



A Review of the Plans Submitted Under the State County-Wide Shared Services Initiative

October 17, 2017

The Rockefeller Institute of Government
The Benjamin Center
Center for Technology in Government

www.rockinst.org

 [@rockefellerinst](https://twitter.com/rockefellerinst)



A Review of the Plans Submitted Under the State County-Wide Shared Services Initiative

Contents

Executive Summary	4
Introduction to the State County-Wide Shared Services Initiative	6
Financial Match from the State	8
The Policy Rationale behind the County-Wide Shared Services Initiative	9
Why Counties?	10
Among the Nation's Highest Property Taxes	10
Improving Local Government Efficiency	12
Review of the County-Wide Shared Services Plans	13
The Overall Completeness of the Plans	14
Projects and Savings Overview	14
Savings Compared to County Population and Property Tax Burden	16
Breakdown by Average Savings per Taxpayer	17
Savings by Region	19
Plans and Savings by Types of County Governing Bodies	19
Summary of Plans by Project Category	21
Public Health and Insurance	22
Emergency Services	23
Sewer, Water, and Waste Management Systems	23
Energy Procurement and Efficiency	24
Parks and Recreation	25
Education and Workforce Training	25
Law and Courts	25
Shared Equipment, Personnel, and Services	26
Joint Purchasing	27
Governmental Reorganization	27
Transportation and Highway Departments	28
Records Management and Administrative Functions	29
Legal and Regulatory Barriers to Shared Services	30
Impediments to Cooperative Health Insurance Purchasing	30
Impediments to the Consolidation of Municipal Justice Courts and Reducing the Number of Town Justices	32
State Education Law Impediments to Shared Services	33
Property Tax Assessing by the County	33
Impediments to a County Refinancing Its Municipalities' Debt	34
Need for State Approval to Combine Police Departments Located in Towns within Different Contiguous Counties	34
Lessons Learned: Best Practices and Policies	34

1. The better plans have clear goals, timelines, and specific methodologies for determining savings.	34
2. Municipalities should make permanent a version of the shared service panels created under the CWSSI.	35
3. The state and local governments should develop a formal regulatory and technical assistance working group to break down barriers to shared services.	36
4. The state should align financial incentives to any ongoing CWSSI or successor process.	37
5. Common financial and operational reporting should be consistent, because the current process makes it difficult to adequately compare municipalities.	37
6. The county should be central in organizing shared services, but does not always have to provide the service.	38
7. School Districts should participate on the panels going forward.	38
8. Technology is integral to shared services, so it cannot be an afterthought.	38
Appendices	40
Appendix A: County-wide Shared Services Initiative	41
Appendix B: Guidance document	48
Program Overview	50
Participants	50
Plan Development and Submission	51
State Technical Assistance	54
State Matching Funds — Application Guidelines and Parameters	54
County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan	59
Appendix C. Summary of Total Projects and Savings by County	64
Appendix D. The Maxwell Citizens Guide and Best Practices	65
Appendix E. Top 15 Counties with Highest Property Taxes	67
Appendix F. Median Property Tax Burden (Total Taxes Paid), by State	68
Appendix G. The Public Hearing Process	69
Appendix H. Fully Implemented Tax Savings by Population	73
Appendix I. County Plan Snapshots	74

Executive Summary

This year, New York State enacted the County-Wide Shared Services Initiative (CWSSI) law with the mission of reducing property taxes and improving local government efficiency. The law requires counties to convene a shared services panel consisting of the chief executive officer of all towns, villages, and cities, and with the option of including school districts to develop taxpayer savings and efficiencies plans. Counties had the option of submitting a plan by September 15, 2017, or September 15, 2018.

The first round of the CWSSI program has yielded taxpayer savings, efficiencies, and better coordination among local governments across the state. More importantly, the state law created an infrastructure for better coordination and cooperation among local governments.

Here are the central findings:

- Of the fifty-seven counties required to create a plan, thirty-four — or nearly 60 percent — filed with the state this year. The remainder must adopt plans next year.
- Of the thirty-four counties, nine included school districts/BOCES in the process.
- In total, counties reported 389 proposals adopted, resulting in \$208 million in projected savings in 2018, nearly \$75 million in 2019, and \$76.1 million in recurring savings in the out-years.
- Seven of the counties failed to properly report the required financial information, specifically out-year projections for recurring tax savings. Those counties were Broome, Columbia, Livingston, Nassau, St. Lawrence, Wayne, and Wyoming Counties. Therefore, 2019 projections of \$75 million and the \$76.1 million in total out-year savings are likely incomplete and will be greater in the end.
- When ranking counties by highest savings reported in the first year (2018), Nassau County is first (\$130.5 million), followed by Broome County (\$20.3 million), Suffolk County (\$16.5 million), Dutchess County (\$15.2 million), and Monroe County (\$7.3 million).
- When ranking counties by highest savings reported in the out-years, Suffolk (\$20.9 million) was first followed, by Dutchess (\$12.5 million), Albany (\$9.7 million), Montgomery (\$4.6 million), and Erie (\$4.2 million).
- There were many cases where much smaller counties reported larger overall tax savings than some of the state's largest counties. For example, Montgomery County, with a population of less than 50,000 people, found \$4.6 million in recurring tax savings versus Westchester County, with nearly one million people, which found \$1.2 million in savings.
- The higher a county's total property tax burden does not mean that county found more recurring tax savings. For example, Westchester County has the highest property tax burden in the state — and the nation — and found less recurring tax savings than eleven counties with lower property taxes. Suffolk County, on the other hand, has the fifth highest property tax burden in the state, but it exceeded every other county's total projected recurring tax savings.

- Nassau, Broome, Montgomery, Dutchess, and Albany Counties reported the largest savings per taxpayer, while Oneida, Wyoming, Franklin, St. Lawrence, and Yates Counties are at the bottom. (Nassau County was the highest, at \$317.56 per taxpayer, and the lowest was Yates County at \$0.00 per taxpayer.)
- Counties with elected county executives were less likely to defer the plans into year two (22 percent deferred) versus those with appointed county managers (40 percent deferred) indicating a strong separately elected executive could have had more leverage to complete the plans—though this would need additional future analysis.
- Plans produced a range of programs in twelve main areas. Those areas are: public health and insurance; emergency services; sewer, water, and waste management systems; energy procurement; parks and recreation; education and workforce training; law and courts; shared equipment, personnel, and services; joint purchasing; government reorganization; transportation and highway departments; and records management and administrative functions.
- There was wide variation among the counties in how they presented their plans and how detailed the methodologies were in determining their savings. Some counties like Chautauqua and Schenectady counties provided great detail about how they arrived at their savings, while counties like Columbia and Wyoming provided virtually no information in general.

Important to the process was the “bottom up” approach, i.e., allowing the local municipalities to drive the process and outcomes, instead of counties simply dictating what would be included. As the Montgomery County plan stated, success was because it was the “‘bottom to top’ approach” and the Albany County plan “was driven from the bottom-up” so that “every community was heard.” This was critical for buy in and success.

Some of the additional challenges after our review were: inconsistent reporting, which at times, made it difficult to compare plans. Given the relative newness of the law, this on some level is understandable and likely improved for next year. Additional legal and regulatory barriers made some proposals more difficult or impossible to adopt/implement than others. It would be beneficial to improve these processes in the future.

Many counties took this as a first step, stating they would continue to work beyond the scope of the law. We recommend that this important work therefore continue with the adoption of a permanent shared service panel structure, coupled with technical support and financial incentives provided by the state. We believe those ingredients are recipes for success. If the initial plans are any indication, there could be additional property tax savings and increased government efficiency.

As Mayor Martin P. Flint, Jr. of the village of Remsen said of the Oneida County shared services plan, “This was a great first step in the right direction.”



Introduction to the State County-Wide Shared Services Initiative

In January, as part of his State of the State agenda, Governor Andrew M. Cuomo [proposed a new program](#) requiring that counties to convene local municipalities to develop and approve plans to lower the cost of local government by finding efficiencies and shared services. A final version of the plan was enacted in the state’s budget (a copy of the law is attached as Appendix A).¹ Known as the County-Wide Shared Services Initiative (CWSSI), every county had to convene a shared services panel to develop a Shared Services and Taxpayer Savings Plan.

The law authorized the chief executive officer of each county, outside of a city of one million or more residents, to prepare a plan for shared services among the county, cities, towns, and villages within the county for the purpose of identifying property tax savings. In New York, the “chief executive” function is different county-by-county, with some being elected executives and some being managers appointed by the county legislature. Each county was mandated to create a Shared Services Panel, chaired by the chief executive officer of the county and comprised of one representative from each city, town, and village within the county. School districts, Boards of Cooperative Educational Services (BOCES), and special improvement districts within the county could also participate, though they were not required to do so. In all, nine counties — Albany, Dutchess, Franklin, Nassau, Onondaga, Ontario, St. Lawrence, Suffolk, and Wayne — included school districts/BOCES in the process.

¹ See Part BBB of Chapter 59 of the State Laws of 2017. The main difference between what was proposed and what was finally enacted was a proposed referendum to approve or disapprove the locally developed plans. The enacted version had no referendum.

The statute requires that each county's plan contain "new recurring property tax savings through actions such as, but not limited to, the elimination of duplicative services; shared services such as joint purchasing, shared highway equipment, shared storage facilities, shared plowing services, and energy and insurance purchasing cooperatives; reduction in back office administrative overhead; and better coordination of services." Moreover, nothing in the process allowed the shared service panels from overwriting local laws and rules. If plans contain proposed actions that by law are otherwise subject to a procedural requirement such as a public referendum, then the actions will not be operative until said procedural requirement occurs.



The statute requires that each county's plan contain "new recurring property tax savings."

Under the law, counties may elect to defer adoption of a plan until 2018, but must report to the public the reason for the deferral. Thirty-four of the fifty-seven eligible counties submitted adopted proposals to the state this year. Counties deferring until 2018 will follow the same process as outlined for 2017, with the same deadlines.

Ahead of the counties convening their respective local municipalities the Department of State [held](#) information sessions² on the program, issued several guidance documents, and provided technical assistance throughout the process.³ In addition, a [May 2017 guide](#) by the Campbell Public Affairs Institute at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University outlined some of the lessons and best practices that New York State counties should consider when contemplating the possibility of sharing services and hosting public forums to discuss shared service plans. (For a full description of the Maxwell School Best Practices see Appendix D.)

The county chief executive officer was to consult with panel members and collective bargaining units in creating a draft plan. Counties were required to submit their draft property tax savings plan to their respective county legislative body no later than August 1, 2017. Each plan was to be accompanied by certification from the county chief executive as to the accuracy of the savings contained. The county legislative bodies reviewed the draft plans and could, by a majority of its members, issue an advisory report with recommendations to the county chief executive officer. If necessary, the county chief executive officer could modify the shared services plan in response to the advisory report.

Each county was required to hold at least three public hearings, prior to a vote by the Shared Services Panel to approve the plan, to allow for public input on the proposed plan (for a listing of the public hearings, see Appendix G). Public notice of hearings was

2 "Information & Guidance on the Recently Adopted County-Wide Shared Services Initiative," Department of State, n.d., https://www.dos.ny.gov/lq/pdf/INVITE_FINAL.PDF.

3 See *County-wide Shared Services Initiative Guidance Document* (Albany: NYS Department of State, n.d.), <https://www.dos.ny.gov/lq/pdf/CWSSI.GuidanceDoc.pdf> and *Questions and Answers* (Albany: NYS Department of State, n.d.), https://www.dos.ny.gov/lq/pdf/CWSS_QandA.pdf.


to be provided at least one week prior to the hearing, as prescribed in subdivision 1 of section 104 of the *Public Officers Law*.

Shared Services Panels that did not defer until 2018 were required to hold a vote on the final plan by September 15, 2017. Prior to the vote, each member of the Panel could have removed any action that affects their local government. Each Panel member had to state in writing the reason for their vote; a majority of the Panel had to approve the plan in order for it to be adopted. After adoption, the county chief executive officer submitted the final plan to the New York State Division of the Budget and disseminated it to county residents. Approved shared services plans had to be presented publicly no later than October 15, 2017.

The law states that if the plan was not approved, the county chief executive officer had to release the draft plan to the public as well as the vote and justification of each panel member. To date, no panels have voted down a plan.

Financial Match from the State

Under the CWSSI law, there is a one-time financial match from the savings in the first year of each county's adopted plan. Thus, each county with a Shared Services Plan that is finalized in 2017 would be eligible for a one-time match from the state of the net savings from the new shared service actions that are implemented and achieved among multiple jurisdictions between January 1 and December 31 of 2018. Counties that finalize Shared Services Plans in 2018 will be eligible for a one-time state match for savings achieved between January 1 and December 31 of 2019. The Department of State will develop an application for counties to apply for state funds to match the net savings achieved from each new Shared Services Plan action implemented in the aforementioned timeline. Only actually and demonstrably realized net savings, rather than expected savings from Shared Services Plans, are eligible for the match.



The Policy Rationale behind the County-Wide Shared Services Initiative

As described by the New York State Division of Budget's *Briefing Book*, the policy and legislative intent behind the CWSSI was "to help reduce the burden of high property taxes"⁴ as well to find more efficient delivery of services and programs. Below, we briefly examine the rationale behind the law.


4 New York State Division of the Budget, *Briefing Book for Fiscal Year 2017-18* (pg. 85) located at <https://www.budget.ny.gov/pubs/executive/eBudget1718/fy1718littlebook/BriefingBook.pdf>.

Why Counties?

The logic behind having counties convene the process at the local level was three-fold: (1) every resident in New York lives in a county, but not necessarily a village or a city, for instance; (2) counties are, in many ways, the most regional⁵ form of local government; and, (3) because other local units of municipal governments — towns, villages, and cities — with few exceptions, are wholly contained within the boundaries of counties. However, though more regional in size and scope, the size of a county can vary greatly (e.g., Hamilton County has a population under 5,000 — smaller than many other towns and villages).

Among the Nation's Highest Property Taxes

Property taxes were first imposed in New York in 1654 when it was a Dutch Colony, New Amsterdam. Today, property taxes help fund local government and school programs and services. Counties, towns, villages, cities, fire districts, and other special taxing districts (e.g., certain library districts — subject to voter approval) have independent power to levy property taxes.




The local property tax remains one of the most significant tax burdens in New York State. Counties in New York have among the highest property taxes in the nation. The median property tax burden in New York (\$4,330) is more than twice the national median. In 2003, the total property tax levies for counties, towns, villages, cities, school districts and fire districts was \$24.6 billion. By 2015, total property tax levies rose to \$42.8 billion — or 74 percent.

New York ranks fourth overall among all states in median local property taxes paid.⁶ However, if broken down to the county level, Westchester County has the highest property taxes in the nation — more than four times higher than the national median — and five of the fifteen counties with the highest property taxes in the nation are in New York. The other counties in the top fifteen (Nassau, Rockland, Putnam, and Suffolk) are

5 New York Department of State, *Local Government Handbook* (pg. 39) at https://www.dos.ny.gov/lg/publications/Local_Government_Handbook.pdf.

6 U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey. New Jersey (\$7,171) is first, Connecticut (\$5,107) is second, New Hampshire (\$4,927) is third, and New York (\$4,330) is fourth. The national median is \$2,107.

located downstate. However, when you measure in property taxes as a percentage of home value, upstate counties have among the highest property taxes in the nation.⁷



Until the state enacted the inflationary real property tax cap with a maximum annual increase of two percent,⁸ annual property tax increases in counties, towns, villages, cities, school districts, and fire districts exceeded inflation — at more than twice the rate. School districts (with fire districts a close second) have the highest annual property tax increases and cities the smallest increase (see Figure 1).

School districts make up approximately 72 percent of an average homeowner's total property tax bill with counties accounting for 12 percent, towns 9 percent, cities 2 percent, villages 3 percent, and fire districts 2 percent.

Therefore, a central reason behind the state law was reducing property taxes.

7 See, Tax Foundation's "Median Effective Property Tax Rates by County, Ranked by Taxes as a Percentage of Household Income, 3-Year Average, 2008-2010," July 27, 2012. Nineteen of the twenty highest taxed counties by home value were in upstate New York: Orleans (1), Wayne (2), Niagara (3), Allegany (4), Monroe (5), Cortland (6), Seneca (7), Chautauqua (8), Cattaraugus (9), Montgomery (10), Genesee (11), Livingston (12), Oswego (13), Wyoming (14), Erie (15), Steuben (16), Cayuga (17), Chemung (18), and Onondaga (19).

8 Since the enactment of the property tax cap, the average annual growth in real property taxes has been reduced from 5.3 percent (2000-10) to 2.2 percent. See *The New York State Property Tax Cap 2015 Report* (Albany: Office of Governor Andrew M. Cuomo, n.d.), <https://www.governor.ny.gov/sites/governor.ny.gov/files/atoms/files/PropertyTaxCap.pdf>.

Table 1. Percentage of Local Government and School District Revenue from Property Taxes

Type	Property Tax as a Percentage of Total Revenue
Counties	21%
Cities	22%
Towns	46%
Villages	43%
School Districts	46%
Fire Districts	83%
Source: Office of the State Comptroller, “Open Book,” http://www.openbooknewyork.com/ , 2015 data.	

Improving Local Government Efficiency

To address the state’s property tax burden, the CWSSI’s intent was to try to improve local government efficiency. We note that many of the plans included detailed histories of past shared services. Indeed, local governments play a critical role in delivering services in communities. However, the system of local governments and other entities is complex — not only for average citizens, but public officials alike. In many ways, it’s not a coherent system; it is a series of patchwork entities that were created to meet certain needs over time, which in turn has grown increasingly cumbersome

There are thousands of different types of local governmental entities, with varying degree of autonomy, taxing and debt issuing authority, and with overlapping jurisdiction. There are thousands of local entities⁹ with taxing authority including, but not limited to: 693 school districts, 932 towns, 545 villages, sixty-two cities, fifty-seven counties, 891 fire districts, and about seventy independent special districts. Layered on top of these independent taxing authorities are thousands of other local entities that do not have independent real property taxing authority, but in many cases, have the power to assess other fees or issue debt such as 7,621 town special districts, 144 county special districts, 374 local public authorities, fifty-eight soil and water conservation districts, forty-three consolidated health districts, and 126 business improvement districts. Finally, there are 2,472 private not-for-profit corporations or associations, like local development corporations, library associations, and fire departments that are created to provide government-like service. Although they have no independent taxing authority, many can issue bonds and the like.

9 See Office of the State Comptroller’s “Number of Local Governments and Other Local Entities” as of December 2016, <http://osc.state.ny.us/localgov/datanstat/files/entitytablessummary.pdf#search=%20taxing%20entities>.

Table 2. Types of Local Governmental Entities	
Type	Number
Counties	57
Towns	932
Villages	545
Cities	62
Fire Districts	891
School Districts	693
Independent Special Districts	70
Town Special Districts	7,621
County Special Districts	144
Local Public Authorities	374
Soil & Water Conservation Districts	58
Consolidated Health Districts	43
Business Improvement Districts	126
Private not-for-profit corporations or associations, like local development corporations, library associations, and fire departments that are created to provide government-like service	2,472
Source: Office of the State Comptroller.	

Some local governments are also experiencing fiscal distress. Legislation enacted in 2013 created the Financial Restructuring Board for Local Governments to help struggling municipalities restructure their finances. To date, the Restructuring Board is currently reviewing or has completed reviews for twenty municipalities, and the CWSSI is an additional tool to assist these municipalities to get on stronger financial footing.

While the state has argued that inefficiencies and duplication drives increased local costs, some counties responded in their plans, that increased costs are driven by federal and state mandates. Chenango, Dutchess, Erie, Franklin, Fulton, Madison, Monroe, Oneida, Onondaga, Ontario, Oswego, Westchester, and Yates noted that increasing property tax costs are also a result of unfunded mandates from the state, including the Taylor Law and Triborough Amendment; Wicks Law; the Medicaid funding framework that split costs with counties (which the state has noted it has taken over 100 percent of any additional costs to counties); the absence of a strong “ability to pay” criterion in binding arbitration; and the costly civil service provisions, including 207a and 207c of the General Municipal Law regarding firefighter and police officer disability benefits.

