# AGENDA

| | |
|---|---|
| Meeting Type: | W |
| Date: | 05-21-1991 |
| SUBJECT | |

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office

# AGENDA

Budget Workshop

Tuesday, May 21, 1991

5 00 - 8 00 p m

I Budget Announcements

II Dinner

III Continued Discussion of the Operating Budget

- List of Things to Revisit
- List of Things to Consider Adding

**MEMORANDUM**

TO: Mayor and City Council

FROM: J. Wenden White
City Manager

SUBJECT: Revisions to User Fees for FY92 and User Fee Policy

DATE: May 20, 1991

According to the User Fee Policy, I am presenting the FY92 User Fees for your review as part of the budget process. The fee schedules are attached.

There have been some changes in Land Development related fees. Staff reductions have been made in response to the slow down in land development and construction activity. Planning has cut one position devoted to rezonings and Engineering has transferred two positions from Public Service and Land Development to the Construction Division. When the economy improves and the land development/construction activity resumes normal levels, adjustments will be required in staffing to meet the demand for service and fees will be reviewed again in the next budget cycle.

Other fees have increased because more staff time has been required for those services. For example, two caseworkers were added to Engineering in 1990 to facilitate building permit processing and one and a half new positions were added for tree ordinance review.

In July, we expect Superior Court Judge Lewis to rule on the Homebuilder Associations' complaint regarding the City's authority to charge fees and the reasonableness of the fees. If the ruling is against the City, the amount of lost revenue would be approximately $1.3 million. The ruling would be applicable to other municipalities in North Carolina, as well.

One revision is recommended in the User Fee Policy

- Fees charged to governmental agencies will be the same as those fees charged to anyone else (except the City of Charlotte would not charge itself fees)

The reason to charge other government agencies is that Mecklenburg County, the State of North Carolina, and the Federal Government do not offer exemptions to the City of Charlotte for fees.

Attachment

# CITY OF CHARLOTTE USER FEE POLICY

Amended May 15, 1991
Effective July 1, 1991

1. User fees are a reasonable means of financing services that offer a direct benefit to those who use them.

2. Recovery of direct costs is a valid and reasonable means of establishing appropriate user fees and charges.

3. Engineering fees are to be established with the goal to recover 80% of direct costs only.

4. Planning fees are to be established with the goal to recover 80% of direct costs only.

5. Adult athletic fees and rental of Parks and Recreation facilities are to be established to recover 100% of direct costs only.

6. Youth athletic associations and City-sponsored youth athletic program are exempt from user fees and charges for reserving and using parks and recreation facilities.

7. Individuals identified as indigent will be exempt from fees. The same waiver application form currently used by Parks and Recreation will continue to be used to determine indigency.

8. The annual user fee review process will be used for Council to review user fees as part of the budget process.

9. Cost recovery for other services should be 80% of all direct costs, except when fees would negatively impact the demand for service.

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT
FY92 User Fees

| Service | FY91 Fee | FY92 Fee |
|---|---|---|
| Special Use Permit | | |
| Major | $ 60.00 | $ 50.00 |
| Minor | 60.00 | 50.00 |
| Commercial Inspection Building Permit | 130.00 | 185.00 |
| 100+1 Floodplain Analysis | 185.00 | 125.00 |
| Conditional Rezoning | 60.00 | 50.00 |
| R-O-W Abandonment | | |
| For 1st Street | 250.00 | 250.00 |
| for Each Additional | 125.00 | 125.00 |
| R-O-W Encroachment | 705.00 | 705.00 |
| R-O-W Lease | 12% of Tax Value | 12% of Tax Value |
| Storm Drainage Problem Study | 50.00 | 50.00 |
| Subdivision Review: Single Family-No Streets | 90.00 | 80.00 |
| Subdivision/Multi-Family Plan Review & Inspection | 415.00 (1 acre) See Attached Chart | 475.00 (1 acre) See Attached Chart |
| Tree Ordinance Review | 200.00 | 245.00 |
| UMUD Review | 35.00 | 60.00 |
| Commercial Drainage Plan Review & Inspection (1 acre) | 295.00 (1 acre) See Attached Chart | 284.00 See Attached Chart |
| Erosion Control Review and Inspection (Grading Permit) | 460.00 (1 acre) See Attached Chart | 360.00 (1 acre) See Attached Chart |

