



## Meeting 10 Report

Feb. 17, 2010

Engage Gwinnett, the citizens committee on the future of Gwinnett County, held its 10th meeting on Wednesday, Feb. 17, 2010, at the Gwinnett Center in Duluth. The meeting started at 8:00 a.m. and lasted three and a half hours. The Engage Gwinnett committee will make recommendations in April on county government services, the benefits citizens receive from those services, and how they should be paid for.

The first 50 minutes was held in plenary session (with all members present), so members could hear talks by Katherine L. Meyer, Gwinnett County tax commissioner; Aaron J. Bovos, Gwinnett County chief financial officer; and Steve Pruitt, Gwinnett County tax assessor. (Video of their presentations and copies of their PowerPoint slides are available for viewing at [www.engagegwinnett.com](http://www.engagegwinnett.com).) Members also received an overview of the day's activities from Jon Abercrombie, the Engage Gwinnett facilitator. Members then went to their Work Group meeting rooms, spending the rest of the time in Work Group sessions.

### Meeting Process

Mike Levensgood and Bill McCargo, Engage Gwinnett's co-chairs, welcomed the members, alternate members, citizens and observers. Bill reminded them of Engage Gwinnett's mission:

- Look at the major services provided today by Gwinnett County government and the benefits these services offer to citizens.
- Make judgments about these services, their levels of service, and how they are delivered.
- Recommend ways of paying for the ones that are truly needed.

Mike reviewed how the four public outreach sessions, which begin on Thursday evening, Feb. 18, at First Baptist Church of Duluth, will be structured. He also raised two possibilities: First, that Engage Gwinnett might be asked to meet in the months and years after its report is made in April. (Since the Gwinnett Chamber and the Board of Commissioners created Engage Gwinnett, that would be their decision, Mike said.) Second, that in the remaining meetings, the Work Groups may be asked to consider a "worse-case scenario" – a decline in the tax base that's even greater than those experienced so far. If that

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

happens, Mike said, Engage Gwinnett should be prepared with recommendations. “Let’s all hope we never have to face a situation even bleaker than the one we have now,” Mike said, “but we may want to ask you to think about it and to give the Board of Commissioner the benefit of your thinking about how to make dramatic reductions, should things get even worse.”

Katherine Meyer, the tax commissioner, gave a brief presentation on how taxes are collected. In the past 10 years, she said, the county collected 99% of the taxes it levied, a high collection rate. She added that most of property taxes – about 60% – went to the school system. The county government received about 35%, with the remainder of property taxes going to the state government, municipalities, community improvement districts and elsewhere.

Chief Financial Officer Aaron Bovos talked about the different sources of revenue that come to the state. In thinking about revenues, he said, it’s important to distinguish between the county’s total revenues, much of which is reserved for specific purposes established by law (such as the water and sewer operating fund), and the general fund, over which the county has much greater discretion. The total budget for Gwinnett in 2009 was \$892 million; the general fund was \$415 million, or less than half the total budget. In the total budget, fees and charges (such as those that are on water bills) are a substantial revenue source, rivaling general property tax receipts in some years. But in the general fund, fees for services are a tiny percent of revenues. The property tax provides the great majority of general fund revenues.

One idea that has been advanced to help localities in the current economic situation is a new type of local option sales tax (or LOST). Gwinnett County is one of the few major counties without a local option sales tax, except for the special purpose local option sales tax (called SPLOST) that pays for capital projects, such as new parks, libraries and fire stations. As a result, the overall sales tax in Gwinnett is lower than those of surrounding counties, Aaron said. While they have 7% sales taxes, Gwinnett has a 6% tax.

Existing LOSTs require that, if approved by referendum, the county roll back its total property taxes in exactly the same amount as it collects in the additional sales tax. The new version of LOST, if approved by the General Assembly, would roll back property taxes by 50% – again, assuming voters approved the tax in a public referendum.