Review of the County-Wide Shared Services Plans

In all, out of the fifty-seven applicable counties, thirty-four (or nearly 60 percent) submitted adopted plans to the state. In addition, several of the counties that deferred final action until next year, including Chemung, Orange, and Tioga, submitted draft

plans to the state. We reviewed all thirty-four plans that were approved and submitted, as well as the material submitted by the remaining counties that deferred until 2018.

The Overall Completeness of the Plans

There was wide variation among the counties in how they presented their plans and how detailed the methodologies were in determining their savings. With greater resources to bear, the assumption was that larger counties would be more complete and sophisticated in their underlying analysis. That wasn't always the case. In many cases, the smaller counties provided more detailed information behind their estimates and assumptions. For example, Cattaraugus and Schuyler Counties provided significant detail to back up their savings estimates and assumptions, while Suffolk County did not provide as much detail. Franklin County's plan was not in-depth and was not long at two pages, but it provided considerable detail on how they arrived at their savings by clearly stating their assumptions. Nassau County provided a tremendous amount of detail, but the data was not well organized or presented in an easy-to-understand or synthesized fashion.

Some counties provided virtually no detail on how they arrived at their savings estimates. For example, Columbia County provided virtually no details in their one-page plan; Broome, provided newspaper articles summarizing their process, but virtually no backup of their savings methodologies; Clinton County submitted a one-and-a-half page spreadsheet with little detail; Livingston County provided a spreadsheet with each proposal broken down by savings, but without any methodology of how they arrived at their savings; Dutchess, Monroe, Ulster, and Westchester Counties had more detailed sheets breaking down the cost for each proposal, but with very little detail on their methodologies and assumptions; Saratoga provided a short summary of their two proposals; and Wyoming County had a high-level one-page spreadsheet.

On the other hand, Albany, Chautauqua, Onondaga, Oneida, Ontario, Rensselaer, Schenectady, and Schuyler Counties provided detailed summaries of how they arrived at their savings for each proposal, including detailed methodologies.

Projects and Savings Overview

The law required counties submit net savings anticipated in calendar year 2018, calendar year 2019, and annually thereafter.

In total, counties submitted 389 proposals adopted resulting in \$208 million in projected savings in 2018, \$75 million in 2019, and \$76.1 million in recurring savings thereafter.

The Rockefeller Institute of Government computed its own project counts and 2018 savings values for each project based on its own review of individual reports. Specifically, the Institute used coversheets submitted by the counties — in addition to project descriptions found in the more detailed reports — as the basis for the project count and total 2018 savings. Moreover, the Rockefeller Institute of Government did additional research based on media reports and inference



Overall, the top five counties with the largest overall fully implemented recurring property tax savings were Suffolk (\$20.9 million), Dutchess (\$12.5 million), Albany (\$9.7 million), Montgomery (\$4.6 million), and Erie (\$4.2 million).


about which projects were withdrawn (but not clearly marked as such in the reports). Taken together, likely accounts for some of the initial slight differences in totals reported elsewhere.¹⁰

When ranking counties by highest tax savings reported in the first year (2018), Nassau County is first (\$130.5 million) followed by Broome County (\$20.3 million), Suffolk County (\$16.5 million), Dutchess County (\$15.2 million), and Monroe County (\$7.3 million).

If you ranked counties by reported recurring tax savings in the out-years, the top five are Suffolk (\$20.9 million), Dutchess (\$12.5 million), Albany (\$9.7 million), Montgomery (\$4.6 million), and Erie (\$4.2 million).¹¹ A chart summarizing the totals by county can be found at Appendix C.

As was mentioned above, the CWSSI law required that the sum total of net savings in such plan must be certified as being anticipated in calendar year 2018, calendar year 2019, and annually thereafter. However, seven of the thirty-four counties that adopted plans this year failed to properly report this financial information. Those counties were Broome, Columbia, Livingston, Nassau, St. Lawrence, Wayne, and Wyoming counties. In every case these counties submitted at least 2018 savings, but did not submit the required 2019 and fully implemented projections. Given that some of the counties did not provided the legally required fiscal information the \$76.1 million total recurring savings in the out-years is incomplete, and likely higher.

Figure 2. Total Property Tax Savings in All Adopted Plans



10 In the absence of a uniform template for reporting, some counties failed to break down estimated savings by project. Consequently, our estimate of approximately \$208 million is likely under inclusive. For example, this estimate excludes savings from Columbia, St. Lawrence, and Suffolk because individual project savings could not be ascertained from their shared services reports. Several additional counties, including Broome, Franklin, and Madison, reported “total” or “estimated” savings without specifying the year of accrual. Although these latter estimates were included in our analysis, they may more accurately reflect fully phased in savings.

11 Note: Nassau County was not included because the county submitted incomplete data that was required under the law. Specifically, they provided a year one savings of \$130 million, but not year two, or the fully implemented out-years.

Savings Compared to County Population and Property Tax Burden

We also reviewed the county recurring property tax savings in relation to their size and overall property tax burden. One could assume that the counties with the larger populations would have the larger total savings in total dollars. In some cases, that was true. The most populated counties — including Suffolk, Monroe, Erie, Dutchess, and Albany — submitted more total recurring savings to the state. (See Appendix H for a full breakdown of tax savings by population.)

However, quite a different picture emerged in other cases. When breaking down the savings compared to the size and property tax burden of the counties, there is significant variation among them.

For instance, of the four largest counties (populations of 500,000 or more), Westchester County found the least reported recurring tax savings (\$1.2 million), while Suffolk County found significantly more tax savings than Westchester (\$20.9 million). Additionally, the remaining highest populated counties, Monroe and Erie, found more overall tax savings than Westchester.

In other cases, much smaller counties reported larger overall tax savings than some of the state's largest counties. Montgomery County stands out in this case. Montgomery County, with a population of less than 50,000 people, identified \$4.6 million in recurring tax savings versus Westchester County with nearly one million people which found \$1.2 million in savings. In fact, Montgomery County had greater property tax savings than several other much larger counties, including Erie, Onondaga, Saratoga, and Oneida counties.

Finally, other smaller counties outperformed some of the largest counties in the state. Dutchess (\$12.5 million) and Albany (\$9.7 million) counties with populations of approximately 300,000 each, found greater savings than Erie County (\$4.2 million), which is three times the size of Dutchess and Albany, as well as Monroe County (\$7.3 millions), which has nearly 750,000 people.

An interesting picture emerges when you compare a county's overall recurring property tax savings with overall property tax burden. Counties with higher total property tax burdens did not necessarily find more recurring tax savings. Figure 3 shows the overall tax savings by county in order of overall property tax burden. For example, Westchester County has the highest property tax burden in the state — and the nation



For the four largest counties (populations of 500,000 or more), Westchester County found the least recurring tax savings (\$1.2 million), while Suffolk County found 178 percent more tax savings than Westchester (\$20.9 million).




On tax savings, Montgomery County stands out. With a population of less than 50,000 people, Montgomery found \$4.6 million in recurring tax savings versus Westchester County with nearly 1 million people, which found \$1.2 million in savings.

— and found less recurring tax savings than eleven counties with lower property taxes. Suffolk County, on the other hand, has the fifth highest property tax burden in the state, but it exceeds every other counties' total reported recurring tax savings. Counties such as Albany, Erie, and Montgomery that fall in the relative middle in overall property tax burden in the state, exceed the recurring savings of several other counties with higher property taxes such as Tompkins, Rensselaer, Schenectady, and Ulster.



Counties such as Albany, Erie, and Montgomery that fall in the relative middle in overall property tax burden in the state, exceed the recurring savings of several other counties with higher property taxes such as Tompkins, Rensselaer, Schenectady, and Ulster.




Breakdown by Average Savings per Taxpayer

Using data reported by the counties, an average per taxpayer savings averages to roughly \$46 per taxpayer annually when all plans are fully implemented. However, given the reporting issues with counties, it is unclear how accurate the per-taxpayer savings are at this time.

As Figure 4 shows, Nassau, Broome, Montgomery, Dutchess, and Albany Counties reported the largest savings per taxpayer for 2018, while Oneida, Wyoming, Franklin, St. Lawrence, and Yates Counties are at the bottom. Nassau County was highest at \$317.56 and the lowest was St. Lawrence County at \$0.02 per taxpayer. (We eliminated Yates, given they did not submit any proposals in their plan.)


Figure 4. Average Annual Taxpayer Savings by County (2018)



Note: Information submitted by counties was inconsistent. Some counties did not submit this as part of their final plan.

Savings by Region

Figure 5. Project Savings by Regional Economic Development Councils



When looking at the overall fully phased in savings and projects by Regional Economic Development Council regions, Long Island had the most savings, with the Mid-Hudson Valley coming in a close second. The North Country trailed, with less than \$1.5 million fully phased in. In terms of total projects, the Finger Lakes and Hudson Valley regions had the most (sixty-four), while North Country had the least (nineteen).

Plans and Savings by Types of County Governing Bodies

In general, jurisdictions with the legally strongest, most politically independent, locally grounded executives were least likely to defer their adoption of their shared services plans in the first year. In fact, as Table 3 illustrates, counties with elected executives deferred the adoption of their plans about half the time that appointed county managers did.

New York State has sixty-two counties. Five are within greater New York City, and do not function independently as general purpose governments (the boroughs of New York City). The remaining fifty-seven are among the state's general purpose local governments that are constitutionally required to have "... a legislative body elected by the people thereof...."¹² Thirty-four of these are organized and function under the

¹² Article IX §1.a.

State's County and Alternative County Government laws, which initially vests governing authority in either a board comprised of the supervisors of the county's constituent towns or a separately elected legislature.¹³

The remaining twenty-three counties have adopted home rule charters under the provisions of Article IX of the state constitution which provides that "Counties, other than those wholly included within a city, shall be empowered by general law, or by special law enacted upon county request ... to adopt, amend or repeal alternative forms of county government provided by the legislature or to prepare, adopt, amend or repeal alternative forms of their own."¹⁴

In 2017 there were sixteen counties operating with boards of supervisors and forty-two — twenty-three with charters and eighteen others — with legislatures. Boards of Supervisors are the traditional governing structure for counties in New York State. Legislature systems in counties were created in response to United States Supreme Court's one-person-one-vote decisions of the mid-1960s. Board of Supervisor systems in counties that retained them were able to achieve compliance with one-person-one-vote by adopting weighted voting schemes.

Though most have separate executives, there is no state constitutional requirement that county governments in New York State have a separation of powers system. In seven counties with Boards of Supervisors and three with legislatures executive duties are performed by the body's presiding officer, elected by his or her peers. A county operating under state law may choose to adopt one of four specified alternative forms of government with varying degrees of independent executive authority. Counties may appoint: an administrator (who may also be the board chair) to serve conterminously with the elected board; a director to serve a fixed four-year term; or a manager — uniquely given authority to appoint and remove other department heads — to serve at its pleasure. Or a county may choose to have a president elected to a four-year term, with veto power.¹⁵ If one of these options are chosen, executive powers and responsibilities are specified in state law.¹⁶ Currently, seven counties operating with Boards of Supervisors have administrators, and two employ managers. Three of the counties with legislatures and operating under state law assign executive duties to the legislative chair, four have managers, and eleven employ administrators. The director and president options for counties are not currently in use.

Of the twenty-three charter counties, eighteen have chosen a separation of powers system with an elected executive. These tend to be the state's largest counties in population and size of budget. Three have managers, and two administrators. The powers and duties of these executives are locally determined; they are based in the county charter, not state law.

13 County Law. Article 4. § 150, 150a; Alternative County Government Law. Article 3, §100-102 .

14 Article IX §1(h)(1)

15 Alternative County Government law/ Article 2. §53.

16 Alternative County Government Law Article 4.

Table 3. Executive Type and Deferral of Compliance Numbers and Percent of Counties			
	Total	Deferred	% Deferring
Leg. Chair	10	6	60
Administrator	20	8	40
Manager	9	4	44*
Elected Executive	18	4	22
	57	22	39
*None of these are charter counties.			

Twenty-two counties deferred compliance with the 2017 state shared services planning requirement. Of these, six (or 37.5 percent with this form of government) were governed through Boards of Supervisors. Half of these Board of Supervisor counties had no separate executive, two had administrators and one had a manager. Of the remaining sixteen counties that deferred, six had administrators, four had elected executives, three had managers and three had no separation of powers in their governments. Additionally, none of the three with manager systems was a charter county.

Summary of Plans by Project Category

Many plans that were submitted illustrated that they built on past work. In addition to real property tax savings, finding more efficiencies in government were also a central element to the plans. Initiatives were classified based on the type of services performed. A cursory analysis of each county's shared services report finds that CWSSI participants produced a range of programs in twelve main areas. Those areas are: public health and insurance; emergency services; sewer, water, and waste management systems; energy procurement; parks and recreation; education and workforce training; law and courts; shared equipment, personnel, and services; joint purchasing; government reorganization; transportation and highway departments; and, records management and administrative functions. Table 4 includes the total number of projects and 2018 savings by type of service.

The Institute only used 2018 data when breaking down by project in this section because it was the most complete.

Table 4. 2018 Savings and Number of Projects, by Category

Service	No. Projects	2018 Projected Savings
Public Health and Insurance	25	\$14,957,388.00
Emergency Services	25	\$21,642,225.00
Sewer, Water, and Waste Management Systems	26	\$131,820,378.00
Energy Procurement	23	\$2,365,144.00
Parks and Recreation	16	\$731,818.00
Education and Workforce Training	1	\$800,000.00
Law and Courts	26	\$3,715,296.00
Shared Equipment, Personnel, and Services	68	\$9,309,354.76
Joint Purchasing	27	\$1,714,596.00
Reorganization	5	\$1,134,540.00
Transportation & Highway Departments	77	\$13,014,848.00
Records Management and Administrative Functions	70	\$6,883,497.00
Total	389	\$208,089,084.76

Note: Projected savings may be under-inclusive as some counties are still evaluating some of their proposed initiatives. Thus, projected savings may be greater than those presented here.

Public Health and Insurance

Pooling health insurance costs is an area that could result in significant savings to municipalities. Several counties, including Albany, Broome, Monroe, Saratoga, Schenectady, and Tompkins, are developing health consortia designed to improve the quality of health care and reduce costs — finding at least \$10.8 million in savings.

Under existing law, small municipalities are often prohibited from adopting a self-insured plan because “the small number of health contracts and the potential volatility of a small pool of contracts present too much risk” (*Schenectady County County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan*). However, by aggregating municipalities into one self-insured consortium, smaller municipalities are able to participate and achieve greater savings.



Several counties including Albany, Broome, Monroe, Saratoga, Schenectady, and Tompkins are developing health consortia designed to improve the quality of health care and reduce costs—finding at least \$10.8 million in savings.

In Schenectady County, for example, local officials engaged health care consultants from Locey and Cahill, LLC, to evaluate alternative models under Articles 44 (Employee Welfare Funds) and 47 (Municipal Cooperative Health Benefit Plans) of the New York State Insurance Law. Following an analysis of demographic and health cost claims data, health care plans, labor contract language, and premium equivalent rates, Locey and Cahill, LLC, identified approximately \$766,000 in initial savings. Under the consortium model, the county predicts that the majority of savings will “accrue to the

smaller municipalities that cannot independently capitalize on the savings of a self-insured plan.”

In addition to developing health care consortia, several others are considering participation in pharmaceutical prescription programs. In Albany County, for example, local officials are considering joining the Capital District BOCES Pharmacy Purchasing Coalition, which would allow schools to collectively purchase pharmacy benefits without sacrificing existing coverage. Similar pharmaceutical coalitions that seek to leverage large-scale group purchasing discounts are under consideration in Broome and Franklin Counties, as well.

Other counties committed to pursuing health insurance coalitions/consortia in the future such as Ontario and Rensselaer counties.

Emergency Services

In just over ten counties, local officials proposed to consolidate emergency communications, fire and ambulance services, and dispatch operations for a total of \$21.6 million in 2018 projected savings. While in some instances, the county will assume responsibility for dispatch services and emergency communication systems, others seek to shrink costs and generate savings through shared personnel and equipment. With respect to the former, Sullivan County 911 has agreed to provide police dispatching services to the town of Fallsburg. With a population of 12,870, the town has struggled to meet growing demands for policing without raising taxes. However, by empowering Sullivan County 911 to take over its police dispatching services, the town will be able to add up to five additional police officer positions, or one additional officer per shift (*Sullivan County Shared Services Final Plan and Report*).

By comparison, Chautauqua County plans to offset the administrative burden placed on individual fire companies by hiring a full-time administrator (*County-Wide Shared Service Property Tax Savings Plan for Chautauqua County*). As the ranks of volunteer firefighters continue to dwindle, the county believes that a shared staff person will reduce the growing paperwork burden imposed on fire chiefs and extend the availability and activity of existing volunteers. In order to identify current and future needs for support, Chautauqua County will conduct a thorough evaluation of existing operations under the direction of local fire service leaders. Undoubtedly, their participation in the Countywide Fire Services Initiative will result in greater buy in.

Sewer, Water, and Waste Management Systems

In 2018, the greatest level of projected savings was reported in sewer, water, and waste management service. However, nearly all projected savings in this area are contingent on a single initiative, namely the \$128 million plan to consolidate sewage treatment services in the city of Long Beach with Nassau County. If the plan is successful, the city’s wastewater will be transported through an aqueduct under Sunrise Highway to Bay Park Water Reclamation Facility, where Nassau County is currently installing advanced denitrification technology. Once treated, the city’s wastewater will be transported to the Cedar Creek Wastewater Treatment Plant and pumped into the Atlantic Ocean. In June 2017, city officials told the *Long Island Herald* that the project would prevent more than fifteen tons of pollutants from being deposited into Reynolds Channel and the Western Bays.

The remaining initiatives in this area are far more modest in size and scope. In Schuylar County, for example, the villages of Watkins Glen and Montour Falls hope to achieve cost savings by developing a joint wastewater treatment plant. In addition to decommissioning existing plants and building a new state-of-the-art facility, both villages plan to create a regional governing structure comprised of all municipal users. Cost savings of \$200,000 will be achieved primarily by reducing staffing levels. However, the county anticipates that, by decommissioning existing sites, two additional waterfront locations will become available for future development.

In addition to shared facilities, counties such as Chautauqua plan to address staffing problems by developing a shared pool of water and wastewater system operators. While smaller municipalities are generally forced to rely on a single operator who is almost “always on call,” larger systems attempt to meet staffing shortages with costly overtime pay. By combining staff from as many as twelve municipalities, several of which are located in neighboring Cattaraugus County, the Chautauqua Region Water & Wastewater Cooperative aims to reduce staffing costs by as much as 20 percent (or \$317,000 annually), while improving the overall quality of service.

Finally, other municipalities plan to share responsibility for water and sewer line construction. In the town of Dickinson, for example, SUNY Broome and Broome County signed a three-way agreement to install a new waterline on the SUNY Broome campus. The town of Dickinson will perform the work, which will result in a savings of \$64,000 to the county.

Energy Procurement and Efficiency

Many counties, like Albany, Clinton, Monroe, and Schenectady adopted proposals to pool energy costs and implement energy efficiency program. Several counties are already participating in the Municipal Electric and Gas Alliance (MEGA) — a multicounty/municipality energy purchasing consortium. In Albany and Monroe Counties, participation in Choice Aggregation programs will allow local governments to achieve the most competitive prices for electricity by encouraging municipalities to collectively purchase energy products and services. In Albany, each municipality must pass a local law to participate. However, residents and businesses may opt out of the program at any time. An initial savings of \$1,000,000 is expected in Albany County in 2019. Other counties considering participation in the Municipal Electric and Gas Alliance are Cattaraugus, Clinton, Schenectady, and Sullivan.

