Cattaraugus County
John R. Searles, County Administrator

303 Court St.
Little Valley, NY 14755
Phone (716) 938-2577
Fax (716) 938-2760

September 8, 2017

New York State Division for the Budget
Albany, NY

To whom it may concern,

It is with great honor that I submit to you the Countywide Shared Services Initiative Plan for Cattaraugus County.

Per New York State requirements, Cattaraugus was required to convene a panel composed of all the elected Supervisors and Mayors in Cattaraugus County to discuss shared services and efficiencies and to prepare a plan for submission to New York State.

We convened this group of forty-three (43) elected officials and it was decided that we would strive to have a submission in 2017 rather than waiting until 2018.

To accomplish the task at hand, this group committed to attending six (6) different meetings of two hours each to discuss shared services and efficiencies and to put forward proposals. In the end a plan containing thirty two (32) separate proposals were generated, which, when taken together, represent the Plan for Cattaraugus County.

According to State law, we were required to have three (3) Public Hearings on the Plan. These Public Hearings were held in Ellicottville, Olean and Little Valley on dates ranging from late July to August 23, 2017.

On August 1, 2017, the Cattaraugus County Legislature was presented with the Plan for comment. At a Board meeting on August 23, 2017, the Cattaraugus County Legislature passed a resolution supporting the Plan as submitted.

The full group of local elected officials were again convened on September 7, 2017 specifically to consider approval of the Plan. Forty (40) of forty-three (43) elected officials attended this meeting and affirmatively endorsed this Plan. Attached is a summary sheet showing those who voted for the Plan.

All meetings, in accordance with State guidance were appropriately advertised and open to the Public, labor organizations, the media, highway superintendents, County Department Heads, and County Legislators. All meetings were held in the evening in a central location in the County.

According to direction from the New York State Department of State, this plan is to be emailed to the New York State Division for the Budget by September 15, 2017. This is a cover letter for that Plan. The actual Plan documents are attached.

Should you have any questions about this submission, please don't hesitate to contact me.

Respectfully submitted,

Jack Searles
County Administrator
County of Cattaraugus, NY

County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Appendix A

County of Cattaraugus			
County Contact: Paula Stockman & Jack Searles			
Contact Telephone: 7169389111, extension 2577			
Contact Email: jrsearles@cattco.org			
Partners			
Row 1 – 2 (total # of) Cities in Cattaraugus County			
	Participating Cities	**Panel Representative**	**Vote Cast (Yes or No)**
1.	Olean	Bill Aiello	Absent
2.	Salamanca	Michael Smith	Absent
3.			
Row 2 – 32 (total # of) Towns in Cattaraugus County			
	Participating Towns	**Panel Representative**	**Vote Cast (Yes or No)**
1.	Allegany	John Hare	Yes
2.	Ashford	Charles Davis III	Yes
3.	Carrollton	James R Stoddard	Absent
4.	Coldspring	Melissa Davis	Yes
5.	Conewango	Wayne McGuire	Yes
6.	Dayton	Mark Smith	Yes
7.	East Otto	Ann Rugg	Yes
8.	Ellicottville	Matthew J McAndrew	Yes
9.	Farmersville	Robert Karcher	Yes
10.	Franklinville	Lorrie B Fisher	Yes
11.	Freedom	Daren J Whitacre	Yes
12.	Great Valley	Daniel Brown	Yes
13.	Hinsdale	Thomas Hooper	Yes
14.	Humphrey	Carrie Childs	Yes
15.	Ischua	Jeffrey Goodyear	Yes
16.	Leon	Frederick S Filock	Yes

Appendix A

17.	Little Valley	Pete Wrona	Yes
18.	Lyndon	Carol Evans	Yes
19.	Machias	Stephen J Cornwell	Yes
20.	Mansfield	Robert Kies	Yes
Use Additional Sheets if necessary			

Row 3 – 9 (total # of) Villages in Cattaraugus County

	Participating Villages	Panel Representative	Vote Cast (Yes or No)
1.	Allegany	Greg Pearl	Yes
2.	Cattaraugus	Wirt Smith	Yes
3.	Delevan	John Stumpf	Yes
4.	Ellicottville	John Burrell	Yes
5.	Franklinville	Harvey Soulvie	Yes
6.	Gowanda	David Smith	Yes
7.	Little Valley	Norman Marsh	Yes
8.	Portville	Emily Woodhead	Yes
9.	South Dayton	Scott Kerr	Yes
10.			
Use Additional Sheets if necessary			

