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September 10, 1991

AGENDA

I. City-County Consolidation Plan (Martin Cramton)
   A. Review Police Consolidation Issues and Strategies
      1. Representation of Citizens in Unincorporated Areas
      2. Tax Equity for Police Services
   B. Review and Approve Consolidation Principles
      1. Parks and Recreation
      2. Arts
      3. Police
   C. Review and Approve Consolidation Process

II. Law Enforcement Center Site Selection (Discussion to begin at 1:30)
   A. Presentation of Law Enforcement Center Site Alternatives
      (OMNI Architecture)
   B. Review and Approve LEC Site

III. Political Consolidation*

* On September 3, the County Commission approved a motion to "go on record in favor of political consolidation" and to request the City Council to pass a similar resolution. The Commission has asked that this be presented to City Council as the first agenda item at this meeting.
MEMORANDUM

September 9, 1991

TO: Mayor and City Council
     County Commissioners

FROM: Tom Mangum
     Councilmember

SUBJECT: Parks and Police Consolidation

Regrettably, I will not be able to attend the City/County consolidation discussion on Tuesday. However, I wanted to take the opportunity to express my concerns over the consolidation issue breaking down. We, as elected officials, stated five to seven months ago that we wanted to consolidate the police under the City and the parks under the County. We have made our policy decision on consolidation, and it is now time for us to have the courage to turn this consolidation over to our professional managers and let them worry about the consolidation of the departments.

We knew that after we made this decision there would be pressures to change and do other things. That is why the professional staff needs to handle this consolidation issue. There is going to be "blood, sweat, and tears" over this; we all know that. We need to go ahead and have the political courage to accept that and go ahead and allow Wendell and Jerry to handle the job, and do it properly.

I implore all of you to make this decision today. Let's get on with consolidation so that we can run this City and County better, and try to get a handle on our crime problems. Thank you for your consideration in taking time to read this memo.

cp

C: Wendell White
   Gerald Fox
I. City-County Police Consolidation Issues

A. Strategies to Address Representation of Citizens in Unincorporated Areas

- Strategy #1: Joint Standing Committee
- Strategy #2: Planning Commission Model
- Strategy #3: Collective Voting Body

B. Strategies to Address Tax Equity for Police Services

- Strategy #1: County-wide Tax Levy
- Strategy #2: Special Tax District (for unincorporated Mecklenburg County and Mint Hill)
- Strategy #3: County-wide Levy and Special Tax District

II. City-County Consolidation Plan (This is the same material which was presented on July 30, 1991)

A. Consolidation Principles

- Parks and Recreation
- Arts
- Police

B. Police Consolidation Plan
CITY-COUNTY POLICE CONSOLIDATION

CONSOLIDATION PRINCIPLE (Presented July 30, 1991)

* City Council and the Board of County Commissioners, meeting jointly, will approve the Police budget and service levels and periodically review the Police Department's performance.

QUESTION: In what way(s) can we resolve "joint" decision making between the City Council and the County Commission to ensure adequate representation for those citizens in the unincorporated areas of Mecklenburg County?

In what way(s) can we ensure accountability to those citizens?

AMENDED CONSOLIDATION PRINCIPLE

* Officials elected by citizens in the unincorporated areas will approve and/or participate in the approval of police service levels in those areas and have an active role in monitoring the performance of the consolidated Police Department.

ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES (A summary of the three strategies is presented on page 5.)

Alternative Strategy #1: Joint Standing Committee

The Board of County Commissioners will approve service levels to be provided within unincorporated Mecklenburg County.

A. Similar to other consolidated City-County agencies, service levels to be provided within the unincorporated areas will be established by the Board of County Commissioners through the approval of an Interlocal Agreement. The Interlocal Agreement can be amended each year to accommodate changes in police service delivery needs.

Municipalities (such as Mint Hill) can choose to receive the level of service provided within the unincorporated areas or, choose a higher or lower level of service.

B. A "joint" standing committee of the two elected bodies will serve as an on-going representative body to:

- Monitor the performance of the consolidated Police Department.
- Advise the City Council and County Commission on Police issues.
- Mediate "unresolved" complaints/requests for service from citizens.
- Evaluate and recommend changes in the Interlocal Agreement.
- Review the annual workplan and proposed budget for Police services.

The five-member committee will be composed of two Council members and two Commissioners with the Committee chair alternating annually between the Chair of County Commission and the Mayor. A description of the "joint" standing committee is presented on page 4.

C. Funding of service levels to be provided within the unincorporated areas will be established by the Board of County Commissioners via a County-wide tax levy for police services or establishment of a special district for police. (Funding strategies to resolve "equitable distribution of costs" are presented on pages 6-12.)

Alternative Strategy #2: Planning Commission Model

The unified Police Department can operate in a manner identical to the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Planning Commission which would include the Police Chief being hired via a process involving representation from both elected bodies, the City Manager, the County Manager, and the Chairperson of the citizens committee. Or, the unified Police Department can operate in a manner similar to the Planning Commission with the one exception which has been articulated in the consolidation principle stating that "the Police Chief will report to the City Manager, who will be responsible for hiring and firing."