ENGINEERING DEPARTMENT

PROPOSED USER FEES FOR FY 1992

| DRAINAGE/DETENTION | | | GRADING PERMIT | | | SUBD/MF PLAN REVIEW AND INSPECTION | | |
|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|---|
| NUMBER OF ACRES | FEE PER ACRE | TOTAL FEE | NUMBER OF ACRES | FEE PER ACRE | TOTAL FEE | NUMBER OF ACRES | FEE PER ACRE | TOTAL FEE |
| 1 | $284 | $284 | 1 | $361 | $361 | 1 | $475 | $475 |
| 2 | $225 | $451 | 2 | $287 | $573 | 2 | $377 | $754 |
| 3 | $197 | $591 | 3 | $250 | $751 | 3 | $329 | $988 |
| 4 | $179 | $716 | 4 | $227 | $910 | 4 | $299 | $1,197 |
| 5 | $166 | $830 | 5 | $211 | $1,056 | 5 | $278 | $1,389 |
| 6 | $156 | $938 | 6 | $199 | $1,192 | 6 | $261 | $1,568 |
| 7 | $148 | $1,039 | 7 | $189 | $1,321 | 7 | $248 | $1,738 |
| 8 | $142 | $1,136 | 8 | $181 | $1,444 | 8 | $238 | $1,900 |
| 9 | $137 | $1,229 | 9 | $174 | $1,562 | 9 | $228 | $2,055 |
| 10 | $132 | $1,318 | 10 | $168 | $1,676 | 10 | $220 | $2,205 |
| 11 | $128 | $1,405 | 11 | $162 | $1,786 | 11 | $214 | $2,349 |
| 12 | $124 | $1,489 | 12 | $158 | $1,892 | 12 | $207 | $2,490 |
| 13 | $121 | $1,570 | 13 | $154 | $1,996 | 13 | $202 | $2,626 |
| 14 | $118 | $1,650 | 14 | $150 | $2,097 | 14 | $197 | $2,759 |
| 15 | $115 | $1,727 | 15 | $146 | $2,196 | 15 | $193 | $2,889 |
| 16 | $113 | $1,803 | 16 | $143 | $2,292 | 16 | $189 | $3,016 |
| 17 | $110 | $1,878 | 17 | $140 | $2,387 | 17 | $185 | $3,140 |
| 18 | $108 | $1,951 | 18 | $138 | $2,479 | 18 | $181 | $3,262 |
| 19 | $106 | $2,022 | 19 | $135 | $2,570 | 19 | $178 | $3,382 |
| 20 | $105 | $2,093 | 20 | $133 | $2,660 | 20 | $175 | $3,500 |
| 21 | $103 | $2,162 | 21 | $131 | $2,748 | 21 | $172 | $3,616 |
| 22 | $101 | $2,230 | 22 | $129 | $2,834 | 22 | $170 | $3,729 |
| 23 | $100 | $2,297 | 23 | $127 | $2,920 | 23 | $167 | $3,842 |
| 24 | $98 | $2,363 | 24 | $125 | $3,004 | 24 | $165 | $3,952 |
| 25 | $97 | $2,428 | 25 | $123 | $3,087 | 25 | $162 | $4,061 |
| 26 | $96 | $2,492 | 26 | $122 | $3,168 | 26 | $160 | $4,169 |
| 27 | $95 | $2,556 | 27 | $120 | $3,249 | 27 | $158 | $4,275 |
| 28 | $94 | $2,619 | 28 | $119 | $3,329 | 28 | $156 | $4,380 |
| 29 | $92 | $2,681 | 29 | $118 | $3,408 | 29 | $155 | $4,484 |
| 30 | $91 | $2,742 | 30 | $116 | $3,485 | 30 | $153 | $4,586 |