The last speaker was Steve Pruitt, the tax assessor, who reviewed how property tax assessments are made, when they are made and how bills are sent out. The assessments of Gwinnett’s 275,000 parcels of property have not been completed, he said. It’s usually in March that his office has a clear sense of whether valuations will rise or fall – and by how much. But looking at last year’s experience with falling valuations and the continued poor economic situation in the county, he feels sure, he said, that the tax

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

base will decline this year in this year's assessments. "The question is not whether the tax base goes down, but by how much," he added.

During a question period, Steve was asked if he could estimate how much the property tax base might decline this year. He said he believed it could decline 6% to 9%.

Facilitator Jon Abercrombie said that, in their Work Groups, members should do two things: Discuss what they wanted their group's representatives to say about their preliminary recommendations during the public outreach sessions this week and next; and begin talking about how they might address the "worse-case scenario" of a dramatically declining tax base.

### **Work Group Discussions**

The Work Groups held discussions and considered possible recommendations in their work areas. They also talked extensively about what they wanted to tell public session attendees about their work in the days ahead. The following is a brief summary of some of the discussions that were held.

#### **Community Services**

Work Group members spent considerable time discussing their presentation for the public outreach sessions and talking generally about how they might approach a "worse-case scenario" if drastic cuts were required in the years ahead.

They also heard from officials from the Gwinnett Public Library system and the Community Services Department. Library officials said that they felt they may not have been heard as clearly as they had hoped in earlier sessions. The system has made significant reductions in expenses they said, by among other things extending the life of some computer equipment, reducing staff training to near zero, and so on, they said. And they were willing to consider changing the way library branches are staffed – but they cautioned that when changes were proposed last year, the public reaction was one of strong opposition.

Still, they said, they believed that should changes be made in the staffing of branches – perhaps moving to a regional system, where some branches are operated with longer hours than others – the library system could reduce costs even further, perhaps by as much as 10% – and without the kind of across-the-board hourly reductions that were implemented last fall.

The factor that complicated last fall's budget adjustments, they said, was the opening of a 15th library branch at Hamilton Mill. Had the system not been required to expand just as budget cuts were requested, it could have handled the reductions much better than it did.

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

Community Services Director Phil Hoskins spoke for the Parks and Recreations Division about how that division might absorb further cuts, should the tax base require dramatic reductions. Phil said his efforts would be directed at cutting programs rather than maintenance of county facilities. That's because, he said, if revenues rebound the programs can be reestablished, but if the county lets trails, restrooms, ballfields and other facilities decline, the cost of repair later on could be much higher.

### **Development and Infrastructure**

The Development and Infrastructure Work Group heard a presentation from the director of the Department of Transportation. The presentation focused on public transit service offered in Gwinnett County and the county's transition to the use of LED lighting in traffic signals. The Work Group also held a brief discussion on its presentation that will be delivered at upcoming public meetings.

In his presentation on LED lighting, the DOT director pointed out that the big savings that comes from the switch to LED lighting is in maintenance costs. Incandescent bulbs burn out much faster than LED lighting, so they must be replaced more often. DOT expects the savings from signals that have already been converted to be \$430,000 over seven years. The expected cost savings for the entire system, once all signals have been converted, will be \$750,000 over seven years.

LED bulbs also use 80% less energy than incandescent bulbs. The county currently pays a set fee to the power company, and will be renegotiating those fees, based on the expected energy savings.

In his presentation on transit service, the director gave an overview of why the county provides this service and how it is funded. In the mid-1990s, Gwinnett County was the largest jurisdiction in the country without a transit system. In 1997, the Atlanta region went into non-conformity status with the Clean Air Act, which made the Atlanta region ineligible to receive federal funding for many types of projects. A regional transit process was a key element of bringing the region back into conformity. Gwinnett County has received federal money since 1999 to operate its transit service – if the service is stopped, most of that federal money (between \$40 and \$50 million) would have to be returned.