The following statements describe the Planning Commission model as it could be applied to a unified Police Department:

A. A citizens' Police Advisory Committee will be formed with representatives appointed by both the City Council and County Commission. The role of the Advisory Committee will be to:
   - Monitor the performance of the consolidated Police Department.
   - Advise the City Council and County Commission on Police issues.
   - Evaluate and recommend changes in the Interlocal Agreement.
   - Review the annual workplan and proposed budget on Police services.

B. Service levels to be provided within the unincorporated areas will be approved by the Board of County Commissioners (with input from the Police Advisory Committee) through the approval of an Interlocal Agreement. The Interlocal Agreement can be amended each year to accommodate changes in police services.
Municipalities (such as Mint Hill) can choose to receive the level of service provided within the unincorporated areas or choose a higher or lower level of service.

C. Funding of service levels to be provided within the unincorporated areas will be established by the Board of County Commissioners via a County-wide tax levy for police services or establishment of a special district for police. (Funding strategies to resolve "equitable distribution of costs" are presented on pages 6-12.)

D. The Police Advisory Committee and Board of County Commissioners will review and approve the Police Department's annual workplan.

E. Charlotte City Council will approve the Police Department's annual workplan and budget with input from the Board of County Commissioners and Police Advisory Committee.

F. The Police Chief's performance review will be conducted by the City Manager with input from the County Manager and Chairperson of the Police Advisory Committee.

Alternative Strategy #3: Collective Voting Body

The City Council and the County Commission will vote collectively with respect to police services and funding. This option will require special legislation to establish a body with authority to enact City-County policies and funding mechanisms for police services.

A. A combined "body" of the City Council and County Commissioners will be established for police services only. Two-thirds majority will be required for action. Voting members will include eleven City Council members and seven County Commissioners. The Mayor will preside at these joint meetings.

B. Service levels to be provided within the unincorporated areas of Mecklenburg County as well as in the City of Charlotte will be approved by the newly formed joint "body."

Municipalities (such as Mint Hill) can choose to receive the level of service provided within the unincorporated areas or choose a higher or lower level of service.

C. Funding of service levels will be established by the newly formed joint "body." (Funding strategies to resolve "equitable distribution of costs" are presented on pages 6-12.)
ALTERNATIVE STRATEGY #1

COMMITTEE MEMBERSHIP:
2 COUNTY COMMISSIONERS
2 COUNCIL MEMBERS
ROTATING CHAIRMAN—MAYOR OR COMMISSION CHAIR

COMMITTEE ROLES:
* MONITOR POLICE DEPARTMENT PERFORMANCE
* ADVISE COUNCIL AND COMMISSION ON POLICE ISSUES
* MEDIATE "UNRESOLVED" CITIZEN COMPLAINTS/REQUESTS FOR SERVICES
* EVALUATE AND RECOMMEND CHANGES TO INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT
## COMPARISON OF "REPRESENTATION" STRATEGIES

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>STRATEGY #1</th>
<th>STRATEGY #2</th>
<th>STRATEGY #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>&quot;Joint&quot; Standing Committee</td>
<td>Planning Commission Model</td>
<td>Collective Voting Body</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ROLES/RESPONSIBILITIES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Establish Service Levels</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Areas</td>
<td>County Commission</td>
<td>County Commission</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Charlotte</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Determine Funding Mechanism</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated Areas</td>
<td>County Commission</td>
<td>County Commission</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Charlotte</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>City Council</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monitor Performance of Department</td>
<td>&quot;Joint&quot; Standing Committee</td>
<td>&quot;Citizens&quot; Police Committee</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Input on Interlocal Agreement</td>
<td>&quot;Joint&quot; Standing Committee</td>
<td>&quot;Citizens&quot; Police Committee</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Review Annual Workplan and Budget</td>
<td>&quot;Joint&quot; Standing Committee</td>
<td>&quot;Citizens&quot; Police Committee</td>
<td>Both</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>ISSUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Requires Special Legislation</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CONSOLIDATION PRINCIPLE (Presented July 30, 1991)

* In implementing the consolidation, equitable distribution of costs, operational effectiveness, and cost savings are objectives.

QUESTION: In what way(s) can we resolve the "equitable distribution of costs" for police services?

AMENDED CONSOLIDATION PRINCIPLE

* In implementing the consolidation, equitable distribution of costs, operational effectiveness, and cost savings are objectives. Equitable distribution of costs for police services will be achieved when residents of municipalities and unincorporated areas in Mecklenburg County contribute funding in proportion to the level of service provided.

ALTERNATIVE STRATEGIES (Tax rate comparisons of the strategies are presented on pages 11-12.)

NOTE: Under each of the strategies presented below, tax equity means shifting the burden of supporting police services provided in unincorporated areas and Mint Hill from all County property to property only in the unincorporated areas and Mint Hill. As a result, property owners in the unincorporated areas and Mint Hill will realize a tax increase, while property owners in Charlotte, Davidson, Cornelius, Huntersville, Pineville and Matthews will realize a decrease in taxes.

Alternative Strategy #1: County-wide Tax Levy

Establish a County-wide tax levy for police services equal to the support provided within unincorporated areas of Mecklenburg County. This provides funding for a County-wide level of service for Police. The calculations on page 8 illustrate how the County-wide tax levy can be determined.

