AGENDA

Meeting Type:	W
Date	05-23-1990
SUBJECT	

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office

Budget Workshop 5/23/90

✓90-36-FOR
✓90-46
✓90-43 - MAY BE WITHDRAWN
✓90-44

Sue Stynchcombe ✓ 5:20
Stan Campbell ✓
Don Chadfelter ✓ 5.35
Ann Hammond ✓
Pat McCrory ✓
Jon Mangum ✓ 5.20
Noyle Martin ✓
Roy Matthews ✓ 5:20
Cynda Patterson ✓
Ella Scarborough ✓
Richard Vinroot ✓ 5:25
Lynn Wheeler ✓

5:17 P.M.

3

Patterson
White - Stadium
Mark Richardson
Martin
Richardson
McCrory
Richardson

30
10
6
46

Scarborough
Richardson
Myrick
Morgan

Alexander - Capital p. 111 & 171
Myrick
Martin
Alexander - Water & Sewer
Clodfelter
Alexander
Matthews
Stowe
Matthews
Stowe
Clodfelter
Alexander
Clodfelter
Richard Martin
Clodfelter
Alexander
Wirrost
Stowe
Alexander

Scarborough
Stowe
Scarborough
Stowe
Scarborough
Stowe
Martin
Alexander
Martin
White
Alexander
Martin
White
McCrory
Alexander
McCrory
Alexander
Myrick
White
Myrick

Motel Tax - 60% of 6% TAX
THEY GENERATE -

INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT -

Martin
Myrick
Cinroot

Myrick
White
McCrory
Matthews P 198 - Water & Sewer
Stowe
Alexander
Stowe - Wilkinson & Singleton
Myrick
Matthews
Myrick
White
Matthews
Stowe
Matthews
Stowe
Alexander
Stowe
Matthews
Stowe
Alexander
Mangum
Stowe
Mangum
Stowe

Morgan 6:02 PM.
Stowe
Morgan
Stowe
Morgan - Solid Waste Storage
Martin
Stowe - Cost shared with other towns
Hammond
Stowe
Hammond
Stowe
Hammond
Morgan
Patterson
Morgan
Stowe
Morgan
Alexander
Scarborough
Alexander

Transportation -
Hammond
Alexander
Chodfelter

Pressley

Clodfelter

Pressley

Clodfelter

Scarborough

Matthews - P. 34 Hilton Rd. P 38 Sharon Med.

Pressley

Matthews

Pressley

Matthews

Pressley

Clodfelter

Hammond

Clodfelter

Alexander

Clodfelter

Alexander

Clodfelter

Hammond

Vinroot

Clodfelter

Scarborough P. 54

Pressley

Scarborough

Presley

Scarborough

Presley

Scarborough - Westinghouse

Presley

Scarborough

Presley

Scarborough Hwy 49/York Rd.

Presley

Clodfelter

Presley

Clodfelter

Hammond

Presley

Alexander

Hammond

Presley

Hammond

Alexander

Clodfelter

Vinroot

Clodfelter

Presley

Vinroot

Presley

Alexander - House - 6:28 P.M.

Patterson

Alexander

Patterson - wants update on CHAP - P.61

Cloffelter

Alexander

Cloffelter

Alexander

Cloffelter

Alexander

Matthews

Patterson

Matthews

Burch

Matthews

Alexander

Cloffelter

Martin

Alexander

Martin

Alexander

Martin

Alexander

Cowherd

Martin

Alexander - Government Facilities

McCrory - Law Enforcement Ctr.

Alexander

McCrory

Alexander

McCrory -

Matthews

Alexander

Wheeler

Alexander

McCrory

White

Alexander

McCrory

Cowherd

McCrory

Alexander

Cowherd

Clodfelter

McCrory

Mangum

Clodfelter

Cowherd

Mangum

Alexander

Scarborough

Cowherd

Scarborough — P. 79 - Governmental Page — Co. Manager

Cowherd

Scarborough

Cowherd

Scarborough

Cowherd

Scarborough - Could project be delayed?

White

Alexander Mynick

White

Martin

Matthews

Clodfelter

Syfert

Clodfelter

Syfert

Clodfelter

Sygert
Clodfelter
White
Clodfelter
White
Scarbrough
Campbell
Clodfelter
McCrory
Patterson
Martin
Patterson
Morgan
Alexander
Morgan
Alexander - Economic Dev.
McCrory
Alexander
McCrory
Matthews
Alexander
Matthews
Alexander
Matthews

Alexander
Matthews
Clodfelter
Matthews
Alexander
Hannah - Trolley - light rail - Portrack
Unroot
Myrick
Unroot
Myrick
Hannah
Myrick
McCrory
Myrick
Patterson
Myrick
Patterson
Clodfelter 7 17 P.M. (wheeler left)
Martin
Clodfelter
Scarborough
Patterson
Scarborough
Alexander

Clodfelter
Alexander
Patterson - Tomorrow Night or Next Week
Alexander
Patterson
McCrory
Patterson
Morgan
Alexander
Matthews
Scarborough - POSTPONE FINAL DECISIONS
Morgan - AGREES
Matthews
Vinroot
Patterson
Alexander
Vinroot
Patterson - POSTPONE TO NEXT THURSDAY 5/31 5:00 - 9:00
McCrory
Alexander
Hammond - AIRPORT INVESTMENT
Clodfelter
Hammond
Patterson
McCrory

Pattison

Hammond

Vincent

Patterson

Vincent

Campbell

Patterson

Clodfelter

Martin - Ice Arenas

Matthews - Improve Corridors - 1985 Bonds

McCrory - Concentrating effort on small stuff

Martin 7:50

McCrory

Martin

Campbell

Mangum

Martin

Mangum

Patterson

Campbell - How much do we spend on Wish

Clodfelter

White

Campbell

White

McCrory

Vinroot

White - Retreat Early Nov. or Dec.

Mangum

White

Mangum

Patterson

Myrick

Alexander - Parks + Rec.

Patterson

Martin

Campbell

Martin

Campbell

Patterson

Alexander

McCrory

Patterson

Myrick

Mangum

Alexander - Neighborhood Improvements

Patterson

Alexander

Cloodfelter

Alexander

Hammond

McCrory

Alexander

Vensoot

Morgan

Patterson

Myrick

Morgan

Myrick

Vinroot

Myrick

McCrory

Alexander - Transit

Cowherd

Alexander

Cowherd

Alexander

Martin

Alexander

Martin

Cloodfelter

Campbell

Alexander - Report on Airport Buses
Clodfelter
Cowherd
Alexander
Clodfelter
Matthews p. 228
Alexander
McCrory
Matthews
Myrick
Clodfelter
Matthews
McCrory
Mangum
Matthews

Clodfelter - 248 & 249 Airport - MASTER PLAN UPDATE
McCrory - Police Dogs for Airport
Alexander
Martin
Alexander
McCrory
Myrick
McCrory
White

McCrory

Alexander - TOMORROW NIGHT - INFO THEY ASKED FOR.

