

APRIL 8, 2008

MINUTES OF MECKLENBURG COUNTY BOARD OF COMMISSIONERS

NORTH CAROLINA  
MECKLENBURG COUNTY

The Board of Commissioners of Mecklenburg County, North Carolina, met in Budget/Public Policy Session in Conference Center Room 267 of the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Government Center located at 600 East Fourth Street at 3:00 p.m. on Tuesday, April 8, 2008.

ATTENDANCE

**Present:** Vice-Chairman H. Parks Helms and Commissioners  
Dumont Clarke, Norman A. Mitchell, Sr.  
Dan Ramirez and Valerie C. Woodard  
County Manager Harry L. Jones, Sr.  
Clerk to the Board Janice S. Paige

**Absent:** Chairman Jennifer Roberts and Commissioners Karen Bentley, J. Daniel Bishop, and Bill James

---

*Commissioner Ramirez was absent when the meeting was called to order and until noted in the minutes.*

*Vice-Chairman Helms called the meeting to order in the absence of Chairman Roberts.*

*Budget/Management Director Hyong Yi noted the agenda items scheduled for discussion, which were Program Review and Fleet Consolidation.*

**(1) PROGRAM REVIEW**

Planning and Evaluation Director Leslie Johnson gave an update on FY08 Program Review.

The following was covered in the presentation:

Evaluation Criteria

- Relevance
- Performance
- Efficiency

Framework

Overview

- 4<sup>th</sup> year utilizing PART framework (Performance Assessment Tool from the Office of Management and Budget)
- Standards more stringent
- 15 program categories reviewed
- 82 services reviewed

Performance Legend

*Commissioner Ramirez entered the meeting.*

Performance Results

Program Category Summaries

Service Ratings

*A copy of the report is on file with the Clerk to the Board.*

Comments

Commissioner Mitchell asked about some of the Relevance scores being low. *The response was that Relevance looks at a number of things, which impacts the score. It was noted that mandatory services will have a high relevance score, next would be those services that are mandatory, but the Board has discretion when it comes to the level of funding for those services; then you have services that are discretionary. With respect to discretionary services, there are two questions asked, does the service meet or provide a tangible benefit, need or address a need or benefit to the community? Secondly, what impact is that service having to the problem? It was noted that sometimes it's difficult for outside agencies to quantify or anyone to quantify, how much of a difference they're making to the bigger part of the problem as a whole.*

Commissioner Woodard expressed concern for the impact on outcomes when there are outside agencies that do not provide the necessary data. She asked if the County could delay allocating funds if an outside agency does not provide the necessary data. *The response was that there are checks and balances for outside agencies.*

Director Yi noted that the application process for outside agencies requires certain data be provided, including performance measures that can be tracked. If those performance measures aren't provided, then their application is disqualified. Also, outside agencies receive funding on a quarterly basis and a pre-requisite to receiving funds is the submission of a quarterly performance measures report. Once the quarterly report is received and in accordance with expectations, funds are released.

Commissioner Ramirez asked if outside agencies have to apply annually. *The response was yes.*

Commissioner Clarke questioned whether the category title, Results Not Demonstrated, the best title to use, since it was explained that it means there's no quantitative data available to make an assessment using the PART tool. Commissioner Clarke said something that captures that thought more directly may be a better category. He said using Results Not Demonstrated tends to indicate that something isn't performing, when that may not be the case.

Commissioner Clarke said it's important to look at things also from a quality standpoint and not just from a quantitative perspective.

Commissioner Clarke suggested using an additional measure that addresses the question of what would the community be like if this service didn't exist. *The response was that some of this is captured under Relevance.*

There were no further questions or comments.

This concluded the presentation.

No action was taken or required at this time.

**(2) FLEET CONSOLIDATION**

General Manager John McGillicuddy introduced the staff that would be addressing the Charlotte-Mecklenburg Fleet Maintenance Consolidation Proposal, Chuck Robinson with the City of Charlotte and Leon Miller, director of General Services.

General Manager McGillicuddy said an Interlocal agreement is being drafted for the consolidation of City and County fleet departments under the administration of the City.

The following was covered in the presentation:

Background as to how this proposed consolidation idea came about

The focus of the consolidation

- Is it good for taxpayers?
- Is it good for fleet users?
- Is it good for County fleet employees?

City's qualifications

Consolidation proposal

- Scope of Service
- Management Plan
- Operating Plan
- Cost Model
- Financial Impacts

Next Steps

- Consideration of Interlocal Agreement by the Board on May 7, 2008
- Consideration of Interlocal Agreement by City Council on May 12, 2008
- Budget approved through City and County annual budget process
- Consolidation effective July 1<sup>st</sup>

It was noted the County will continue to be responsible for

- Purchasing County vehicles and gasoline cost
- Maintaining the current facility and its equipment
- Management and oversight of the Interlocal Agreement.

It was noted that this consolidation on the County's part will result in departments taking on more accountability for the maintenance of their fleet.

General Services will work with the City and County departments to ensure things are working as anticipated.

Comments

Commissioner Ramirez asked for clarification on how the consolidation will work as it relates to the role of County General Services and the current facility, which was explained. *It was noted that this is a consolidation of the maintenance of the County's light vehicles. It was explained that the City will work out of the County's current facility.*

Commissioner Ramirez asked about savings as a result of the consolidation, which was addressed. *It was noted that the estimated savings doesn't include inflation cost.*

Commissioner Helms asked was it correct to assume that eventually the current County facility will become surplus. *The response was possibly, but the current facility is a part of the agreement. If it was to be disposed of, the County would have to provide a replacement facility to the City, in order to maintain the agreement, otherwise it would be grounds for termination of the agreement.*

General Manager McGillicuddy said the County will still need to fund the vehicle replacement fund.

Commissioner Ramirez asked about the replacement of aging vehicles. *The response was that the average replacement age is every five years, however, there are vehicles in the fleet that are 8, 10, and 11 years old.*

Commissioner Ramirez asked about the use of fuel efficient vehicles. *The response was that for the last several years, the County has purchased both high mpg and low emissions vehicles. With respect to hybrids, an analysis was done and the conclusion was that the County is able, at this point and time, factoring in the current price of gasoline, to purchase and replace nearly two conventional gasoline vehicles for the price of one hybrid. It was noted that there are hybrids,*

**APRIL 8, 2008**

*however, in both City and County fleets.*

*Commissioner Mitchell asked about the benefits of the consolidation. The response was that there will be a reduction in cost for the County. Also, the efficiency of the operation will increase and better service to customers.*

*Commissioner Mitchell asked about the status of County employees. The response was that all employees will be transferred over to the City "whole." There will not be a loss of any benefits or pay. Employees will have more opportunities for advancement because the City's fleet department is larger and has more positions.*

There were no further questions or comments.

This concluded the presentation.

No action was taken or required at this time.

*The above is not inclusive of every comment but is a summary.*

#### **ADJOURNMENT**

Motion was made by Commissioner Woodard, seconded by Commissioner Ramirez and unanimously carried with Commissioners Clarke, Helms, Mitchell, Ramirez, and Woodard voting yes, that there being no further business to come before the Board that the meeting be adjourned at 4:33 p.m.

---

Janice S. Paige, Clerk

---

H. Parks Helms, Vice-Chairman