As many as five counties are considering the possibility of converting conventional street lighting to LED lights, which use approximately 75 percent less energy than traditional incandescent lights. Although the cost to taxpayers for street lighting has compelled local officials to consider alternatives, counties have responded in a multitude of ways. In Albany, for example, the county plans to address local concerns about the specialized maintenance of lights, overall capital costs, and negative encounters with utility companies by centralizing installation services and developing a team of shared maintenance personnel for those municipalities and school districts that need assistance with upkeep. By comparison, Rensselaer teamed up with Siemens Corporation, one of the world’s largest producers of energy-efficient technologies, “to provide the County with an evaluation of energy savings for street lights, to work with National Grid to coordinate buyout of existing street lights and to provide a turnkey solution to migrate existing street lights to LED.” Still other counties have expanded

these initiatives beyond street lighting to include municipal buildings. In Schenectady, for example, the establishment of a Municipal Lighting Fund seeks to incentivize installation of LED fixtures through a \$125,000 co-fund. To access the fund, municipalities will be required to take advantage of other rebate programs, including those offered by National Grid. However, the county will continue to identify and apply for grant funding. Based on the fund's current size, Schenectady estimates over \$54,000 in annual savings.

Parks and Recreation

Seven counties proposed more than fifteen different initiatives designed to cut back on the costs of maintaining recreational facilities including parks, sports fields, and outdoor movie theaters. As just one example, the village of East Aurora in Erie County has agreed to allow the town of Aurora to utilize a number of village-owned facilities for its summer recreational program, including a general-purpose building, restrooms, tennis courts, and sports fields. In return, the town has promised to provide maintenance services for the facilities while in use. Whereas this arrangement will save East Aurora approximately \$8,000 in annual maintenance fees, not having to rent such facilities will save the town of Aurora nearly \$18,000 per season. In a similar vein, Broome and Onondaga Counties plan to merge resources and consolidate personnel by offering mowing and landscaping services to several municipalities. Also of note is Onondaga's proposed web-based data center, which would provide park facility reservations and rental information for every park located in Onondaga County regardless of municipality jurisdiction.

Education and Workforce Training

A few initiatives focused on education and workforce training initiatives. One notable example is Montgomery County's DSS (Department of Social Services) to Work Initiative. Under this initiative, local officials partnered with Fulton Montgomery Community College to develop Job Readiness Skills Training, "a four-week workshop that ... mentors participants towards creating positive attitudes and workplace behaviors they need to begin and change their lives." Beginning in 2018, Montgomery County DSS plans to expand working relationships to include several local school and Hamilton-Fulton-Montgomery BOCES, "drawing upon resources available through the Summer Youth Employment Program and the extraordinarily innovative Agricultural PTECH (Pathway to Technology) program."

Law and Courts

Reorganizing and consolidating courts was included in many plans. Nearly twenty-six initiatives, totaling a projected savings of \$3.7 million in 2018, fall under the heading of law and courts. Shared services in this area generally take on one of three forms:

- First, numerous counties expressed interest in exploring the consolidation of town and village courts. In Broome County, for example, the town of Kirkwood is planning to take over town of Conklin Courts, resulting in \$60,000 savings for Conklin and \$25,000 in revenue for Kirkwood. Still others plan to build new facilities. Thus, in Montgomery, the county plans to construct a shared municipal court building featuring spaces for jury deliberation, client-lawyer conference rooms, holding rooms for prisoners, and clerical offices. Greater cost efficiencies

will result from avoiding building costs, reducing utility expenses, and shrinking personnel.

- Second, at least two municipalities are considering shared police services. Whereas the village of Rouses seeks to eliminate its police department and transfer services to the Clinton County Sheriff's Department, Nassau is taking the reverse approach. More specifically, Nassau plans to transfer law enforcement services for Bayville Village to the village of Centre Island Police Department for an estimated cost savings of \$500,000.
- Finally, several municipalities plan to share law enforcement training and equipment. In Onondaga, for example, the village of Liverpool Police Department will sponsor a three-day Certified Breath Analysis Operator training session. By utilizing the Liverpool Police Department in-house certified training officers, these sessions will be open to other agencies at significant cost savings. As another example, the city of Rochester has requested a police records management system to be implemented in parts of Monroe County, but projected savings have yet to be determined.

Other counties, such as Cattaraugus, did not include a formal proposal, but would explore court consolidation in the future.

Shared Equipment, Personnel, and Services

Virtually every county proposed sharing specialty equipment, services and personnel among local governments and school districts. While many informal agreements were already in place, several counties plan to formalize these arrangements through signing a memorandum of understanding. Some of the most common cites for shared services include the following:

- *Animal Control*: New York State law requires towns and cities to appoint dog control officers (DCOs), as well as some villages. As observed by Rensselaer County, DCOs are often “responsible for capturing and impounding dangerous or stray animals, investigating cases of animal cruelty, enforcing licensing laws, providing expert testimony in court cases, rescuing trapped animals, writing incident reports, and providing humane care to animals under their supervision,” (*Rensselaer County 2017 County-wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan*). Despite the magnitude of their responsibilities, many DCOs are either part-time, on-call, or contracted out, resulting in costly and sometimes insufficient coverage. Thus, two towns in Erie County plan to share dog control services on a fee-for-service basis. Whereas the town of Evans will answer calls from Eden and North Collins at a flat rate of \$50 per call, Orchard Park will service the towns of Aurora and Colden at \$100 per call. By way of comparison, Rensselaer is considering moving dog control responsibilities to the County Sheriff's Department in an effort to reduce overreliance on part-time and civilian DCOs. This plan is expected to have several benefits including the elimination of safety concerns that arise when civilian DCOs answer calls related to domestic disputes, drug dealers, and other illegal activity. Moreover, deputies assigned to dog control duty will possess the power of arrest. Finally, enhanced enforcement of unregistered dogs is expected to result in greater municipal revenue for licensing fees. If feasible, preliminary estimates suggest that switching to a

county-wide system in Rensselaer could save project partners approximately \$38,800 per year.

- **Code Enforcement:** Municipalities in as many as four counties are considering shared code enforcement operations. Perhaps the most detailed of these initiatives originates from Schuyler County, where local municipalities currently provide safety inspections to meet their own needs. Although eight of the county's twelve towns and villages already share staff, decentralization has resulted in a dizzying array of titles and administrative costs. The county thus plans to improve the quality and efficiency of work by establishing a centralized department, which will ultimately be located in a single municipality. All remaining municipalities will enter into an inter-municipal agreement to contract for services in three distinct coverage areas, namely residential, commercial, and property maintenance. As part of the analysis to determine the feasibility and potential costs savings of centralized code enforcement, it was concluded that a centralized system consisting of six full-time employees (one coordinator, two code enforcement officers, two safety inspectors, and one clerk) will expedite the inspection process and generate potential savings of \$8,772.
- **Geographic Information Systems (GIS):** Two counties, Cattaraugus and Steuben, will provide GIS mapping services to assist municipalities in planning their infrastructure. Compared to using an outside firm, which can levy flat rate charges as high as \$100 for data storage and consulting, costs for mapping services provided by Cattaraugus County will result in a one-time savings of \$24,000.
- **Personnel:** Several municipalities expressed interest in sharing specialty personnel, including construction crews, lawyers, animal control officers, assessors, financial advisers, and engineers. However, the structure for sharing personnel varies significantly across counties. For example, Albany hopes to develop a county-wide workforce database containing data for all Albany County employees and its municipalities to facilitate collaborative workforce management. By comparison, Broome County utilizes student interns from Binghamton University to perform a range of duties in place of salaried employees, resulting in savings of \$40,000.

Joint Purchasing

Seventeen of the thirty-four participating counties also proposed joint purchasing agreements for materials, parts, and services, sometimes through the county, or among the various municipalities. As just one example, Albany County will create a centralized purchasing system, available to all municipalities, for such items and services as medical supplies, software, computer hardware, equipment, telecommunication systems, gasoline, diesel fuel, waste removal, recycling, electrical, plumbing, heating, ventilation, and air conditioning (HVAC), and asbestos removal.

Governmental Reorganization

Local municipalities in at least four counties are exploring the possibility of consolidation and dissolution. According to a summary of [Article 17-A](#) of the general Municipal Law, “[t]he consolidation of local government entities can result either in the elimination of the original local governments and the forming of a new local

governmental entity or in one surviving governmental entity with the others absorbed into it.” By comparison, “dissolution is the termination of a local government entity” (note Article 17-A does not apply to agency consolidations within municipalities). In Chautauqua County, municipal officials are considering both options. Thus, local leaders of the towns of Gerry and Charlotte are seeking a merger with the understanding that the largest source of savings will stem from cost reductions in the highway departments. Indeed, the combined highway crews will be less likely to contract for services from outside agencies; the combined department will purchase less capital equipment; and the cost of administrative functions is also likely to decline (*County-wide Shared Service Property Tax Savings Plan: Chautauqua County*). By comparison, the village of Cherry Creek is seeking dissolution into the larger town. Spurred by a petition from residents under Article 17-A, negotiations led to a dissolution plan that currently enjoys support from the town board. However, because the town has already assumed many local services, dissolution is expected to result in relatively minor savings. Similar initiatives are under study in the village of Cattaraugus in Cattaraugus County and the village of Cazenovia in Madison County.

Montgomery County was among the most aggressive in proposing consolidation and dissolution of municipalities and departments. Montgomery’s plan included:

- The dissolution of the village of Canajoharie into the town of Canajoharie.
- Consolidation of the county public health and mental health departments.
- Consolidation of the courts of several towns.
- Consolidation of several village policy departments into the county sheriff’s office.
- Consolidation of eleven property tax assessing districts into the county.
- Consolidation of thirteen vehicle repair shops into one.



Montgomery County was among the most aggressive in proposing consolidation and dissolution of municipalities and departments.

Transportation and Highway Departments

Overall, participating counties proposed the greatest number of projects in the areas of transportation and highway departments. By and large, a significant number of these counties and their corresponding municipalities aim to share materials, parts and services that are necessary to the safe and efficient operations of their Public Works Departments. This may include county-wide purchase of salt, sand, asphalt zippers, excavators, and other public works equipment. In Cattaraugus, as in many other places, “[t]he County’s buying power allows it to obtain discounted prices on products and services due to volume and competition among its many vendors. Municipalities are able to piggyback on material bids or purchase items from the County at costs,” (*Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan*). Aside from joint purchasing agreements, nearly half of the participating counties expressed interest in equipment sharing, plowing, street sweeping, snow removal, or repaving services. While the full list of services is too long to reproduce here, some notable examples include the following:

- **Mowing:** In Erie County, nearly twenty-five municipalities plan to assume primary responsibility for grass cutting on county roads. Currently, the county maintains approximately 1,200 center lane miles of roads. Under the proposed initiative, the county would pay municipalities a flat rate per lane mile to mow county roads within their limits. “After taking into account personnel, equipment, fuel and OT costs, of which roughly half is in wasted time and fuel traveling to and from mowing locations,” the county expects to save approximately \$24,000 a year.
- **Plowing:** In Clinton, the town of Black Brook has agreed to plow county roads within its borders. By eliminating travel costs, overtime, and the duplication of efforts, estimated savings to the town and county are \$306,040 and \$274,733, respectively. Plow sharing arrangements are also under consideration in Franklin, Monroe, and Nassau Counties.
- **Paving:** Steuben County plans to chip seal and pave town roads in over thirty municipalities, in addition to loaning out its road grinder and other equipment. By minimizing costs relative to private sector rates, the project is expected to generate annual savings of \$222,500. Dutchess, Sullivan, and Nassau Counties are also considering shared paving services, equipment, and purchasing agreements.
- **Equipment Sharing Platform:** At the request of local supervisors and mayors, Cattaraugus County plans to coordinate shared public works projects between municipalities by launching a computerized public works equipment listing and sharing platform. Although an inventory of existing equipment was compiled by the Department of Emergency Services in 2009, the county plans to update the list to include equipment available in 2017. Once updated, the inventory will be placed in a computerized database, which will allow local highway superintendents to search for and request the use of available equipment online. Although the county anticipates a phased startup, reduced costs in equipment and labor could generate potential savings of \$62,228 as early as 2018.

Records Management and Administrative Functions

Second only to the total number of transportation and highway initiatives, county and municipal government officials identified nearly seventy opportunities to share administrative and “back office” functions. As the [Office of the New York State Comptroller](#) has observed, “business office functions appear to hold promise because there is both the potential for savings and they are often easier to implement.” One way to think about shared service opportunities in this area is to group them by subcategories.

- **Records Management:** With respect to records management, Monroe and Wayne Counties, among several others, are beginning to develop projects that would allow each jurisdiction to store digital records online. While digitizing records may not generate immediate savings, future facility costs can still be substantial. Wayne County, for example, anticipates future storage facility costs of approximately \$5,000,000. Consequently, the county believes that “moving forward is fiscally sound,” even though the impact on the Real Property tax rate will be minimal (*County-Wide Shared Services Plan: Wayne County*).

- *County Tax Collection:* No less than four counties are providing municipalities with access to County Tax Collection Software.
- *Information Technology (IT) Functions:* IT functions may include, but are not limited to IT administration, management (e.g., procurement, maintenance, support) and security. As just one example, Madison County plans to provide IT services for participating towns and villages. Average savings per participant are approximately \$3,500 per year, while total savings are estimated at \$42,000.

Legal and Regulatory Barriers to Shared Services

In our review of the Shared Services Plans submitted by counties to the Division of Budget and Department of State, including draft plans that were not formally adopted, a number of barriers to sharing services between municipalities and school districts were identified. These include:

Impediments to Cooperative Health Insurance Purchasing

This was identified as a problem by Albany, Cattaraugus, Chenango, Columbia, Erie, Madison, Oswego, and Schenectady counties. Currently, municipalities in New York State have three primary options for health care. They can:

- Secure an insured plan (e.g., Blue Cross Blue Shield);
- Participate in a self-insured plan; or
- Select a self-funded plan through a third party administrator, self-administered or through an insurance company.

According to the Cattaraugus County Shared Services plan, approximately thirty counties are self-funded for health insurance. Similar situations occur in school districts, generally coordinated by the local BOCES. Self-funded plans often purchase stop loss insurance to protect themselves against catastrophic illnesses and accident claims. These self-funded plans are not subject to NYS Department of Financial Services oversight or federal Employee Retirement Income Security Act of 1974 (ERISA) regulations.

By state law and/or regulation, local governments with fewer than fifty covered employees (the number increases to 100 if starting after 2016), must be community rated. Only employers with more than fifty covered employees (the number has increased to more than 100 employees starting after 2016) can be experience rated, based on recent claims. Further, municipalities that have fewer than 100 employees cannot buy stop loss insurance. These limits imposed by state law and/or regulation effectively limit the availability of municipal health insurance plans and have the effect of driving municipal health insurance costs higher, particularly for smaller local governments.

When two or more municipalities come together for the purpose of providing employee health insurance, they are subject to either Article 47 or Article 44 of the NYS Insurance Law. The process for achieving Article 47 compliance, for self-insured programs, is both time consuming and costly. Only Tompkins County has been able to achieve compliance, and yet this process took more than three years to complete with the liabilities fully funded. Some of the challenges the Greater Tompkins County

Municipal Health Insurance Consortium faced included the governance structure with labor representation, funding of reserving requirements in advance of the effective date (a significant financial burden for municipalities, especially smaller municipalities); filing of plan documents (insurance certificates); development of budget and premium rate models; and a number of other items that the New York State Department of Financial Services required.

A summary of the impacts of Article 47 of the NYS Insurance Law upon cooperative insurance purchasing is delineated in a document entitled “Cooperative Health Insurance Purchasing: Article 47 Impediments,” which was provided in the Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan. Effectively, the requirements of Article 47 compliance upon a self-insured program significantly impact cost effectiveness.

According to the consultant reports cited in the Albany and Schenectady County Shared Services Plans, the process of forming and operating a consortium under Article 44 of the NYS Insurance Law is less onerous than under Article 47 with less reporting and filing requirements. Medical benefits can be provided through an “employee welfare fund”. For these purposes, an employee welfare fund is a trust fund maintained by one or more employers with one or more labor unions, directly or indirectly through trustees. The benefits can be provided through the purchase of insurance or otherwise. We are unaware, however, of any county that has formed a health insurance consortium under Article 44. This may be due to confusion about whether Article 44 health insurance consortiums are subject to community rating. The Albany County consultant report cites a December 28, 2004 opinion of the Insurance Department’s Office of General Counsel exempting a Taft-Hartley Fund from the small group rules. However, the language of the opinion implies that other trusts established under collective bargaining agreements may qualify.

Both the Albany and Schenectady County Shared Services reports made suggestions regarding policy changes that could make it easier for municipalities to form health insurance consortia. These include:

1. Exempt any municipal employer from the provisions of the “Community Rating Law” if they are eligible to participate in a Municipal Cooperative Health Benefits Plan (Consortium) operating pursuant to Article 5G of the New York State General Municipal Law, Article 44 of the New York State Insurance Law, or Article 47 of the New York State Insurance Law.
2. Provide the New York State Department of Financial Services with the ability to grant waivers from the requirements of the community-rating law for municipal corporations, including school districts and BOCES, when it can be proven that the Consortium would be able to provide better overall benefits at a lesser cost as compared to the community rated health insurance market.
3. Under current state law and regulations, a public-sector health insurance brokerage, like the New York Municipal Benefits Corporation formed by the Capital Region BOCES, cannot refund commissions to the municipalities and school districts that are part of their consortium. This has the effect of increasing the cost of health insurance to municipalities and school districts in a consortium. Insurance Law §4224(c) should be amended to exempt public entities and entities wholly owned or controlled by public entities from the anti-rebating law. In

addition, Education Law §1950 should be amended to expressly authorize a BOCES to create a subsidiary public benefits corporation.

The state Department of Financial Services should work with local governments to find ways to streamline its current regulations and provide technical assistance so that it is easier for counties to form municipal health insurance consortia and reduce health insurance costs for its municipalities and school districts.

Impediments to the Consolidation of Municipal Justice Courts and Reducing the Number of Town Justices

Identified as a problem by Cattaraugus, Hamilton, Madison, Ontario, Wayne, Westchester, and Yates counties, many local governments believe that New York State is restrictive and prescriptive about how the consolidation of justice courts are to be handled.

For the dissolution of a village court, the village must pass a resolution or local law indicating the intent to dissolve into a town court, subject to permissive referendum of village residents. This dissolution can only take effect upon the expiration of the current justices' term.

Town courts may consolidate per NYS Uniform Justice Court Act Section 106-b. The legislature authorizes multiple towns to elect a single justice to preside in the justice courts of two or more adjacent towns within the same county. The Cattaraugus County Shared Services plan explains the process as follows:

The process of electing a single justice would begin with each town enacting a joint resolution agreeing to undertake a study of this idea. This resolution must be filed with the town clerk of each of the participating towns. Once this occurs, a study may begin.

Within 30 days after the study is completed, each town must publish a notice in its official paper notifying the public that a study has been completed, and shall set a time for a Public Hearing on the results of the study. This hearing must be completed no less than 20 to no more than 30 days after the publication of the notice and the Public Hearing.

Within 60 days following the last public hearing, the town boards of each town must decide whether or not they will participate in the joint plan to elect a single justice. If two or more adjacent towns do not approve the plan, the process is then terminated. If the plan is approved by two or more adjacent towns, each board that approves must adopt another resolution. This resolution should call for 1) election of a single justice to preside over the courts, 2) abolition of the existing office(s) of Town Justice in each of the participating towns and 3) the election of a single Town Justice every fourth year thereafter.

Once the joint resolution has been passed, a resolution must then be forwarded to the State Legislature as a "home rule message". The State Legislature will then have to enact legislation implementing the plan.

The shared justice would have jurisdiction in each of the participating towns. The shared justice would be required to keep separate books, dockets and records for each Justice Court, as well as a separate bank

account for each. Revenue would continue to be allocated to each participating Town. (UCJA-IO6-b) The State imposed process to achieve consolidation is deliberate, detailed and cumbersome, it is not amenable to quick implementation. It is also expected the State requirements for maintaining records by municipality may be problematic.