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

PLANNING DEPARTMENT
FY92 USER FEES

| Services | FY91 Fee | FY92 Fee |
|---|---|---|
| Rezoning: By-Right | | |
| Single Family | $ 180.00 | $ 160.00 |
| Multi-Family | 355.00 | 320.00 |
| Other Rezoning | 710.00 | 645.00 |
| Rezoning: Conditional | | |
| Single Family | 385.00 | 495.00 |
| Multi-Family | 770.00 | 990.00 |
| Other Rezoning | 1,535.00 | 1,975.00 |
| Special Use Permits | | |
| Major | 2,500.00 | 2,800.00 |
| Minor | 1,340.00 | 1,190.00 |
| Subdivisions | | |
| Single Family (No Streets) | 115.00 | 175.00 |
| Single Family (Streets) | 200.00 | 300.00 |
| Nonresidential | 205.00 | 310.00 |
| Final Plats | 40.00 | 80.00 |
| Final Plats Revision | 20.00 | 40.00 |
| Final Plats Condo | 20.00 | 25.00 |
| Planned Multi-Family | 440.00 | 660.00 |
| UMUD | 790.00 | 1,185.00 |

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

DEPARTMENT OF TRANSPORTATION
FY92 User Fees

| Service | FY91 Fee | FY92 Fee |
|---|---|---|
| Commercial Driveway Permit | $ 80.00 | $ 80.00 |
| Zoning Petition | 175.00 | 140.00 |
| Subdivision Processing Single Family (streets), Non-Residential and Multi-Family Plan Review | 205.00 | 70.00 |
| Parade Permit | 10.00 | 10.00 |
| Street Closing Permit | 10.00 | 10.00 |

CITY OF CHARLOTTE

PARKS AND RECREATION DEPARTMENT
FY92 USER FEES

| SERVICE | FY91 FEE | FY92 FEE |
|---|---|---|
| RESERVATIONS | | |
| o Reservation Fee | $ 15.00 | $ 15.00 |
| RENTALS AND OTHER FEES | | |
| o Picnic Shelters | | |
| - Small (4 hours) | 8.00 | 10.00 |
| Each additional hour | 2.00 | 3.00 |
| - Medium (4 hours) | 10.00 | 15.00 |
| *Each additional hour* | *3.00* | *4.00* |
| - Large (4 hours) | 30.00 | 25.00 |
| Each additional hour | 8.00 | 6.00 |
| - Indoor (4 hours) | 40.00 | 45.00 |
| Each additional hour | 10.00 | 10.00 |
| o Soccer Field | | |
| - Rental <u>without</u> Lights (4 hours) | 4.00 | 4.00 |
| <u>with</u> Lights (4 hours) | 32.00 | 44.00 |
| o Bandshell (4 hours) | 80.00 | 60.00 |
| Each additional hour | 20.00 | 15.00 |
| Special Set-up | 0 | 25.00 |
| o Portable Stage | 200.00 | 150.00 |
| o BMX Track Rental per day (8 hours maximum) | 30.00 | 25.00 |
| o Rose Garden Wedding (3 hours) | 40.00 | 30.00 |
| Each additional hour | 15.00 | 10.00 |
| o Grady Cole Center (per day) | 800.00 | 900.00 |
| Civic Room | 200.00 | 200.00 |
| o Rental of a Park | 210.00 | 230.00 |

| SERVICE | FY91 FEE | FY92 FEE |
|---|---|---|
| RESERVATIONS | | |
| o League Sports Fees: | | |
| - Softball | | |
| 2 Games Per Week (Spring/Summer) | $ 365.00 | $385.00 |
| 1 Game Per Week (Fall) | 205.00 | 250.00 |
| 2 Games Per Week (Fall) | 202.00 | 190.00 |
| - Volleyball (Winter) | 105.00 | 150.00 |
| Volleyball (Spring/Fall) | 105.00 | 140.00 |
| - Soccer-Adult Women (Spring/Fall) | 497.00 | 575.00 |
| - Basketball-Adult | | |
| 1 Game Per Week (Winter) | 334.00 | 370.00 |
| 1 Game Per Week (Summer) | 266.00 | 305.00 |
| o Swimming Pools (All Pools) Per Day | Child $ .50<br>Adult $1.00 | Child $ .50<br>Adult $1.00 |
| o Trees Planing Coop. | 40.00 | 70.00 |
| o Photographic Location Fee | 200.00 | 200.00 |
| o Memorial Stadium | 2,400.00 | 5,230.00 |
| - Colleges | 700.00 | 700.00 |
| - High Schools | 500.00 | 500.00 |
| o Reedy Creek Shelter 3 (4 hours) | | 130.00 |
| - Each additional hour | | 35.00 |
| o Recreation Center Rental (3 hour minimum) | | |
| - Clubroom without kitchen | 60.00 | 60.00 |
| Each additional hour | 20.00 | 20.00 |
| - Clubroom with kitchen | 90.00 | 90.00 |
| Each additional hour | 30.00 | 30.00 |
| - Gym | 60.00 | 100.00 |
| Each additional hour | 20.00 | 35.00 |
| - Entire Center | 105.00 | 120.00 |
| Each additional hour | 35.00 | 40.00 |