KNOW WHAT YOU WANT TO HAVE STRAW VOTES ON ON 5/31

McCrory

White

McCrory

White

Hammond

McCrory

Clodfelter

McCrory - Mulock Pick-ups

White

Martin

Hammond

Myrick

Matthews

Counties = 18% increase in last 10 yrs.

Alexander

Myrick

Alexander

Clodfelter

Alexander

Martin

Richard Martin

Martin

White

Alexander

White

Martin

White - Retirement

Martin

Morgan

Alexander

Myrick

McCrary

Adjourn 9:03

RICHARDSON Sports

MEMORANDUM

TO: City Council
Stan Campbell
Dan Clodfelter
Ann Hammond
Tom Mangum
Hoyle Martin
Roy Matthews
Pat McCrory
Cyndee Patterson
Ella Scarborough
Richard Vinroot
Lynn Wheeler

Citizens Stadium Advisory Committee
John Boatwright
Boyd Cauble
Stuart Dickson
Chuck Duncan
Rusty Goode
Peter Keber
Loy McKeithen
Mike Schneiderman
Bob Walton
Richard Whisnant

Carla DuPuy, Chairman of County Commissioners
Jerry Fox, County Manager
Mayor Sue Myrick
Wendell White, City Manager

FROM: Mark S. Richardson

DATE: May 23, 1990

RE: NFL Economic Impact Study

Attached are the figures we have received from Dr. John Connaughton of UNC-Charlotte in response to our request that he prepare a study for us on the economic impact of an NFL franchise and stadium for the City of Charlotte and Mecklenburg County.

We wanted to share these figures with you immediately and also will provide you with the complete text accompanying the study as soon as we receive it.

1901 Roxborough Road • Suite 211 • Charlotte, N C 28211 • (704) 365-3343

THE ECONOMIC IMPACT AND NET REVENUE EFFECTS OF AN NFL FRANCHISE AND STADIUM ON CHARLOTTE, NORTH CAROLINA

(SELECTED TABLES)

Prepared by:

John E. Connaughton, Ph.D.

TABLE 1

REVENUE GENERATED BY TEAM DIRECTLY

ITEM	DOLLAR EXPENDITURE 1992	INSIDE MECKLENBURG	MSA	OUTSIDE MSA
Attendance	700,000	341,600	102,200	256,200
Gross Ticket Sales	$36,717,000	$17,917,896	$5,360,682	$13,438,422
Concessions	3,501,300	1,708,634	511,190	1,281,476
Parking	1,000,000	488,000	146,000	366,000
Total	$41,218,300	$20,114,530	$6,017,872	$15,085,898

TABLE 2

REVENUE GENERATED BY OTHER EVENTS

ITEM	TOTAL	INSIDE MECKLENBURG	MSA	OUTSIDE MSA
Attendance	285,000	139,080	41,610	104,310
Gross Ticket Sales	$ 6,670,000	$ 3,254,960	$ 973,820	$ 2,441,220
Concessions	1,282,500	625,860	187,245	469,395
Parking	407,500	198,860	59,495	149,145
Total	$ 8,360,000	$ 4,079,680	$ 1,220,560	$ 3,059,760

TABLE 3

BROADCAST COST REVENUE GENERATED BY TEAM

TYPE	DOLLAR EXPENDITURE 1992	INSIDE MSA	OUTSIDE MSA
National TV Contracts	$32,000,000		$32,000,000
Local Production Costs	1,200,000		1,200,000
Total TV Contact Share	$33,200,000		$33,200,000
Local TV Contracts Estimates			
Contract Rights	500,000		
Production Costs*	150,000		
Estimated Margin 30%	195,000		
Total Costs	$ 845,000		
Advertising			
National 65%	549,250		549,250
Local	295,750	295,750	
Local Radio Contract Estimates			
Contract Rights	2,000,000		
Production Costs	300,000		
Estimated Margin 30%	690,000		
Total Costs	$ 2,990,000		
Advertising			
National 30%	897,000		897,000
Local 70%	2,093,000	2,093,000	
Misc Radio Shows			
Contract Rights and Production Costs	194,000		
Estimated Margin 30%	58,200		
Total Costs	$ 252,200		
Advertising			
National 30%	75,660		75,660
Local 70%	176,540	176,540	
Total Direct Local Advertising	$37,287,200	$2,565,290	$34,721,910

TABLE 4

REVENUE GENERATED BY VISITING TEAMS/MEDIA/ETC.

ITEM	DOLLAR EXPENDITURE ORIGINATING OUTSIDE MSA
Visiting Teams	$ 250,000
Hotel/Motel	100,000
Food/Entertainment	150,000
Visiting National TV/Radio	36,000
Hotel/Motel	14,400
Food/Entertainment	21,600
Visiting Local TV/Radio	50,000
Hotel/Motel	20,000
Food/Entertainment	30,000
NFL Referees/Scouts/Officials	54,000
Hotel/Motel	21,600
Food/Entertainment	32,400
Visiting Fans	400,000
Hotel/Motel	160,000
Food/Entertainment	240,000
Total	$ 790,000

TABLE 5

REVENUE GENERATED BY SPECTATORS

ITEM	DOLLAR EXPENDITURE 1992	INSIDE MECKLENBURG	MSA	OUTSIDE MSA
Food and Entertainment Restaurants, hotels bars *	$18,222,540	$8,892,600	$2,660,491	$6,669,449
Gasoline and Auto Expenditures **	504,320	---	143,810	360,510
Taxis, Buses, Etc. **	100,864	---	28,762	72,102
Out-of-Pocket Expenditures ***	2,017,280	---	575,240	1,442,040
Retail Shopping ***	1,260,800	---	359,525	901,275
	$22,105,804	$8,892,600	$3,767,828	$9,445,376

*42% of Gross Ticket Sales, Based on Hammer, Siler, Charlotte Coliseum Study

**Percentages of Gross Based on Wharton School Philadelphia Study

***Based on Charter Properties Perfromance Place Study

TABLE 6

ADVERTISING REVENUE

ITEM	DOLLAR EXPENDITURE 1992	INSIDE MECKLENBURG	INSIDE MSA	OUTSIDE MSA
Stadium Advertising	$1,750,000	---	$612,500	$1,137,500
Promotional "Giveaways" at Stadium	630,000	---	220,500	409,500
Player Shoe Contracts	100,000	---	---	100,000
Local Promotions	150,000	100,000	50,000	---
Total	$2,630,000	$100,000	$883,000	$1,647,000