Row 4 – 0 (total # of) School Districts, BOCES, and Special Improvement Districts in County

	Participating School Districts, BOCES, and Special Improvement Districts	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

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.**
	$147,118,225

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.**
	$83,778,927 (no School Districts, BOCES or Special Improvement Districts participated in the development of the Plan)

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.**
	2017-$648,703, 2018-$1,354,822, 2019-$1,310,240 (*some of these are 1 time savings and not reoccurring, the vast majority of amounts cited are projections based upon actual municipalities implementing or being able to implement the plan and finally this is based on projections that appear to

	be accurate at the time of submission but are subject to change)
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.**
	2017-.76%, 2018-1.62%, 2019-1.56% (assuming projected savings are realized as projected)
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.**
	2017-$7.57, 2018-$15.81, 2019-$15.29 (2018, assumes 85,700 taxpayers and assumes the projections, which are subject to change for any variety of reasons are accurate)
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.**
	Using the methodology suggested by NYSDOS, with County CPI rates as the comparison base, assuming no override of the tax cap by any participating municipality, and that all projected figures are realized as projected, the numbers would be 2017-<.08%, 2018-.22% and 2017-.45% (see attached derivation schedule)
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.**
	Using the methodology suggested by NYSDOS, with County CPI rates as the comparison base, assuming no

NEW YORK STATE OF OPPORTUNITY

County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Additional Towns			
Row 2 – (total # of) Towns in County			
	Participating Towns	**Panel Representative**	**Vote Cast (Yes or No)**
1.	Napoli	Melissa Kish	Yes
2.	New Albion	Loyd Chilson	Yes
3.	Olean Town	Annette Parker	Yes
4.	Otto	Ronald Wasmund	Yes
5.	Perrysburg	Jennifer Dabolt	Yes
6.	Persia	Paula Schueler	Yes
7.	Portville	Gary Woodhead (Deputy Supervisor)	Yes
8.	Randolph	Dale Senn	Yes
9.	Red House	Tamara Booth	Yes
10.	Salamanca	Michael Phillips	Yes
11.	South Valley	Mark Burch	Yes
12.	Yorkshire	Marcia Spencer	Yes
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			
17.			
18.			
19.			
20.			
21.			
22.			
23.			
24.			
25.			
26.			
27.			
28.			

	override of the tax cap by any participating municipality, and that all projected figures are realized as projected, the numbers would be 2017-<.08%, 2018-.22% and 2017-.44% (see attached derivation schedule)

*There are several assumptions implicit in this Plan.

First, municipalities in the State and New York State itself operate on different fiscal years. The analysis applied here is projected on the fiscal year used by the County which is the calendar year. Assuming costs and revenues do not change on a year over year basis, impacts made in one calendar year may both impact the current calendar year and subsequent calendar years, unless saving are one time in nature. This plan does contain one time savings. It should be noted that the CPI component of the tax cap calculation does vary between municipalities depending upon their budget cycle.

Second, New York State did not provide the necessary denominators for calculation of Rows 5-9 of the above document or common means to calculate Row 10-1. This will cause variation from one County to another and seriously compromises the validity of comparing data across counties. This caused Cattaraugus County to make a set of assumptions about these figures. These include:

Row 5: Total taxes represent all taxes raised by all municipalities, school districts, BOCES and special assessment districts in Cattaraugus as determined by the Cattaraugus County Department of Real Property Tax Services.

Row 6: The taxes raised by participating entities are the total taxes less those levied by school districts, BOCES and special assessment districts in Cattaraugus as determined by the Cattaraugus County Department of Real Property Tax Services.

Row 7 The attached plan contains 31 different proposals. Some of these proposals contain actual savings, other rely on projections, and some of these items are one time in nature, while still others may be reoccurring. This represents a plan that s subject to modification and refinement. The numbers represent best projections at the time the plan was developed, however, they are certainly subject to change for any variety of reasons. The tight timeline afforded to counties by the State caused there to be a set of best estimate proposals on many of these items. They are subject to change and are not immutable or otherwise unchangeable.