| SERVICE | FY91 FEE | FY92 FEE |
|---|---|---|
| RESERVATIONS CONTINUED: | | |
| o St. Mary's Chapel | | |
| - 3 hours | 90.00 | 95.00 |
| Each additional hour | 30.00 | 30.00 |
| o Softball Field (per hour) | | |
| - Class A | $ 5.00 | $ 5.00 |
| With Lights | 12.00 | 15.00 |
| - Class B (no lights available) | 2.00 | 2.00 |
| - Class C (no lights available) | 1.00 | 1.00 |

o Tournament Fees (New FY92)

- Renaissance Softball Complex - $960 deposit plus $15.00 per team participating in tournament.

- Park Road Park Complex - $615 plus $10.00 per team participating in tournament.

- Hornet's Nest Park Complex - $615 plus $10.00 per team participating in tournament.

## Q & A'S FROM PUBLIC HEARING AND BUDGET WORKSHOP ON FY92-93 BUDGET

### MAYOR MYRICK

**Q. DO UTILITY COMPANIES REIMBURSE THE CITY TO REPAIR UTILITY CUTS IN STREETS?**

A. Yes, all utility companies (Duke Power, Southern Bell, Cablevision, Piedmont Natural Gas, and CMUD) reimburse the City monthly for street cut repairs. These payments are deposited as revenue to General Fund. The annual amount for cut street repairs is approximately $800,000 which covers 100% of the City's cost.

**Q. HAVE WE EVER CONSIDERED TRANSFERRING GRADY COLE CENTER AND MEMORIAL STADIUM TO THE COLISEUM AUTHORITY? IF YES, ARE THERE COST SAVINGS?**

A. No formal consideration has been given to transferring Grady Cole and Memorial Stadium operations to the Coliseum Authority. As noted on page 125 of the recommended FY92 Operating Budget, revenues are projected to cover the cost of operating these facilities.

**Q. WHY WOULD THE REDUCTION OF $23 MILLION IN ROAD PROJECT SAVINGS ONLY TRANSFER 1/4 CENT FROM MUNICIPAL DEBT FUND TO GENERAL FUND?**

A. The impact of eliminating $22.2 million in projects was calculated to determine the maximum amount of the Debt Service Fund portion of the property tax rate that could be transferred to the General Fund. This maximum amount was determined to be one-fourth cent. While debt service on $22.3 million would be approximately $2.2 million or one cent on the tax rate, only one-fourth cent could be moved because the deleted projects were scheduled to be funded by bond sales in later years and therefore would not reduce debt service in FY92. The change in timing of bond sales in these later years allowed only a one-fourth cent reduction, since the entire amount was not eliminated from FY92.

### COUNCILMEMBER CLODFELTER

**Q. WHY IS THERE A PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION PROMOTION PROGRAM IN THE GENERAL FUND AND A MARKETING PROGRAM IN THE PUBLIC TRANSPORTATION FUND?**

A. There is an error on page 121 of the Operating Budget which shows 3 positions for Public Transportation promotion. One position has been reduced (graphic technician p.12). The correct number of positions is 2.

## COUNCILMEMBER CLODFELTER CONTINUED

The Marketing program, in the Transportation Fund, and the Public Transportation Promotion program, in the General Fund, in fact are one program which is funded from the two sources. The Section which manages and operates the combined program is attached to CDOT Administration.

The five positions for this program include: Transportation Alternatives Manager; two Information Specialists; Office Assistant, and Graphic Artist.

The program has been divided between the two funds since the early 1980's when the USDOT/UMTA grant for operating assistance was tied, by formula, to local expenditure. The Transportation Fund was established at that time, with all activities within it, to separate expenses which were eligible within the USDOT/UMTA formula.