TABLE 7

ECONOMIC IMPACT OF STADIUM CONSTRUCTION

CATEGORY	% OF CONSTRUCTION	% LOCAL CONTENT	DIRECT LOCAL IMPACT
Labor	40 %	85 %	$ 42,500,000
Material Production	27 %	50 %	$ 16,875,000
Material Supply	18 %	65 %	$ 14,625,000
Overhead	15 %	100 %	$ 18,750,000
Total Local Construction Spending	(100 %)	(74 %)	$ 92,750,000
Mecklenburg Impact			$282,535,050
MSA Impact			$388,891,475

TABLE 8

ANNUAL MECKLENBURG COUNTY/MSA ECONOMIC IMPACT

	INSIDE MECKLENBURG	MSA	OUTSIDE MSA	TOTAL
Table 1				
Revenue Generated by Team Directly	$17,917,896	$ 5,360,862	$13,438,422	
Table 2				
Revenue Generated by Other Events	4,079,680	1,220,560	3,059,760	
Table 3				
Broadcast Revenue		2,565,290	34,721,910	
Table 4				
Revenue Generated by Visiting Team			790,000	
Table 5				
Revenue Generated by Spectators	8,892,600	3,767,828	9,445,376	
Table 6				
Revenue Generated by Advertising	100,000	883,000	1,647,000	
Total	$30,990,176	$13,797,540	$63,102,468	$107,890,184
Mecklenburg County Direct Effect	$15,495,088	$76,900,008		$ 92,395,096
Mecklenburg County Indirect Multiplier				2.0462
Total Mecklenburg County Indirect Impact				$189,058,845
Total Mecklenburg County Impact (Direct & Indirect)	$22,393,858		$63,102,468	$281,453,941
MSA Direct Effect				$ 85,496,326
MSA Indirect Multiplier				3.1928
Total MSA Indirect Impact				$272,972,670
Total MSA Impact Direct and Indirect				$358,468,996

TABLE 9

1990 MECKLENBURG IMPACT

Wage and Salaries	$9,765,373,400
Wage and Salaries Stadium Impact	130,836,679
Average Annual Wage and Salary Increase 1981-1990	11.1 %
1990 Wage and Salary Impact as a % of Total Wage and Salary	1.34%
Stadium Wage and Salary % Increase as a % Annual Average Wage and Salary Increase	14.7

TABLE 10

1990 TAX ESTIMATE
(millions)

Type of Tax	City	County	Combined	Tax Elasticity	1989-90 Net Increase	Net Increase (Stadium Tax Effect)	Stadium Tax Increase as a % of Total Tax	1989-90 % Tax Increase	Stadium Tax Effect as a % of Annual Tax Increases
Property	95.4	175.2	270.6	1.07	23.1	3.9	1.44%	9.33%	16.9%
Sales	25.0	51.5	76.5	1.69	6.3	1.7	2.22%	8.98%	27.0%
ABC	1.3	1.7	3.0	—	—	—	—	—	
Total	170.7	420.5	591.2	1.01	46.8	8.0	1.35%	8.60%	17.1%

Q. WHAT ARE THE IMPLICATIONS OF INCREASING THE PROPOSED INCREASED INSURANCE DEDUCTIBLE FROM $200 TO $250?

A. By increasing the deductible from $100 to $200, the City saves an estimated $557,758 annually. Increasing the deductible from $200 to $250 would produce and estimated incremental savings of $117,472.

Q. WHY IS THERE NO RECREATION PROGRAM AT RAMBLEWOOD?

A. Plans are currently in place to provide a recreation program to the Ramblewood neighborhood during the summer of 1990. Recreation on the Move - Parks and Recreation Department's mobile recreation unit staffed and equipped to provide youth with supervised leisure experiences in athletics, games, arts, crafts, music, dance, and special events--will conduct a summer program at Ramblewood Park beginning June 11 and ending August 3.

One of five sites serviced by Recreation on the Move, Ramblewood will be visited each Thursday from 11:00 a.m. to 6:30 p.m. and will be staffed by three Summer Recreation Leaders. Our contact person is Ms. Ellen Sanders, 9901 Garthwood Road, 523-7225 (H); 552-0900 (W). Ms. Sanders is the neighborhood association's president and she has organized a group of parent volunteers who have agreed to assist with the over 300 children they believe will attend.

There are no plans for a year-round program at Ramblewood; however, Parks and Recreation will analyze the level of participation in the summer and consider it in long range needs assessment.

Q. WHAT SUPPORT DOES CCVB GIVE TO THE 600 FESTIVAL, THE CHARLOTTE SHAKESPEARE COMPANY AND THE CULTURAL STUDY COMMITTEE?

A. Attached is the program review for the CCVB which was not submitted with the outside agency package. The review lists CCVB's support of these three and other activities.

Q. HOW MANY DISPUTE SETTLEMENT CASES DID COMMUNITY RELATIONS HANDLE LAST YEAR AND IN THE CURRENT FISCAL YEAR? HOW MANY MORE CAN THEY HANDLE?

A. Last year, Community Relations handled 651 Dispute Settlement cases. By the end of the current fiscal year, Community Relations will have handled 625 cases. With the present staff, they could probably handle 30 additional cases if required to do so.

Q. DOES UNCC INTERNATIONAL STUDIES CONTRIBUTE TO SISTER CITIES?

A. The UNCC International Studies does not contribute funds to Sister Cities; however, the Director of UNCC's International Studies program serves as the Vice President of Sister Cities.

Q. **WHAT PERCENTAGE OF CDOT OPERATING REVENUES ARE DERIVED FROM GASOLINE TAX REVENUES OR FROM AUTO LICENSE FEES? OF THE AMOUNTS SPENT ON LOCALLY FUNDED TRANSPORTATION PROJECTS IN THE CIP, WHAT AMOUNT IS DERIVED FROM GASOLINE TAX REVENUES OR FROM AUTO LICENSE FEES?**

A. The City collects $20 on each motor vehicle registered in the City limits. The FY91 auto privilege tax revenue estimates for FY91 are as follows:

Fund	$20 Distribution	FY91 Revenue Estimate
General Operating Fund	$ 5.00	$1,326,645
CIP-TSM Intersections	7.50	1,891,125
Transit Operating	7.50	2,220,000
Total	$20.00	$5,437,770

The auto privilege tax portion of the Transit Operating Funds is 12.4%.

The revenue estimates for the CIP - TSM Intersections and Transit Operating Fund differ because of the accounting system used by the Transit Operating Fund. Purchasing commitments made at the end of a fiscal year are carried forward to the new fiscal year when purchases are actually received. Actual FY91 revenue estimates for the Transit Operating Fund are equal to the CIP - TSM Intersections.

There are two divisions of CDOT, Street Maintenance and CDOT-Operations, which charge specific operating expenses to the Powell Bill Operating Fund. The State Gasoline Tax Revenue (Powell Bill) estimate for FY90 is $8,221,265.