Row 8 The comments for Row 7 also apply here. Effectively you are estimating savings based on projections that will probably change. It is interesting that the denominator for this calculation is Row 6 or the 2017 Property Taxes. When projecting into the future, normally you want to adjust the denominator in the calculation rather than holding this as a constant. Effectively freezing the levy at

NEW YORK STATE OF OPPORTUNITY

County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Appendix A

2017 levels over values the savings. Given the current methodology, the accuracy of this number as a predictor should seriously be questioned.

Row 9 Per the guidance from New York State, this is calculated by taking the amounts of savings and dividing this by the number of taxpayers in the County. According to the Cattaraugus County Department of Real Property Tax Services the number of taxpayers in the County are 85,700. This becomes the denominator for this item.

Row 10-11 The calculation in this row uses the product of Row 8, which is flawed as noted above. Further, this does not take into consideration the ability of a local municipality to override the tax cap. It also assumes all savings projections are absolute true and correct and able to be achieved. The guidance for this calculation provided by the State is exceeding confusing. Interpretation will vary between counties, effectively rendering already meaningless information useless.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby affirm under penalty of perjury that information provided is true to the best of my knowledge and belief. This is the finalized county-wide shared services property tax savings plan. The county-wide shared services property tax savings plan was approved on 9/7, 2017, and it was disseminated to residents of the county in accordance with the County-wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Law*

John R Searles — County Chief Executive Officer

(Print Name)

John R Searles — 9/8/17

(Signature) (Date)

NEW YORK STATE OF OPPORTUNITY

County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Appendix A

Derivation of

Calculations of Rows 8-11

Calculation of Row 8

2017= $63781/$83,778,927 (Row 6)=.76%

2018=$1,354,822/$83,778,927 (Row 6)=1.62%

2019=$1,310,240/$83,778,927 (Row 6)=1.56%

Calculation of Row 9

2017 $648,703/85700=$7.57

2018 $1,354,822/85700=$15.81

2019 $1,310,240/85700=$15.29

Calculation of Row 10

Year	County CPI %	Row 8%		Variance
2017	**.68% less**	**76%**	**=**	**<.08%**
2018	1.84% less	1.62%	=	.22%
2019	2.00% less	1.55%	=	.44%

Calculation Row 11

Year	County CPI %	Row 8%		Variance
2017	**.68% less**	**76%**	**=**	**<.08%**
2018	1.84% less	1.62%	=	.22%
2019	2.00% less	1.55%	=	.44%

Appendix A

Attached are a number of items including:

ATTACHMENT #1: Cattaraugus County Act 359-2017 entitled *Supporting Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan*

ATTACHMENT #2: Financial summary of Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan

ATTACHMENT #3:: Individual descriptions of Plan proposals

ATTACHMENT #4: Dates/locations/Times of Public Hearings

ATTACHMENT #5: Vote Tally from the September 7, 2017 meeting of the Cattaraugus Shared Services Panel

Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan

ATTACHMENT #1

Cattaraugus County Act 359-2017 entitles *Supporting Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan*

ACT NO. 359-2017

by Mr. Boberg, Mr. Snyder, Sr., Mrs. Stockman,
Mr. VanRensselaer Ms. Vickman and Mrs. Labuhn
and Mr. Breton, Mr. Hale, Mr. Helmich, Mr. Higgins, Mr. Klancer,
Mr. Neal, Mrs. Stockman, Mr. Giardini, Ms. Hastings,
Mr. Koch and Mr. Padlo

SUPPORTING CATTARAUGUS COUNTY SHARED SERVICES PLAN

Pursuant to Section 153 of the County Law.

I. WHEREAS, the New York State 2017-2018 budget established a County-Wide Shared Services Initiative with the intent of generating property tax savings by facilitating operational collaboration between local governments, and

II. WHEREAS, municipalities throughout Cattaraugus County have, for many years, been vigilant in the search for, and implementation of, increased operational efficiencies, including collaborations to reduce and/or stabilize costs and tax rates, and

III. WHEREAS, the Cattaraugus County Shared Services Panel ("Panel") devoted considerable time and effort to find additional efficiencies among willing local governments, in order to comply with the County-Wide Shared Services Initiative, and

IV. WHEREAS, members of the Panel regularly consulted with each other and representatives of the collective bargaining units of the county, cities, towns, and villages, and

V. WHEREAS, the proposed Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan ("Plan") identified thirty-one (31) different projects with potential savings as follows:

2017	$ 634,781.00
2018	$1,354,822.00
2019	$1,310,240.00,

and

VI. WHEREAS, the Cattaraugus County Legislature was provided with the proposed Plan by the state-mandated deadline of August 1, 2017, and

VII. WHEREAS, the County and many municipalities donated time and resources to the drafting and development of this Plan and the subsequent report, now, therefore, be it

I. RESOLVED, that the Cattaraugus County Legislature, having reviewed the proposed Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan, fully supports the proposals contained within the Plan and recommends that the Cattaraugus County Shared Services Panel approve the Plan, and be it further

II. RESOLVED, that the Cattaraugus County Legislature hereby thanks the members of the Panel for their time, effort, and collaboration in drafting a Plan potentially saving $3,299,843.00 by 2019 for the taxpayers of Cattaraugus County, and be it further

III. RESOLVED, that the Cattaraugus County Legislature hereby directs the County Administrator to quantify the amount of the expenses incurred by the Cattaraugus County Shared Services Panel in producing the Plan and the subsequent report and recommend that this be included in the Plan as a one-time shared service savings for 2017.

Adopted 8/23/17

Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan

ATTACHMENT #2

Financial Summary of Countywide Shared Services Plan

Cattaraugus County Shared Services Initiative Plan Project Status 8-28-2017 Project	Municipalities involved	2017 Actual Savings	2017 Projected Savings	2017 Total	2018 Actual Savings	2018 Projected Savings	2018 Total	2019 Actual Savings	2019 Projected Savings	2019 Total Savings	2017-19 Total Savings
Proposals Involving >2 Municipalities											
Purchase of Materials from County											
~Purchase of Pipe	Cattaraugus County,Village of Cattaraugus, Seneca Nation of Indians, Towns ofColdspring, Ellicottville, Great Valley, Humphrey, Little Valley, Machias, Mansfield, Otto , Randolph & Salamaca.	$1,997	$0	$1,997	$0	$1,597	$1,597	$0	$1,278	$1,278	$4,872
~Use of Road striping contract	Cattaraugus County, Villages of Allegany and Gowanda, Towns of Allegany, Ashford, East Otto, Ellicottville, Olean and Perrysburg	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
~Purchase of Sand/salt mix	Cattaraugus County, Village of Little Valley; City of Olean, Randolph Central School Distrkts; Olean Housing Authority; Towns of Little Valley and Randolph	$16,921	$0	$16,921	$0	$13,536	$13,536	$0	$10,829	$10,829	$41,286
~Use of Alcohol/Drug testing contract	Cattaraugus County, Villages of Little Valley, Gowanda, Allegany, Portville, South Dayton, & Ellicottville, Cities of Salamanca DPW, & BPU; Towns of Allegany, Ashford, Carrollton, Dayton, Franklinville, Freedom, Hinsdale, Humphrey, Leon, Little Valley, Mansfield, Napoli, Olean, Persia, Portville, Salamanca, & Yorkshire	$7,913	$0	$7,913	$0	$6,330	$6,330	$0	$5,064	$5,064	$19,307
~Purchase of parts	Cattaraugus County, Villages of Little Valley & Cattaraugus, Towns of Mansfield, Dayton, East Otto, New Albion, Leon, Conewango, Otto, Coldspring, Perrysburg, Persia, Salamanca, & Little Valley; City of Salamanca, Fire Districts in Otto, Allegany, Little Valley, New Albion-Cattaraugus; & Cattaraugus-Little Valley School District	$1,482	$0	$1,482	$0	$1,414	$1,414	$0	$1,131	$1,131	$4,027
~Signs	Chautauqua County; Seneca Nation of Indians;Cities of Olean and Salamanca; Chautauqua County Airport; Towns of Allegany, Ashford, Carrollton, Coldspring, Conewango, Cuba (Allegany County), East Otto, Ellicottville, Farmersville, Franklinville, Freedom, Gerry (Chautauqua County), Hinsdale, Hinsdale -Historical, Leon, Lyndon, Machias, Mansfield, Napoli, Olean, Otto, Perrysburg, Persia, Portville, Randolph, Red House, Salamnca,& Yorkshire; Villages of Allegany, Cattaraugus, Delevan, Ellicottville, Franklinville, Gowanda, Little Valley, Silver Creek (Chautauqua County), Sindairville (Chautauqua County), & South Dayton; Cattaraugus Little Valley School District; Fire Districts in East Otto and the City of Salamanca	$117,092	$0	$117,092	$0	$93,674	$93,674	$0	$74,939	$74,939	$285,705
Subtotal Purchase of Material		$145,404	$0	$145,404	$0	$116,551	$116,551	$0	$93,241	$93,241	$355,196