In order for a town to reduce the number of its justices it is subject to permissive referendum as provided by New York State Town Law Article 7, Section 90 through Section 94. In addition, the current options and flexibility offered in Section 106a and Section 106b of the Uniform Justice Court Act lacks the flexibility to deal with two or three towns, when they start out with different numbers of justices. For example, Hamilton County is made up of six towns with two justices and three towns that each have one justice and they have found it difficult to consolidate their town courts due to the restrictions in Section 106a and Section 106b of the Uniform Justice Court Act.

The Yates County Shared Services Plan cites the problem of justice court consolidation into a “district” court that occurs when two of the county’s villages are divided among multiple towns, each of which might or might not choose to participate in a district court. They believe that state legislation is needed to ease this and other barriers to establishment of a “district” court.

Ontario County cited operational and security mandates that increase expenditures relating to the court system including staffing, access control, and the inability to use court facilities for other municipal operations like committee meetings, boards, and community access.

State Education Law Impediments to Shared Services

Under current state education law shared services purchased from a county are not eligible for state education aid reimbursement. This was identified as a problem by Albany, Chautauqua and Onondaga counties. There was support to have the state and counties work together to allow shared services purchased from a county to be eligible for reimbursement (just as it is for BOCES) as long as the shared service is for the same or lower cost than the cost available from BOCES.

School districts cannot obtain power from solar facilities located outside school district boundaries. This makes it difficult for school districts in urban areas to take advantage of solar power. It also makes it impossible for solar collaborations between neighboring school districts and municipalities when economy of scale can result in greater energy cost savings.

Currently Section 8 of the 1950 Education Law does not allow Big Five school districts to participate in cooperative purchasing with BOCES across New York State. It should be amended to allow Big Five school districts to engage in shared bids or piggybacking on BOCES contracts.

Property Tax Assessing by the County

Real Property Tax Law only allows for a one year contract between the towns and county for assessing duties. The law should be changed to allow for a town to dissolve their assessing function if both parties agree. This was identified as a problem by Cattaraugus County. This is similar to when the villages dissolved their assessing. If this is not done, then it would be a disaster if towns buy-in to having the county do their

assessments and then drop out down the road. To insure workflow and quality services there needs to be a change in state statutes to allow for, and even endorse, this option.

Impediments to a County Refinancing Its Municipalities' Debt

Given the current low-interest rate environment, there was an idea to allow the county to offer municipalities an option to consolidate and pool debt. While some municipalities have refinanced and consolidated their debt on their own, lowering interest rates, and therefore overall annual costs, during the process, Albany County floated an idea to pool all municipal debt at a lower rate. However, upon working with the county's bond counsel, it was raised that consolidating debt for municipalities is prohibited. Therefore, the state should work with municipalities to determine the legal impediments and clear a way to give counties more flexibility to pool and refinance local debt.

Need for State Approval to Combine Police Departments Located in Towns within Different Contiguous Counties

This was identified as a problem by Hamilton County. Hamilton County is working with the Town of Inlet and the town of Webb in Herkimer County to allow for one shared police force. This opportunity to combine the Inlet and Webb Police Departments makes fiscal sense and will provide better law enforcement coverage. In order to accomplish this shared services project state legislation is needed but the local governments were unable to obtain legislative approval in 2017.

Lessons Learned: Best Practices and Policies

The first round of the CWSSI program has yielded taxpayer savings, efficiencies, and better coordination among local governments across the state. Many plans submitted highlighted that there were many shared service efforts already underway, yet overall not only did the CWSSI yield additional taxpayer savings, it more importantly created an infrastructure for better coordination and cooperation among local governments.

As county shared services panels move into the implementation phase or complete and adopt plans next year, the following are findings based on our review of the program to date:

1. The better plans have clear goals, timelines, and specific methodologies for determining savings.

There was great variation among the plans, including how they arrived at cost estimates — and the reporting itself. For example, plans such as Franklin and Westchester Counties did not describe how they achieved the savings, while Cattaraugus County explained their estimates with great specificity.

Remaining plans due next year should include a clear description of goals and a specification of the goals in terms of each of the stakeholders. Moreover, detailed analysis of the proposed project is needed in terms of key stakeholder. Questions to be answered, such as: Does the enabling policy framework exist? How will the work processes be redesigned to be interoperable across boundaries? Who are the

responsible parties and what role will each play in planning and execution of the shared service?

Other details such as milestones, expected challenges and potential solutions, and workflow and timelines characterize leading plans. Finally, clear and specific methodology for determining the cost and the savings estimates, as well as a list of underlying assumptions related to the plan should be included.

2. Municipalities should make permanent a version of the shared service panels created under the CWSSI.

Many of the shared service panels included additional work and future issues beyond the scope of the CWSSI process. There were a number of examples including Albany, Ontario, Rensselaer, and Yates counties. Although Yates County was unable to adopt a plan with any savings in the first year, they were explicit in saying they would continue to work together. “The Panel recognized the value of the process and the identification of possible opportunities for efficiency and cost reduction....Through the Readiness Initiative, the Panel will in the future continue the work initiated under the Shared Services process and continue its pursuit of further options for service consolidation and cost reduction” (*Yates County Shared Services Plan*). Likewise, Jefferson County stated in its plan that “many on the Panel have decided to continue informally reviewing a series of other potential shared services that have already been identified.”

The success of shared services is based in large part on the success of the shared governance put in place to design, manage, and monitor the shared service implementation. Many county plans made no mention of the governance structures necessary to ensure that shared service is managed through an open, well-defined, and effective shared resource. The identification of what decisions will be made and by who is critical for ensuring the long-term success of the shared service.

Overall, the initiatives presented within the plans require to a great extent the creation of new ways of working and of working together. Whether counties and municipalities are engaging in shared services or managed services, some level of change is required of all those providing, requesting, and receiving services. It may be fair to assume that some counties and municipalities who have already been successful in creating complex shared services arrangements understand the upfront investment needed to identify the depth and the nature of the changes and investments required and to create the necessary capability to make and sustain those changes. Those who have created successful managed services arrangements may be less experienced in the deep and thorough analysis and change management that will be required to create a fully functional and value generating shared service. Even the simplest shared services projects will require new levels of knowledge and information sharing such as providing shared access to data and creating joint scheduling systems for shared resources, among others. Variations in the level of understanding that shared services requires new ways of working and will not generate envisioned savings if systems are put in place that replicate how work has always been done.

Our review found that many officials on the panel thought the core process of working together was helpful, especially as new issues emerged — technology issues, new policies that had to be implemented, and the like. In addition, many of the

proposals raised in the plans submitted will be over multiple years and take an ongoing concerted effort among municipalities.

Therefore, we recommend that counties formalize and make permanent a shared services panel. One model adopted by Onondaga County was to use state General Municipal Law section 239-n, which authorizes the creation of intergovernmental relations councils. The purpose of the law is “to strengthen local governments and to promote efficient and economical provision of local governmental services within or by such participating municipalities.” The state law authorizes this council — which is made up of the local governments within counties — to make recommendations of additional efficiencies, operate as a purchasing consortium, and hire staff and create by-laws.

In addition, there are other ways to create a more formalized arrangement, like under section 239-n of the General Municipal Law, which are found under some county charters. For instance, the Ulster County Charter has a provision for Intermunicipal Collaboration, which has yet to be implemented (see ARTICLE XXXVII of the Ulster County Charter).



We recommend that counties formalize and make permanent a shared services panel. One model, that was adopted by Onondaga County was using state General Municipal Law section 239-n which authorizes for the creation of intergovernmental relations councils.

3. The state and local governments should develop a formal regulatory and technical assistance working group to break down barriers to shared services.

There are many laws, regulations, and policies in place at the state and local level that make commonsense shared services and efficiencies more difficult. For example, as was mentioned in the barriers to shared services sections, there were examples where motivated school districts and municipalities ran into regulatory walls, like school districts inability to build solar panels outside their district lines.

In many cases, there was confusion about whether there was an actual legal prohibition, whether the problem was regulatory, or simply policy. Case in point, there was confusion around the creation of health consortia. Already a complicated undertaking for local governments, the process could be eased by a clear line of communication between local governments and state agencies to eliminate unnecessary and antiquated laws, rules, and regulations, as well as speed the process of implementing shared services.

In other cases, some of the more impactful shared services ideas, like health and other insurance consortia, energy efficiency (like LED lighting and solar installations), and government consolidations, require more technical policy, financial, and other expertise that some of the smaller municipalities do not have.

Therefore, the state and local governments should develop a formal regulatory and technical assistance working group to break down barriers to shared services.

4. The state should align financial incentives to any ongoing CWSSI or successor process.

As mentioned above, we believe the CWSSI process should be made permanent through the permanent creation of shared service panels. If that is implemented, the state should create new financial incentives or align the existing financial incentives offered for shared services and government efficiencies to the panels to spur ongoing work.

The state's one-time match is a great start. However, some counties believe the shared services law creating the 2017 process provides financial disincentives to municipalities to complete the plan this year since the law only allows the state match for savings achieved in year one of their plan. All counties that did not submit a plan in 2017 either explicitly or implicitly stated a major reason for not submitting their plan was to maximize state matching funds in 2019.

In addition, many of the proposals included in the submitted plans were contingent on receiving existing state funding, like four of the six shared services proposals described in Ulster County that are contingent on winning the state Municipal Consolidation and Efficiency competition.

Realigning or additional financial “carrots” were raised in various plans. Ontario County observed in its shared services plan that the state should consider permanent incentives for inter-county cooperation and dialogue and regionalization of continuing services that result in reduced property taxes. Similarly, the Tompkins County plan states that the state should incentivize large-scale shared services activities through the provision of grant funds offered through the NYS Department of State or other agencies:

If these panels are made permanent, it will take additional financial realignment to fund their activities and make them successful—especially the larger and more complex proposals. Therefore, the state should realign existing financial incentives or create new financial incentives for any panel made permanent by a county.

5. Common financial and operational reporting should be consistent, because the current process makes it difficult to adequately compare municipalities.

Even with the guidance provided by the state, many of the plans greatly varied in terms of how they analyzed proposals and reported their findings. Not only was that not in compliance with the requirements under the law, it made it difficult to compare to other plans. Counties, like Franklin, had “tbd” or no information provided in some parts of their plan. The format of the plans were also varied, making an apples-to-apples comparison impossible. Therefore, the state should work with the panels to develop a common template on reporting information.



The state should create new financial incentives or align the existing financial incentives offered for shared services and government efficiencies developed and implemented by the panels to spur ongoing work.

6. The county should be central in organizing shared services, but does not always have to provide the service.

Simply because the chief executive officer of the county chaired the panels did not mean that the counties were best suited to provide all the services. In many cases, it was not the county, but towns, cities, and villages that had the expertise and equipment to share — so the services does not always have to come from the county itself. For example, in the Albany County plan, the county will coordinate shared personnel services, but the local municipalities would share the needed personnel to one another. The critical factor was a centralized process to organize efforts, but the better plans used the strengths of all of their local governments to share services and find greater efficiencies.

7. School Districts should participate on the panels going forward.

Some counties, like Sullivan noted it was “unfair” that schools were not required to participate. However, the law allowed the panels to include school districts—it was up to the county. Nine counties, included school districts in the process. In many cases, it was simply a matter of leadership by the chief executive officer of the county. Because school districts use BOCES, they have expertise to offer in shared services generally. But, more importantly, many ideas for savings and better service came up among local governments and school districts that would not otherwise have been adopted unless they were included.

8. Technology is integral to shared services, so it cannot be an afterthought.

Every shared service has some aspect of technology are a core element. The shared service plans put forth appear to fall into two general categories: (1) IT as the focus. These include initiatives that specifically state that a project that is or relies on IT and (2) IT as an enabler. These include initiatives those focused on a new cooperation, sharing of resources, consortia, among others.

Of the plans that present new technology as the main focus of the shared service, the tendency is to focus on the new technology versus the business goals and what is involved in realizing those business goals. Emphasis is placed on the availability of new systems rather than the system as an enabler for a business process. Lack of attention to the business processes and the overarching service delivery goals of the shared service increases risk and cost, leading often to failure of the system to deliver any particular public value. In order to mitigate that risk, the 80/20 rule applies here. Eighty percent of the work associated with a public sector innovation should be focused on the upfront work; identifying the desired goals, requirements, interdependencies, agreements, and necessary modifications to current policies and processes. If the “before the beginning” work is completed, the implementation typically requires only 20 percent of the overall effort. Conversely, if there is no time spent at the beginning and there is a rush to a solution, technological or otherwise, then implementation is high risk and prone to failure.

Acknowledgments

This report was authored by the Rockefeller Institute of Government, the Benjamin Center at SUNY New Paltz, and the Center for Technology in Government at the University at Albany.

Contributions were made by:

Dr. Jim Malatras, president, the Rockefeller Institute of Government

Dr. Katie Zuber, assistant director of policy & research, Rockefeller Institute

Dr. Gerald Benjamin, director, the Benjamin Center

Mr. Tom Cetrino, lead researcher, the Benjamin Center

Dr. Theresa Pardo, director, Center for Technology in Government

Ms. Meghan Cook, program director, Center for Technology in Government

Ms. Heather Trela, chief of staff, Rockefeller Institute of Government

Research assistance was provided by:

Ms. Urška Klančnik, research scholar, Rockefeller Institute of Government

Editing and formatting assistance provided by:

Ms. Michele Charbonneau, staff assistant for publications, Rockefeller Institute

Special thanks to:

New York State Department of State and **New York State Division of the Budget** for providing data used in this report.

Appendices

Appendix A: County-wide Shared Services Initiative

S. 2009--C

125

A. 3009--C



County-wide Shared Services Initiative (Enacted by Part BBB of Chapter 59 of the Laws of 2017)

34 PART BBB

35 Section 1. County-wide shared services property tax savings plan. 1.
36 Notwithstanding the provisions of the municipal home rule law, the
37 Alternative county government law, or any other general, special or
38 local law to the contrary, the chief executive officer of each county
39 outside of a city of one million or more shall prepare a property tax
40 savings plan for shared, coordinated and efficient services among the
41 county, cities, towns and villages within such county.
42 Such plan may include school districts, boards of cooperative educa-
43 tional services, and special improvement districts within such county if
44 the school district, board of cooperative educational services or
45 special improvement district has a representative on the shared services
46 panel.
47 2. a. There shall be a shared services panel in each county consisting
48 Of the chief executive officer of the county, who shall serve as chair,
49 and one representative from each city, town, and village in the county.
50 b. The chief executive officer of each town, city and village shall be
51 the representative to the shared services panel and shall be the mayor,
52 if a city or a village, or shall be the supervisor, if a town.
53 c. The chief executive officer of the county may invite any school
54 district, any board of cooperative educational services, and/or any

1 special improvement district in the county to participate in the county-wide shared services property tax savings plan. Upon such invitation, the governing body of such school district, board of cooperative educational services, and/or a special improvement district may accept such invitation by selecting a representative of such governing body, by majority vote, to serve as a member of the shared services panel.

7 d. In the development of the county-wide shared services property tax savings plan, the chief executive officer of the county shall regularly consult with, and take recommendations from, all the representatives of the shared services panel, as well as with and from the representative of each collective bargaining unit of the county and the cities, towns, and villages as well as from the representative of each collective bargaining unit of any participating school district, board of cooperative educational services and special improvement district.

15 3. Public input, as well as input from civic, business, labor, and community leaders, shall be accepted by the chief executive officer, the county legislative body and the shared services panel on the proposed county-wide shared services property tax savings plan. To facilitate such input, three or more public hearings shall be arranged to be held within the county. All such public hearings shall be conducted prior to the submission of the county-wide shared services property tax savings plan to a vote of the shared services panel, and public notice of all such hearings shall be provided at least one week prior in the manner prescribed in subdivision 1 of section 104 of the public officers law. Civic, business, labor, and community leaders, as well as members of the public, shall be permitted to provide public testimony at any such hearings.

28 4. a. Such property tax savings plan shall contain new recurring property tax savings through actions such as, but not limited to, the elimination of duplicative services; shared services, such as joint purchasing, shared highway equipment, shared storage facilities, shared plowing services, and energy and insurance purchasing cooperatives; reduction in back office administrative overhead; and better coordination of services.

35 b. The chief executive officer of the county shall submit such property tax savings plan to the county legislative body no later than August first, two thousand seventeen. Such property tax savings plan shall be accompanied by a certification as to the accuracy of the savings contained therein.

40 c. The county legislative body shall review and consider the county-wide shared services plan submitted to it in accordance with paragraph b of this subdivision. A majority of the members of such body may issue an advisory report making recommendations as deemed necessary. The chief executive officer may make modifications to the plan based on such recommendations. If modifications are made by the chief executive officer, he or she shall produce an updated certification as to the accuracy of the savings contained therein.

48 d. the county shared services panel shall consider the county-wide shared services tax savings plan. A majority vote of the panel shall be required for approval of such plan, provided however that each member of the panel may, prior to the panel-wide vote, cause to be removed from the plan any proposed action that affects the unit of local government represented by the respective member. Written notice of such removal shall be provided to the chief executive officer of the county prior to the panel-wide vote on the plan.

e. If a county does not achieve an approved county-wide shared services property tax savings plan by the deadlines required for 2017, then it shall release to the public a report on the proposal, the vote of the panel which vote shall require each panel member, in writing to state the reason for such vote. The county shall then follow the same procedures defined in this section to attempt to produce an approved county-wide shared services property tax savings plan by the deadlines required for 2018.

5. a. Upon approval of the shared services panel, the chief executive Officer of the county shall finalize the county-wide shared services property tax savings plan and shall transmit to the director of the division of the budget a certification of the plan and its property tax savings plan. The chief executive officer of the county shall finalize any such approved county-wide shared services property tax savings plan no later than September fifteenth, two thousand seventeen, and any such plan shall be publicly disseminated to residents of the county in a concise, clear, and coherent manner using words with common and everyday meanings.

b. The beginning of the plan publicly disseminated shall contain the information and shall be in the form set forth hereinbelow:

County-wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary			
Row 1	Participating Cities	(insert number of cities in the county as well as the number and list of such cities with a representative on the panel who voted on such plan)	
Row 2	Participating Towns	(insert number of towns in the county as well as the number and list of such towns with a representative on the panel who voted on such plan)	
Row 3	Participating Villages	(insert number of villages in the county as well as the number and list of such villages with a representative on the panel who voted on such plan)	
Row 4	Participating school districts, BOCES, and special improvement districts	(insert number of school districts, BOCES, and special improvement districts in the county as well as the number and list of such school districts, BOCES, and special improvement districts with a representative on the panel who voted on such plan)	
Row 5	2017 Local Government property taxes	(insert sum total of property taxes levied in the year 2017 by the county, cities, towns, villages, school districts, BOCES, and special improvement districts within such county)	
Row 6	2017 Participating Entities property taxes	(insert sum total of property taxes levied in the year 2017 by the county, any cities, towns, villages, school districts, BOCES, and special improvements districts identified as participating in the panel in rows one through	

1			four above)
2	Row 7	Total Anticipated	(insert sum total of net
3		Savings	savings in such plan certified
4			as being anticipated in calendar
5			year 2018, calendar year 2019,
6			and annually thereafter)
7	Row 8	Anticipated Savings	(insert sum total of net
8		as a Percentage of	savings in such plan
9		Participating	certified as being anticipated
10		Entities property	in calendar year 2018 as a
11		taxes	percentage of the sum total in
12			Row 6, calendar year 2019
13			as a percentage of the sum total
14			in Row 6, and annually
15			thereafter as a percentage of the
16			sum total in Row 6)
17	Row 9	Anticipated	(insert the amount of the
18		Savings to the	savings that the average
19		Average Taxpayer	taxpayer in the county
20			will realize in calendar year
21			2018, calendar year 2019,
22			and annually thereafter if the
23			net savings certified
24			in the plan are realized)
25	Row 10	Anticipated	(insert the percentage amount a
26		Costs/Savings to	homeowner can expect his or her
27		the Average	property taxes to increase or
28		Homeowner	decrease in calendar year 2018,
29			calendar year 2019, and
30			annually thereafter if
31			the net savings certified in the
32			plan are realized)
33	Row 11	Anticipated	(insert the percentage amount a
34		Costs/Savings to	business can expect its property
35		the Average	taxes to increase or decrease in
36		Business	calendar year 2018, calendar year
37			2019, and annually thereafter if
38			the net savings certified in the
39			plan are realized)
40	c. The chief executive officer of the county shall conduct a public		
41	presentation of the plan no later than October 15, 2017. Public notice		
42	of such public presentation shall be provided at least one week prior in		
43	the manner prescribed in subdivision 1 of section 104 of the public		
44	officers law.		
45	d. Any such finalized property tax savings plan which would have the		
46	effect of transferring or abolishing a function or duty of the county or		
47	of the cities, towns, villages, districts or other units of government		
48	wholly contained in the county, shall not become operative unless and		
49	until it is approved in accordance with subdivision (h) of section one		
50	of article nine of the state constitution.		
51	6. a. If the county-wide property tax savings plan shall fail to		
52	Obtain the approval of the shared services panel, voting on the plan in		
53	accordance with this section, the chief executive officer of the county		
54	shall resubmit such plan to the shared services panel, in accordance		
55	with the procedures established for first consideration of the plan		

1 outlined by this section, no later than August first, two thousand eight-
2 teen.