	FY90 Budget	FY90 Powell Bill Charges	% of Budget from Powell Bill
St. Maintenance	$6,573,840	$1,218,700	18%
CDOT-Operations	2,305,781	381,893	16%

The FY90 CIP allocated $41,832,625 for Transportation projects.

The Powell Bill Capital contribution for FY90 is $1,852,000. Thus, of the amount spent on locally funded transportation projects, 4% is derived from Gasoline Tax Revenues.

Q. **WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE PLANNER FOR SMALL TOWNS? WHAT IS THE COUNTY DOING?**

A. The Planning Commission requested a Planner position (estimated annual cost: $42,580) to work with the small towns and regionalism in the FY90 Budget. The request was not funded in the FY90 Budget. The Planner position is also currently not included in the County's recommended FY91 Budget.

Q. WHY HAS THE PUBLIC SERVICE AND INFORMATION BUDGET INCREASED OVER THE PAST TWO YEARS?

A. The Public Service and Information (PS&I) budget has increased as follows:

FY89	FY90	FY91	% Change
$588,453	$686,933	$822,738	19.8%

The increase from FY90 budget to FY91 budget for PS&I is $133,805. The major components of this increase are $25,000 for pay plan adjustments, $25,000 for the new Videographer position, $24,275 for transfer of the CMGC Chamber Video Technician position to PS&I, $31,000 for capital outlay (car, video equipment, audio board, and VCR's for Channel 32), camera operator for televising Council meetings - $9,000, and $15,000 for contract videographer for special projects.

Q. WHAT ARE THE NAMES LOCATIONS AND STAFFING LEVELS AT OUR 16 RECREATION CENTERS?

A. The attached listing of Recreation Center addresses and staffing information is provided in response to this question.

Q. COUNCIL REQUESTED INFORMATION CONCERNING SUMMER STUDENT BUS PASSES, *ESTIMATED LOSS IN CTS RIDERSHIP DUE TO PROPOSED FARE INCREASE*, COMPARISON OF CTS FARES TO OTHER CITIES, AND RIDESHARE/VANPOOL PROGRAM.

A. The attached response was provided by CDOT.

Q. WHAT AGENCIES/CONTRACTS DID WE PLAN TO ELIMINATE FUNDING OVER TIME THAT ARE INCLUDED IN THE RECOMMENDED BUDGET?

A. The following agencies were to receive one-third less funding each year until funding was eliminated:

Festival In The Park
YWCA Scattered Sites
United Family Services
Senior Center
Crisis Fuel Assistance
Youth Involvement Council
Sister Cities
Crime Prevention Program

Q. **WHAT WOULD THE FUNDING RECOMMENDATION BE IF THE MINT MUSEUM, AFRO-AMERICAN CULTURAL CENTER AND NATURE MUSEUM WERE FUNDED UNDER THE SOME GUIDELINES AS DISCOVERY PLACE?**

A. The City's contract with Discovery Place obligates funding for two major categories of expense: maintenance and utilities. The chart below projects these categories for the above listed agencies. These are estimates.

	Discovery	Mint	AACC	Nature Museum
Maintenance and Assoc. Supplies	$198,140	$ 380,000	$38,000	$ 91,500
Utilities	152,479	135,000	14,000	17,000
Total	$350,619	$ 415,000	$52,000	$ 88,500
Recommended Budget	$350,619	$1,456,000	$35,000	$244,530

Q. **WHAT WOULD IT COST TO REPLACE THE TREES LOST DUE TO HUGO?**

A. Replacement of trees lost due to Hugo is estimated to cost $1.7 million. Some revenue may be received from FEMA to offset a small portion of the cost. The attached estimated reflects costs projected for a replacement effort over a three-year period.

NAME OF PROGRAM: Charlotte Convention & Visitors Bureau

CONTRACTOR: Charlotte Convention & Visitors Bureau

CONTRACT AMOUNT: $1,308,092

CONTRACT PERIOD: July 1, 1989 to June 30, 1990

PRIOR YEAR FUNDING: $1,169,000

INTRODUCTION·

The Charlotte Convention & Visitors Bureau (CCVB) has requested continued funding for FY90-91. These funds would be used to promote and attract conventions and visitors to the Charlotte area. Monies are dedicated for this purpose from the hotel/motel occupancy tax according to the following schedule:

50% of first million dollars
35% of second million dollars
25% of the remainder

The purpose of this report is to review the effectiveness of the Charlotte Convention & Visitors Bureau at meeting the objectives contracted for by the City for the period of July 1, 1989 through June 30, 1990.

GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND CURRENT STATUS:

Goal: Book 150 convention groups.

Status: It is projected that the CCVB convention division will book 129 groups in FY90. Groups booked included N.C. Conference on Exceptional Children, National Lifesavers Conference, NBA All-Star Weekend, National Beta Club and the International Technology Education Association. Although total groups booked will be less than earlier projections, the average group size should increase 17% (see below). This will result in attracting approximately the same number of delegates as projected (101,652 actual vs. 101,250 projected).

Goal: Increase average group size to 675.

Status: The CCVB projects the average group size for all conventions booked in FY90 to be 788 (a 17% increase over goal).

GOALS, OBJECTIVES AND CURRENT STATUS:

Goal: Increase national awareness and interest in Charlotte as a meeting and convention destination.

Status: The CCVB created and implemented an aggressive cooperative marketing campaign which included national and regional advertising and a direct sales program. The theme of the FY90 campaign is "Who Would Have Dreamed", playing off Charlotte's growth and successes. The Bureau produced a new Convention Planners' Guide, Purveyor's Services Directory, and hosted planner receptions and familiarization tours. Of particular note was a reception for New York planners held at Sotheby's.

CCVB was also instrumental in the success of conventions such as the Society of Automotive Engineers, National Recycling Congress, and the International Hosiery Exposition.

Goal: Increase local awareness of Charlotte as a meeting and convention destination.

Status: The CCVB continues to promote the importance of conventions and trade shows locally through publicity, speakers bureau, and promotions such as National Tourism Week.

Goal: Work cooperatively to secure a new, larger convention center.

Status: The CCVB works with the Convention Center Citizens Advisory Committee and the Technical Coordinating Committee on the new convention center project. Efforts have included promoting the need for the new center through a special newsletter and brochure and meeting with key legislators regarding the funding legislation.

Goal: Increase Charlotte's awareness level among group tour operators, travel agents, and individual tourists.

Status: Charlotte took the lead in creating a regional tourism cooperative which includes 12 counties in North and South Carolina. This cooperative will jointly promote the mid-Carolina region to tour operators and travel agents. Other efforts included a "Spring Sensations" promotion which involved advertising in Southern Living magazine and three AAA Motor Club magazines. The promotion featured special packages at attractions and hotels. The CCVB also produced a new visitor's guide and a new group tour manual.