Budget and Evaluation plans to study the staffing level of the Transportation Promotion Program and Marketing Programs during FY92.

## *COUNCILMEMBER VINROOT*

**Q. WHAT RATIONALE WAS USED IN THE DECISION TO PHASE OUT CITY FUNDING FOR CERTAIN COMMUNITY AGENCIES SUCH AS THE YOUTH INVOLVEMENT COUNCIL AND THE CRISIS ASSISTANCE MINISTRY?**

A. As described in the Issue Paper on "Support for Cultural and Community Support Agencies" given to Council in March, 1991, in the discussion leading to the adoption of the FY90 Budget, City Council approved a plan to phase out City funding for selected cultural and community agencies. The rationale for funding some agencies and not others was based upon the philosophy that the City should assist organizations that directly support City Council initiatives and also those that provide typical City service responsibilities, and for which no other significant base of funding currently exist or could be developed.

The Youth Involvement Council (YIC) is a United Way supported organization that provides leadership training to young people between the grades of 9 through 12 and focuses upon the prevention and elimination of prejudice. Although initially YIC had some internal problems generating outside contributions, 78 percent of their FY91 budget came from sources other than the City and the County contribution of $45,000.

The Crisis Assistance Ministry provides assistance to families facing an emergency shortage of food, shelter, clothing, or furniture. Crisis Assistance is coordinated by the Charlotte Area Clergy Association and serves as the lead agency to coordinate all emergency financial

## COUNCILMEMBER VINROOT (CONTINUED)

assistance in the community. The City's contribution makes up a little over 3 percent of the Crisis Assistance Ministry's FY91 budget of $2,579,615. The rest of their budget was funded by a number of public and private organizations such as Mecklenburg County, Duke Power and the Federal Emergency Management Administration.

The reduction schedule is based on the City's FY91 contribution of $85,030. Accordingly, the City's contribution would decrease by 1/3 to $56,120 in FY92, and to $28,060 in FY93, to $0 in FY94.

## COUNCILMEMBER MATTHEWS

**Q. WHAT COST SAVINGS AND/OR OTHER BENEFITS HAVE RESULTED FROM INTERNAL CONSULTING PROJECTS**

A. Attached is Internal Consulting's "Report Card" for March 1990 - May 1991. It describes some of the results of Internal Consulting's efforts in terms of cost savings, cost avoidance, increased revenue potential, service improvements, and other benefits.

A summary of the estimated pay-off of Internal Consulting is described below (Internal Consulting's FY91 estimated costs total $167,624):

| | |
|---|---|
| Charges to CMUD for Services | $ 18,288 |
| Immediate Cost Savings (implemented or to be implemented in FY91-FY92) | 177,142 |
| Cost Avoidance | 171,658+ |
| **Total** | **$367,088+** |

These figures are intended to be a conservative reflection of the value of their services, as they represent the low end of the ranges on the attached pages and because some of the recommended productivity improvements are difficult to quantify at this time. The figures also do not reflect any long-term savings nor the value of recommendations or services which result in service improvements, such as their work with the CMUD Advisory Committee. Internal Consulting's workplan, however, includes a post-project review one year after the completion of a project. The intent of the post-project review is to assess if and how departments have implemented recommendations and to determine actual savings realized.

COUNCILMEMBERS MANGUM AND CLODFELTER

**Q. WHAT IS THE STATUS OF THE RENTAL CAR SURTAX AND PARKING SPACE TAX BEING CONSIDERED BY THE NORTH CAROLINA LEGISLATURE?**

A. Both these taxes have been introduced in the Legislature in order to benefit a "Regional Transit Authority within a three county region". Clearly these taxes are directed as a source of revenue for the Research Triangle area.

The parking tax is to be levied at a fee of up to $60 per space. If this tax were implemented just within the innerloop of Charlotte, the tax at its maximum of $60 per space could generate $1.8 million assuming there are 30,000 spaces within the subject area. This tax could be directed at the entire County (and we are currently seeking information regarding the total number of parking spaces available).

The rental car surtax would impose a tax up to 5% on gross receipts of rental car agencies within the Transit Authority's jurisdiction. The gross receipts of the major rental companies and airport car rentals are approximately $43 million. The maximum proposed tax would yield $2,150,000 without taking into consideration the "non-major" rental car companies.