A. The basis for the county-wide tax levy will be to recover the cost of police services within unincorporated Mecklenburg County plus a proportion of overhead costs for administration, communications, investigations, etc.

B. Board of County Commissioners will levy a county-wide tax for police services. Funds collected by the County but generated by municipal assessed values will be returned to municipalities (in proportion to their assessed valuation) for the purposes of supporting municipal services. See page 9 for illustration of reallocation of county-wide tax levy.

C. Each municipality can use the funds generated by the County-wide tax to buy police services from the consolidated Police Depart-
ment. Additional funding for municipalities desiring/needing additional police services will be raised through municipal revenues.

Alternative Strategy #2: Special Tax District
Establish the unincorporated area of Mecklenburg County (and any municipality desiring basic police service from a City-County Police Department) as a special tax district for police services. This option requires special legislation for the County to establish special districts for police.

(If the current cost of County police services provided in unincorporated Mecklenburg County and Mint Hill was levied only on property in unincorporated Mecklenburg County and Mint Hill, the property tax rate for those properties would be 12.0 cents per $100 assessed valuation. The overall County tax rate for all County property would decrease by 3.26 cents per $100 assessed valuation. The net impact on property owners in unincorporated areas and Mint Hill would be a 8.74 cent increase.)

A. Methodology used for basis of tax levy will be established to recover the cost of police services within unincorporated Mecklenburg County plus a proportion of overhead costs for administration, communications, investigations, etc.

B. Funds collected through the Special District tax levy will be provided to the City for services provided by the consolidated Police Department.

Alternative Strategy #3: County-wide Levy & Special District
This strategy combines a County-wide tax levy with a special tax district. See page 10 for description. This option requires special legislation for the County to establish special districts for police.

A. County Commission and City Council identify police services to be recovered through tax levied on County-wide assessed values. Services may include: School Resource Officers, Police Athletic League, Lake Police.

B. Establish the unincorporated area of Mecklenburg County (and any municipality desiring basic police services from a City-County Police Department) as a special tax district. Rural/suburban patrol services would be recovered through a tax levy in the special district.

C. Police services provided in municipalities will be recovered through municipal tax levies. Services may include: Urban/Suburban patrol, Helicopter, Drug Interdiction Unit.

D. Methodology would be developed to allocate the cost of police administration, support services (e.g., training, communications, data process), and investigation.
**ALTERNATIVE STRATEGY #1**
Illustration Purposes only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Assessed Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Charlotte Assessed Value $24,838,658,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Unincorporated Mecklenburg County Assessed Value $9,439,968,300</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. County-wide Assessed Value $36,900,000,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Services</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4. Charlotte Police Services $47,973,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Unincorporated Mecklenburg County Police Services $11,100,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Tax rate to support services within</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>unincorporated Mecklenburg County (5 - 2)</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.120 *</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. County-wide taxes collected from 12 0 cent</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>police tax (3 * A)</strong> $43,394,400</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Charlotte portion of county-wide police tax</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>*<em>revenue (B <em>(1 - 3))</em></em> $29,210,262</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<p>| |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>D. Charlotte costs in excess of revenue</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>provided through 12.0 cent tax levy (4 - C)</strong> $18,762,738</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Tax rate is adjusted to account for 98% collection rate
## ALTERNATIVE STRATEGY #1

Allocation of Countywide Tax Levy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>FY92 BUDGETED</th>
<th>% OF 1990 CENSUS</th>
<th>% OF</th>
<th>FY92 POLICE BUDGET**</th>
<th>TAX LEVY NEEDED TO SUPPORT POLICE BUDGET***</th>
<th>ALLOCATION OF 12.0 CENT COUNTY-WIDE TAX LEVY FOR POLICE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>ASSIGNED VALUATION</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>24,838,658,000</td>
<td>67.31%</td>
<td>417,621</td>
<td>81.66%</td>
<td>47,973,571</td>
<td>0 197</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornelius</td>
<td>203,000,000</td>
<td>0.55%</td>
<td>2,581</td>
<td>0.50%</td>
<td>431,619</td>
<td>0 217</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Davidson</td>
<td>217,350,000</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>4,046</td>
<td>0.79%</td>
<td>400,000</td>
<td>0 188</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntersville</td>
<td>147,000,000</td>
<td>0.40%</td>
<td>3,014</td>
<td>0.59%</td>
<td>322,591</td>
<td>0 224</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>1,074,506,940</td>
<td>2.91%</td>
<td>13,651</td>
<td>2.67%</td>
<td>1,006,868</td>
<td>0 096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mint Hill</td>
<td>596,516,760</td>
<td>1.62%</td>
<td>11,567</td>
<td>2.26%</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0 000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pineville</td>
<td>383,000,000</td>
<td>1.04%</td>
<td>2,970</td>
<td>0.58%</td>
<td>596,910</td>
<td>0 159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unincorporated</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg County</td>
<td>9,439,968,300</td>
<td>25.58%</td>
<td>55,983</td>
<td>10.95%</td>
<td>11,100,000</td>
<td>0 120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL MECKLENSBURG</strong></td>
<td>36,900,000,000</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>511,433</td>
<td>100.00%</td>
<td>61,831,559</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Not included are $890,000 in services provided to Mint Hill, and back up services to Cornelius, Davidson, Huntersville, and Pineville

