<u>AGENDA</u>

Meeting Type:	W
Date	10-09-1992

City of Charlotte, City Clerk's Office

AGENDA CITY/COUNTY POLITICAL CONSOLIDATION WORKSHOP

October 9, 1992

Charlotte/Mecklenburg Government Center

8:30	Coffee
8:45	Introduction of Panel and Format; Opening Comments by Mayor Vinroot and Chairmen Autrey on what we expect to accomplish today.
	Begin Presentations (Representative of a city presents for 10 minutes then panel has 5 minutes to comment and ask questions. Alternate one consolidated city with one city that attempted consolidation)
10:30	Break
10:45	Reconvene (Complete presentations and panel discussion.)
11:45	Lunch
12.45	Reconvene: Panel takes questions from elected officials and others in attendance
2:00	Elected Officials discuss and decide on next step in process
3:00	Adjourn 2755

CITY/COUNTY POLITICAL CONSOLIDATION WORKSHOP List of Attachments

- 1 Political Consolidation Workshop Panelists
- 2 Information on Cities Represented at Political Consolidation Workshop
- 3 Elected Officials Survey: Political Consolidation
 - -Summary Results
 - -Numerical Results
 - -Highlights of Qualitative Responses
- 4 A Chronology of Charlotte-Mecklenburg Political Consolidation Efforts
- 5 Charlotte/Mecklenburg Comparative Information

POLITICAL CONSOLIDATION WORKSHOP PANELISTS

Nashville

e Mr. Charlie Cook Finance Director 107 Metropolitan Courthouse Nashville, Tenn. 37201 615-862-6151 FAX 862-6040

Chattanooga

Mr. Randy Nelson City Attorney 400 Proneer Building Broad Street Chattanooga, Tenn 37402 615-757-5342

Roanoke

Mr. Beverly Fitzpatrick Vice Mayor Dominion Bankshares 10 S. Jefferson St. Roanoke, Va. 24011 703-563-7578

Sacramento

Ms. Anne Rudin Mayor 915 I Street City Hall - Room 205 Sacramento, Calif. 95814 916-264-5407

Athens

Ms. Gwen O'Looney Chief Elected Officer 301 College Ave. Room 300 Athens, Ga. 30613 706-613-3010

Indianapolis

Mr. William Hudnut Former Mayor Hudson Institute Herman Kahn Center P.O. Box 26-919 Indianapolis, Ind. 46226

Jacksonville HESTER A Maddall Mr. Lex Hestor Chief Administrative Officer 220 E. Bay Street Jacksonville, Fl. 32202 904-630-1740

Vinton, Va.

Mr. George Nester Former Town Manager Mattern & Craig 701 First Street S.W. Roanoke, Va. 24016 703-345-9342

Beech Grove, Ind.

Mr. Elton Geshwiler Former Mayor 1125 Timber Grove Place Beech Grove, Ind. 46107 317-784-6875

Moderator

Mr. Jake Wicker Institute of Government CB# 3330 Knapp Building UNC-Chapel Hill Chapel Hill, N.C. 27599 919-962-2377

INFORMATION ON CITIES REPRESENTED AT POLITICAL CONSOLIDATION WORKSHOP

	POPU	LATION	FORM OF GOVERNMENT		RNMENT
<u>CITY/YEAR</u>	City	County	Type*	District	At-Large
CONSOLIDATED:					
Nashville(1962)	462,000	497,000	SM	35	5
Jacksonville(1967)	609,000	646,000	SM	14	5
Indianapolis(1968)	719,000	785,000	SM	25	4
Athens(1990) //14/9/	87,600	87,600	CM	8	2
Effective	2 date				
00				PROPOSFI	O IN CONSOLIDATION
ATTEMPTED				District	At-Large
CONSOLIDATION:					
Chattanooga(1984)	162,000	284,000	SM	9	0
Wilmington (1987)	54,000	114,000	CM		4
Roanoke(1990)	101,000	175,000	CM	9	2
Sacramento(1990)	323,000	914,000	CM	11	0
CONSIDERING					
CONSOLIDATION:					
Charlotte(1992)	423,000	511,400	CM	NA	NA