To save costs, Gwinnett Transit has by reduced its Saturday service and eliminated its least used routes. As a condition of federal funding, all service cuts must be approved by the Federal Transit Administration. The transit system is funded in what was referred to as a “three-legged stool” model. Each “leg” is a separate source of funding: federal grants, farebox receipts, and a county subsidy. These three sources of revenue are nearly balanced with one another.

The Work Group began discussing some possible ways the transit service could be better marketed, and which parts of the service could carry more ridership. The express bus service and the local route 10 are at

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

(or near) capacity, while all the other local routes could handle more riders. Should route 10 or the express routes attract more ridership, it would mean having to provide more busses and, therefore, incur more cost. The Work Group speculated that additional ridership on the local routes would simply be additional revenue since that would mean the service would not have to provide additional buses. The Work Group then brainstormed ideas for attracting new riders to use local transit service.

### **Fire and Emergency Services**

The Fire and Emergency Services Work Group heard from two speakers. First was Chief Bill Myers of Fire and Emergency Services, he addressed prior concerns over multiple units arriving in emergency situations. Bill clarified the different levels of emergencies and the response for each type are: 1) Ambulance or fire engine only with no lights or sirens; 2) Ambulance only with lights; 3) Ambulance and fire engine. Which of these is dispatched depends on information given by caller to 911; the dispatch, along with fire and EMS personnel, will always err on the side of caution. A national program determines questions asked by operators to callers to determine the level of the emergency.

Kenneth Poe, director of Human Resources, answered questions posed at the Feb. 3rd meeting regarding employee benefits, contributions and the automated system used to process applications and new hires.

The Work Group reiterated its primary concern was the desire to do no harm. The group also discussed what will be presented to the public meetings.

### **Observations, Considerations, Recommendations**

The following is a complete list of the draft observations, considerations and recommendations from each of the four Work Groups, as they were revised at the Engage Gwinnett meeting on Feb. 17. Most of these were written at earlier meetings, but there were some changes at this most recent meeting.

### **Community Services Work Group**

#### **General**

#### Observations

- After several decades of growth in the county tax digest, in 2009 Gwinnett County experienced a decline in the tax digest. 2009 was a wake-up call for the government and the citizens of Gwinnett County. We anticipate further declines in the tax digest before it begins to increase again. We should make recommendations that take this volatility into account while still providing some predictability. If the tax digest declines or increases by more than x% (10?), then the Board of Commissioners should revisit budget recommendations.

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

### Preliminary Recommendations

- While elections are a significant expense, they are core to the maintenance of democracy
- Cooperative Extension Service – relatively small budget amount and they’re doing a great job – no cuts recommended

### Health and Human Services

#### Observations

- Benefit: Safety net for those at risk and most vulnerable
- Benefit: Information, education, awareness
- Benefit: Early intervention before a situation gets worse (or before government services are needed)
- Research and data are being used to prioritize and focus on needs in community
  - Also used for grants from outside of county
  - Coalition has created strategic plan
- Big difference between subsidies: Hospital, DFCS, MH, BOH; vs. Ch Shelter, BF Gw, Coalition, etc.
- Senior population growing greatly and living longer
- Haven’t done adequate planning for senior growth – not just community services, but also transportation, planning, etc. – we’re just playing catch-up now. All County Departments need to consider the great senior population increase in planning for future senior services and needs.
- Senior services funding is based on census (change in funding will come in approximately 2012) – mainly work with seniors ages 80+; very few services are available for 60 to 80 year-olds.
- Needs far outstrip funding, losing ground on Health and Human Services indicators
- Granting system is not working
- Leverage provided by subsidy funding is important
- Public health money is based on 1970s population
- Cannot afford to lower funding for Health and Human Services
- Approximately 50% of children in school are on free or reduced lunch
- County is mandated to provide Senior Services
- Broad network of providers trying to meet Health and Human Services needs