** Police budgets for Pineville, Huntersville, Matthews, Davidson, and Cornelius may not include fringe benefits

*** Assumes Police Budgets financed only by property tax revenues
# ALTERNATIVE STRATEGY #3

Service classifications are provided as illustrations only

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Police Services to be Recovered Through County-wide Assessed Values</th>
<th>Police Services to be Recovered Through Special Tax District Assessed Values</th>
<th>Police Services to be Recovered Through Charlotte Assessed Values</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>School Resource Officers</td>
<td>Rural/Suburban Patrol</td>
<td>Urban/Suburban Patrol</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake Police Services</td>
<td></td>
<td>Helicopter Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police Athletic League</td>
<td></td>
<td>Drug Interdiction Unit</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLUS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of costs for Administration and support services (e.g. communications, training, records, data processing)</td>
<td>Allocation of costs for Administration and support services (e.g. communications, training, records, data processing)</td>
<td>Allocation of costs for Administration and support services (e.g. communications, training, records, data processing)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>PLUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLUS</strong></td>
<td><strong>PLUS</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allocation of costs for Investigative Services (e.g. Crime Lab, Investigations)</td>
<td>Allocation of costs for Investigative Services (e.g. Crime Lab, Investigations)</td>
<td>Allocation of costs for Investigative Services (e.g. Crime Lab, Investigations)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<----------------------------->  <----------------------------->  <----------------------------->

All Mecklenburg County property owners would share in the costs of these services

Property owners in unincorporated Mecklenburg County and Mint Hill would share in the costs of these services

Property owners of Charlotte would share in the costs of these services
## COMPARISON OF POLICE TAX EQUITY STRATEGIES

**ILLUSTRATION OF TAX LEVY CHANGES FOR STRATEGIES #1 AND #2**

(cents per $100 assessed valuation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CHARLOTTE PROPERTY OWNER</th>
<th>CURRENT SITUATION</th>
<th>STRATEGY #1 County wide Tax</th>
<th>STRATEGY #2 Special Tax District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City/Town Tax Rate</td>
<td>55 00</td>
<td>43 00 *</td>
<td>55 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg County Tax Rate</td>
<td>65 50</td>
<td>62 24</td>
<td>62 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County-wide Tax for Police</td>
<td>0 00</td>
<td>12 00</td>
<td>0 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special District Tax (uncorporated Mecklenburg County and Mint Hill)</td>
<td>0 00</td>
<td>0 00</td>
<td>0 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TAX LEVY</strong></td>
<td><strong>120 50</strong></td>
<td><strong>117 24</strong></td>
<td><strong>117 24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Increase/(Decrease) from Current</td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><em>(3 26)</em></td>
<td><em>(3 26)</em></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>UNINCORPORATED AREA PROPERTY OWNER</th>
<th>CURRENT SITUATION</th>
<th>STRATEGY #1 County wide Tax</th>
<th>STRATEGY #2 Special Tax District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City/Town Tax Rate</td>
<td>0 00</td>
<td>0 00</td>
<td>0 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mecklenburg County Tax Rate</td>
<td>65 50</td>
<td>62 24</td>
<td>62 24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County-wide Tax for Police</td>
<td>0 00</td>
<td>12 00</td>
<td>0 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Special District Tax (uncorporated Mecklenburg County and Mint Hill)</td>
<td>0 00</td>
<td>0 00</td>
<td>12 00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL TAX LEVY</strong></td>
<td><strong>65 50</strong></td>
<td><strong>74 24</strong></td>
<td><strong>74 24</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tax Increase/(Decrease) from Current</td>
<td><strong>--</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 74</strong></td>
<td><strong>8 74</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumes City of Charlotte reduces City tax levy equivalent to the new County wide tax levy for police services
### COMPARISON OF POLICE TAX EQUITY STRATEGIES

**NET CHANGE FROM CURRENT TAX LEVIES***

*(cents per $100 assessed valuation)*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Property Owner</th>
<th>Strategy #1</th>
<th>Strategy #2</th>
<th>Strategy #3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Charlotte</td>
<td>DECREASE**</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>greater than 3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matthews</td>
<td>DECREASE**</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>3.26</td>
<td>less than 3.26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huntersville</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>greater than 8.74</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mint Hill</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Owner</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>8.74</td>
<td>greater than 8.74</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Assumes Police Services are funded entirely through property tax revenues

** Assumes municipalities reduce municipal tax levies equivalent to the new County-wide tax levy for police services

*** Assumes Mint Hill chooses the same service level provided within the unincorporated areas

How to read the chart  Under Strategy #2 (Special Tax District for Unincorporated Mecklenburg County and Mint Hill) a Charlotte property owner will realize a reduction in their Mecklenburg County property tax levy of approximately 3.26 cents, a property owner of the unincorporated area or Mint Hill will realize an increase of approximately 8.74 cents
CITY-COUNTY CONSOLIDATION
PLANNING
(Presented July 30, 1991)

Consolidation Principles
(Amended Consolidation Principles are reflected in CAPITAL letters.)