Project	Municipalities involved	2017 Actual Savings	2017 Projected Savings	2017 Total	2018 Actual Savings	2018 Projected Savings	2018 Total	2019 Actual Savings	2019 Projected Savings	2019 Total Savings	2017-19 Total Savings
Joint Procurement and/or accessing self funded health insurance programs by municipalities	Cattaraugus County, Towns of Franklinville, farmersville, Hinsdale, Ischua, Little Valley, Allegany, Otto, Ashford, Mansfield, Leon, Olean, South Valley, Randolph, Conewango, Napoli, & Humphrey; City of Olean; Villages of South Dayton, Franklinville, Allegany, & Cattaraugus	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Property Tax Assessing by Cattaraugus County	Cattaraugus County, Towns of Allegany, Dayton, Franklinville, Farmersville, Freedom, Ischua, Hinsdale, Little Valley, Ashford, Leon, Mansfield, Randolph,Persia, South Valley, Conewango, Red House,Humphrey & Salamanca, City of Olean	$0	$0	$0	$0	$137,840	$137,840	$0	$137,840	$137,840	$275,680
Participation in the Municipal Electric and Gas Alliance (MEGA)	Cattaraugus County, City of Olean, Towns of Allegany, Otto, Franklinville, Freedom, Ellicottville, Randolph, Hinsdale, Little Valley, South Valley, East Otto; Villages of South Dayton, Gowanda, & Cattaraugus	$21,847	$3,854	$25,701	$21,847	$12,816	$34,663	$21,847	$14,963	$36,810	$97,174
Computerized coordinated Public Works equipment listing and equipment sharing platform	Cattaraugus County, Towns of Ashford, Allegany, Carrollton, Coldspring, Conewango, Dayton, Franklinville, Freedom, Great Valley, Hinsdale, Humphrey, Leon, Little Valley, Lyndon, Machias, Mansfield, Napoli, New Albion, Olean, Perrysburg, Persia, Portville,Randolph, & South Valley; Cities of Olean and Salamnca; Villages of Allegany, Ellicottville, Franklinville, Gowanda, Little Valley	$0	$0	$0	$0	$62,228	$62,228	$0	$49,782	$49,782	$112,010
Consolidation of Justice Courts	Towns of Ellicottville, Mansfield, Franklinville, Otto, Farmersville & Village of Ellicottville	$0	$0	$0	$0	$109,292	$109,292	$0	$109,292	$109,292	$218,584
Consolidation of Justiice Courts	Towns of Ischua, Hinsdale, Allegany, Olean, & Humphrey	$0	$0	$0	$0	$67,845	$67,845	$0	$67,845	$67,845	$135,691
Joint procurement of building demolition services	Cattaraugus County, Towns of Allegany, Franklinville, Ellicottville, Ashford, Allegany, Randolph, City of Olean; Villages of Franklinville, Ellicottville, Allegany, Gowanda and South Dayton	$0	$0	$0	$0	$76,468	$76,468	$0	$76,468	$76,468	$152,936
Joint Procurement of Professonal Engineering Services	Cattaraugus County, Towns of Little Valley , East OttoAshford, Randolph, Lyndon, New Albion; City of Olean; and Villages of Allegany,Cattaraugus, South Dayton & Gowanda	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0		$0
Cost to produce plan	Cattaraugus County and all municipalities in County	$13,922	$0	$13,922	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$13,922
Subtotal Projects involving >2 municipalities		**$181,173**	**$3,854**	**$185,027**	**$21,847**	**$583,040**	**$604,887**	**$21,847**	**$549,431**	**$571,278**	**$1,361,193**