Status: Charlotte also hosted 12 familiarization tours for tour operators and travel agents, including 2 from the United Kingdom and 1 from Canada.

Goal: Increase tourism-related revenues in Metrolina.

Status: Although 1989 figures have not been released by the N.C. Department of Economics and Community Development, we project that tourism revenues will exceed $1,130,000,000, on 8% increase over 1988.

Goal: Increase local awareness of travel industry's importance.

Status: Efforts such as the National Tourism Week and other publicity efforts helped build awareness for the importance of tourism in Charlotte.

Goal· Implement a matching funds grant program for projects and/or events which have the potential for increasing tourism and improving the quality of life for Charlotteans.

Status: During FY90, $75,000 was available for matching fund grants. Grant requests totaled $262,006.12. Grants were awarded for the following events and/or projects.

1.	Charlotte Soccer -- 1990 McDonald's Youth Soccer Cup	$ 1,000.00
2.	Spirit Square Center for the Arts -- Folio: Festival of the New Arts	$ 2,500.00
3.	Hezekiah Alexander Foundation, Inc. -- Brochures	$ 700.00
4.	Native American Festival -- Native American Festival	$ 650.00
5.	Central Charlotte Association -- 1991 Guide to Uptown	$ 1,000.00
6.	SpringFest, Inc. -- WCNC-TV Jazz Charlotte 1990	$ 1,000.00
7.	Carolina's Carrousel, Inc. -- Parade and Festival	$ 2,000.00
8.	J.C. Smith University -- Band Trip to Ireland	$ 500.00

Status:	9.	Cultural Study Committee -- Cultural Study	$10,000.00
	10.	NCWTA -- 1990 NCWTA Matchmaker Conference	$ 2,000.00
	11.	Historic Landmarks Fund -- Restoration of Charlotte Trolley	$ 2,000.00
	12.	Citizens Advisory Committee -- National Tourism Week	$ 2,000.00
	13.	Opera Carolina -- Rustavi Company	$ 4,000.00
	14.	600 Festival Association -- 600 Festival	$16,000.00
	15.	Charlotte Shakespeare Company -- Summer Tour	$ 1,000.00
	16.	Friends of Fourth Ward -- Walking Tour Guide	$ 1,081.12
	17.	Science Museums of Charlotte, Inc. -- CIMUSET/ICOM	$ 7,000.00
	18.	International House -- Council of International Visitors	$ 1,500.00
	19.	Mint Museum -- Exhibition of Japanese Art	$ 2,500.00
	20.	Arts & Science Council -- First Night Charlotte	$ 2,000.00
	21.	Mecklenburg Aquatic Club -- Charlotte Ultra Swim	$ 2,000.00

A total of $62,431.12 was awarded to grant applicants in FY90. The balance, $12,568.88 will be carried over the FY91.

FY91 FUNDING.

Funding is recommended at $1,385,896.

Charlotte Parks and Recreation Department
Recreation Centers

Recreation Center	Center Director	Assistant Center Director	Rec. Leader
Albemarle Road 5027 Idlewild Rd Charlotte 28212 (704) 567-1941	1 Center Director II	1 Assistant Center Director	1 Recreation Leader
Amay James 2425 Lester St Charlotte 28209 (704) 336-3053	1 Center Director II	1 Assistant Center Director	1 Recreation Leader
Boulevard Homes 1620 Brooksvale St Charlotte 28209 (704) 399-8166	1 Center Director I	1 Assistant Center Director	
Double Oaks 1326 Woodward Ave. Charlotte 28209 (704) 336-2056	1 Center Director I	1 Assistant Center Director	
Earle Village 610 East 7th St Charlotte 28204 (704) 336-2095	1 Center Director I	1 Assistant Center Director	
Enderly 1220 Clay Ave. Charlotte 28208 (704) 393-7333	1 Center Director II	1 Assistant Center Director	1 Recreation Leader
Greenville 1330 Spring St Charlotte 28208 (704) 336-3367	1 Center Director I	1 Assistant Center Director	
Hawthorne 345 Hawthorne Lane Charlotte 28204 (704) 336-2008	1 Center Director II	1 Assistant Center Director	1 Recreation Leader
Latta 510 East Park Ave Charlotte 28203 (704)336-2533	1 Center Director II	1 Assistant Center Director	1 Recreation Leader

Marion Diehl 2219 Tyvola Road Charlotte 28210 (704) 527-0237	1 Marion Diehl Center Director 1 Recreation Specialist (Seniors) 1 Recreation Specialist (Therapeutic) 1 Recreation Leader (Therapeutic-perm parttime) 1 Pool Manager 3 Lifeguards 1 Office Assistant II 1 Custodian	1 Center Director I	1 Recreation Leader
Methodist Home 3200 Shamrock Dr Charlotte 28215 (704) 568-3363	1 Center Director II	1 Assistant Center Director	1 Recreation Leader
Naomi Drenan/Grayson 750 Beal St Charlotte 28211 (704) 365-1265	1 Center Director II	1 Assistant Center Director	1 Recreation Leader
Revolution 1201 Remount Rd Charlotte 28208 (704) 336-3841	1 Center Director I	1 Assistant Center Director	
Sugaw Creek 943 W. Sugaw Crk Rd Charlotte 28213 (704) 596-0107	1 Center Director II	1 Assistant Center Director	1 Recreation Leader
Tuckaseegee 4820 Tuckaseegee Rd Charlotte 28208 (704) 399-4492	1 Center Director II	1 Assistant Center Director	1 Recreation Leader
West Charlotte 2400 Kendall Dr. Charlotte 28216 (704) 393-1560	1 Center Director II	1 Assistant Center Director	1 Recreation Leader

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: May 23, 1990

TO: Lisa Schumacher
Budget & Evaluation Department

FROM: G. T. Lathrop, Deputy Director
Department of Transportation

SUBJECT: QUESTIONS FROM COUNCIL REGARDING TRANSPORTATION BUDGET

Question: What is the cost of the summer student pass?

$25.00

Question: How many were sold in the first year of the program, the summer of 1989?

130

Question: What is the Department's position on issuing free bus passes for students in the summer?

The $25.00 fee is reasonable. We would like to run the program for a second year as it was operated last year to see what sort of response we have. We were very pleased with the program last year and had absolutely no operational problems

with it. On the other hand, the amount of revenue is small ($3250 in 1989). Any concerns about abuse of an unlimited or "free" riding privilege could be dealt with by making it clear that the pass would be revoked if it were abused or if the pass holder created any disturbance or nuisance on the vehicles.

Question: What is the estimated loss in ridership due to the proposed September increase in CTS fare?

The attached table shows projections of ridership and revenue for four different scenarios:

1. Operation in FY91 with no service increase and no fare increase.
2. FY91 with only a service increase.
3. FY91 with only a fare increase.
4. The projection furnished in the budget showing the combined effect of both.