ACCOUNTABILITY

The County, through the County Manager, will take the lead on the consolidation of Parks and Recreation and Arts.

The City, through the City Manager, will take the lead on the consolidation of Police.

ORGANIZATIONAL CONTEXT

A unified Parks and Recreation Department will be established to operate as a department within Mecklenburg County Government. The principles of the consolidation include:

* The department head will report to the County Manager, who will be responsible for hiring and firing.

* The Board of County Commissioners will establish service levels and approve resource needs for Parks and Recreation.

* In implementing the consolidation, equitable distribution of costs, operational effectiveness, and cost savings are objectives.

* The Parks and Recreation Departments may begin to phase-in their consolidation prior to July, 1992, as they begin to plan and implement recreation programs for the Fall, Winter, Spring, ...

* AN OBJECTIVE DURING THE IMPLEMENTATION OF THE CONSOLIDATION IS THAT PARKS AND RECREATION EMPLOYEES WILL NOT BE LAID-OFF NOR NEGATIVELY IMPACTED WITH RESPECT TO PAY. COST SAVINGS WILL BE ACHIEVED THROUGH ATTRITION.

* In implementing the consolidation, the County will equitably address personnel issues, such as duty assignments, promotional opportunities and benefits.

* Some functions of the City Parks and Recreation Department may not be consolidated with the County (i.e., trees, median maintenance, cemeteries).
A unified "Arts/Science/Cultural" program will be established to operate as a function of Mecklenburg County Government. The principles of the consolidation include:

* The consolidation goal of a unified "Arts/Science/Cultural" program is to transfer both the facilities and the funding responsibility from the City to the County.

* The Board of County Commissioners will establish service levels and approve resource needs for a unified "Arts/Science/Cultural" program.

* In implementing the consolidation, equitable distribution of costs, operational effectiveness, and cost savings are objectives.

* In implementing the consolidation, the Board of County Commissioners will consider the recommendations and priorities of the Cultural Action Plan.

* An objective during the implementation of the consolidation is that employees will not be laid-off nor negatively impacted with respect to pay. Cost savings will be achieved through attrition.

A unified Police Department will be established to operate as a department within Charlotte City Government. The principles of the consolidation include:

* The Police Chief will report to the City Manager, who will be responsible for hiring and firing.

* Officials elected by citizens in the unincorporated areas will approve and/or participate in the approval of police service levels in those areas and have an active role in monitoring the performance of the consolidated Police Department.

* In implementing the consolidation, equitable distribution of costs, operational effectiveness, and cost savings are objectives. Equitable distribution of costs for police services will be achieved when residents of municipalities and unincorporated areas in Mecklenburg County contribute funding in proportion to the level of service provided.

* The Police Departments may begin to consolidate selected functions prior to July, 1992.

* An objective during the implementation of the consolidation is that police department employees will not be laid-off nor negatively impacted with respect to pay. Cost savings will be achieved through attrition.
In implementing the consolidation, the City will equitably address personnel issues, such as rank, duty assignments, promotional opportunities, and benefits.

Some functions of the County Police Department may not be consolidated with the City (i.e., building security, radio maintenance).

STAFF/CITIZEN INPUT
Both the City and County will solicit input from the employees of the various departments and the community (including each of the towns in Mecklenburg County).

The process for consolidation will include the establishment of:

A "Blue Ribbon" Citizens' Advisory Committee: Members will be appointed by the City Manager and County Manager. The target membership of this committee will be community leaders from large organizations (Duke Power, Royal Insurance, NCNB, First Union,...) who are knowledgeable of the dynamics of large-scale organizational change. Areas of expertise should include personnel, organizational change, and/or finance. The role of the committee will be to serve in an advisory capacity to the Joint City/County Management Steering Committee by providing input and perspective on issues and advising on the resolution of organizational and programmatic issues relating to all three consolidation efforts.

A Joint City/County Management Steering Committee: The membership of this committee includes the City Manager, County Manager, Deputy City Manager, and the Assistant City and County Managers. The role of this committee will be to sort and resolve organizational and programmatic issues relating to all three consolidation efforts. Issues relating to policy and/or service levels will be brought to the City Council and County Commission.

Employee (Staff) Task Forces: The membership of these task forces will include the employees in the departments being consolidated. The role of these task forces will be to solicit employee input, help identify organizational, programmatic and financial issues, and recommend solutions to facilitate consolidation.

Stakeholders' Task Forces: Members will be appointed by the City Manager and County Manager. The membership of these task forces will include representatives from agencies, advisory committees, Mecklenburg County towns, and other groups who have an interest in the changes being implemented. The role of these task forces will be to provide citizen input, to advise on organizational, programmatic and financial issues, and to recommend solutions which facilitate consolidation. Members of existing Citizens' Committees will be requested to serve in this capacity (i.e., City and County Parks Advisory Committees; City and County Civil Service Boards).
PROGRESS AND TIMEFRAME

THE EFFECTIVE DATE TARGETED FOR THE CONSOLIDATIONS IS SEPTEMBER 1992. Both the City and County will begin working together on operational and implementation issues in each of the areas prior to the implementation date.

The consolidation process is outlined on page 17.

Consolidation "updates" will be provided for the City Council and County Commission during the joint luncheons or at other special meetings.