Project	Municipalities involved	2017 Actual Savings	2017 Projected Savings	2017 Total	2018 Actual Savings	2018 Projected Savings	2018 Total	2019 Actual Savings	2019 Projected Savings	2019 Total Savings	2017-19 Total Savings
Proposals involving 1-2 Municipalities											
Dissolution Study for Village of Cattaraugus	Village of Cattaraugus/Town of New Albion	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Participation in a Selective Insurance Dividend Program	Village of Delavan/Town of Yorkshire	$1,600	$0	$1,600	$1,600	$0	$1,600	$1,600	$0	$1,600	$4,800
GIS Project Allegany	Cattaraugus County/Town of Allegany	$0	$0	$0	$0	$24,000	$24,000	$0	$0	$0	$24,000
GIS Project Little Valley	Cattaraugus County/Town of Little Valley	$0	$0	$0	$0	$24,000	$24,000	$0	$0	$0	$24,000
GIS Project Ellicottville	Cattaraugus County/Town of Ellicottville	$0	$0	$0	$0	$24,000	$24,000	$0	$0	$0	$24,000
GIS Project Ashford	Cattaraugus County/Town of Ashford	$0	$0	$0	$0	$24,000	$24,000	$0	$0	$0	$24,000
GIS Project Randolph	Cattaraugus County/Town of Randolph	$0	$0	$0	$0	$24,000	$24,000	$0	$0	$0	$24,000
Joint Building and use of a Sand/Salt Storage shed	Cattaraugus County/Town of Ashford	$0	$0	$0	$0	$30,066	$30,066	$0	$30,066	$30,066	$60,132
Purchase of an Asphalt Zipper	Town/City of Olean	$254,898	$0	$254,898	$203,919	$0	$203,919	$163,135	$0	$163,135	$621,952
Installation of Guardrail by the County	Cattaraugus County/Town of Lyndon	$9,789	$0	$9,789	$0	$7,831	$7,831	$0	$6,265	$6,265	$23,885
Engineering services for Bridge NY Grant Newton Street Bridge	Cattaraugus/Town of Salamanca	$4,031	$0	$4,031	$0	$0	$0	$4,031	$0	$4,031	$8,061
Shared Highway Services	Town of Salamanca/Town of Little Valley	$5,693	$0	$5,693	$0	$0	$0	$5,693	$0	$5,693	$11,386
Subtotal Proposals involving 1-2 Municipalities		**$276,011**	**$0**	**$276,011**	**$205,519**	**$157,897**	**$363,416**	**$174,459**	**$36,331**	**$210,790**	**$850,216**

Project	Municipalities involved	2017 Actual Savings	2017 Projected Savings	2017 Total	2018 Actual Savings	2018 Projected Savings	2018 Total	2019 Actual Savings	2019 Projected Savings	2019 Total Savings	2017-19 Total Savings
Proposals involving 1 Municipality											
DEC Fishing Rights	Village of Delevan	$0	$800	$0	$0	$4,000	$4,000	$0	$0	$0	$4,000
Reduction in number of Town Justices from two to one Town of Persia	Town of Persia	$0	$0	$0	$0	$17,081	$17,081	$0	$17,081	$17,081	$34,162
Reduction in number of Town Justices from two to one	Town of Freedom	$0	$0	$0	$0	$9,000	$9,000	$0	$9,000	$9,000	$18,000
Participation in the New York Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR)	County of Cattaraugus	$167,108	$0	$167,108	$324,935	$0	$324,935	$492,043	$0	$492,043	$984,086
Participation in the New York Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR)	Town of Leon	$2,600	$0	$2,600	$2,600	$0	$2,600	$2,600	$0	$2,600	$7,800
Participation in the New York Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR)	Town of Ashford	$4,000	$0	$4,000	$4,000	$0	$4,000	$4,000	$0	$4,000	$12,000
Reduced Health Insurance Cost due to opt out and Composite rates	Town of Yorkshire	$0	$10,000	$10,000	$0	$20,955	$20,955	$0	$0	$0	$30,955
Health Care Premium cost sharing	Town of Coldspring	$3,448	$0	$3,448	$0	$3,448	$3,448	$0	$3,448	$3,448	$10,344
Purchasing pipe from Cattaraugus County	Town of Salamanca	$9	$0	$9	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$9
Reduction of kenneling costs due to contracting for this service	Town of Coldspring	$500	$0	$500	$0	$500	$500	$0	$0	$0	$1,000
Subtotal for Proposals involving 1 municipality		**$177,665**	**$10,800**	**$187,665**	**$331,535**	**$54,984**	**$386,519**	**$498,643**	**$29,529**	**$528,172**	**$1,102,356**