The car rental surcharge has passed the House. The parking space tax has not passed either the House or Senate to date. It appears the proponents for the Regional Transit Authority funding are concentrating on the car rental surcharge.

If either of these tax bills are to be amended to include Charlotte-Mecklenburg, the amendment would need to change the definition of Regional Transit Authority to include "counties with populations in excess of 350,000 people" or similar language which would clearly limit the taxing authority to the Research Triangle and Charlotte-Mecklenburg. From a practical standpoint, this type authorizing legislation requires a tremendous amount of advanced work with the Delegation, the small towns in Mecklenburg County, and those industries most affected. The parking tax would certainly create a great deal of debate within Mecklenburg County. The car rental lobbies are fewer in number and might be less vocal in their opposition to a surcharge.

# INTERNAL CONSULTING

Report Card

March 1990 - May 1991

| Project Description | Implementation Status | Cost Savings/Cost Avoidance/Service Improvements |
|---|---|---|
| 1. CMUD Lab Consolidation. Review of alternatives for consolidating laboratories at the water and wastewater plants. | Implementation plan has been approved. Pilot consolidation scheduled for FY93. | Immediate Cost Savings:<br>* $26,672 (1 position)<br>Potential Long Term Savings<br>* $40,000-$150,000 (2 to 3 positions)<br>Cost Avoidance<br>* Improved lab staff Productivity<br>* Process control testing conducted by plant staff<br>* Long-term savings of analytical testing equipment |
| 2. Advisory Committee on CMUD Policies: Facilitate work of Advisory Committee; provide analytical and logistical support. | In January 1991, Council approved implementation plan for Advisory Committee recommendations | Service Improvements:<br>* New Street Main Extension Program<br>* New Loan Fund Program<br>* Other process improvements<br>* New CMUD-developer liaison committee |
| 3. Tree Ordinance Review and the Building Permit Process. Review of the Tree Ordinance and corresponding staff needs. | In November 1990, Council approved a staffing level to administer the Tree Ordinance | Cost Avoidance<br>* Eliminated Pre-submittal Site Visit $36,271 (1 position)<br>* Required Construction Inspectors to perform on-sight construction oversight $40,774 (1 5 positions)<br>* Set minimum standard of site reinspection at 10% of all sites (instead of 100%) $32,013 |
| 4. Engineering Cost Analysis: Analysis of cost of services in support of the capital improvement program. | An implementation plan has been approved. Several immediate and long-term changes are being implemented. | Immediate Cost Savings<br>* Reduction in size of survey crews. $42,470-$63,630<br>Potential Long Term Savings. Undetermined |

# INTERNAL CONSULTING
## Report Card

| Project Description | Implementation Status | Cost Savings/Cost Avoidance/Service Improvements |
|---|---|---|
| 5. Central Services Division Span of Leadership/Layers of Management: Organization review of Central Services. | An implementation plan is being developed<br>An intra-divisional reorganization was recommended | Service Improvements<br>* Reorganization recommended to improve service to CMGC, reorganization will eliminate one layer of management |
| 6. Meter Reading and Billing Alternatives: Analysis of changes to the frequency of reading water meters and billing customers. | Findings and cost information under review by CMUD and Finance | Potential Cost Savings<br>* Option under review yields estimated cost savings of $400,000+ |
| 7. Integrated Communications Plan: City reorganization/realignment of technology (computers, radios, phones, ...) resources. | A reorganization plan has been approved. | Potential Long Term Savings<br>* Undetermined (Savings are projected to be significant as the new "technology" organization consolidates resources and eliminates duplicate communication paths)<br>Cost Avoidance (of outside consultant)<br>* Ernst & Young fee for Phase II of communications project $62,600 |
| 8. Community Development Receivables Process Review: Review of CD loan tracking and collections processes. | Finance Department is performing an inventory and analysis of all CD loans. The result of this effort will enable the City to identify which loans should be purged, "written-off" as uncolllectable, and which should be maintained on our new automated system | Service Improvements<br>* Immediate revenue collection. $21,000<br>* Improving loan tracking and collecting will reduce number of loan defaults and increase annual program revenues |
| 9. City Manager's Office Review: Review of workflow and analysis of City Manager's Office. | On April 9, 1990, the results of review were presented to the Department Heads. | Service Improvements<br>* Task Forces established for "Crime and Drugs" and Economic Development-"City within a City"<br>* New departmental alignments with the Assistant City Managers to balance workload<br>* Additional "professional administrative" support provided for the Mayor |