#### Considerations

- Subsidy process broken
  - We cannot fail to provide health and human services funding
  - Revise process – Gwinnett Coalition for HHS (or another central agency) be a re-granting agency to address specific needs and leverage capacity
  - Can ill afford to reduce funding
  - Basis of funding shouldn’t be “because we always have”
  - May not be addressing biggest needs today
- How do you prioritize?
  - Create fees for some services

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

- Out of sight, out of mind concern
- What group should be involved in planning senior services? (study)
  - Coalition sub-committee
  - Friends of Gwinnett County Senior Services
  - Planning Department
  - ARC
  - Non-biased
- Why are Public Health dollars based on 1970s population?
- What would be the possible consequences of the coalition being charged as the re-granting agency?
- Want more agencies considered for subsidy funding
- Consider having Coalition (or another existing group – not a new one) assume responsibilities for regranting subsidy funding
  - More efficient
  - Certain subsidies (hospital system and public health) may need to be treated differently from smaller ones

#### Preliminary Recommendations

- Revised process for results-based strategic (accountability, process, needs assessment, strategic plan) funding for subsidies for Health and Human Services
- Level of funding for Health and Human Services not be cut any further
- Maintain current level of subsidy funding
  - Establish more efficient granting process that meets current needs, without creating a new entity
- Implement 1997 Board of Commissioners resolution empowering Coalition and requiring subsidies to address needs in comprehensive plan and opening the possibility of funding to other non-profits that are addressing pressing needs
- Don't cut senior services – need is greater than we're addressing and is going to increase dramatically
- A study of senior services be commissioned to assess needs and what is already being done (cost)
- Advocate for an increase in public health funding based on current population rather than based on Gwinnett's 1970 population
- Suggest Coalition take on responsibility for administering subsidy funding

#### Library

##### Observations

- Budget has been constant for last three years
- Only change Hamilton Mill branch
- It is a well-run organization
- Current staffing model is very rigid – may be a structural defect that needs to be addressed with need to cut budget

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

- Quantify savings of regional model – need thoughtful presentation of what it involves (recommendation)
- Public library supports pre-kindergarten through 12<sup>th</sup> grade education – public, private and home schooling

#### Considerations

- Potentially degraded services
- Hours stay the same, services may be different
- Might promote efficiency and creativity of how to address future funding decline
- Technology changes in five years may be enormous
- Maintain high quality of service with more flexibility
- There is a need for meeting space
- Inappropriate to assume “one size fits all”

#### Preliminary Recommendations

- More centralized responsibilities for some things
- Each library facility should be viewed as a branch of a central library system
- Defer/suspend new sites (renovations okay)
- Reconsider replacement facilities (more square footage leads to increased costs)
- Consider implications of online access: hours of operation, staffing, cost (impending technological changes)
- Continue with state funding
- Reduce library staffing budget by 5% in 2011 and an additional 5% in 2012. This level should be maintained through 2014. The staffing budget reductions may be absorbed at management’s discretion, except that hours of operation should remain at 71 hours per week. Maintain level of services and hours – deal with budget cuts through tiered system and staffing changes. We strongly encourage the library board and leadership to explore alternative staffing models, including but not limited to:
  - Aggressively increasing volunteer staff at all libraries
  - Re-engineering the model of maintaining multiple degreed personnel to accomplish tasks that could be completed by non-degreed staff or volunteers
  - Limiting availability of non-core services to certain times or days at some locations
  - Engaging Friends of the Library to muster a volunteer recruitment, training and placement campaign
- Fix five-year budget at 2010 levels – revisit and quantify savings on regional/tiered system
- Meeting space should be made available for homework, study, independent team problem solving during afternoons, evening and weekends

#### **Parks and Recreation**

#### Observations



ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

- Has already reduced recreational programs, services and special events, eliminated 18 full-time positions and reduced facilities' operation hours
- Deferred capital projects
- YAAs have an important role in our community
  - Number of volunteers and volunteer hours
  - Involve thousands of youth and teens in activities and increase skills
  - Parent involvement
- Must preserve quality of assets – avoid cycle of decline