3 b. Any proposed county-wide shared services property tax savings plan
4 prepared for reconsideration by the shared services panel, shall follow
5 the same procedures prescribed in this section for original consider-
6 ation in two thousand seventeen. No county-wide shared services property
7 tax savings plan shall be deemed approved, or may be finalized, without
8 approval of such plan by the shared services panel.

9 c. If the shared services panel approves the proposed county-wide
10 shared services property tax savings plan for 2018, the chief executive
11 officer of the county shall finalize any such approved county-wide
12 shared services property tax savings plan no later than September
13 fifteenth, two thousand eighteen, and any such plan shall be publicly
14 disseminated to residents of the county in a concise, clear, and coher-
15 ent manner using words with common and everyday meanings.

16 d. The beginning of the plan publicly disseminated shall contain the
17 information and shall be in the form set forth herein below:

18 County-wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

19	Row	1	Participating	Cities	(insert number of cities in the
20					county as well as the number
21					and list of such cities with
22					a representative on the
23					panel who voted on such plan)
24	Row	2	Participating	Towns	(insert number of towns in the
25					county as well as the number
26					and list of such towns with
27					a representative on the
28					panel who voted on such plan)
29	Row	3	Participating	Villages	(insert number of villages in the
30					county as well as the number
31					and list of such villages with
32					a representative on the
33					panel who voted on such plan)
34	Row	4	Participating	school	(insert number of school
35			districts, BOCES, and		districts, BOCES, and special
36			special improvement		improvement
37			districts		districts in the county
38					as well as the number
39					and list of such school districts,
40					BOCES, and special improvement
41					districts with a representative
42					one the panel who voted on
43					such plan)
44	Row	5	2018 Local Government		(insert sum total of property taxes
45			property		levied in the year 2018 by the
46			taxes		county, cities, towns, villages,
47					school districts, BOCES, and
48					special improvement districts within
49					such county)
50	Row	6	2018 Participating		(insert sum total of property taxes
51			Entities property		levied in the year 2018 by the
52			taxes		county, any cities, towns, villages,
53					school districts, BOCES,
54			and special improvement districts		
55			identified as participating		

1			in the panel in
2			rows one through four above)
3	Row 7	Total Anticipated	(insert sum total of net savings in
4		Savings	such plan certified as being
5			anticipated in calendar year 2019,
6			calendar year 2020, and annually
7			thereafter)
8	Row 8	Anticipated Savings	(insert sum total of net savings in
9		as a Percentage	such plan certified as being
10		of Participating	anticipated in calendar year 2019
11		Entities property	as a percentage of the
12		taxes	sum total in Row 6, calendar
13			year 2020 as a percentage of the
14			sum total in Row 6, and annually
15			thereafter as a percentage
16			of the sum total in Row 6)
17	Row 9	Anticipated Savings	(insert the amount of
18		to the Average	the savings that the average
19		Taxpayer	taxpayer in the county will
20			realize in calendar year 2019,
21			calendar year 2020, and
22			annually thereafter if the net
23			savings certified in the plan
24			are realized)
25	Row 10	Anticipated	(insert the percentage amount a
26		Costs/Savings to	homeowner can expect his or her
27		the Average	property taxes to increase or
28		Homeowner	decrease in calendar year
29		2019, calendar year	
30			2020, and annually thereafter if
31			the net savings certified in the
32			plan are realized)
33	Row 11	Anticipated	(insert the percentage amount a
34		Costs/Savings to	business can expect its property
35		the Average	taxes to increase or decrease in
36		Business	calendar year 2019, calendar year
37			2020, and annually thereafter if
38			the net savings certified in the
39			plan are realized)
40	e. The chief executive officer of the county shall conduct a public		
41	presentation of the plan no later than October 15, 2018. Public notice		
42	of such public presentation shall be provided at least one week prior in		
43	the manner prescribed in subdivision 1 of section 104 of the public		
44	officers law.		
45	f. Any such finalized property tax savings plan which would have the		
46	effect of transferring or abolishing a function or duty of the county or		
47	of the cities, towns, villages, districts or other units of government		
48	wholly contained in the county, shall not become operative unless and		
49	until it is approved in accordance with subdivision (h) of section one		
50	of article nine of the state constitution.		
51	7. For the purposes of this part "chief executive officer" means the		
52	county executive, county manager or other chief executive of the county,		
53	or where none, the chair of the county legislative body.		
54	8. Each county plan may be eligible for one-time funding to match		
55	savings in such plan, subject to available appropriation. The secretary		
56	of state shall develop an application, approved by the director of the		

1 budget, with any necessary requirements to receive such matching fund-
2 ing. Savings that are actually and demonstrably realized by the partic-
3 ipating local governments are eligible for matching funding. For actions
4 that are a part of an approved plan finalized in 2017, savings from new
5 actions implemented on or after January 1, 2018 are eligible for match-
6 ing funding. For actions that are a part of an approved plan finalized
7 in 2017, savings achieved from January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018
8 are eligible for matching funding. For actions that are a part of an
9 approved plan finalized in 2018, savings from new actions implemented on
10 or after January 1, 2019 are eligible for matching funding. For actions
11 that are a part of an approved plan finalized in 2018, savings achieved
12 from January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019 are eligible for matching
13 funding. Only net savings between local governments for each action
14 would be eligible for matching funding. Savings from internal efficien-
15 cies or any other actions taken by a local government without the
16 participation of another local government are not eligible for matching
17 funding. Each county and all of the local governments within the county
18 that are part of any action to be implemented as part of the approved
19 plan must collectively apply for the matching funding and agree on the
20 distribution and use of any matching funding in order to qualify for
21 matching funding.

22 9. Where the implementation of any component of such finalized proper-
23 ty tax savings plan is, by any other general or special law, subject to
24 a public hearing, a mandatory or permissive referendum, consents of
25 governmental agencies, or other requirements applicable to the making of
26 contracts, then implementation of such component shall be conditioned on
27 compliance with such requirements.

28 10. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, section or part
29 of this act shall be adjudged by any court or competent jurisdiction to
30 be invalid, such judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the
31 remainder thereof, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause,
32 sentence, paragraph subdivision, section or part thereof directly
33 involved in the controversy in which such judgment shall have been
34 rendered. It is hereby declared to be the intent of the legislature that
35 this act would have been enacted if such invalid provisions had not been
36 included herein.

37 § 2. School district and board of cooperative educational services
38 participation in county-wide shared services property tax savings plans.
39 Notwithstanding any provision of the education law, or any other
40 provision of law, rule or regulation, to the contrary, any school
41 district or board of cooperative educational services may participate in
42 a county-wide shared services property tax savings plan established
43 pursuant to the provisions of this chapter, and may further participate
44 in any of the activities listed in paragraph a of subdivision 4 of
45 section one of this act with any participating county, town, city,
46 village, special improvement district, school district and/or board of
47 cooperative educational services participating in such county-wide
48 shared services property tax saving plan.

49 § 3. This act shall take effect immediately.

Appendix B: Guidance document



County-wide Shared Services Initiative Guidance Document

Table of Contents

Program Overview	1
Participants	1
Plan Development and Submission	2
Plan Contents	4
State Technical Assistance	5
State Matching Funds - Application Guidelines and Parameters.....	5
County-wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary.....	10

Program Overview

The FY 2018 State Budget includes a new initiative designed to generate property tax savings by facilitating operational collaboration between local governments. The County- wide Shared Services Initiative (the "Initiative") establishes a Shared Services Panel (the "Panel") in each county, chaired by the Chief Executive Officer of the County. The Panels will work to help develop, and ultimately approve a County-wide Shared Service Property Tax Savings Plan (the "Plan"), through intergovernmental cooperation to find new opportunities to share and coordinate services.

Plans that create actual and demonstrable property tax savings may be eligible for a one- time match of the net savings resulting from new actions implemented pursuant to the Plan.

Participants

The Panel Chair and Panel Members are required to participate in the development of the County-wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan, as described in the table below. Panel meetings should comply with the New York State Open Meetings Law.

Panel Participants	Composition	Duties
Panel Chair (the Chief Executive Officer (CEO) of the County)	The county executive, county manager, county administrator or other chief executive of the county, or, where none, the chair of the county legislative body.	Responsible for the proper creation, development and submission of the County-wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan. The CEO is permitted to identify and invite the participation of Optional Panel Members (see below).
Required Panel Members	Mayors of every city and village, and supervisors of every town, within the county.	Participate in development of the Plan. Vote on the Plan.
Optional Panel Members	One representative from the governing body of any school district, board of cooperative educational services (BOCES), and/or special improvement district in the county, upon receipt and acceptance of an invitation to participate on the Panel from the Panel Chair (CEO).	Participate in development of the Plan. Vote on the Plan.

The goal of the county-wide planning process is to save property taxpayers money, by identifying collaborative opportunities for shared services between as many local governments as possible.

Plan Development and Submission

The following Plan development timeline outlines responsibilities and important dates. It is intended to help facilitate the creation of the County-wide Shared Services Plan.

Plan Development Timeline	
Starting Immediately	
Action	Explanation
<u>Creation of the Panel</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>CEO shall</u> convene a Shared Services Panel within the county.	The CEO shall serve as chair of the Panel. In addition to the CEO, the Panel must consist of the mayor of every city or village within the county, and the supervisor of every town within the county.
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>CEO may</u> invite to participate on the Panel: School Districts, BOCES, and/or Special Improvement Districts.	Upon invitation by the CEO, the governing body of the invited entity may accept the invitation by selecting, by a majority vote, a representative of the governing body to serve on the Panel.
No Later Than August 1, 2017	
<u>Development of the Initial Plan</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/> <u>CEO shall</u> consult with, and take recommendations from Panel representatives.	The CEO shall regularly consult with, and take recommendations from all the representatives of the shared services Panel as well as the representative of each collective bargaining unit of the county and the cities, towns, and villages and other optional invited panel members.

<input type="checkbox"/> CEO shall submit the plan to the county legislative body. The plan must be accompanied by a certification as to the accuracy of the property tax savings.	<p align="center"><u>Submission to the County Legislative Body</u></p> <p>CEO shall submit the plan to the county legislative body. The plan must be accompanied by a certification as to the accuracy of the property tax savings. The following certification may be used: <i>"By my signature below, I hereby certify that the savings identified and contained herein are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief"</i>.</p> <p>Thereafter, the county legislative body shall review the Plan, and may, by a majority of its members, issue an advisory report with recommendations to the CEO.</p>
<p align="center">No Later Than September 15, 2017</p>	
<input type="checkbox"/> The CEO may modify the Plan in response to any advisory report issued by the county legislative body.	<p>Upon receipt of an advisory report from the county legislative body, the CEO may modify the Plan.</p> <p>If modified, the CEO shall produce an updated certification as to the accuracy of the property tax savings.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> CEO shall arrange three or more public hearings to occur within the county.	<p>The CEO, the county legislative body, and the Panel shall accept input and testimony on the Plan from the: public, civic, business, labor, and community leaders. To facilitate such input, a minimum of three public hearings shall be held within the county. All such public hearings shall be conducted prior to the submission of the county-wide shared services property tax savings plan to a vote of the shared services Panel. Public notice of all such hearings shall be provided at least one week prior in the manner prescribed in subdivision 1 of section 104 of the Public Officers Law. This process should begin as early as possible, as at least three public hearings must be conducted prior to the Panel vote.</p>
<input type="checkbox"/> Panel shall vote on the Plan submitted by CEO.	<p>A majority vote of the Panel is required for approval of the Plan. Each Panel Member must state in writing the reason for his or her vote. However, prior to the vote each member of the Panel may remove any proposed action that affects their local government. Written notice of the removal will be provided to the CEO prior to the Panel-wide vote.</p>
<p><u>If the Plan is Approved:</u></p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The CEO shall finalize the Plan.</p> <p><input type="checkbox"/> The CEO shall submit to the Director of the Division of the Budget a certification of the Plan and its property tax savings plan.</p>	

<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>The CEO shall</u> disseminate the Plan to residents of the county in a concise, clear, and coherent manner using words with common and everyday meanings.
<u>If the Plan Fails or is not Voted on:</u>	
<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>The CEO shall</u> release, to the public, a report on the proposal, including the vote of the Panel, the vote of each Panel Member and the reasons for their vote.
<input type="checkbox"/>	<u>The CEO shall</u> then follow the same procedures defined in this section to attempt to produce an approved county-wide shared services property tax savings plan by the deadlines required for 2018 (which are the same dates as in 2017).
No Later Than October 15, 2017	
<u>The CEO shall</u> conduct a public presentation of the Plan, if it was approved.	Public notice of such public presentation shall be provided at least one week prior in the manner prescribed in subdivision 1 of section 104 of the Public Officers Law.

Plan Contents

County-wide Shared Service Property Tax Savings Plans should include, but are not limited to, shared and coordinated actions that can be implemented during the subsequent calendar year.

The proposals in the Plan must be among: the county, cities, towns and villages within the county, as well as any participating school districts, BOCES or special improvement districts.

The Plan must contain new recurring property tax savings to be achieved through actions such as, but not limited to, the elimination of duplicative services, shared services, the reduction of back-office administrative overhead, and the improved coordination of services.

If the Plan contains a proposed action that by law is otherwise subject to a procedural requirement such as a public referendum, then the planned action will not be operative until said procedural requirement occurs.

The Plan must begin with the summary document (APPENDIX A) when it is publicly disseminated and when it is submitted to the Director of the New York State Division of the Budget (DOB). There is no prescribed format for the individual proposals contained within the plan, but they must be in a concise, clear, and coherent manner using words

with common and everyday meaning. A certification of the Plan and the property tax savings set forth therein is required when the final Plan is transmitted by the CEO to DOB (APPENDIX A, Certification). The Panel Chair may obtain individual certifications from any local governments within which savings will be attributed from such local government.

State Technical Assistance

The Department of State will provide technical assistance to local governments engaged in this Initiative. Please check regularly at www.dos.ny.gov for updates and assistance opportunities. In addition, the Department of State has established an email address (countywidesharedservices@dos.ny.gov) through which questions and requests may be submitted.

State Matching Funds — Application Guidelines and Parameters

To commence the process to receive State matching funds, each county CEO must submit a completed application to the Department of State ("the Department"). A formal application for State matching funds is currently being developed by the Department in conjunction with the Division of the Budget. Initial guidance regarding State matching funds is provided below to assist local governments as they develop and implement their Plans. The actual and specific requirements for State matching funds will be fully established in the formal application.

The Initiative authorizes funding from the State to match one calendar year (2018 or 2019) of net savings achieved from the implementation of qualified actions that are included in an approved Plan (State matching funds). Prior to applying to the State, each county CEO must have already met the specific thresholds and statutory requirements, which include, at a minimum:

- creation of the Panel;
- development of the Plan;
- holding a minimum of three public hearings;
- Achieving a Panel-approved and finalized Plan by September 15th of the year of submission;
- Submission of the final, approved Plan to the Division of the Budget; and
- presentation of the Panel-approved Plan to the public by October 15th of the year of submission.

Counties are eligible to receive State matching funds for net savings achieved in one match year, either from: 1) new shared service actions included in approved 2017 Plans that have been implemented between January 1, 2018 and December 31, 2018; or 2) new shared service actions included in approved 2018 Plans that have been implemented between January 1, 2019 and December 31, 2019. As such, the Department does not

anticipate receiving applications from counties until after December 31, 2018, when the first match year has concluded and county CEOs have calculated and reconciled the various savings and expenditures for each new action in the approved Plan where State matching funds will be requested. This application timeline will allow counties to provide savings for the match year that are “actually and demonstrably realized.”

The minimum statutory requirements each county must meet to comply with the County- wide Shared Services Initiative and to receive State matching funds are regularly clarified through Q&As and guidance made available at http://www.dos.ny.gov/lq/countwide_services.html. The following represents a summary of the various statutory requirements with clarifications provided to date for shared service actions to qualify for State matching funds:

1. **Any application for State matching funds must be submitted by a county CEO.** The CEO for each of the 57 counties outside of the City of New York with a Plan that has been approved by the Panel and submitted to the State Division of the Budget by September 15, 2017 or September 15, 2018 can apply for State matching funds if net savings have been achieved from the implementation of one or more Plan action(s) in the applicable match year.
2. **Only the first year/applicable match year of net savings achieved from each new implemented action are eligible for matching funds from the State.** For Plans approved by the 2017 statutory deadlines, only net savings achieved from each new Plan action implemented during the first year/ applicable match year of January 1, 2018 through December 31, 2018 are eligible for the one-time match of net savings from the State. For Plans approved by the 2018 statutory deadlines, only net savings achieved from each new Plan action implemented during the first year/ applicable match year of January 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019 are eligible for the one-time match of net savings from the State.
3. **Any savings resulting from a county’s match calculation for each new implemented action must be "actually and demonstrably realized" to be eligible for the match.** Actual and demonstrable net savings achieved in the applicable match year may be different than what was expected in the approved Plan that was submitted to the State Division of the Budget by September 15, 2017 or September 15, 2018.
4. **Savings that can be matched by the State must be from new actions included in an approved Plan that were implemented.** For Plans approved by the 2017 statutory deadlines, the Plan action is new if the action was implemented after January 1, 2018 but before December 31, 2018. For Plans approved by the 2018 statutory deadlines, the Plan action is new if the action was implemented after January 1, 2019 but before December 31, 2019.

If a Plan includes an expansion of an existing action (e.g., a new local government joins a purchasing cooperative that existed before January 1st following the Plan's approval), only the net savings achieved during the match year from the expansion of the action are eligible; the base savings, regardless of whether a new agreement (or renewal) is formed, would not be eligible for State matching funds.

5. **Savings included in the calculation must be from shared services between two or more participating local government entities.** Plans may include actions that are not shared services between two or more participating local government entities. However, net savings from internal efficiencies or any other action taken by a local government without the participation of another local government entity are not eligible for matching funds.
6. **Only net savings are eligible for matching funds.** For example, if Town A saved \$5 million by discontinuing a service and transferring the service to Town B, and Town B increased its programmatic costs by \$4 million, the net savings would be \$1 million, not Town A's \$5 million gross savings.
7. **One-time costs and one-time savings are to be reasonably amortized.** For example, if a shared services agreement requires a one-time cost of \$500,000 for purchasing equipment that is expected to last 10 years, the savings would only be reduced by \$50,000 - reflecting one-tenth of the cost.

Conversely, if a shared services agreement would enable a one-time savings of \$500,000 by not having to purchase equipment that is expected to last 10 years, the savings should only be \$50,000 - reflecting one-tenth of the savings for the applicable match year only.

8. **Implementation costs covered in-part or fully by State (or Federal) government funding or "efficiency grants" that are incurred during the applicable match year must be properly accounted for in calculating net savings.** Receipt of such funds does not preclude or disqualify the county from applying for State matching funds. However, the local government must account for the project's full implementation costs, regardless of whether they were offset by any outside grants.