The County Commission and City Council will be requested to approve contracts with agencies, such as the Institute of Government and UNCC's Urban Institute, to assist in completion of this process.

INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT AND IMPLEMENTATION

The development and approval of an Interlocal Agreement will serve as the vehicle to implement the consolidation of Police, Parks and Recreation, and Arts.
## Attachment A

### CITY-COUNTY CONSOLIDATION PLAN

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACTIVITY</th>
<th>EMPLOYEE TASK FORCE</th>
<th>STAKEHOLDER TASK FORCE</th>
<th>JOINT MGMT STEERING COMMITTEE</th>
<th>BLUE RIBBON CITIZENS COMMITTEE</th>
<th>ELECTED OFFICIALS</th>
<th>TIMEFRAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>
| 1 Process Definition  
* Initial Issues Inventory  
* Define Process and Schedule | X | | | | | September 1991 |
| 2 Approve Consolidation Principles and Process | | | | | X | | |
| 3 Organize Task Forces  
* "Blue Ribbon" Citizens Committee  
* Employee Task Forces  
* Stakeholders Task Forces  
Status Report | | X | | X | | October |
| 4 Inventory Responsibilities—Resources  
Solicit Citizen/Stakeholder/Employee Input and Identify Issues  
* Organization/Personnel/Budget  
* Financial/Legal  
* Service Levels (similarities and differences) | X | X | X | X | | 30 days |
| 5 Prepare Assessment of Issues | X | X | X | X | X | January |
| 6 Sort/Prioritize Issues for Resolution  
Status Report | X | X | X | X | X | | |
| 7 a Define Organizational/Program Delivery Options (on issues) | X | X | | | | 210 days |
| b Identify Impact of Options | X | X | | | | |
| c Recommend Solutions to Issues | X | X | X | | | |
| 8 a Define Financial Options | X | X | | | | |
| b Identify Impact of Options | X | X | | | | |
| c Recommend Solutions to Issues  
Status Report | X | X | X | X | | |
| 9 Develop Consolidation Agreement—Highlight Policy Issues (Interlocal Agreement) | X | X | X | X | | 270 days |
| 10 Approve Interlocal Agreement | | | | | X | June |
| 11 Implementation | | | | | | effective September 1992 |
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LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER SITE EVALUATIONS

Following the July 30 joint City-County meeting, information has been prepared in response to questions about site selection for the Law Enforcement Center.

This information is summarized below with related back-up material attached.

Site Expansion
A review of expansion feasibility for each site has been prepared by OMNI Architecture and is included on pages 2-3.

In summary, none of the sites under consideration preclude future building expansion. The square footage projections used by OMNI Architecture in the initial report were based on a 20-year forecast. If expansion beyond the 20-year timeframe is critical, then it can be included in the building program.

Operating Costs
The proximity of the Law Enforcement Center to other Criminal Justice facilities is an important operating consideration for the Charlotte Police Department. On the average, 68 officers attend court daily, 60 officers attend Grand Jury each Monday, and 21 arrested felons are walked from the Law Enforcement Center to the Intake Center daily.

The Police Department has projected the cost impact of officers' walking from each site alternative to the Courthouse, Grand Jury, District Attorney's Office and the Intake Center.

Site M reflects the highest operational cost due to its distance (1/2 mile) from the Courthouse, Grand Jury, District Attorney's Office and the Intake Center. The other sites were estimated at approximately 1/10 of a mile to those facilities, and therefore result in lower operational costs.

NOTE: Citizens also benefit from the proximity of the Law Enforcement Center to the Courthouse, Intake Center, and other government buildings. The Police Department estimates that up to 20 percent of the 48,000 yearly visitors to the Law Enforcement Center also visit other facilities in the Governmental Plaza Area.

A summary of the Police Department's operational concerns and issues related to Law Enforcement Center site selection are included on pages 4-8. An illustration of one of the cost calculations is included on page 9.

Timetable
An updated Process Time Line prepared by OMNI Architecture is included on page 10.

The Law Enforcement Center can be completed in a four to five year range once a number of decisions about site selection, consolidation and funding have been made. The Law Enforcement Center will contain specialized areas which are not conducive to fast design and construction. For reference purposes, the CMGC took 5 years to program, design, and construct.
LAW ENFORCEMENT CENTER: SITE STUDIES
EXPANSION FEASIBILITY FOR SITES C, D, M & O/E

The growth projections used in the initial report were based on a 20 year forecast.

Not knowing the direction of growth after 20 years (nor for that matter before that date), it has been assumed that for at least 20 years the Police Dept. will function as a centralized operation.

At some point, as the city inevitably grows into the county, decentralization is an option, with satellite/precinct operations being established. If this should occur, the 180,000 s.f. would not need expansion.

If however, the operations stay centralized past the 20 year projection date, expansion of the building becomes an issue that needs to be addressed.

Generally, none of the sites under consideration preclude expansion.

SITE C & D

Both sites are basically one (1) city block. Both currently have land available to the east and/or west for purchase.

When we began this study, Site D was 1/2 - block larger and spread across Alexander Street. This land is still available and would add 88,462 s.f. for a cost of $3,440,000.00.