Project	Municipalities involved	2017 Actual Savings	2017 Projected Savings	2017 Total	2018 Actual Savings	2018 Projected Savings	2018 Total	2019 Actual Savings	2019 Projected Savings	2019 Total Savings	2017-19 Total Savings
GRAND TOTALS											
Proposals involving >2 Municipalities		$181,173	$3,854	$185,027	$21,847	$583,040	$604,887	$21,847	$549,431	$571,278	$1,361,193
Proposals involving 1-2 Municipalities		$276,011	$0	$276,011	$205,519	$157,897	$363,416	$174,459	$36,331	$210,790	$850,216
Proposals involving 1 Municipality		$177,665	$10,800	$187,665	$331,535	$54,984	$386,519	$498,643	$29,529	$528,172	$1,102,356
Total of all projects		**$634,849**	**$14,654**	**$648,703**	**$558,901**	**$795,921**	**$1,354,822**	**$694,949**	**$615,291**	**$1,310,240**	**$3,313,765**
Total projects=	**32**										

Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan

ATTACHMENT #3

Individual proposals that taken together constitute the Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan

County of Cattaraugus

2017

Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Joint purchase of materials, parts and services through Cattaraugus County.

Contact person: Joe Pillittere ***Title***: Commissioner

Organization: Cattaraugus County Department of Public Works

Email: jtpillittere@cattco.org

Phone: 716-938-2483

Interested/participating municipalities (as of 2016 records):
The following entities have purchased commodities from Cattaraugus County:

- **Seneca Nation of Indians**
- **County of:** Chautauqua County
- **Town of:** Allegany, Ashford, Carrollton, Conewango, Coldspring, Dayton, Farmersville, Franklinville, Freedom, East Otto, Ellicottville, Hinsdale, Hinsdale-Historical, Humphrey, Leon, Little Valley, Lyndon, Mansfield, Machias, Otto, Napoli, New Albion, Olean, Perrysburg, Persia, Portville, Randolph, Red House, Salamanca, & Yorkshire
- **City of:** Salamanca DPW/BPU, Olean
- **Village of:** Cattaraugus, Little Valley, Gowanda, Allegany, Delevan, Franklinville, Portville, South Dayton, Ellicottville
- **Fire Districts**: Otto Fire District, Allegany Fire Department, New Albion-Cattaraugus, Little Valley, Salamanca
- **School Districts**: Cattaraugus-Little Valley
- **Entities outside Cattaraugus County**: Chautauqua County Airport, Town of Cuba, Town of Gerry, Village of Silver Creek, Village of Sinclairville

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

_X_Elimination of duplicative services

_X_Shared services

_X_Reduction of back-office administrative overhead

_X_Improved coordination of services

Project Description:

Currently, Cattaraugus County continues to purchase materials, parts and services that are necessary for the safe and efficient operations of its Public Works department. This includes, but is not limited to: salt/sand, parts, pipes, road striping and drug/alcohol testing. Additionally, Cattaraugus County operates a sign shop able to produce high quality warning and regulatory signs. The 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 cost.

In addition, since the County performs all the administrative functions to obtain the items, this also saves municipalities on their administrative/back office costs. And, in some cases, it is easier to travel to the County's location then to drive to a vendor or pay for delivery charges.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational:

Cattaraugus County has a history of providing needed commodities to municipalities both within the County and to neighboring counties. We also provide these items to the Seneca Nation of Indians. All items are provided on an as needed basis. This causes variation on a year over year basis especially among participating municipalities, but, in aggregate the dollar value of commodities remains fairly constant. Usage by municipality will depend on local needs, accessibility and cost to the municipality.

There is a cost effective shared service provided, albeit, the users will vary, somewhat, from one year to another.

This effort could be embellished. To do this, needed items used by the majority of participants would need to be assessed. Specifically, those items/services that most, if not all, municipalities will need and use during a given year would need to be identified. Initially, a suggested that a rollout could include a few items that will be purchased, stored and provided to municipalities at discounted prices. This would also include drug/alcohol testing, which is mandated to be performed on commercial drivers.

Expenses would be tracked and trends associated with this initiative analyzed to evaluate its effectiveness and savings. Based on results, items can be adjusted, added or deleted.

Finally, there needs to be active and continuous participation from as many municipalities as possible in order to see real savings that make a positive impact.