For example, two local government entities will combine water department operations. Amortized first year/applicable match year costs are \$400,000 for equipment and consultants, and first year savings are expected to be \$900,000. The initiative also received \$300,000 in State "efficiency grant" funds. Net savings must be calculated as follows: the full \$400,000 in costs must be netted against the \$900,000 in year one savings, for net savings of \$500,000. Net savings should not be calculated using \$100,000 in costs (\$400,000 minus the \$300,000 State grant) for net savings of \$800,000.

9. Savings from each new Plan action implemented in an applicable match year must be related to activities supported by property taxes. Net savings from services supported by fees are not eligible for matching funds from the State.
10. Net savings from each new, implemented Plan action do not need to reduce property taxes, but can reduce what property taxes would have otherwise risen to if not for the implemented action. If an application for State matching funds can reasonably demonstrate that the net savings achieved through implementation of a new shared services action has enabled a local government entity's levy to remain stable or that the percentage growth for the levy is less than it otherwise would have been absent implementation of that action (even if the levy is still increasing year to year), the difference in estimated/potential levy versus actual levy can be counted as savings. Documentation would need to be provided to the Department showing that the levy would have increased without implementation of the Plan action(s).
11. Avoided costs may be eligible for State matching funds, however, the application to the State for such funds must clearly demonstrate that the avoided costs certified as savings would have been incurred but for the action's implementation. For example, if one local government entity assumed that costs for asphalt were going to increase by five percent annually and the local government entity enters into a shared service agreement with other local government entities that would allow for asphalt purchase at a two percent cost increase, the local government entity that anticipated a three percent cost increase must conclusively demonstrate that it would have paid the additional three percent (five percent less the two percent increase) but for the shared services agreement.
12. The county and all the local government entities within the county that are part of any action to be implemented as part of an approved Plan must collectively apply for the matching funds and agree on the distribution and use of such funds.

The county and each local government entity that is part of any action to be implemented as part of an approved Plan must enter into an agreement for distribution and use of State matching funds. The county CEO's application to the Department for State matching funds must attach the applicable use and distribution agreement(s).

If the county is notified by the Department that a use and distribution agreement is no longer valid, if for example the amount of funds that the State approved as a one-time match is less than the savings the county applied for (potentially due to the disqualification of individual actions and savings that do not meet the statutory and administrative criteria), the county will be required to resubmit an updated use and distribution agreement to reflect the new match amount that was approved by the State.

13. The application for state matching funds will require documentation demonstrating the achievement of any claimed net savings among local governments from the implementation of each new shared services action included in the application, and will include one or more attestations from the involved entities as to the accuracy of the savings amounts claimed.



County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan

APPENDIX A

County-wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

County of			
County Contact:			
Contact Telephone:			
Contact Email:			
Partners			
Row 1 – (total # of) Cities in County			
	Participating Cities	Panel Representative	Vote Cast (Yes or No)*
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
Use additional sheets, if necessary. *The written justification provided by each Panel Representative in support of his or her vote on the Plan is attached hereto, as Exhibit 1.			
Row 2 – (total # of) Towns in County			
	Participating Towns	Panel Representative	Vote Cast (Yes or No)*
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			

Page 10 of 14



County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan

APPENDIX A

10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			
17.			
18.			
19.			
20.			

Use additional sheets, if necessary.

*The written justification provided by each Panel Representative in support of his or her vote on the Plan is attached hereto, as Exhibit 1.

Row 3 – (total # of) Villages in County			
Participating Villages		Panel Representative	Vote Cast (Yes or No)*
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			
8.			
9.			
10.			

Use additional sheets, if necessary.

*The written justification provided by each Panel Representative in support of his or her vote on the Plan is attached hereto, as Exhibit 1.



County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan

APPENDIX A

Row 4 – (total # of) School Districts, BOCES, and Special Improvement Districts in County		
Participating School Districts, BOCES, and Special	Panel Representative	Vote Cast (Yes or No)*
1.		
2.		
3.		
4.		
5.		
6.		
7.		
8.		
9.		
10.		
11.		
12.		
13.		
14.		
15.		
16.		
17.		
18.		
19.		
20.		
Use additional sheets, if necessary. *The written justification provided by each Panel Representative in support of his or her vote on the Plan is attached hereto, as Exhibit 1.		
Row 5		
2017 Local Government Property Taxes	The sum total of property taxes levied in the year 2017 by the county, cities, towns, villages, school districts, BOCES, and special improvement districts within such	



County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan

APPENDIX A

Row 6	
2017 Participating Entities Property Taxes	The sum total of property taxes levied in the year 2017 by the county, any cities, towns, villages, school districts, BOCES, and special improvements districts identified as participating in the panel in the rows above.
Row 7	
Total Anticipated Savings	The sum total of net savings in such plan certified as being anticipated in calendar year 2018, calendar year 2019, and annually thereafter.
Row 8	
Anticipated Savings as a Percentage of Participating Entities Property Taxes	The sum total of net savings in such plan certified as being anticipated in calendar year 2018 as a percentage of the sum total in Row 6, calendar year 2019 as a percentage of the sum total in Row 6, and annually thereafter as a percentage of the sum total in Row 6.
Row 9	
Anticipated Savings to the Average Taxpayer	The amount of the savings that the average taxpayer in the county will realize in calendar year 2018, calendar year 2019, and annually thereafter if the net savings certified in the plan are realized.
Row 10	
Anticipated Costs/Savings to the Average Homeowner	The percentage amount a homeowner can expect his or her property taxes to increase or decrease in calendar year 2018, calendar year 2019, and annually thereafter if the net savings certified in the plan are realized.
Row 11	
Anticipated Costs/Savings to the Average Business	The percentage amount a business can expect its property taxes to increase or decrease in calendar year 2018, calendar year 2019, and annually thereafter if the net savings certified in the plan are realized.



County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan

APPENDIX A

CERTIFICATION OF PLAN AND PROPERTY TAX SAVINGS TO DIRECTOR OF BUDGET

By my signature below, I hereby certify that the County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan submitted herewith is final, that it was completed in accordance with the requirements of Part BBB of Chapter 59 of the Laws of 2017, and that the savings identified and contained herein are true and accurate to the best of my knowledge and belief.

County Chief Executive Officer

(Print Name)

(Signature)

(Date)

Page 14 of 14

Appendix C. Summary of Total Projects and Savings by County

Total Projects and Savings by Participating Counties				
County	No Projects	2018	2019	Fully Implemented
Albany	8	\$1,556,000	\$6,715,500	\$9,715,500
Broome	14	\$20,306,837	\$0	\$0
Cattaraugus	32	\$1,354,822	\$1,310,240	\$1,310,240
Chautauqua	5	\$1,003,500	\$1,003,500	\$1,003,500
Chenango	3	\$100,000	\$140,000	\$100,000
Clinton	5	\$708,717	\$716,867	\$725,111
Columbia	6	\$1,880,000	\$0	\$0
Dutchess	37	\$15,200,000	\$12,100,000	\$12,500,000
Erie	22	\$4,452,635	\$4,351,670	\$4,201,670
Franklin	12	\$1,650,891	\$350,891	\$350,891
Jefferson	2	\$331,500	\$331,500	\$331,500
Livingston	4	\$175,100	\$175,100	\$0
Madison	10	\$1,099,975	\$1,075,475	\$1,075,475
Monroe	40	\$7,264,758	\$7,266,008	\$7,266,008
Montgomery	11	\$1,200,000	\$2,379,121	\$4,552,320
Nassau	45	\$130,507,124	\$0	\$0
Oneida	13	\$164,000	\$164,000	\$164,000
Onondaga	32	\$5,618,370	\$5,488,370	\$1,088,370
Ontario	11	\$4,668,138	\$466,932	\$476,037
Rensselaer	6	\$165,945	\$1,491,209	\$1,491,209
Saratoga	2	\$364,230	\$364,230	\$364,230
Schenectady	7	\$272,505	\$1,186,220	\$1,544,470
Schuyler	3	\$250,000	\$300,000	\$400,000
Seneca	3	\$512,510	\$242,510	\$242,510
St. Lawrence	0	\$17,283	\$17,283	\$0
Steuben	20	\$1,887,050	\$1,887,050	\$1,950,000
Suffolk	10	\$16,500,052	\$20,900,052	\$20,900,052
Sullivan	9	\$1,190,130	\$1,190,130	\$1,190,130
Tompkins	6	\$145,975	\$281,037	\$288,918
Ulster	6	\$1,662,458	\$1,667,140	\$1,667,140
Wayne	3	\$49,853	\$49,853	N/A
Westchester	12	\$2,130,000	\$1,200,000	\$1,200,000
Wyoming	3	\$27,450	\$0	\$0
Yates	0	\$0	\$0	\$0
Total	402	\$224,417,808	\$74,811,888	\$76,099,281

Appendix D. The Maxwell Citizens Guide and Best Practices

[A May 2017 guide](#) by the Campbell Public Affairs Institute at the Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs at Syracuse University outlined some of the lessons and best practices that New York State counties should consider when contemplating the possibility of sharing services and hosting public forums to discuss shared service plans.

The guide outlines several potential benefits citizens may enjoy from their local government sharing services. Citizens may enjoy lower property taxes from the cost savings that shared service may provide from increased bargaining power, the elimination of duplicative services, standardization of procedures and more effective and efficient resource allocation. Citizens may also see that the quality of services provided improves through shared service agreements, through better cooperation and integrated planning, enhanced efficiencies, centralized and improved personnel training and advantages of larger scale operations. Benefits of shared service arrangements depend on the presence of excess capacity, the similarity of functions and services, the similarity in the needs of ends users or recipients of services and the relatively low implementation costs of shared services solutions. The combination of lower property taxes and improved services may make communities more attractive to businesses, which would improve the local economy. Finally, shared services can potentially enhance democracy and civic health as residents have a clearer understanding of the responsibility for service delivery and responsiveness that may also instill greater confidence in government.

Using previous examples of shared services in New York State, the guide summarizes lessons and best practices for governments that are considering such arrangements. Services and functions being considered for consolidation should be presented in term of both expected utility of sharing *and* the projected ease of managing the joint provision of services. Major challenges or obstacles need to be identified, as well as what kind of data — detailed budget and tax data, staffing information, the work space and work flow of departments targeted for shared services, etc. — are needed to understand and address the challenges.

In discussions about shared services, local governments should communicate broadly and be comprehensive, making sure to include all potential stakeholders in the conversation as well as dealing proactively with possible questions and doubts. Local governments should also consider how to frame possible benefits — shared benefits for all parties, cost avoidance, improved effectiveness of service delivery. Local governments should also identify and share all associated costs, so that there are no hidden costs that emerge down the road.

Beyond New York, the guide looks at shared services experiences in California as well as government mergers in Indianapolis, Indiana, and Louisville, Kentucky for additional lessons that would be applicable. From the California case study, the researcher found that centralized agencies or commissions can play vital roles like identifying areas of interest and overlap or serving as a clearinghouse for providers looking for partnerships. Establishing trust and building relationship is important to overcome divisions and have organizations work together. Partner agencies or service

providers should be allowed to take the lead whenever possible, as they are closest to the delivery of the service and can provide a unique perspective. Local knowledge should also be supplemented with outside analysis and expertise. Shared services should also not be limited to proximity and geography; opportunities to consolidate human resources or IT are not limited to physical closeness.

Though government consolidations are far more complicated than shared services, the Indianapolis and Louisville mergers can still provide some useful guidelines. Practical concerns should come before politics; failure to do so may result in inefficiencies that limit cost savings. Managing expectations is another important takeaway. Local governments should be very specific about the goals that they want to achieve by sharing services and be cautious of overstating expectations. The departments and functions that are likely to be the most controversial or be the biggest impediment should be identified early in the process.

Successful public hearings on potential shared service plans should make an effort to recruit participation from a diverse cross-section of the community through advertising forums on a variety of different communication channels (social media, radio, government websites, newspapers, etc.). To facilitate discussion, public forums may be held in smaller spaces. Citizens at public forums will have different levels of knowledge about how services are provided, so a short educational component at the beginning of each forum may help orient and familiarize them prior to any discussion. Moderators at public forums should be sensitive to groups of citizens that tend to be interrupted more often in public meetings, to insure a diversity of participation.

For the full text of the report see:

www.maxwell.syr.edu/uploadedFiles/campbell/NYS-Shared-Services-Guide.pdf.

Appendix E. Top 15 Counties with Highest Property Taxes

Highest Median Property Taxes Paid In U.S., by County		
	County, State	Median property taxes paid
1	Westchester County, New York	\$10,000+
2	Nassau County, New York	\$9,667
3	Rockland County, New York	\$9,522
4	Bergen County, New Jersey	\$9,373
5	Essex County, New Jersey	\$9,167
6	Hunterdon County, New Jersey	\$8,883
7	Passaic County, New Jersey	\$8,720
8	Morris County, New Jersey	\$8,651
9	Union County, New Jersey	\$8,604
10	Somerset County, New Jersey	\$8,351
11	Putnam County, New York	\$8,276
12	Suffolk County, New York	\$8,151
13	Monmouth County, New Jersey	\$7,593
14	Hudson County, New Jersey	\$7,276
15	Middlesex County, New Jersey	\$6,967
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey.		

Appendix F. Median Property Tax Burden (Total Taxes Paid), by State

Highest Median Property Taxes Paid in U.S., by State	
State (w/DC)	Median Property taxes paid
New Jersey	\$7,171
Connecticut	\$5,107
New Hampshire	\$4,927
New York	\$4,330
Illinois	\$3,887
Rhode Island	\$3,841
Massachusetts	\$3,794
Vermont	\$3,661
Wisconsin	\$3,242
Maryland	\$3,054
California	\$2,978
Alaska	\$2,963
Washington	\$2,770
District of Columbia	\$2,519
Texas	\$2,501
Oregon	\$2,467
Pennsylvania	\$2,429
Nebraska	\$2,404
Michigan	\$2,230
Minnesota	\$2,201
Maine	\$2,139
United States	\$2,107
Ohio	\$1,982
Virginia	\$1,938
South Dakota	\$1,803
Kansas	\$1,793
Iowa	\$1,786
Florida	\$1,769
North Dakota	\$1,768
Nevada	\$1,626
Montana	\$1,607
Colorado	\$1,492
Utah	\$1,444
Georgia	\$1,425
Hawaii	\$1,399
Arizona	\$1,393
Missouri	\$1,357
North Carolina	\$1,296
Idaho	\$1,233
Delaware	\$1,212
Wyoming	\$1,153
New Mexico	\$1,115
Indiana	\$1,079
Tennessee	\$1,024
Kentucky	\$987
Oklahoma	\$958
South Carolina	\$778
Mississippi	\$768
Arkansas	\$647
Louisiana	\$644
West Virginia	\$579
Alabama	\$528
Source: U.S. Census Bureau, 2009-2013 5-Year American Community Survey.	

Appendix G. The Public Hearing Process

Each county was required to hold three public hearings over the course of the process. The breakdown by month are as follows:

April: 1

May: 3

June: 23

July: 22

August: 50

September: 20

The majority of the county reports did not provide the dates for the public hearing, so we compiled the list searches of public notices, news stories, and the like. Some of the counties opted to hold all three of their public hearings on the same day.

County	Dates of Public Hearings
Albany	7/31/2017
	8/7/2017
	8/29/2017
Broome	4/20/2017
	7/5/2017
	7/26/2017
Cattaragus	7/7/2017
	8/15/2017
	8/23/2017
Chautauqua	8/29/2017
	8/30/2017
	8/31/2017
Chemung	6/29/2017
	7/11/2017
	8/1/2017
Chenango	6/1/2017
	6/1/2017
	6/12/2017
Clinton	8/8/2017
	8/9/2017
	8/10/2017
Columbia	8/16/2017
	8/16/2017
	8/16/2017
Dutchess	8/2/2017
	8/30/2017
	8/31/2017

County	Dates of Public Hearings
Erie County	7/17/2017
	7/18/2017
	7/19/2017
Franklin	7/18/2017
	7/18/2017
	7/18/2017
Fulton	7/31/2017
	8/14/2017
	8/14/2017
Hamilton	9/7/2017
	9/7/2017
	9/11/2017
Jefferson	8/2/2017
	8/3/2017
	8/9/2017
Livingston	9/11/2017
	9/11/2017
	9/11/2017
Madison	6/26/2017
	7/26/2017
	8/8/2017
Monroe	8/24/2017
	8/31/2017
	9/7/2017
Montgomery	9/4/2017
	9/6/2017
	9/11/2017
Nassau	6/26/2017
	6/28/2017
	6/30/2017
Oneida	8/28/2017
	8/30/2017
	8/31/2017
Onondaga	8/3/2017
	9/7/2017
	9/11/2017
Ontario	7/6/2017
	7/6/2017
	7/6/2017

County	Dates of Public Hearings
Orange	8/30/2017 8/30/2017 8/30/2017
Oswego	8/8/2017 8/9/2017 8/11/2017
Rensselaer	8/10/2017 8/23/2017 9/7/2017
Rockland	5/17/2017 5/24/2017 6/15/2017
Saratoga	6/14/2017 6/20/2017 8/15/2017
Schenectady	6/6/2017 6/22/2017 7/19/2017
Schoharie	deferred — no indication that hearing were held
Schuyler	5/17/2017 6/21/2017 7/12/2017
Seneca	6/13/2017 6/13/2017 6/13/2017
St. Lawrence	6/6/2017 6/8/2017 6/12/2017
Steuben	8/28/2017 8/28/2017 8/28/2017
Suffolk	8/30/2017 9/7/2017 9/12/2017
Sullivan	9/12/2017 9/12/2017 9/12/2017
Tioga	6/29/2017 7/11/2017 8/1/2017

County	Dates of Public Hearings
Tompkins	6/21/2017
	7/19/2017
	9/6/2017
Ulster	8/22/2017
	8/23/2017
	9/6/2017
Wayne	8/14/2017
	9/6/2017
	9/12/2017
Westchester	8/24/2017
	8/28/2017
	9/5/2017
Wyoming	6/6/2017
	7/5/2017
	7/27/2017
Yates	8/28/2017
	8/31/2017
	9/5/2017

Appendix H. Fully Implemented Tax Savings by Population

Fully Implemented Tax Savings Grouped by Population




?