^{*:} KEY: SM = Strong Mayor, CM = Council/Manager

INFORMATION ON CITIES REPRESENTED AT POLITICAL CONSOLIDATION WORKSHOP(cont)

CITY	ELECTED	<u>OFFICIALS</u>	TAX DISTRICTS	<u>OTI</u>	IER TOWNS*	CONSOLIDATED SERVICES PROVIDED
CONSOLIDATED:						
Nashville	Pt.Time	Non-Part	2	4	Out/Vote	All
Jacksonville	Pt. Time	Partisan	1	4	Out/Vote	All, towns do pol/fire
Indianapolis	Pt.Time	Partisan	12	4	Out/Vote	All but schools; towns do pol/fire
Athens	Pt.Time	Non-Part	2		Out/Vote	All but schools
		PROPOS	SED IN CONSOLIDA	TION		
ATTEMPTED	ELECTED	<u>OFFICIALS</u>	TAX DISTRICTS	QT	IER TOWNS	CONSOLIDATED SERVICES PROVIDED
CONSOLIDATION: Chattanooga	Pt.Tıme	Non-Part	2+		Out/Vote	Degional cower/navate water
Wilmington	Pt. Time	Partisan	<u>ራ</u> ፕ	2	Out/Vote Out/Vote	Regional sewer/private water All
Roanoke	Pt. Time	Partisan		1	Out	All but health/mental
Sacramento	Pt. Time	Non-Part	2		N/A	All but schools
CONSIDERING CONSOLIDATION:			TAT A			N.T.A.
Charlotte		11/4	INA.	O		

^{*:} KEY: Out means the other towns still exist completely independently

Out/Vote means the other towns still exist but vote in the consolidated city's elections and their own In means that the other towns no longer exist

ELECTED OFFICIALS SURVEY POLITICAL CONSOLIDATION

SUMMARY RESULTS

Total Surveys Returned: 24

Surveys Returned by Jurisdiction:

City: 11
County: 4
Towns. 9
TOTAL: 24

Currently "For" Consolidation:

City: 5
County. 3
Towns: Q
TOTAL 8

Currently "Against" Consolidation:

City: 5
County: 1
Towns: 9
TOTAL: 15

Currently "Undecided" on Consolidation

City: 1
County. 0
Towns: 0
TOTAL 1

ELECTED OFFICIALS SURVEY POLITICAL CONSOLIDATION

NUMERICAL RESULTS

The information below is sorted by the respondents position on political consolidation. The columns titled "FOR CONSOLIDATION" represent answers by those favoring political consolidation. The columns titled "AGAINST CONSOLIDATION" represent answers by those opposing political consolidation.

- 1. Even if you do not favor consolidating city and county governments, what would your preferences be on the following issues if city and county governments consolidated?
 - A. How many total members, including the Mayor/Chairperson, should be on the elected governing body?

	FOR CONSOLIDATION	AGAINST CONSOLIDATION	TOTAL
10 or less	3	5	8
11 to 16	5	7	12
17 to 22	0	2	2
23 or more		1	
N/A	0	1	

B Given your preferred number of total members, how should they be divided?

	FOR CONSOLIDATION	AGAINST CONSOLIDATION	TOTAL
PERCENT DISTRI	CT		
VS. AT-LARGE			
100/0%		3	3
80/20%	0	1	
75/25%			2
70/30%	3	6	9
60/40%		1	2
50/50%	2	2	4
45/55%		1	2
N/A	0	1	

C. Should district representatives be voted on by just their district or the entire population?

	FOR	AGAINST	TOTAL
	CONSOLIDATION	CONSOLIDATION	
District	6	12	18
Entire Pop.	2	3	
N/A	0		1

D. Should elections to the governing body be partisan or non-partisan?

	FOR	AGAINST	TOTAL
	CONSOLIDATION	CONSOLIDATION	
Partisan	4	8	12
Non-Partisan	3	8	11
N/A	1	0	