Comparison of #3 to #1 (increase fare vs: no change) indicates a loss of about 280,000 passengers with a gain in revenue of just under $400,000.

Question: Could we avoid a fare increase in September

1990 by drawing down the transportation fund balance?

The increased revenue due to the fare increase is just under $400,000 per year. As the attached table shows, this decreased revenue also decreases the fund balance at a rate of about $400,000 per year for each Fiscal Year from 1991 to 1994. For example, at the end of FY92, when our original projection showed a negative fund balance of just over $358,000 in the transportation fund, the negative balance is increased to $1,148,000. This reflects the loss of approximately $400,000 in revenue in each of the two Fiscal Years, 1991 and 1992.

Question: What are fares in other cities comparable to Charlotte?

A table showing Charlotte's current fare structure, the fare structures for three other systems in North Carolina and for seven southeastern cities is attached.

Question: What has been the experience with participants in the vanpool and carpool programs?

Currently our matching file on the computer has in it about 3500 names of people who have requested a carpool match. We have been able to supply approximately 75% of the requests with a match within 24 hours. We have no information on the actual number of carpools which have been formed or on the duration of those carpools.

As of this month we have 13 vanpools in operation: two from Gastonia, two from Denver, two within the City of Charlotte and one each from Concord, Newton Conover, Mooresville, Huntersville, Cornelius, Rock Hill and Salisbury. There are 182 people participating in the program. The City began operating the program in the Spring of 1987 when we took over the operation from a private contractor. Since that time only two vanpools have disbanded. Generally the vanpools remain full. As people drop out, new participants join, and several of the vanpools have waiting lists. Seven vanpools have been started within the last six months, partly as a result of the cooperation of Duke Power Company and the Wilton-Connor Packaging Company on Westinghouse Boulevard, which reflects the increased interest on the part of employers and CDOT's efforts to encourage vanpooling through contacts with major employers

in the area. Two new vanpools are expected to begin on or about the first of June.

Question: What are the expenditures for the vanpool and carpool program and what are the sources of revenue?

Costs for vanpools, including depreciation, insurance and operation, are estimated for each year and are paid pro-rata by participants in the vanpool. The only City cost is that of the staff time to administer the program, which requires about 50% of the time of one of the Rideshare Specialists in the Department, or about $25,000 a year, including fringe benefits.

GTL:cb

Attachments

COMPARISON OF TRANSIT FARES

(Data as of August, 1989)

	BASE	PEAK	EXP	MONTHLY PASS
Charlotte	$.70	-	$1.00	$25 (local)
Chapel Hill	$.50	-	-	-
Raleigh	$.60	$.75	$ .85	$25 (local)
Winston Salem	$.50	-	-	$18 (local)
Atlanta	$.85	-	-	$32 (local)
Jacksonville	$.60	-	$ .75	$10 (weekly)
Knoxville	$.75	-	$1.30	-
Louisville	$.35	$.60	-	-
Memphis	$.85	-	$ .95	-
Nashville	$.75	-	$ .95	-
Norfolk	$.80*	-	$ .90*	$20-$30

(*plus zone charges)

CDOT, 5/23/90

Projections of Revenue and Ridership for Charlotte Transit
With Combinations of Service & Fare Increase
GTL 3/28/90,DATASET FY91TAB,DISK #9

	PASSENGERS	REVENUE
FY90	10,734,204	$4,554,991
FY91	10,734,204	$4,554,991
(No Change)		
FY91	11,089,637	$4,702,983
(Svc Incr)	355,433	$147,992
	3.31%	3.25%
FY91	10,454,889	$4,947,838
(Fare Incr)	(279,315)	$392,847
	-2.60%	8.62%
FY91	10,810,322	$5,095,830
(Both)	76,118	$540,839
	0.71%	11.87%

TRANSPORTATION FUND
COST AND REVENUE PROJECTIONS

With September '90 Service Increase
and Fare Increase

	FY90 BUDG PROJ'N FIRST 6 MO	FY91 TOTAL	FY92 TOTAL	FY93 TOTAL	FY94 TOTAL
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	15,395,340	18,026,857	19,803,022	21,637,701	23,272,709
CAPITAL MATCH		200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
TOTAL		18,226,857	20,003,022	21,837,701	23,472,709
REVENUES	15,387,164	16,245,337	16,913,264	17,612,049	18,280,501
SURPLUS (DEFICIT)	(8,176)	(1,981,520)	(3,089,758)	(4,225,652)	(5,192,208)
FUND BALANCE	4,712,958	2,731,438	(358,320)	(4,583,972)	(9,776,180)

TRANSPORTATION FUND
COST AND REVENUE PROJECTIONS

With September '90 Service Increase
NO Fare Increase

	FY90 BUDG PROJ'N FIRST 6 MO	FY91 TOTAL	FY92 TOTAL	FY93 TOTAL	FY94 TOTAL
OPERATING EXPENDITURES	15,395,340	18,026,857	19,803,022	21,637,701	23,272,709
CAPITAL MATCH		200,000	200,000	200,000	200,000
TOTAL		18,226,857	20,003,022	21,837,701	23,472,709
REVENUES	15,387,164	15,852,490	16,516,489	17,211,306	17,875,750
SURPLUS (DEFICIT)	(8,176)	(2,374,367)	(3,486,534)	(4,626,395)	(5,596,959)
FUND BALANCE	4,712,958	2,338,591	(1,147,943)	(5,774,338)	(11,371,297)

DEPARTMENT: Parks and Recreation - Operations

CATEGORY: Special Program

TITLE: Replacement of Trees Lost Due to Hurricane Hugo

BUDGET:

Number of Positions			3	
	Year 1	Year 2	Year 3	Total
Personnel Costs	$ 63,670	$ 66,854	$ 70,197	$ 200,721
Operating Costs	184,745	193,982	203,681	582,408
Capital Costs	61,500	0	0	61,500
Tree Cost	285,579	299,179	314,171	898,929
Sub-Total	595,494	560,015	588,049	1,743,558
Possible FEMA Revenues	(184,000)	0	0	(184,000)
TOTAL	$411,494	$560,017	$588,049	$1,559,560

DESCRIPTION: Approximately 4,600 street trees and 9,000 park trees were lost to Hurricane Hugo. A three year replacement program is proposed using a combination of City forces and contract work for replacement and initial maintenance. Partial Federal reimbursement may be received.

IMPLEMENTATION DATE: July 1, 1990

OBJECTIVE: Replace street and park trees destroyed as a result of Hurricane Hugo and ensure no more than 10% loss.

THURSDAY, 5/24

Suggested Reduction: Productivity/Energy Study - $100,000

There are two components to the uses of these funds:
1). the energy components allow for improvements to be made to City facilities that will result in long-term energy savings;
2). the productivity components allows for outside consultants to be brought in as needed to provide special expertise not available from Internal Consulting or other City staff.