Appendix I. County Plan Snapshots

Snapshot

Albany County



Total Population

308,846



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 39



Participating governments:

3 cities, 10 towns,
6 villages



Participating school
districts and BOCES:
12 SD and 2 BOCES



Total Property Tax Savings

2018 Savings

\$1,556,000

2019 Savings

\$6,715,500

Fully Phased in Savings

\$9,715,000




Number of Projects: 8

Projects	Project Savings
Creation of the Albany County Community Choice Aggregation Energy Program	\$1,500,000
Create a County Health Consortium	\$3,000,000
Creation of a County-Wide Centralized Shared Specialty Equipment Program	\$525,000
Shared Personnel through a Centralized Process Organized by the County	\$1,300,000
Create Additional Joint Purchasing Agreements and Centralized Contracts for Equipment, Materials, Services, and Supplies	\$600,000
Consolidate Vehicle Maintenance and Repair Services Within the County and Combine County, Town, and School District Vehicle Maintenance Facilities in Voorheesville, Berne, Knox, and Westerlo	\$1,990,500
Consolidate Interpretation/Translation Services Within County	\$50,000
Retrofitting Lights to High Efficiency LED Lighting	\$750,000

Snapshot

Broome County



Total Population

195,334



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 15



Participating governments:

1 city, 10 towns,
6 villages



Participating school districts and BOCES:

0



Total Property Tax Savings

2018 Savings

\$20,306,837

2019 Savings

N/A


Fully Phased in Savings

N/A



Number of Projects: 14

Projects	Project Savings
Emergency Communications Projects	\$18,661,000
Caseworkers in School	\$325,897.02
Pharmacy Prescription Program	\$1,000,000
Insurance	N/A
Binghamton University	\$40,000
County Tax Collection	N/A
Park Maintained (Memorial Park)	\$2,480
Park Maintained (Otsiningo Park)	\$42,934
Sport Fields	\$300
Park Maintenance (Choconut Dog park)	\$24,800
Movie Screen	\$1,500
Shared Water Line Construction	\$64,000
Court Consolidation	\$60,000
Performance Stage	\$45,000



Total Population

77,677



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Administrator
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 21



Participating governments:

2 cities, 32 towns,
9 villages



Participating school districts and BOCES:

0



Total Property Tax Savings

2018 Savings

\$1,354,822

2019 Savings

\$1,310,240

Fully Phased in Savings

\$1,310,240



Number of Projects: 32


Projects	Project Savings
Joint Purchase of Materials, Parts and services through Cattaraugus County	\$290,810*
Jointly Procuring and/or Accessing Self-Funded Health Insurance Programs by Municipalities	N/A
Property Tax Assessing by the County	\$145,110.39**
Participation in the Municipal Electric and Gas Alliance (MEGA) for Cost Savings in Utilities Used by Municipalities	\$97,174***
Computerized Coordinated Public Works Equipment Listing and Equipment Sharing Platform	\$112,010****
A Proposal to Explore the Consolidation of Justice Courts	\$109,292.32
A Proposal to Explore the Consolidation of Justice Courts	\$67,845.36
A Proposal for the Joint Procurement of Building Demolition Services by Various Municipalities	\$137,641.76***
Joint Procurement of Professional Engineering Services	N/A
Shared Services Costs Associated with the Production of the County-wide Shared Services Plan	\$13,922
Merge the Village of Cattaraugus with the Town of New Albion	N/A
Reduced Insurance Costs Due to Enrolling in an Insurance Dividend Program by the Village of Delevan and the Town of Yorkshire	\$3,200****
GIS County Shared Service – Allegany	\$24,000
GIS County Shared Service – Village of Little Valley	\$24,000
GIS County Shared Service – Town of Ellicottville	\$24,000



Projects	Project Savings
GIS County Shared Service – Ashford	\$24,000
GIS County Shared Service – Randolph	\$24,000
Shared Salt / Sand Shed	\$54,119****
Asphalt Zipper Equipment Purchase	\$621,952***
Guard Rail Replacement – Town of Lyndon	\$23,885.74***
Newton Street Submission (over stream / creek) 2018 Bridge N.Y. Program	\$4,032.72
Labor Savings as a Result of a Shared Service Arrangement Between the Town of Salamanca and the Town of Little Valley	\$3,017
NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) Acquiring Fishing Rights on Elton Creek from the Village of Delevan	\$4,000
Reduction in Number of Town Justices – Town of Persia	\$17,081
Reduction in Number of Town Justices – Town of Freedom	\$9,000
Reduced Cost of Insurance Coverage due to Participation in the New York Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR) by Cattaraugus County, NY	\$816,978***
Reduced Cost of Property Insurance due to Participating in the New York State Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR) in the Town of Leon	\$7,800***
New York State Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR) in Town of Ashford	\$12,000***
Teamsters Contract with Town of Yorkshire to Reduce Health Insurance Costs	\$30,955*
Healthcare Premium Cost Split	\$6,896.16*
Animal Control Kenneling Agreement – Town of Coldspring	\$1,000*
Purchase of Materials from Cattaraugus County Department of Public Works	\$9
<p>*Represents the sum for 2017 and 2018.</p> <p>**Represents the sum for 2018, 2019, and 2020.</p> <p>***Represents the sum for 2017, 2018, and 2019.</p> <p>****Represents the sum for 2018 and 2019.</p>	

Snapshot

Chautauqua County



Total Population

129,504



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 19



Participating governments:

2 cities, 27 towns,
13 villages



Participating school districts and BOCES:

0



Total Property Tax Savings

2018 Savings

\$1,003,500

2019 Savings

\$1,003,500

Fully Phased in Savings

\$1,003,500



Number of Projects: 5

Projects	Project Savings
Countywide Fire Service Initiative (2018)	\$200,000
Chautauqua Region Water & Wastewater Cooperative (2018)	\$215,000
Dunkirk & Fredonia Collaborate in Shared Composting Facility (2018)	\$280,000
Towns of Gerry & Charlotte to Merge, Village of Sinclairville to Dissolve (2018)	\$298,500
Village of Cherry Creek Dissolves into Town (2018)	\$10,000

Snapshot

Chenango County



Total Population

48,579



Body of government:

CEO: Elected Board Chair

Legislative Body: Board of Supervisors

Number of Members: 23



Participating governments:

1 city, 21 towns,
8 villages



Participating school
districts and BOCES:

0



Total Property Tax Savings

**2018
Savings**

\$100,000

**2019
Savings**

\$140,000

Fully Phased in Savings

\$540,000



Number of Projects: 3

Projects	Project Savings
Continued Work in Concert on the Best and Most Cost Efficient Delivery of Public Works Services in Chenango County	\$500,000
Combine the County's Sealer of Weights and Measures Function	\$30,000
Review the Possibility of Eliminating All Lighting Districts Within the County	\$10,000

Snapshot Clinton County



Total Population

81,073



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Administrator
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 10



Participating governments:

**1 city, 14 towns,
3 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**
\$708,717

**2019
Savings**
\$716,867

Fully Phased in Savings
\$725,111




Number of Projects: 5

Projects	Project Savings
Law Enforcement – Elimination of Village Police Department	\$310,528
Plowing – Town to Plow County Roads in the Town of Black Brook	\$306,040
Assessing Services – County Coordinated Assessing of City of Plattsburgh	\$73,754
Procurement Efficiencies – Towns, City, Villages to Use County Contracts and Bids	\$9,535
Electric and Gas – Potential Participation in Municipal Electric & Gas Alliance (MEGA)	\$8,860

Snapshot

Columbia County



Total Population

60,989



Body of government:

CEO: Elected Board Chair

Legislative Body: Board of Supervisors

Number of Members: 23



Participating governments:

**1 city 18 towns,
3 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**

\$1,880,000

**2019
Savings**

N/A

Fully Phased in Savings

N/A




Number of Projects: 6

Projects	Project Savings
Inter Municipal Agreement Between the County and All Towns and Villages to Share Management Information Services (MIS)	N/A
Inter Municipal Agreement Between the County and All Towns and Villages to Share Real Property Data Verification and Revaluation Services	N/A
Inter Municipal Agreement Between the County and All Towns and Villages to Share Human Resources Training and in Servicing on Mandatory Polices	N/A
Inter Municipal Agreement Between the County and All Towns and Villages to Provide Paper and Other Office Supplies	N/A
Inter Municipal Agreement Between the County and All Towns and Villages to Participate in the County's ASO for Health, Medical and Prescription Plans	N/A
County to Share County and City Operations Building Center with Hudson City	N/A

Snapshot

Dutchess County



Total Population

294,473



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 24



Participating governments:

2 cities, 20 towns,
8 villages



Participating school
districts and BOCES:
13 SD and 1 BOCES



Total Property Tax Savings

2018 Savings

\$15,200,000

2019 Savings

\$12,100,000

Fully Phased in Savings

\$12,500,000



Number of Projects: 37

Projects	Project Savings
Salt Purchasing Cooperative	\$1,230,447*
Shared Paving via County	\$411,431*
Highway Equipment Rental via County	\$54,445*
Dutchess Delivery Shared Electronic Communication & Outreach	\$433,642*
County Procurement Specialist	\$177,919*
Motor Vehicle Repair	\$70,960*
Microsoft Office 365 Maintenance and Administration	\$19,924*
Website Development and Maintenance	\$172,550*
Tyler Technology Public Safety Software	\$197,400*
Worker's Compensation Pool	\$7,482,914*
Drug Task Force	\$7,052,820*
Crisis Intervention Training	\$202,000*
Shared Court Facilities (A)	\$88,000*
Shared Court Facilities (B)	\$120,000*
Municipal Solar Farm	\$506,000*
Financial Management Software Training	\$2,057
Shared Fuel Farm (A)	\$75,200*
Share Fuel Farm (B)	\$201,000
Laserfiche Electronic Content Management User Group	\$16,000*
Sports field - Infield Mix	\$34,500*
Sports field - Permanent Synthetic Marking	\$339,845*


Snapshot

Dutchess County



Projects	Project Savings
Workplace Violence/ Defensive Driving Training	\$2,000*
Shared Municipal Sewer Supply	\$400,000*
Public Access Channel — P.A.N.D.A.	\$870,738*
Shared Skid Steer Purchase	\$96,675
Public Safety Dispatch Consolidation	\$653,323
Consolidation of Firehouses	\$135,050
Highway Departments Shared Services (A)	\$120,000*
Highway Department Shared Services (B)	\$375,760*
Law Enforcement Computer-Aided Dispatch	\$640,000*
Regional Ambulance Service	\$40,000
Shared Electronic Fuel Dispensing	\$132,832*
Consolidation of Water and Wastewater System	\$190,000*
Public Transit Services Consolidation	\$2,626,705*
Family Court Conflict Defender Swap	\$68,083*
Village of Wappingers Falls & County Police Consolidation	\$1,164,000*
Shared Highway Garage and Salt Shed	\$900,000*
*Represents the sum for 2018 and 2019.	

Snapshot Erie County



Total Population

921,046



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 11



Participating governments:

3 cities, 25 towns,
16 villages



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**

\$4,452,635

**2019
Savings**

\$4,351,670

Fully Phased in Savings

\$4,201,670



Number of Projects: 22

Projects	Project Savings
Storm Sewer Maintenance	\$390
Shared Animal Control Services (A)	\$44,000
Shared Composting Facility (A)	\$24,700
Shared Building Inspection Services	\$30,000
Shared Recreation Facilities	\$18,000
Shared Electronic Waste Disposal	\$5,812
Shared Animal Control Services (B)	\$5,700
Cooperative Highway Equipment Purchasing	\$10,485
Shared Engineering & Sewerage Expertise	\$300,000*
Coordinated Municipal Purchasing	\$217,121
Shared Highway Equipment	\$313,000
Shared Composting Facility (B)	\$80,000
Shared Animal Control Services (C)	\$20,650
Issuance of Joint Financial Software RFP	\$19,080
Expansion of Senior Dining Program	\$131,000
Coordinated Solid Waste Management Plan	\$100,000**
County-wide Household Hazardous Waste Collection	\$2,000,000
County-wide Real Property Tax Processing and Collection	\$945,640
Coordinated HUD AFFH Assessment	\$57,400
Municipal Grass Cutting on County Road Right of Ways	\$263,057
Expansion of Senior Transportation Program	\$1,200

Snapshot

Erie County



Projects	Project Savings
Expansion of Energy Aggregation	\$1,400
*Represents the sum for 2018 and 2019.	
**This initiative will result in approximately \$300,000 in savings over the course of three (3) years.	

Snapshot

Franklin County



Total Population

50,409



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Manager

Legislative Body: Legislature

Number of Members: 7



Participating governments:

**0 cities, 19 towns,
6 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

8 SD and 1 BOCES



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**

\$1,650,891

**2019
Savings**

\$350,891

Fully Phased in Savings

\$350,891




Number of Projects: 12

Projects	Project Savings
Installation of County Tax Collection Software	\$92,240
Joint Purchasing Through Franklin County Purchasing Office	\$4,305
Pharmacy Purchasing Coalition Through a Partnership with BOCES	\$50,000
Reduction of the Price to Municipalities of 'Non-Asbestos' Disposal of Municipal-Owned Blighted Buildings	\$15,000
Shared Internet Services	\$1,875
Road Salt Purchase	N/A
Shared Space with a Franklin County Extension Office	\$10,000
Joint CFA Funding for Village and Town of Tupper Lake for a New Water Line	\$1,300,000
Franklin County in Partnership with Town of Malone & Village of Malone Will Provide Administrative Oversight of Two Sidewalk Installations	\$170,000
Plow Sharing by Town of Belmont and Town of Duane	\$7,471
Sharing Video Conferencing Technology	N/A
Partnership with BOCES to Secure Grant Writing Assistance	N/A

Snapshot

Jefferson County



Total Population

114,006



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Administrator
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 15



Participating governments:

1 city, 17 towns,
13 villages



Participating school districts and BOCES:

0



Total Property Tax Savings

**2018
Savings**
\$331,500

**2019
Savings**
\$331,500

Fully Phased in Savings
\$331,500




Number of Projects: 2

Projects	Project Savings
Public Safety Communications	\$331,500
Intra County Service Consolidation	N/A

Snapshot

Livingston County



Total Population

64,257



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Administrator
Legislative Body: Board of Supervisors
Number of Members: 18



Participating governments:

0 cities, 17 towns,
9 villages



Participating school districts and BOCES:

0



Total Property Tax Savings

2018 Savings	2019 Savings	Fully Phased in Savings
\$175,100	\$175,100	N/A




Number of Projects: 4

Projects	Project Savings
Consolidation of Grant-Writing Services	\$175,000*
Shared Highway Equipment	\$90,000*
Shared Scanner Service	\$5,200*
Consolidation of Ambulance Services	\$80,000*
*Represents the sum for 2018 and 2019.	

Snapshot

Madison County



Total Population

71,329



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Administrator
Legislative Body: Board of Supervisors
Number of Members: 20



Participating governments:

1 city, 14 towns,
7 villages



Participating school districts and BOCES:

0



Total Property Tax Savings

2018 Savings

\$1,099,975

2019 Savings

\$1,075,475

Fully Phased in Savings


\$1,075,475



Number of Projects: 10

Projects	Project Savings
Madison County to Establish Countywide Health Insurance Pool	N/A
Regional Court Consolidation	N/A
Madison County to Provide IT Services for Towns and Villages	\$42,000
Madison County CivicPlus Website Available to Towns and Villages starting September	\$26,250
Madison County to Provide Phone Service for Towns and Villages	\$5,250
County-Based Assessor's Office	N/A
County Coordination of Document Shredding / Disposal	N/A
Village of Cazenovia to Provide Water to Route 20 East Corridor	N/A
Shared Highway Garage	\$530,631.74
Cazenovia Town / Village Consolidation	\$495,843

Snapshot Monroe County



Total Population

747,727



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 29



Participating governments:

1 city, 20 towns,
9 villages



Participating school districts and BOCES:

0



Total Property Tax Savings

2018 Savings

\$7,264,758

2019 Savings

\$7,266,008

Fully Phased in Savings

\$7,266,008



Number of Projects: 40

Projects	Project Savings
Combining Village and Town Courts	\$140,000*
Shared Assessment Services	N/A
Grass Mowing	\$1,876*
Plowing Handicapped Parking Spaces	\$500*
Sidewalk Snow Removal at the Mendon Library	\$1,750*
Provide Water Spicket Access to Village Employees	\$890*
Accepting Village Brush at the Town Highway Department	\$10,000*
Consolidation of Fire Dispatch Operations	N/A
Utilizing Town Dispatchers for Winter Callouts	\$30,000*
Consolidating Sewer Districts in the Town of Ogden	\$16,000*
Consolidating Lighting Districts in the Town of Ogden	\$16,000*
Shared Building Code Enforcement Services	\$70,000*
IT Services Contract	\$60,750*
Shared Telephony Services	N/A
Shared Contract Compliance Function for Public Works Projects	N/A
Consolidated Library Services	\$1,075,200*
Medical Insurance Consortium	\$2,765,312*
Security Awareness Training	N/A
DOT Summer Work Program	\$5,410,128*
Shared Use of the City's PlowTrax Application	N/A
Backup Data Storage Disaster Recovery	\$100,000*



Projects	Project Savings
Dissolution of Monroe Security & Safety Systems Local Development Corporation and Consolidation of Operations into Monroe County	\$1,684,000*
Dissolution of Upstate Telecommunications Corporation LDC and Consolidation of Operations into Monroe County	\$1,156,000*
Dissolution of Monroe NewPower Corporation LDC and Consolidation of Operations into Monroe County	\$1,312,000*
Dissolution of Civic Center Monroe County Local Development Corporation and Consolidation of Operations into Monroe County	N/A
Dissolution of Greater Rochester Outdoor Sports Facility Corporation and Consolidation of Operations into Monroe County	\$640,000*
Police Records Management System	N/A
Shared Fiber Optic and Associated Assets	N/A
Shared Small Equipment Loans	N/A
Shared Board-Up Services	N/A
Shared Roadside Emergency Towing Services	N/A
Utilizing County Data Storage (Submitted by the Town of Greece and Monroe County)	\$7,680*
Utilizing County Data Storage (Submitted by RGRTA and Monroe County)	\$7,680*
Utilizing ezIQC Joint Purchasing Program	N/A
Shared Fueling Station	\$15,000*
Shared Highway Equipment Purchasing	\$10,000*
Utilizing Joint PVC Storage Facility	N/A
Community Choice Aggregation	N/A
Town of Brighton	N/A
LED Street Lighting	N/A
*Represents the sum for 2018 and 2019.	

Snapshot

Montgomery County



Total Population

49,276



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 9



Participating governments:

**1 city, 10 towns,
10 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**

\$1,200,000

**2019
Savings**

\$2,379,121

Fully Phased in Savings

\$4,552,320



Number of Projects: 11

Projects	Project Savings
Dissolution of Village of Canajoharie & Consolidation with the Town of Canajoharie	\$330,197
Functional Consolidation Mental Health and Public Health and Improved Interface with Local Government, School and Emergency Services Partners	\$85,000
Multijurisdictional Court Consolidation	\$480,000
Western Montgomery County Municipal Building	\$98,000
Law Enforcement Consolidation – Transfer of Local Law Enforcement Services from the Village of Fort Plain and the Village of Canajoharie to the Montgomery County Sheriff's Office	\$396,474
Creation of a Countywide Assessment Department	\$270,000
Consolidated Repair Facility (CRF)	\$666,356
Creation of Efficiencies Through Electronic Records Management / Content Development, Investment in Phone and Communication Systems and a New IT Software Backbone	\$1,344,174
Town of Minden-Village of Fort Plain Joint Development of Salt Storage Facility and Fuel Depot	\$39,000
DSS to Work	\$800,000
Expanded Sharing of DPW Services	\$150,000



Total Population

1,361,500



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 19



Participating governments:

2 cities, 3 towns,
64 villages



Participating school districts and BOCES:

1 SD



Total Property Tax Savings

2018 Savings	2019 Savings	Fully Phased in Savings
\$130,507,124	N/A	N/A



Number of Projects: 41

Projects	Project Savings
Development of a shared Automated Roadway Pavement Management System	\$1,271,904
Nassau County to Provide Road Paving Services on Town of Oyster Bay Roads	\$403,862
Consolidate Wastewater Treatment Services Between Long Beach and Nassau County	\$128,000,000
Long Beach to Plow County Owned Roads Within the City of Long Beach	\$18,952
IMA with Nassau County to Purchase Property from the County; on-going Maintenance of the Property handled by the Village	\$51,929
Cooperative Agreement with Nassau County for Villages to Provide Street Sweeping Services on All County Roads Within the Villages	\$46,463
Cooperative Agreement between Nassau County and the Village of Malverne for the Village to Provide Snow Plowing Services on All County Roads Within the Village	\$17,038
Transfer the Maintenance of Long Beach Road from Austin Blvd to the Long Island Rail Road Plaza from Nassau County to the Village of Island Park	\$13,324
Transfer the Maintenance of Warwick Road from Long Beach Road to Harbor Isle Bridge from Nassau County to the Village of Island Park	\$13,324
Transfer the Maintenance of Island Parkway from Long Beach Road to Harbor Isle Bridge from Nassau County to the Village of Island Park	\$13,324
NCPD to Purchase Diesel Fuel from TOB for District Vehicles	\$475
Bayville to Take Over Snow Removal of Bayville & Ludlam Avenues from Nassau County	\$15,000
Bayville to Take Over Snow Removal of West Harbor Drive from Town of Oyster Bay	\$5,000