#### Considerations

- Community may benefit from county and Board of Education to work together better: communications, coordination of facilities, planning

#### Preliminary Recommendations

- Use SPLOST money to renovate parks that will result in future costs savings (in lieu of additional/new parks) (i.e., artificial turf, diff lighting, natural landscaping, etc.)
- Active recreational facilities – recoup more of their costs, evaluate potential for this (including EHC)
- Analyze potential for privatization of some/all(?) facilities, i.e. courthouse
- Use more natural landscaping that requires less upkeep
- Analyze coordination with GCPS – comm. Schools, use of ball fields, pools, etc., could Parks and Recreation leverage school fields more/better? Maximize cooperation and coordination.
- Institute an online process to reserve fields, park, etc.
- Analyze potential financial benefits, feasibility and other concerns related to charging user fees – including parking fees – at parks and report to the Board of Commissioners
- EHC should become self-sufficient
- Privatize, sell or outsource operations of swimming facilities or increase user fees so they're completely self-supporting, including future capital costs not covered by SPLOST, staffing, etc.
- Charge user fees for active fields and facilities. Analyze all costs, savings, youth athletics' fair share of these expenses, charge market rates for other groups (for-profits, traveling teams, adult athletics, etc. – possibly a per-player fee?)
- New active parks – if not developed by county, give communities the option to cover the operating costs
- Keep county funding at current level. Any increases in costs will have to be offset by user fees. Explore creative ways to bring new, active facilities online.
- Rethink currently planned parks to minimize operating costs in future
- If the golf course is servicing the county's debt obligation, let it ride. If not, plan an exit strategy (develop a work out plan).

#### **Development and Infrastructure Work Group**

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

## **Planning and Development**

### Observations

- County is perceived to be more pro-residential and anti-business development
- Conflicting policies in planning and development
- State responsibility of all roles of planning and development, Board of Commissioners and planning commission
- Planning and development department is and should be about generating revenue
- Planning and development is tasked with the future of Gwinnett County
- No near-term demand for outsourcing
- What are the current service levels?

### Considerations

- Consider opportunities to combine departments (cross-train)
- Policy and procedures should be business friendly because businesses generate revenue. Our tax base is too heavily weighted to residential vs commercial.
- Can permits and inspection be combined with license and review (consideration)

### Preliminary Recommendations

- Board of Commissioners to maintain current permitting, processing and plan review service levels – keep us competitive when growth returns
- Department evaluate policies and procedures to ensure that they align with Partnership Gwinnett goals
- Fast track renaming the Planning and Development department to Planning and Economic Development
- Do not outsource (outside contracting) any essential Planning and Development functions
- Consider updating the recommendations made by the Matrix Consulting Group
- Implement interventions of the 2030 Unified Plan

## **Transportation**

### Observations

- Public transportation system serves less than (0.5% - what % is this available to?) of population in Gwinnett
- Roads: SPLOST is capital only, not for operating
- Great strides in efficiencies and cost-cutting (maintenance)
- Centralized facility functional and efficient
- Everything stops at the county line – no coordination with the other counties

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

- The oversupply of parking raises the impact of stormwater runoff and discourages the use of transit services

#### Considerations

- Will stimulus funds save costs on traffic lights? How much, now and in the future?
- 21<sup>st</sup> Century traffic control training (more efficient) – need more training
- The department of transportation has managed well within the box – time to consider a new box.
- What role would technology play if starting a department from scratch?
- Transit
  - Add Wi-Fi to express buses
  - Create “intra-county” express routes with fewer stops to increase ridership
  - Quantify the market penetration on existing routes. What if ridership increases by 15%?
  - What if weekly or two-week transit passes are offered?
  - Increasing commuter ridership requires more Park-and-Ride capacity
  - The Unified Plan is a long-term plan and vision for Gwinnett County. Revitalization needs density and density requires transit.
  - Transit also carries an impact on economic development (developments of regional impact).