Suggested Reduction: Festival In The Park - $15,354

The projected total budget for Festival In The Park in 1990 is $97,587. The City's direct contribution represents about 16% of the total budget. Festival has requested additional funding of $3,083 from the City which was not included in the recommended budget. Funding for the Festival comes from the City's contribution, exhibitor fees, and donations to the Festival from businesses and sponsors.

Additionally, the City provides in-kind support to the event through:

- operation of the concessions program;
- intensive clean up, repair and maintenance activities prior to the event;
- provision of staff available during the event for trouble shooting;
- operation of parking lots during the event.

Suggested Reduction: Cutrate Police Enforcement - $120,000

This program is designed to provide intensive traffic enforcement at selected intersections during peak traffic periods. As reported to Council on May 22, 1990, during the past nine months Police has dedicated over 9,300 hours of officer time to this program at 43 different locations. A total of 1,857 citations were issued during the period primarily for illegal turns and running red lights. Seventeen arrests were made.

Suggested Increase: Bulky Item Trash Collection Increase - $109,827

To increase the efficiency of the Bulky Item Collection process an additional collection crew is required. The $109,827 includes funding three positions and providing the two-man crew with a dump truck and other necessary items. The additional position is for administrative/clerical support needed for intake and scheduling the requests for services. This administrative position has already been included in the FY91 Alternative Budget.

Suggested Reduction: Tryon Street Mall Special Support - $206,382
Charge 50% to Municipal Services District

This funding provides maintenance, clean-up, street sweeping, litter collection, and support for special events in the Central Business District. These services include cleaning the bus shelters daily. Also, unsafe fixtures such as broken glass and benches, tree grates and electrical outlets are repaired daily.

Suggested Reduction: Tryon Street Mall Garbage Collection - $119,787

Service is currently provided to 154 businesses located in the Central Business District. Of those businesses, 104 receive daily service, 3 receive service four times per week, 21 receive service three times per week, 21 receive service two times per week, and 5 receive service one time per week. The crew empties approximately 827 cans from these businesses for an average of 5.4 cans per businesses. In addition, the crew services 66 City-owned pebblestone and Lawson trash containers located in the area each day.

Under existing procedures, businesses with no more than eight cans receive two pick-up weekly.

Suggested Reduction: Provide funding to the Mint Museum, Afro-American Cultural Center, and the Nature Museum consistent with funding provided for support to Discovery Place.

(Please see Questions and Answers document).

Suggested Reduction: Council Contingency - $100,000

An appropriation of $400,000 is recommended for Council Contingency in FY91. These monies are intended for Council's use in funding projects which were not included in the Operating Budget. For FY91, it is likely that Council will be asking to entertain requests from outside agencies for funding or for special community projects. It should be noted that the FY91 Operating Budget is increased by 4% but there is not recommended increase in the Council Contingency.

Suggested Reduction: Youth Involvement Council - $22,500

Previously, the City and County have shared the cost of the Youth Involvement Council (YIC), 67% - City, and 33% - County. In the FY(0 Budget discussion, it was proposed that outside agency funding for FY90 be frozen at FY89 levels, reduced by one-third in FY91, one-third in FY92 and eliminated in FY93. This year, YIC proposed an alternate funding arrangement with the City and County sharing at 50% each. Originally, the City's FY91 share would have been $20,000. The YIC alternate proposal increased the funding to $22,500.

Suggested Reduction: Senior Centers - $10,000

The proposed FY91 funding at $10,000 represents a one-third reduction from the FY90 level. Funds are primarily for postage, printing and office supplies.

Suggested Reduction: Police Athletic League (PAL) - $134,976

Currently PAL is staffed with two sworn Officers and two Office Assistants. PAL's objectives include obtaining at least 3% of the Police Department's sworn personnel as volunteers. However, due to the availability of off-duty jobs and volunteer commitments elsewhere, the actual number of Officer volunteers through February 1990 was nine, or 1.24% of sworn personnel. See attached information.

FY90

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION	ACTIVITY
Police/Police Athletic League/401 56	Law Enforcement

Objective #44 ·

To report the number of children served through the PAL Program by reporting the number of children who participate and the number of activities in which they participate

Status of Achievement·

Objective Measures	Dec	Jan	Feb	5 Mo Total	8 Mo Total
# of Participants in·					
Baseball				42	42
Basketball		456	456		456
Boxing	12	15	15	15	15
Football/Cheerleading	450			700	700
Track & Field				350	350
Total	462	471	471	1107	1563
				- 25	- 85
				1082	1478*

Objective Resolution Statement·

* This total, 1478, does not add up across the total line because the same kids are involved in a single activity that spans several months Rather, it more accurately represents the actual number of different youths participating in P.A L activities. Every effort is made to count one child, participating in several P A L activities, only once.

The football season came to an end in December with the Awards ceremony at Grady Cole Center Basketball activities began in January and concluded in February

The boxing program has continued throughout the entire eight-month reporting period, involving a maximum of 15 different youths

Approximately 25 youths were involved in two activities, e.g , track and football, during the first 5-month reporting period Another 65 youths were involved in both football and basketball, during Dec - Feb Therefore, 85 was subtracted from the total of 1563, to get a more accurate total of 1478 different youths.

FY90

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION

Police/Police Athletic League/401 56

ACTIVITY

Law Enforcement

Objective #45

To secure volunteer assistance to the PAL Program from at least 3% of the Police Department's sworn personnel

Status of Achievement

Objective Measures	Dec	Jan	Feb	5 Mo. Total	8 Mo Total
# of Officers Assisting With PAL	6	1	0	9	9
# of Actual Officers	723	751	747	713	723 (Avg)
% of Actual Officers Assisting					1 24

* Reflects the number of participants who remained in the program

Objective Resolution Statement

This objective was not met. The officers who volunteered during this three-month reporting period are the same as those who volunteered during first five-month rating period; therefore the eight-month total is no higher than the five-month total Every effort is made to count each officer only once, regardless of the amount of time and/or the number of activities he participates in

At the beginning of each P A.L season, a notice is posted on the LEC bulletin board requesting police volunteers for that activity

Some reasons for the low officer participation are

1 no adjustments to shifts or days off
2 uncertainty in the future funding of P A L
3 planned civilianization of P A L staff
4 coaching, etc , requires attendance at Saturday games
5 abundance of off-duty jobs paying $12-15/hour
6 those who do volunteer do so in their own neighborhoods

FY90

STATEMENT OF OBJECTIVES

DEPARTMENT/DIVISION	ACTIVITY
Police/Police Athletic League/401 56	Law Enforcement

Objective #46

To secure a number of civilians equivalent to the number of Police Volunteers who provide volunteer assistance to PAL

Status of Achievement

Objective Measures	Dec.	Jan	Feb	5 Mo Total	8 Mo Total
# of Citizens Assisting	90	76	76	135	202*
# of Officers Assisting	6	1	0	9	9

* Reflects the number of participants who remained in the program

Objective Resolution Statement·

The eight-month total does not add up across because some volunteers who participated in December also participated in January and February Every effort is made to count a volunteer only once, regardless of the number of activities he is involved in

Civilians are always willing to assist in the P A L program, as most of the volunteers are the parents of the children involved in the sporting activity The basketball program has a great number of children in the younger age groups, and parents tend to get more involved with the younger kids' activities

FORM B-30BJ

M E M O R A N D U M

DATE: May 12, 1989

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: O. Wendell White
City Manager

Current Council policies, particularly the policies of maintaining a stable tax rate and the spending benchmark, have necessitated that I prioritize all City services and ensure funding first for those services determined to be critical. Public safety in general remains my top priority, as is reflected by my recommendation for increased staffing in Police and Park Rangers.