Projects	Project Savings
Transfer Police Services of the Village of Bayville from the NCPD to the Village of Centre Island PD	\$500,000
Old Brookville to Purchase Road Salt from Town of Oyster Bay	\$57,249
Old Brookville to Purchase Road Salt / Sand Mix from Town of Oyster Bay	6,566
School District to Purchase Regular Gas from Town of Oyster Bay for District Vehicles	\$1,566
School District to Purchase Salt / Sand Mix from Town of Oyster Bay	\$114
Oyster Bay Cove Police Department to Purchase Regular Gas from Town of Oyster Bay	\$6,580
Inc. Village of Mill Neck to Purchase Regular Gas from Town of Oyster Bay	\$1,774
Inc. Village of Mill Neck to Purchase Diesel Fuel from Town of Oyster Bay	\$5,657
Inc. Village of Mill Neck to Purchase Road Salt from Town of Oyster Bay	\$18,860
Inc. village of Mill Neck to Purchase Road Salt / Sand Mix from Town of Oyster Bay	\$25
Brookville to Purchase Road Salt / Sand Mix from Town of Oyster Bay	\$10,724
Village of North Hills Interested in Participating in Shared Tree Work, Paving & Repair, Pavement Marking & Signs Services with the Town of North Hempstead	\$14,000
Village of Lake Success interested in Participating in Shared Storm Cleaning Services with the Town of North Hempstead	\$13,226
Village of Kensington Interested in Participating in Shared Storm Cleaning Services with the Town of North Hempstead	\$6,028
Village of Great Neck Estates Interested in Participating in Shared Storm Cleaning Services with the Town of North Hempstead	\$1,500
Village of Great Neck Interested in Participating in Shared Storm Cleaning Services with the Town of North Hempstead	\$3,723
Village of Roslyn Estates Interested in Participating in Shared Swift Reach 911 Services with the Town of North Hempstead	\$1,200
Village of Roslyn Estates Interested in Participating in Shared Gas Purchasing Services with the Town of North Hempstead	\$950
Village of East Williston Wants to Expand the Current Fuel Purchase Program with the Town of North Hempstead to include the Entire Fire Department Fleet of Vehicles	\$2,010
Inc. Village of Great Neck Plaza and Inc. Village of Great Neck Estates to Work Cooperatively on the Design and Implementation of Salt Storage Shed to Serve the Winter Deicing needs of Both Villages	\$11,500*
Villages to Work Cooperatively on Implementing a Shared Garbage Services Program	\$24,479**
Housing a Public Works Facility in One Central Location for All the Villages; Once Central Location to drop off E-Waste; Combine Road Improvement Projects to Cut Costs on Engineering and Construction Services; Combine Tree Removal Contract, Bid Out Services for Grant Writing in Order to Obtain Funding for the Above Listed Projects	N/A***
The County to Repave Middle Neck Road Within the Village of Flower Hill	\$493,200
Share Professional Arborist Services Among the Villages	\$2,700****
Flower Hill and Plandome Manor to Share Costs Associated with the Construction of a Pedestrian Path	\$3,100
Share Costs Associated with Blueprint Copying / Scanning Services Among the Villages	\$1,000****
Increasing Proposed Personnel Sharing Among the Villages	N/A****
Sharing the Services of a Valley Stream DPW Sign Shop	N/A



Projects	Project Savings
*\$3,000 Savings for Inc. Village of Great Neck Plaza and \$8,500 Savings for Inc. Village of Great Neck Estates.	
**\$20,000 Savings for Inc. Village of Great Neck Plaza and \$4,479 Savings for Inc. Village of Russell Gardens; Savings not stated for Inc. Village of Kensington.	
***Includes the following Villages: Village of New Hyde Park, Village of Stewart Manor, village of Floral Park, Village of South Floral Park, Village of Bellerose.	
****Includes the following Villages: Nassau County, Village of Plandome, Village of Plandome Manor, Village of Plandome Heights, Village of Flower Hill, Village of Baxter Estates.	

Snapshot

Oneida County



Total Population

231,190



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 23



Participating governments:

3 cities, 26 towns,
17 villages



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**
\$164,000

**2019
Savings**
\$164,000

Fully Phased in Savings
\$164,000




Number of Projects: 3

Projects	Project Savings
Boonville Court Consolidation	\$14,000
Oneida County-wide DPW Equipment Sharing Agreement	\$150,000
Rome and Verona Mowing and Snowplowing Shared Service Agreement	N/A

Snapshot

Onondaga County



Total Population

466,194



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 17



Participating governments:

2 cities, 19 towns,
15 villages



Participating school
districts and BOCES:
17 SD and 1 BOCES



Total Property Tax Savings

2018 Savings

\$5,618,370

2019 Savings

\$5,488,370

Fully Phased in Savings

\$1,088,370



Number of Projects: 37

Projects	Project Savings
The Town of Geddes and the Village of Solvay Will Share Code Enforcement Operations	\$50,000
The Village of Fayetteville and the Village of East Syracuse Will Share Code Enforcement Operations	\$25,000
The County of Onondaga, the City of Syracuse and Syracuse City School District Issued a Joint Request for Proposals for a Medicare Advantage Plan	\$4,400,000*
The Town of Van Buren to Share Use of a Scanner/Plotter Unit with the Town of Lysander and the Village of Baldwinsville	\$3,000
The County of Onondaga to Share Oracle Hyperion Planning, a centralized, Excel and Web-based planning, budgeting and forecasting solution that integrates financial and operational planning processes	\$0
The County Proposes to Offer Financing to Towns and Villages, incl. Lighting Districts, that Plan Programs to Replace Streetlight Equipment with Energy-Efficient Replacements with a Break-Even Point of 5 years or Less	\$0
Creation of the Greater Syracuse Shared Services Council	\$0
Quarterly meeting of the Onondaga County Association of Town Supervisors and the Onondaga County Mayors Association	\$0
The Town of Van Buren and the Village of Baldwinsville to Share one Certified Herbicide Applicator	\$3,000

Snapshot

Onondaga County



Projects	Project Savings
The Town of Lysander, the Town of Van Buren and the Village of Baldwinsville to Utilize Onondaga County's Resources to Assist with HR Services as well as Labor Negotiations/Issues	\$30,000
The Village of Manlius to Utilize OCM BOCES for Information Technology Services	\$9,600
Joint Solicitation for Workers Compensation Insurance	\$71,440
The Village of Liverpool to Share Its Portable Speed Detection Trailer with the Town of Salina	\$10,000
The Village of Liverpool Police Department Will Sponsor / Host DCJS Certified Breath Analysis Operator 3-day Training Sessions	\$0
The Village of Skaneateles to Transfer Ownership of Austin Park to the Town of Skaneateles	\$4,000-\$6,650
Onondaga County to Offer Mowing and Landscaping Services to Towns and Villages for Outdoor Park Spaces	N/A
Onondaga County Proposes Creation of a Web Based Data Center to Provide County-wide Park Facility Reservations and Rental Information for Every Park	\$0
The Village of Fayetteville and the Village of Manlius to Purchase of a Sewer Camera and Tractor System	\$17,366
The Towns of Camillus, Manlius and Van Buren to Use the Onondaga County Employees Benefit Association (OCEBA) for Employee Benefits	\$100,000
Onondaga County is Proposing Entry into an Intermunicipal Agreement for Equipment Sharing	\$0
The Town of Geddes and the Village of Solway to Combine Highway Related Services, co-locating in a New Facility	\$150,000
The Town of Van Buren to Use the Onondaga County DOT Fueling Facility on Pottery Road as its Primary Fueling Location	\$51,628
The Town of Van Buren and the Town of Lysander to Share a Tractor with a Long Arm Mowing Attachment	\$23,226
The Village of Baldwinsville to Use Brush Chipping Equipment Owned by the Town of Van Buren	\$60,000
The Town and Villages are Proposing to Include Piggybacking Language in Future Public Works Bids	\$0
Onondaga County and the Town of Salina to Construct a Single Highway Facility for Both Entities	\$168,765
The Town of Lysander to Utilize Existing Sewer Cleaning Equipment Owned by the Village of Baldwinsville	\$40,000
Onondaga County is proposing the creation of a County Wide Fleet Fuel Card	\$2,000**
Relinquish Tax Assessor Services to Onondaga County	\$0
The Town of Camillus Proposal to Create a Safety Training Position that Could be Utilized by Multiple Jurisdictions	\$0
The Village of Baldwinsville, Town of Van Buren and Town of Lysander to Combine Employee Safety Training Operations	\$6,000
OCM BOCES and Member School Districts to Establish a Transportation Hub to Transport Special Needs and Other Students, Using School District Bus Drivers and Vehicles	\$75,000
The County's new Delinquent Tax Collection Software Will be Offered as a Shared Services to All Towns, Villages, and School Districts	\$298,345

Snapshot

Onondaga County



Projects	Project Savings
The Village of Manlius proposes using OCM BOCES electricity and natural gas contract pricing	\$0
The Town of Lysander and the Baldwinsville School District are Proposing Sharing a Fuel Storage Facility.	\$20,000
OCM BOCES will offer discounted energy (electricity and natural gas) commodity pricing to currently non participating Towns and Villages	\$0
OCM BOCES will offer Information Technology Services to currently non participating Towns and Villages	\$0
*Represents the sum for 2018 and 2019. **\$2,000 per tank per year.	

Snapshot Ontario County



Total Population

109,828



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Administrator
Legislative Body: Board of Supervisors
Number of Members: 20



Participating governments:

2 cities, 16 towns,
8 villages



Participating school
districts and BOCES:
9 SD and 1 BOCES



Total Property Tax Savings

**2018
Savings**
\$4,668,138

**2019
Savings**
\$466,932

Fully Phased in Savings
\$476,037




Number of Projects: 11

Projects	Project Savings
Health Officers	\$11,722
Heavy Equipment Initiative: Tub Grinding, VacAll / Sweeper, Drum Roller	\$338,650
Building Sharing Initiative: EMS Equipment Storage, Court Facilities	\$304,409
Municipal Employee Training Institute	\$6,340
Employee Assistance Program Consortium	\$13,551
Municipal Human Resources Support	\$24,000
Commercial Assessing	\$12,800
Planning Services: County / Town of Victor	\$54,363
County / FLCC Public Relations Support	\$109,303
School Tax Collection (Effective 7/1/18)	N/A
City / Town of Canandaigua Shared Services Project: Accounting / Financial, Court / Court Facility, Economic Development, Information Technology, Parks and Recreation, Transfer Station	\$3,793,000

Snapshot

Rensselaer County



Total Population

160,070



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive

Legislative Body: Legislature

Number of Members: 19



Participating governments:

2 cities, 14 towns,
6 villages



Participating school
districts and BOCES:

0



Total Property Tax Savings

**2018
Savings**

\$165,945

**2019
Savings**

\$1,491,209

Fully Phased in Savings

\$1,491,209




Number of Projects: 6

Projects	Project Savings
Dog Control Services	\$38,800
Highway and DPW Services	\$409,000
Household Hazardous Waste	N/A
Regional Purchasing Portal	\$158,000
LED Lighting	\$271,440
Regional Training	N/A

Snapshot

Saratoga County



Total Population

227,053



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Administrator
Legislative Body: Board of Supervisors
Number of Members: 22



Participating governments:

2 cities, 19 towns,
9 villages



Participating school
districts and BOCES:

0



Total Property
Tax Savings

2018
Savings
\$364,230

2019
Savings
\$364,230

Fully Phased in Savings
\$364,230



Number of Projects: 2

Projects	Project Savings
Cooperative Bidding	\$300,265
Medicare-eligible Retiree Health Insurance Consortium	\$63,965

Snapshot

Schenectady County



Total Population

154,553



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Manager

Legislative Body: Legislature

Number of Members: 15



Participating governments:

**1 city, 5 towns,
2 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**

\$272,505

**2019
Savings**

\$1,186,220

Fully Phased in Savings

\$1,544,470




Number of Projects: 7

Projects	Project Savings
Solar Energy Consortium	\$525,000
LED Municipal Lighting Fund	\$54,470
LED Street Lighting Initiative	\$119,000
MEGA Energy Procurement	\$8,000
Municipal Healthcare Consortium	\$766,000
Purchasing Cooperative	\$38,000
Shared Fueling Station	\$34,000

Snapshot

Schuyler County



Total Population

18,099



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Administrator
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 9



Participating governments:

0 cities, 8 towns,
4 villages



Participating school districts and BOCES:

0



Total Property Tax Savings

2018
Savings
\$250,000

2019
Savings
\$300,000

Fully Phased in Savings
\$400,000




Number of Projects: 3

Projects	Project Savings
Centralized Code Enforcement	\$8,772
Centralized Purchasing	\$50,000
Regional Wastewater Treatment Plant (WWTP)	\$200,000

Snapshot

Seneca County



Total Population

34,777



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Manager
Legislative Body: Board of Supervisors
Number of Members: 14



Participating governments:

**0 cities, 7 towns,
1 village**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**
\$512,510

**2019
Savings**
\$242,510

Fully Phased in Savings
\$242,510




Number of Projects: 3

Projects	Project Savings
Snow Removal of County Roads	\$403,622
Roadside Mowing of County Roads	\$85,000
County Renting Unique Highway Department Equipment to Towns	\$23,888

Snapshot

St. Lawrence County



Total Population

110,038



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Administrator
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 15



Participating governments:

**1 city, 20 towns,
8 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

5 SD



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**
\$17,283

**2019
Savings**
\$17,283

Fully Phased in Savings
N/A



Number of Projects: N/A

Projects		Project Savings
N/A		N/A

Snapshot

Steuben County



STEUBEN COUNTY
NEW YORK

Total Population

96,940



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Manager
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 17



Participating governments:

2 cities, 32 towns,
13 villages



Participating school districts and BOCES:

0



Total Property Tax Savings

2018
Savings
\$1,887,050

2019
Savings
\$1,887,050

Fully Phased in Savings
\$1,950,000



Number of Projects: 20

Projects	Project Savings
Shared Service for Road Repair	\$222,500
Shared Service for Bridge Construction	\$280,000
Mobile Work Program	\$128,000
Joint Purchasing	\$45,000
Contract Services for Assessing	\$20,000
County Auction / Sale of Surplus Items	\$5,000
Joint Radio System and Broadband Communications and Consolidation Efforts	\$20,000
Shared Service for Property Rehabilitation	\$40,000
Shared Public Works Equipment & Personnel	\$406,250
Shared GIS Mapping	\$48,000
Cooperative Purchase for Public Works Materials	\$25,400
Shared Dog Control	\$19,900
Sewer Management and Operation	\$171,000
Shared Court Facilities	\$60,000
Shared Town Assessor	\$52,000
Shared Paver	\$82,500
District Courts	\$200,000
Code Enforcement Training	\$6,500
Consolidation of Water Districts	\$25,000
Consolidation of Economic Development Administration	\$30,000

Snapshot

Suffolk County



Total Population

1,492,583



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive

Legislative Body: Legislature

Number of Members: 18



Participating governments:

**0 cities, 10 towns,
33 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

4 SD



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**

\$16,500,052

**2019
Savings**

\$20,900,052

Fully Phased in Savings

\$20,900,052



Number of Projects: 10

Projects	Project Savings
Virtual Municipal Service Store	N/A
Inter-Municipal Services	N/A
Inter-Municipal Agreement	N/A
Certification Audit Process	N/A
Data Analysis	N/A
MuniChat	N/A
Shared Services Newsletter	N/A
Intra-County Projects Program	N/A
Inter-County Project Program	N/A
Office of Inter-Municipal Coordination	N/A

Snapshot

Sullivan County



Total Population

74,801



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Manager

Legislative Body: Legislature

Number of Members: 9



Participating governments:

**0 cities, 14 towns,
4 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**

\$1,190,130

**2019
Savings**

\$1,190,130

Fully Phased in Savings

\$1,190,130



Number of Projects: 9

Projects	Project Savings
Sullivan County and Town of Liberty Parks and Recreation Administration Proposal	\$80,314
Municipalities in Sullivan who have yet to Join Aggregate Power Purchasing	\$21,000
Sullivan County 911 Shared Service for Dispatch of Fallsburg Police	\$487,000
Sullivan County Shared Emergency Notification System	\$53,835
Sullivan County and Town of Bethel / Alliance for Sustainable	\$3,000
Implementing Enterprise Content Management for all Municipalities	\$386,731
Town of Neversink Proposals, also Impacting Towns of Rockland and Fallsburg	\$108,450
Town of Lumberland Proposal	\$28,000
Town of Rockland Proposal	\$21,800

Snapshot

Tompkins County



Total Population

104,871



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Administrator

Legislative Body: Legislature

Number of Members: 14



Participating governments:

**1 city, 9 towns,
6 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**

\$145,975

**2019
Savings**

\$281,037

Fully Phased in Savings

\$288,918



Number of Projects: 6

Projects	Project Savings
Creation of a Tompkins County Council of Governments (TCCOG) Training Academy	\$17,000
Creation and Maintenance of a Service Modernization Plan	\$50,600
Creation and Management of a Purchasing Pool	\$1,000
Acquisition and Operation of a Countywide Mass Notification System	\$6,500
Creation and Management of a Purchasing Pool to Facilitate the Conversion of Street Lights to High Efficiency LED Fixtures	\$170,000
Expansion of the Greater Tompkins County Municipal Health Insurance Consortium	\$49,041*
*Savings for Town of Newfield and Town of Homer.	

Snapshot Ulster County



Total Population

179,225



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive

Legislative Body: Legislature

Number of Members: 23



Participating governments:

**1 city, 20 towns,
3 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**

\$1,662,458

**2019
Savings**

\$1,667,140

Fully Phased in Savings

\$1,667,140



Number of Projects: 6

Projects	Project Savings
Shared Saugerties Highway Facility	\$468,916*
Unified Ulster County Transit	\$468,000*
New Paltz Municipal Center	\$1,732,100*
Ulster County Law Enforcement and Emergency Services Center	\$221,380*
Family Court Conflict Defender Swap	\$68,083*
Ulster County Municipal Purchasing	\$371,119*
*Represents the sum for 2018 and 2019.	

Snapshot Wayne County



Wayne County New York



Total Population

90,798



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Administrator
Legislative Body: Board of Supervisors
Number of Members: 15



Participating governments:

0 cities, 15 towns,
5 villages



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

2 SD



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**
\$49,853

**2019
Savings**
\$49,853


Fully Phased in Savings
N/A



Number of Projects: 3

Projects	Project Savings
Document and Records Storage	\$99,706*
Highway Maintenance / Consolidation	N/A
Justice Courts	N/A

*Represents the sum for 2018 and 2019.



Total Population

974,542



Body of government:

CEO: Elected County Executive

Legislative Body: Legislature

Number of Members: 17



Participating governments:

**6 cities, 17 towns,
22 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**

\$2,130,000

**2019
Savings**

\$1,200,000

Fully Phased in Savings

\$1,200,000




Number of Projects: 12

Projects	Project Savings
Desktop / Virtual Desktop Services & Local Area Network Management	\$173,000
Document Scanning Services	\$462,000
Software Procurement	\$52,000
Wide Area Network (WAN) Management	\$20,000
Symantec Protection Suite	\$33,000
Email & Smart Phone Services	\$75,000
Criminal Justice Warehouse	\$58,000
I/NetViewer	\$122,000
CADTIMES	\$65,000
FireRMS	\$31,000
Special Situation Critical Information Dispatch System	\$88,000
HIPLINK & IPAGE	\$21,000

Snapshot

Wyoming County



Total Population

40,791



Body of government:

CEO: Elected Board Chair

Legislative Body: Board of Supervisors

Number of Members: 16



Participating governments:

**0 cities, 16 towns,
8 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**

\$1,450.48

**2019
Savings**

\$0

Fully Phased in Savings

\$0



Number of Projects: 1

Projects

County-Wide Zoning Services

Project Savings

\$1,450.48

Snapshot Yates County



Total Population

24,923



Body of government:

CEO: Appointed County Administrator
Legislative Body: Legislature
Number of Members: 14



Participating governments:

**0 cities, 8 towns,
4 villages**



**Participating school
districts and BOCES:**

0



**Total Property
Tax Savings**

**2018
Savings**
\$0

**2019
Savings**
\$0

Fully Phased in Savings
\$0



Number of Projects: 0

Projects		Project Savings
N/A		N/A