However, if it is felt that expansion of the building be required, this needs to be part of the program for the building.

The massing diagrams shown on boards C & D, currently show a 30,000 s.f. footprint six (6) stories high. Obviously, expansion can be allowed on the sites by initially building a 20,000 s.f. footprint say, nine (9) stories high, leaving ample room for expansion.
SITE M

Initial site purchase includes a 5.95 acre tract and existing 99,300 s.f. building.

With demolition of the existing building there is room for future expansion of the LEC (We do not feel that the existing building can economically be adapted for LEC use.)

Although this site is larger than C & D, current zoning restrictions on this site require a lower density of development, i.e. setbacks are larger and parking requirements more stringent; which may require more land to accomplish the program.

SITE O/E

The combination of the two sites means it is the largest overall of all the ones under consideration. The city already owns most of Site E.

Limited traffic access to "O" has resulted in most of the parking being on "E", leaving ample room for expansion of the building on "O".

SUMMARY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site Expansion</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>M</th>
<th>O/E</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Site Expansion</td>
<td>Fair</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Good</td>
<td>Optimal</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Charlotte Police Department supports the Governmental Plaza concept of all governmental buildings being in close proximity to each other. The LEC site options on E. Trade Street follow this concept and would contribute to the efficiency of City/County Government. The Stonewall/Independence site option has raised the following concerns. These concerns should be reviewed prior to selection of the LEC's future site.

1. The present LEC is one building in our government network of buildings that citizens and City employees rely on for information and services. The close proximity of government buildings allows our citizens and other government employees convenient access to services and information where limited parking exists. The LEC has an average of 48,000 visitors a year. These visitors often use services housed in other government buildings such as the courthouse, CMGC, and jail in conjunction with visits to the LEC.

2. Charlotte Police Officers conduct a large volume of business in Governmental Plaza. Charlotte Police attend court an average of 16,320 times a year.

3. An accurate measurement of business conducted with CMGC was not readily accessible. It stands to reason that governmental buildings' close proximity is a factor.

4. Charlotte Police officers and investigators make about 7,600 to 7,900 trips to the Jail Intake Center per year in order to interview persons in custody or to incarcerate individuals. Investigators currently are able to walk prisoners to and from the Intake Center.

5. Parking is a major concern for those using the LEC and other Governmental Plaza facilities. The Intake Center has 14 spaces for police officers. The Court parking deck is used to capacity and has only 15 spaces available for police officers. We believe it is inefficient and therefore unreasonable to expect officers to walk the almost ½ mile from the Stonewall Street site to court, the jail, and CMGC, particularly in inclement weather. Likewise, this
It is inconvenient for citizens and other government employees who use all of these facilities. It is impractical for investigators to walk prisoners from Stonewall Street to the Intake Center. Sites along E. Trade Street could accommodate a tunnel for this purpose. The volume of traffic between all government facilities seems to require an LEC in proximity to the Governmental Plaza. There is inadequate parking available to accommodate officers and others visiting the Governmental Plaza.

In the selection process we would stress that the Stonewall/McDowell site would contribute to the inefficiency of government. It would be unreasonable to ask all city employees, police, citizens and other agencies to walk 4/10ths to 5/10ths of a mile to conduct business in or out of the LEC. Officers driving to the Governmental Plaza would contribute to current and future parking problems.

The Trade Street options would support the Government Plaza concept by on-site parking and easy accessibility to pedestrian traffic.
The Police Department relies heavily on communications for its operations. Included are radio and telephone communications, as well as computer data transfer. Communications links currently used are telephone lines, cable, microwave and fiber optic lines. Facilities in the Governmental Plaza are linked to provide an efficient exchange between City and County agencies. The Police Department's communications needs will grow in the future, both in volume and technology.

The Police Department believes communications issues should receive strong consideration in the selection of any LEC site. In general terms, the greater the distance from the Governmental Plaza, the greater our communications costs will be.

The following are issues relevant to the consideration of any site:

1. Fiber Optic Loop - The City has installed a fiber optic loop connecting facilities in the Governmental Plaza area at a cost of approximately $200,000. This loop may be used for radio, telephone and computer communications. In the long term, this loop is much less expensive than installing cable or purchasing telephone lines.

   The Department intends to use this loop to provide links to both City and County computer systems. It will also link the Department's AS400 computer to the CMGC, thus providing electronic messaging and information transfer. The fiber optic loop will be used to link AFIS to the Intake Center. Currently, the Fire Department has a radio link on the LEC building which uses the loop.

   The current loop runs from the Intake Center, through the LEC and follows E. Trade Street and N. Myers Street to Fire Station 1. Thus, any LEC site along E. Trade Street could be connected to the loop with relative ease. MIS estimates that to connect the Stonewall Street site may cost as much as was expended on the current system. No firm figures are available on this.

2. Telephone System - The Department currently leases approximately 200 telephone lines from Southern Bell for its LEC system. Tariffs are based on a fixed charge plus charges for each 1/4 mile increment.
In distance from Southern Bell's 11 Caldwell Street office. The Department is currently in the 1/4 mile zone, Southern Bell's lowest rate. Any site on E Trade Street would remain in this zone. The Stonewall Street site would likely fall in the 1/4 mile zone, thus raising the tariff by approximately 26% or $4,200 per year.