Services within the Public Safety umbrella, nonetheless, must still be prioritized. While I do not believe that the Police Athletic League is operated as well as it should be operated, the program itself is not the issue. Instead, the issue is my intention of providing the maximum public safety services within existing Council policies. This intention is the basis of my recommendation to shift funding from PAL to police patrol.

There are options for improving PAL that I recommend for Council's consideration if the program continues. These options include:

- Reconstruct the PAL Board, placing more police officers on the Advisory Board and review the fundraising aspect of the Board's purpose;

- Trade the two paid police positions with the PAL program for two Recreation Specialists;

- Review programs to ensure coordination and increase efficiency of PAL with Parks and Recreation programs;

- Set new objectives for the PAL program, such as increasing volunteer police participation to 10% of all sworn personnel (about 70 officers) and to secure a similar number of civilian volunteers.

The above are options for your consideration if PAL funding is to be continued. These steps could provide a basis for strengthening the true program purpose.

POLICE DEPARTMENT
Program Review

NAME OF PROGRAM:	Police Athletic League (P.A.L)
PERIOD COVERED:	July 1, 1988 - June 30, 1989
DATE PREPARED:	May 3, 1989
SERVICE PROVIDER:	Police Athletic League - C.P.D.

A. Summary

1. Program was approved by City Council on June 13, 1988 for $159,898, covering a 12-month period (July 1, 1988 - June 30, 1989).

2. During this fiscal year the program will serve approximately 1288 youth: 500 in football/cheerleading; 444 in basketball; 180 in baseball; 150 in track; and 14 in boxing.

3. Program costs were $107,571 through April 30, 1989.

4. Average cost per youth served is $83.52 through April 30, or $124.14 based on annual program budget.

B. Major Findings

1. PAL's Board of Directors, which is authorized by PAL's By-Laws, has not met since 1986 and has not had an active role in the management of PAL since that time.

2. Volunteers participating in PAL's operation consist almost entirely of civilians (non-Police Officers).

3. Funds raised through contributions total $6,413 to date; budgeted for FY89 were $25,000.

4. Measurable objectives had not been developed for PAL for current and prior years. These objectives have been developed for FY90 should funding be authorized.

5. On-duty Youth Bureau Investigators have been used to drive PAL vans in absence of other City licensed drivers in PAL.

C. Participant and Cost Analysis

The PAL Program includes five sports--Pop Warner football, Little League baseball, basketball, track and boxing. There are a total of 1,288 participants in these programs. However, the number of different children served is less since some children participate in more than one sport. The participation levls break down as follows:

Pop Warner Football (contact)	
Players	350
Cheerleaders	150
Little League Baseball	180
Basketball	444
Track	150
Boxing	14
Total	1,288

The FY89 budget for PAL totals $159,898. This budget includes salaries for a Police Sergeant, a Police Officer and two Office Assistants, totalling $95,520. Other budgeted items include operating expenses for the PAL building of $7,703; registration fees for football and baseball, physical exams for the participants in football and boxing and umpire fees--totalling $21,432; uniforms for $23,900; insurance premiums - $2,700; and, miscellaneous athletic equipment and supplies for $5,043. The budget does not include fringe benefits or operating costs for the four PAL vans. The average cost per participant ($159,898 divided by 1,288) is $124.

As a point of comparison, a breakdown of the Youth Athletic League programs operated by the Parks and Recreation Department was developed. The programs listed below describe only the organized youth leagues which are operated by the Parks and Recreation Department and do not include informal games or adult leagues. Participation levels break down as follows:

Flag Football	192
Baseball	1,170
Basketball (winter)	1,536*
Basketball (summer)	180
Soccer (full)	270
Indoor Soccer	980
Total	4,328

*This number includes the 444 youth from the PAL program since they are participating in a jointly sponsored league.

The FY89 budget for Youth Athletics includes salaries for one full time Recreation Specialist ($23,000), officials ($72,752), equipment and supplies ($10,000), and awards ($15,720) for a total of $121,472 or approximately $28 per participant.

Several program differences exist between the PAL Program and the Youth Athletic Program.

1. The Parks and Recreation Program does not involve contact (Pop Warner) football. They organize flag football only.

2. No uniforms are provided; children must provide their own. However, some of the Recreation Center Advisory Councils do provide T-Shirts. Since contact football is not played, all the other sports can be played with simple "uniforms".

3. There are no track or boxing programs under Parks and Recreation.

4. No "door-to-door" transportation is provided by Parks and Recreation.

There are a number of similarities between programs.

1. Neither program charges the children entry fees, per the City Council user fee policy.

2. Both programs rely upon volunteer coaches for the teams.

3. Both programs serve children from low-income and inner-City neighborhoods.

D. Review of PAL's Stated Purpose

PURPOSE: To provide organized athletic activities and programs for young people in the City who, because of domestic or financial hardship, would not otherwise have the opportunity to participate.

ACHIEVEMENT: PAL achieves this purpose. However, the Youth Athletic Program at the 15 Recreation Centers located in Charlotte also serving a similar population.

PURPOSE: To operate these programs in areas of the City where the elements of crime are present and to involve the young people in the areas selected so as to prevent them from becoming a victim of, or a participant in some criminal act.

ACHIEVEMENT: PAL achieves this purpose. However, a number of the Youth Athletic Programs are also located in these areas.

PURPOSE: To provide adult leadership and guidance to the young people in those areas selected by both residents and police officers.

ACHIEVEMENT: PAL partially achieves this purpose. Currently, PAL volunteers are comprised of primarily of civilians. The City's Youth Athletic Program also utilizes volunteers.

PURPOSE: To create an atmosphere that is conducive to better understanding on the part of both police officer and the young people, and to allow officers and young people to see each other outside their normal environments, thus leading to closer communications and respect for each other as individuals.

ACHIEVEMENT: Due to the limited number of Police Officers among PAL's volunteers, this purpose is not being met.