Users

• Village of Lake Bluff - $23,500
• Lake Bluff Library - $476
• Lake Bluff Elementary School - $10,900
• Lake Bluff Middle School - $7,200
• Lake Bluff Park District - $15,500
• Grace Church - $1,150
• Union Church - $950
• Target Development – $3,167/per parcel fee in L-1 & L-2
• Knauz Auto Park - $35,042 (6 parcels)
# Credit Impact on Revenue

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Average Impervious Area (sq ft)</th>
<th>ERUs per Parcel</th>
<th>Total ERU’s in Zoning District</th>
<th>Avg Annual Fee Per Parcel</th>
<th>Annual Revenue By District w/o Credits</th>
<th>Estimated Potential Credits</th>
<th>Annual Revenue by District With Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td></td>
<td>$88.56</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$4,605.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$354.24</td>
<td>$53,164.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>3,281</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td></td>
<td>$111.76</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$43,027.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>$106.96</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$72,195.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td></td>
<td>$106.96</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$43,027.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td></td>
<td>$67.44</td>
<td>$0.00</td>
<td>$4,248.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td></td>
<td>$170.31</td>
<td>$766.40</td>
<td>$28,697.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td></td>
<td>$122.86</td>
<td>$3,808.66</td>
<td>$33,787.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-E</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td></td>
<td>$153.28</td>
<td>$919.68</td>
<td>$8,430.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>22,870</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td></td>
<td>$779.01</td>
<td>$17,917.22</td>
<td>$17,917.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1/L2</td>
<td>92,976</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,167.00</td>
<td>$17,418.50</td>
<td>$207,438.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-1</td>
<td>171,460</td>
<td>53.58</td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,840.36</td>
<td>$17,521.06</td>
<td>$17,521.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>181,280</td>
<td>56.65</td>
<td></td>
<td>$6,174.85</td>
<td>$12,349.70</td>
<td>$12,349.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIO</td>
<td>67,770</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,376.55</td>
<td>$3,050.00</td>
<td>$63,493.38</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total**                       |                |                              |                           | **$627,878.17**               | **$56,188.26**              | **$571,689.92**                        |
# Overview of Existing Asset Management

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Asset Category/System</th>
<th>Miles of Inventory</th>
<th>Ideal Annual Investment Level</th>
<th>Current Annual Investment Level</th>
<th>Funding Source(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Transportation (roads, sidewalks, paths &amp; bridges)</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>TBD</td>
<td>$725,000</td>
<td>General Fund, MFT, Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sanitary</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$345,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>General Fund, Grant</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Storm</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$285,000</td>
<td>General Fund</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>Water Fund</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
New Infrastructure Needs
Legend
- Proposed Storm Sewer
- Existing Storm Sewer
- 100-yr Inundation (Proposed)
- 100-yr Inundation (Existing)

Center Ave
Birkdale Rd
Green Bay Rd
Pine Ct
Lincoln Ave
Rockland Ave
Mawman Ave
Prospect Ave

ESTIMATED COST
$2.6M
Area 2: Estimated Cost $16.6M
Area 3: Estimated Cost $9.0 - $11.4M

Legend
- Proposed Storm Sewer
- Existing Storm Sewer
- 100-yr inundation (Proposed)
- 100-yr inundation (Existing)

Overflow structure and riprap or channel stabilization

STUDY AREA 4
Under proposed conditions, minor 10-year inundation will occur, but will be limited to 0.4".

Legend:
- **0.2% Annual Chance Flood Hazard**
- **Zone A**
- **Floodway**
- **Proposed Storm Sewer**
- **Existing Storm Sewer**
- **100-Yr Inundation (Existing)**
- **100-Yr Inundation (Proposed)**
Ideally, revenue sources are...

**Efficient**
Administration should be feasible and administrative cost proportional to revenue.

**Equitable/Fair**
Paid by those that bear its burden/connected to activity/program.

**Certain**
Clear in application.

**Convenient**
Easy to pay.

**Neutral**
Source should not distort the way a community would otherwise use its resources.
Possible Revenue Sources for Stormwater Bond Debt Service

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Revenue Type</th>
<th>Equitable/Fair</th>
<th>Certain</th>
<th>Convenient</th>
<th>Efficient</th>
<th>Neutral</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Property Tax</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales Tax</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility (flat, site based, hybrid, etc)</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Real Estate Transfer Tax</td>
<td>✗</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
<td>✓</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Real Estate Transfer Tax

A tax can be levied on residential and commercial real estate.