# INTERNAL CONSULTING
## Report Card

| Project Description | Implementation Status | Cost Savings/Cost Avoidance/Service Improvements |
|---|---|---|
| 10 Recreation Division Span of Leadership/ Layers of Management. Organizational review of Recreation. | An implementation plan is being developed. | Cost Savings from Recommendations Pending: $108,000 - $165,000 |
| 11. Reorganization Task Force. Review of building maintenance, grounds maintenance, security and law enforcement, and vehicle and equipment maintenance resources. Includes Police, Parks and Recreation, and General Services. | Project underway | |
| 12. Police Department Management Structure Review. Organizational review of Police. | Project underway. | |
| 13. Medical Services Review: Analysis of delivery and cost of medical services for City workforce. | Project underway. | |

# THINGS TO REVISIT

May 21, 1991

| | ISSUE | IMPACT |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Central Business District Garbage Collection | 390,649 |
| 2 | Transfer Cost of Apartment Garbage Collection to Private Sector | 1,400,000 |
| 3 | Revenue Neutral Budget | 2,300,000 |
| 4 | Carolinas Partnership | 150,000 |
| 5 | Internal Consulting Unit | 193,235 |
| 6 | Longevity | 1,041,642 |
| 7 | City Clerk's Office Additional Clerical Support - NOT ADDITIONAL - ALREADY ON STAFF 30 HRS. INCREASE FROM CH IV TO OA V - 40 HRS - STILL NEED FOR OTHER DUTIES | 15,945 |
| 8 | Art Commission Cost (General Fund Cost) | 39,604 |
| 9 | 5% Reduction in Personnel Costs (General Fund) | 5,400,000 |
| 10 | 2 1/2% Reduction in Personnel Costs of Employees Above 80% of the Median Income | 1,922,156 |
| 11 | Veteran's Service Office | 217,487 |

11 -- SAVE OVERTIME.
WE ASKED FOR 40 HR POSITION
AND GOT AN INCREASE FROM
30 TO 40 HOURS

AND AN INCREASE
TO 40 HOURS

# THINGS TO CONSIDER ADDING

May 21, 1991

| | ISSUE | COST |
|---|---|---|
| 1 | Central Business District Police Request | 437,000 |
| 2 | Full Request of School Resource Officers (12 Officers rather than 5) | 180,000 |
| 3 | Neighborhood Street Lights | 100,000 |
| 4 | Allocation of All or Part of $23M in Road Savings (Assumes 1/4 cent) | 575,000 |
| 5 | Federal Program Representative (Dick Cherry) | 15,000 |
| 6 | Auditorium, Coliseum, Convention Center Transfer | Unknown |

Budget Workshop 5/21/91

Mayor ✓
Campbell ✓
Clodfelter
Hammond ✓
McCrory ✓
Mangum ✓
Martin ✓
Matthews ✓
Patterson - absent
Scarborough ✓
Vinroot
Wheeler ✓

5:15

Myrick
Alexander (Vi)
Police Separation Allowance -
NON-DEPARTMENTAL BENEFIT.
INSTITUTED IN 1987. 98
POLICE OFFICERS NOW RECEIVING
IT- $847,000 ANNUALLY.
Matthews - how much for people added

Alexander 40% for people added on

2- Fire permitting fees
State permitting laws being added. We will be mandated to enforce them. Will generate $200,000 for fees.