E. Should the governing system be Council/Manager or Strong Mayor?

	FOR	AGAINST	TOTAL
CON	ISOLIDATION	CONSOLIDATION	
Council/Manager	6	15	21
Strong Mayor	2	0	2
N/A	0		

F. Would you prefer for the six towns in Mecklenburg County to be part, in some manner, of the consolidated government?

	FOR CONSOLIDATION	AGAINST CONSOLIDATION	TOTAL
Yes	5	7	12
No	0	9	9
N/A	3	0	3

SUMMARY OF ELECTED OFFICIALS SURVEY POLITICAL CONSOLIDATION

HIGHLIGHTS OF QUALITATIVE RESPONSES

- 1. Reasons given by those against consolidation:
 - -"don't fix what am't broke"
 - -bigger not always better; more bureaucratic
 - -no savings
 - -process will take time away from current problems facing Council
 - -less accessibility to citizens
 - -requires full time elected officials
 - -towns would lose their identity
 - -perception that City wants control
- 2. Reasons given by those favoring consolidation:
 - -better coordination and priority setting
 - -save tax payers money
 - -regional competition
 - -more effective government by speaking with one voice
- 3. Ideas given on how to include the towns:
 - -include them in the decision making process
 - -towns represented on the consolidated board, but maintain their own Mayor and Council
 - -have non-voting ex-officio members from the towns on the board
 - -district representation
 - -give towns voting rights on regional and countywide issues
 - -one representative from northern towns and one from southern towns
- 4. Which cities to get information from:

-Nashville -Bowling Green

-Jacksonville
-Indianapolis
-Louisville
-Sacramento
-Toronto
-Miami
-Wilmington
-Virginia Beach
-Chattanooga
-DesMoines

-smaller cities and towns in the area around the big city

- 5. Information wanted from these cities:
 - -Would they consolidate if given the choice again?
 - -How towns are affected?
 - -cost companisons
 - -number of independent boards and commissions
 - -tax rate comparisons
 - -police situation
 - -Has quality of services improved?
 - -How could consolidation work better?
 - -How governing body handles the workload?
 - -What staff support is provided to the elected representatives?
- 6. Most frequently mentioned other organizations to hear from on political consolidation:
 - -National League of Cities
 - -Urban Institute
 - -Institute of Government

A CHRONOLOGY OF CHARLOTTE-MECKLENBURG POLITICAL CONSOLIDATION EFFORTS

1927	Enabling legislation was passed to allow consolidation to be placed on a referendum. The referendum was never put to a vote
1949-50	Reports supportive of consolidation were issued by the N. C. Institute of Government. Several functional consolidations were implemented soon thereafter.
1971	A Consolidation Charter Commission developed a new charter which was presented to the voters and defeated.
1970's	City/County pursue functional consolidation of local government. Currently consolidated functions are: schools, water/sewer utilities, parks, building inspection, purchasing, tax collection, library, planning and zoning, social services, animal control, garbage disposal, and health
1984	A Consolidation Study Committee resolved that they could not find sufficient reasons to recommend consolidation at that time
1990	A Consolidation Charter Study Commission recommended against consolidation. The Commission's chairman, in a separate individual recommendation, recommended consolidation.
1992	City Council adopted as one of their FOCUS 92 goals to study political consolidation

CHARLOTTE/MECKLENBURG COMPARATIVE INFORMATION

	City of Charlotte	Mecklenburg County
Population(1992)	423,000	511,400
Area(1992)	194 sq miles	543 sq.miles
Race(1990)		
White	65 %	71 % 26%
Black Other	32 % 3 %	20% 3%
Median Family Income (1990)	\$38,553	\$40,904
Property Tax Base (1992)	\$25.4 billion	\$37.3 billion
Governing Body	Mayor 4 At-Large 7 Districts	3 At-Large* 4 Districts
Form of Government	Council/Manager	Commission/Manager

^{*} The County Commission selects as their Chairman the top vote getter from the at-large commissioners.