Regionally transfer tax rates vary from $3.00 - $5.00 per $1,000 of the full actual consideration or purchase price.

Village’s actual historical sales data was provided by the Lake County Assessor’s Office.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CY</th>
<th>CY total Sales</th>
<th>$3 per Thousand</th>
<th>$5 per Thousand</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>110,316,435</td>
<td>330,949</td>
<td>551,582</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>119,051,705</td>
<td>357,155</td>
<td>595,258</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>86,998,716</td>
<td>260,996</td>
<td>434,993</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>108,133,080</td>
<td>324,399</td>
<td>540,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2020</td>
<td>142,640,832</td>
<td>427,922</td>
<td>713,204</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jan-April 2021</td>
<td>$ 13,605,000</td>
<td>$ 40,815</td>
<td>$ 68,025</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| AVG         | $ 113,428,153  | $ 330,949       | $ 551,582       |
Next Steps

1. Define Project Scope
2. Identify & Establish Revenue Stream(s)
3. Define Project Timeline
4. Execute
Revenue Requirements

• Planned Expenses
  • Define Project Scope
    • Trunkline/Deep Tunnel $17M
    • Study Area 1 - $3M
      • East Terrace north of E Sheridan Place
    • Study Area 3 - $10M
      • East Blodgett, East Washington, East Woodland
      • East Scranton Ave near Gurney Ave & Moffett Rd
## Fee Methodology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning District</th>
<th>Average Impervious Area (sq ft)</th>
<th>ERUs per Parcel</th>
<th>Total ERU's in Zoning District</th>
<th>Avg Annual Fee Per Parcel</th>
<th>Annual Revenue By District w/o Credits</th>
<th>Annual Revenue by District With Credits</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>R-1</td>
<td>2,600</td>
<td>0.81</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>$88.56</td>
<td>$4,605.25</td>
<td>$4,605.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-2</td>
<td>3,200</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>491</td>
<td>$109</td>
<td>$53,519.00</td>
<td>$53,164.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-3</td>
<td>3,281</td>
<td>1.03</td>
<td>395</td>
<td>$111.76</td>
<td>$43,027.24</td>
<td>$43,027.24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-4</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>662</td>
<td>$106.96</td>
<td>$72,195.47</td>
<td>$72,195.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-5</td>
<td>3,140</td>
<td>0.98</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>$106.96</td>
<td>$4,813.03</td>
<td>$4,813.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>R-6</td>
<td>1,980</td>
<td>0.62</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>$67.44</td>
<td>$4,248.96</td>
<td>$4,248.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-1</td>
<td>5,000</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>270</td>
<td>$170.31</td>
<td>$29,464.06</td>
<td>$28,697.67</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E-2</td>
<td>3,607</td>
<td>1.13</td>
<td>345</td>
<td>$122.86</td>
<td>$37,596.21</td>
<td>$33,787.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C-E</td>
<td>4,500</td>
<td>1.41</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>$153.28</td>
<td>$9,350.16</td>
<td>$8,430.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CBD</td>
<td>22,870</td>
<td>7.15</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>$779.01</td>
<td>$17,917.22</td>
<td>$17,917.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>L1/L2</td>
<td>92,976</td>
<td>29.06</td>
<td>2,063</td>
<td>$3,167.00</td>
<td>$224,856.65</td>
<td>$207,438.15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AP-1</td>
<td>171,460</td>
<td>53.58</td>
<td>321</td>
<td>$5,840.36</td>
<td>$35,042.14</td>
<td>$17,521.06</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>S</td>
<td>181,280</td>
<td>56.65</td>
<td>227</td>
<td>$6,174.85</td>
<td>$24,699.40</td>
<td>$12,349.70</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RIO</td>
<td>67,770</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>610</td>
<td>$2,376.55</td>
<td>$66,543.38</td>
<td>$63,493.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$627,878.17</strong></td>
<td><strong>$571,689.92</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>