#### Preliminary Recommendations

- Do a better job of marketing transit service
- Ensure we're maximizing our use of technology
  - Staff trained and knowledgeable in its use
  - Develop plans and strategies
  - “Smart” technology
- Independent expert review of county's use of technology and facilitate integration across functions (e.g., traffic lights, public safety)
- Third party facilitation/review of inter-departmental coordination
- Transit
  - Complete 5-year transit master plan
  - Offer weekly passes in addition to monthly
  - Market to potential riders of necessity for local routes to increase ridership
  - Assess market penetration in areas currently served and develop strategies to increase ridership to break-even status from general fund standpoint
  - Evaluate the return on investment and funds from MARTA (Breeze Card program)

#### Water and Sewer

##### Observations

- Goal is to pay as you go and reduce debt
- No more bonds – Water department has determined that it's their goal to no longer issue bonds to finance future projects and to maintain a triple-A bond rating

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

- Operates on an enterprise fund, which means it pays for itself through user fees. Therefore, it receives no income from the general fund.
- Costs more to treat sewer than water (60% more)
- Storm water is on property tax bill – funding is approximately 50% of what's needed. Department is researching alternative technologies to reduce costs.
- Implemented collection agency to improve collections by \_\_\_ / to \_\_\_ % of collectables

#### Considerations

- How do we address the storm water infrastructure failing? (cost)
- Shortfall in revenue from fees

#### Preliminary Recommendations

- Continue following the current policy of department operations and financing.

## **Fire and Emergency Services Work Group**

#### Observations

- These cuts have already been made:
  - Human resources from 3 to 1.5
  - Reduction in overall headcount – countered by new hires (need exact figures – we have them, and will find them)
  - Consolidation of warehouse (police warehouse added) – centralized inventory
  - Overall reduction in support personnel
  - Consolidated Fire Marshall, etc., in headquarters
  - Plan review has had cuts in Planning and Development
  - General Operating a/c's have had to cut certain percentages – more cuts than capital with personnel – example, fuel costs
- Gwinnett County has ensured that we have adequate staffing at each site – deliberate cross-training – Fire/EMT
- Interconnection of total system as it relates to service – not just your local station
- Very flexible/dynamic system and process
- Very well trained, professional staff that is well-equipped
- Outsourced some – fire hydrant inspection, EMS billing and collection
- Response time does not meet national standard
- Openness of fire chief and staff – very good attitude
- High morale and team spirit – team-based approach – morale high despite challenges
- Maintain an ongoing process of consistent interpretation of various codes
- Outsourcing was looked at – example: warehousing
- Improvement in relations between fire and hospital system
- Have tried to hire diverse staff – identified current staff and volunteers to promote education

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

#### Considerations

- Response time does not meet national standard
- Aging population in Gwinnett
- Impact of road system and congestion (response time), density, development types, redevelopment (CID)
- Halt in new development gives Fire Department time to catch up
- Gwinnett County strives to exceed the national standard
- Water delivery system affects ISO rating
- SPLOST must do what was voted on – result: unmanned stations, which must be staffed
- Georgia Gwinnett College’s new dorms
- Cultural/language diversity
- Effectiveness and efficiency of 911 affects Fire/EMS
- First, do no harm – don’t make it worse

#### Preliminary Recommendations

- We don’t want to do any harm – don’t want to go backwards
- Additional emphasis on citizen education and outreach for purposes of risk reduction – consider volunteers (expand CPR to include choking and other first aid)
- Code adjustments – example, residential sprinklers (consideration) cost must be balanced with return (including maintenance costs) – example: dense single-family dwellings pose a different challenge for fire coordination with cities as well for interpretation
- Outdoor burning – education issue vs regulation issue? Tie in to HOAs, insert in water bills?
- Inspect fire hydrants more frequently