In addition, the County Police telephones would be added to the telephone system, thus further increasing the costs.

3. Microwave Communications - The Department's 800 MHz radio system operates from a microwave link to Motorola on I-85 at Sugar Creek Road. A direct, line-of-sight link is the best. However, certain sites may require the use of a relay, as is currently used. The cost of a relay can exceed $100,000. Thus a site where a direct link may be used would best suit our radio communications needs.

4. Intake Center - Police Department communications links to the Intake Center are of vital operational importance. The volume of information exchanged and advancements in technology will create increased needs for communication links between the two facilities. In general, the closer these facilities are to each other, the lower the cost will be to provide communications links. Examples are the AFIS link with the Intake Center via the fiber optic loop and the new Digital Imaging System.

The Police Department believes our communications needs will best be served by an LEC site in proximity to the current Governmental Plaza. Listed above are concerns that are readily apparent. Others may arise as technology advances and our needs increase. Thus, the cost of our communications links as well as the system's efficiency will be enhanced by a site in proximity to the Governmental Plaza.

These are issues that the Charlotte Police Department would stress during the site selection for the new LEC. We support the close proximity of the Governmental Center in order to achieve Charlotte's goal of PUBLIC SERVICE.
PEDESTRIAN TRAFFIC SURVEY

The Charlotte Police Department conducts a large volume of business with our citizens each day. The Records Bureau originally reported an average figure of 48,000 visitors to the LEC each year.

The Department wanted to determine the average number of citizens that conduct LEC business in conjunction with another government facility. A three day survey was formulated and conducted over a three day period. Our Records Bureau documented the number of citizens entering the LEC and the number that responded they would be conducting business in another government facility.

The average number of citizens entering the LEC for a three day period was 129. The average number of citizens doing business with other government facilities (CMGC, Jail, Courthouse & Old Courthouse) was 21. Based on the three day survey it was determined that 16.27 percent of our visitors did business in other areas of the Governmental Plaza.

Our Records Bureau confirms that these figures were low and not indicative of a normal days business. With this fact in mind the Department made an assumption that 16 to 20 percent of our visitors utilize other government facilities in conjunction with the LEC. This means that up to 9,600 citizens use the LEC in conjunction with other government facilities.

It is our opinion that a significant number of citizens rely on the close proximity of government buildings in the Government Plaza. The future site of the LEC will impact public service of the Governmental Plaza.
The Charlotte Police Department has determined the following to be accurate based on an average hourly salary rate and an average of officers attending court. Fiscal Affairs reports that $18.75 is the average hourly salary (including fringe benefits). Court Liaison reports that an average of 68 officers attend court daily.

In order to get an accurate walking time an officer walked from each site option to the courthouse. He then documented the time based on a conservative pace.

$18.75 an hour breaks down to 31 cents a minute

**Site O**

Court Plaza
N. McDowell & Elizabeth Ave.

Distance: 1/10 of a mile to courthouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking Time</th>
<th>Pay For This Time</th>
<th>Ave # Officers</th>
<th>Attend Court</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 min. one way</td>
<td>$ .93</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$ 63 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 min. round trip</td>
<td>$1.86</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$126.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

240 (Court Days) X $126.48 = $30,355 a year

**Site D**

Executive/Equity Bldg.
E. Trade & Davidson

Distance: 1/10 of a mile to courthouse if Alexander St. remains open

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking Time</th>
<th>Pay For This Time</th>
<th>Ave # Officers</th>
<th>Attend Court</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3 min. one way</td>
<td>$ .93</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$ 63 24</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 min. round trip</td>
<td>$1.86</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$126.48</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

240 (Court Days) X $126.48 = $30,355 a year

**Site M**

E. Independence Plaza
700 E. Stonewall St

Distance: 5/10 of a mile to courthouse

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Walking Time</th>
<th>Pay For This Time</th>
<th>Ave # Officers</th>
<th>Attend Court</th>
<th>Total Cost</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>12 min. one way</td>
<td>$3 72</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$252.96</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 min. round trip</td>
<td>$7 44</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>$505.92</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

240 (Court Days) X $505.92 = $121,420.80 a year.
**omni architecture**

### L.E.C SITES

**PROCESS TIME LINE (In months)**
(Revised 08/09/91)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Activity</th>
<th>C</th>
<th>D</th>
<th>O/E</th>
<th>M</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>SITE PURCHASE OPTIONS/CONSULTANT SELECTION</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROGRAMMING</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVALS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SCHEMATIC DESIGN</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVALS</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DESIGN DEVELOPMENT</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>APPROVALS</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION DOCUMENT</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BUILDING CODE REVIEW/APPROVALS</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BIDDING</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AWARD</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SITE PREP/EXCAVATION</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONSTRUCTION (ASSUME THAT UTILITIES CAN BE BROUGHT TO SITE CONCURRENTLY)</td>
<td>16-22</td>
<td>16-22</td>
<td>16-22</td>
<td>16-22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OWNER'S EQUIP./SYSTEMS</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>OCCUPY/MOVE-IN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TOTALS**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>52-58</th>
<th>51-57</th>
<th>52-58</th>
<th>505-565</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>