3- Animal Shelter -

4- User fee policy

Tonight - Operating Budget

Campbell

Alexander

White

Campbell

White

Myrick

White

Alexander

Hammond

Alexander

Myrick

Matthews

Alexander

Matthews
Alexander
White
Matthews
Alexander -
Freeze
White
Hammond
Scarborough
Matthews - Worth the money
White
Scarborough
McCrory / Chiroot - Lucas -
Myrick
Alexander
Myrick
Alexander
Mangum
Scarborough
Wheeler
White
Scarborough
Alexander
McCrory

Hammond
Alexander
Matthews
Alexander
Matthews
Alexander
Matthews
Alexander
Matthews
Alexander
Matthews
White
Matthews
White
Matthews
White
Matthews
Alexander
Matthews
White
Hammond
Alexander
Hammond
White

- $180,000 to the good

Alexander
Hammond
Alexander
Hammond
Alexander
Matthews
Alexander
McCrory
Wheeler
Hammond
McCrory
Martin
McCrory
White
McCrory
White
Martin
McCrory
Martin
White
McCrory
White
McCrory
Alexander

McCrory
White
McCrory
Martin
McCrory
White
McCrory
Alexander
Walker
Alexander
White
Campbell
White
McCrory
White
Campbell
Scarborough
White
Campbell
White
Myrick
Martin
McCrory
White
Campbell

1900 ? employees

White
Matthews
White
Martin
White
McCrory
Scarborough
White
Scarborough
McCrory - Basic service that cannot be cut.
White - Yes
Scarborough
Hammond
McCrory
Hammond - 6:30 (HALFWAY ON SIDE 2)
White
Campbell
White
Matthews
White
Vinegat
Alexander 5/30 FINAL DECISIONS
Vinegat
White

Vinroot
Campbell
Vinroot
Myrick
Mangum
Myrick
Mangum - RENTAL TAX
Boyd Caddle
Mangum
Caddle
Vinroot
Mangum
Vinroot
Mangum
Caddle
McCrory
Mangum
Campbell - Retreat
Myrick
Caddle
Martin
Caddle
Martin
Caddle

Hammond gone 7:50
Scarborough left 7:50

McCrory
Martin
Mangum
Vincent
Martin
White
Martin
Myrick
McCrory
Matthews
Myrick
Martin
Campbell
McCrory
Myrick
Wheeler
Alexander
Wheeler
Alexander
Wheeler
Alexander
Myrick
Alexander
Wheeler

Alexander
McCrory
Wheeler
White
Alexander
Myrick
Vincoot
Myrick
Matthews
McCrory
Martin
Manzem
Wheeler
Alexander
Wheeler
Alexander
McCrory
Martin
McCrory
Manzem
Myrick
Ken Szymanski - Apartment - private garage collection
Vincoot
Szymanski

6/6. Regional - all day

Myrick
Szymanski
Myrick
Szymanski
McCrory
Campbell
Szymanski
McCrory
Szymanski
McCrory
Vincent
Szymanski
Campbell
Szymanski
Campbell
Szymanski
Alexander
Vincent
Myrick
Vincent
Martin
Vincent
Myrick
Szymanski
Campbell

Vincent
Myrick
Szymanski
Campbell
Matthews
Vincent
Szymanski
White
Myrick
White
Szymanski
Campbell
Campbell
Szymanski
Campbell
Szymanski
Campbell
Myrick
Campbell
Szymanski
McCrory
Alexander
Myrick
Morgan
Matthews

Alexander - Yes
Matt
Alexander
McCrory
Myrick
Campbell
Myrick
Szymanski
Martin
Morgan
Martin
White - Letter from John Bartwright
CUDC
Matthews
McCrory
Myrick - Finance Committee
McCrory
Campbell
Vincent
Myrick
Campbell
Vincent
Myrick
Campbell
Vincent

Martin
Alexander
Myrick
McCrary
Alexander
Vinroot - 1 - P. 125 - PARK CONCESSIONS
Alexander
Vinroot
Myrick
Vinroot
Alexander
Vinroot
Campbell
Alexander
Vinroot
Martin
White
Alexander
Martin
Myrick
Matthews
White
Matthews
Myrick
Vinroot - 2 - 1,055,000 TELECOMM. BUDGET
3 - P. 157 - VIDEO. PROGRAM

Myrick

McCrory $372,000 - CEMETERIES

Vinroot -

McCrory

Campbell

Vinroot

McCrory - PARK + REC. AREAS

Syfert

Alexander

McCrory

Matthews

White

Matthews

White

McCrory

Myrick

Alexander CULTURAL ACTION 6/3

McCrory - Meeting tomorrow Spring Ord.

Myrick

Del Borgdorf

Myrick -

Borgdorf -

White

Campbell - AUD/COL NUMBER
Rafferty
Myrick

Adjourn 7:45