### **Law Enforcement and Judiciary Work Group**

#### Observations

- Police training facilities may be underutilized with current budgeting constraints
- Information is available online – general public is not aware of resources
- (1) Constitutional fees (not updated) outdated – does not reflect actual costs or cost of living
- (2) Justice system components are complex, interrelated and interdependent
- (3) Justice system could benefit from implementation of new technology
- (1 – 2/3) Benefit of consolidation of police and sheriff (reference article from Randy Meacham on city police training) requires detailed planning and time frame.
- (2 – 2/3) County does have department for process analysis, measurement and improvement (Public perception without this information breeds mistrust)
- (3 – 2/3) Culture of “risk aversion” stymies innovation and creativity at the county government level
- (4 – 2/3) Consolidation of all business unit IT functions (refer to #3 observation from 1/20)

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

- (5 – 2/3) Justice system has done well utilizing “do more with less” eliminating all “fat” from operating budgets.
- Gwinnett County Police Department has been accredited since 1993 (re-accreditation comes every three years) by Commission for Accreditation for Law Enforcement Agencies five times.
- 3.4% of all law enforcement agencies are accredited.
- 458 standards apply to all facets of the Gwinnett County Police Department.

#### Considerations

- Explore partnership with NCR to automate court, fee and filing processes
- Consolidate all facility maintenance
- Expense of whole GJAC security
- Goal: create a world class justice system that is cost-effective, innovative across all platforms
- Use of police training facilities (after officers currently authorized by revised budget are trained) for outside agency training as revenue stream
- (1) Analyze and determine potential revenue with updated fee structure
- (2a) Greater efficiencies and client outcomes can be achieved by interdepartmental consultation
- (3a) Expedite implementation of Criminal Justice Information System – recognize investment in Criminal Justice Information System
- (2b) Assess cause/effect relationship between components of justice system
- (3c) Determine cost efficiency of online payment systems
- (2 – 2/3) Make departmental ‘score cards’ available online
- All law enforcement and corrections facilities maintain the highest industry-recognized level of certification that is fiscally possible.

#### Preliminary Recommendations

- Ask county to reevaluate state mandated fees/price for service and court fees; advocate legislative action
- Privatization of collection of remaining unpaid fees/fines at end of probation period; recommend legislative action
- Explore indigent defense funding, fee per case vs. hourly defense
- Expedite “paperless” system for courts, filing fees, permits
- Use innovation to streamline all processes/implement technological advance to increase efficiency
- Explore outsourcing for / consolidation:
  - Corrections (privatizing)
  - Courthouse security
  - Building maintenance
  - Animal control
  - Process servers

ENGAGE GWINNETT  
MEETING 10 REPORT  
FEB. 17, 2010

- Re-examine basis for 2030 unified plan recommendation of 1.3 police officers per thousand population – use composite numbers of county and city police and population to determine current ratio and current ratio with sheriff’s department
- Examine staffing of animal control and number of animals per household
- Recommend independent review of each judicial system department and the inter-connectivity/cause and effect/interaction of their budgeting, staffing and processes (possible task force of consultant/staff/citizen members)
- Education/community building
- Solicitor’s office explore level of charges not requiring jury trial (less than 6 months jail)
- “Summit meeting” of municipalities and county courts on fines and binding costs
- Explore state reimbursements for county services
- (1a) Support legislation to update Constitutional fees
- (1b) Recoup court costs
- (2a) Adopt a coordinated and strategic approach to justice system service delivery
- (3a) Expedite implementation of Criminal Justice Information System
- (3b) Explore private/public partnership for self-service or paperless delivery of services
- (3c) Implement online payment systems
- (1 – 2/3) Continue Engage Gwinnett process to provide continued citizen input and support
- (2 – 2/3) Continue and support process improvement initiative in the justice system
- (3 – 2/3) Education/community building to extend and compliment the capabilities of the justice system