Currently, we have real savings that can be projected. Further, these efforts could be embellished.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal?

The largest impediment to this initiative is if participation is not being realized, and items stay on the shelves, which costs money and wastes valuable resources (money, space, labor). A lack of sufficient participation could end up costing the County and its taxpayers more money, especially if items are not being utilized or become obsolete over time.

What is the timeline for this effort?

A process that augments current operations could be implemented by June, 2018. Regardless, however, this effort is projected to save municipalities money in both 2017 and 2018.

What are the local advantages to this effort?

The County could see a larger discount due to an increase in volume, which saves money. The towns, villages and cities would also realize savings from these

discounts, decrease their administrative costs, reduce labor and travel/fuel costs, and eliminate delivery charges.

How would savings be realized?

Savings will be realized by purchasing items and services through the County's discounted costs, compared with purchasing these same items and services on their own. For example, the number of County employees that must be tested for drugs and alcohol far outnumbers what other municipalities have in their individual highway departments. The County's equipment fleet also outnumbers local municipalities; therefore, it must purchase more items for repair and maintenance.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

For purposes of this analysis, 2016 actual figures were used to derive savings calculations and projections.

Generally, savings is realized by lower County costs for items compared to purchasing the same commodity from outside sources. Specific examples of this include:

Plastic Pipe:

County	**$6.30/foot**
Local Vendor	**$6.76/foot**

Parts (hydraulic hoses, couplings):

County	**$18-$22**
Local Vendor	**$65-$80**

Road Striping:

County	**$.0587/foot**
***NHA**	**$0.0645-2.3475**

(*National Highway Administration estimates)

Salt/Sand:

County	**$57.11/ton**
National Ave.	**$65.81/ton**

Drug and Alcohol Testing:

County	**$26 (alcohol) - $50 (drug)**
National Ave.	**$50-$80**

Sign Shop:

30" x 30", Warning Sign

County	**$22.51**
Vendor Rate	**$65.00**

24x24, Regulatory Sign

County	**$18.01**
Vendor	**$70.00**

8-ft Post

County	**$24.70**
Vendor	**$44.25**

Sign Base

County	**$10.11**
Vendor	**$25.00**

Based on 2016 actual figures, attached are projected savings realized in 2017 and 2018.

For purposes of this analysis, five (5) commodities are analyzed, namely: pipe, salt/sand, drug/alcohol testing, parts (hydraulic hoses, couplings) and signs.

Sporadically, we also provide miscellaneous other items like shovels, protective clothing, marking paint, etc. as needed. The dollar amount transacted for these commodities is low on a year over year basis. Given this, these commodities are not included in this calculation.

Additionally, the County acts to initiate a shared services contract annually for road striping with Chautauqua County for road striping. Municipalities can "piggy back" off of this County contract, if these have the need, in a given year, for this service.

This usage varies widely from year to year. Given this variation, this analysis is not included below.

Attached on additional pages are discrete analyses for: pipe, sand/salt, drug/alcohol testing parts (hydraulic hoses, couplings) and signs. This data is based on 2016 actual numbers and reflect trends. The projections for both 2017 and 2018 are estimated for each user municipality. Again, actual usage will vary on a year over year basis, but, aggregate saving remains constant.

As you will note there is a significant savings realized annually through cooperative and shared purchasing between municipalities in the County. This impacts almost every municipality in the County. According to the attached analysis current savings amount to:

Calculation of Savings
Grand totals

Commodity	2017 Savings	2018 Projected Savings	2017-18 Savings
Pipe	$1,997	$1,997	$3,993
Sand/Salt	$16,921	$16,921	$33,841
Drug/alcohol testing	$7,913	$7,913	$15,826
Parts (Hydraulic hoses, couplings)	$1,482	$1,482	$2,965
Signs	$117,092	$117,092	$234,184
Grand totals	**$145,405**	**$145,405**	**$290,810**

Again, on a targeted basis this could be further enhanced by mid-2018.

Calculation of Savings
Grand totals

Commodity	2017 Savings	2018 Projected Savings	2019 Projected Savings
Pipe	$1,997	$1,597	$1,278
Sand/Salt	$16,921	$13,536	$10,829
Drug/alcohol testing	$7,913	$6,330	$5,064
Parts (Hydraulic hoses, couplings)	$1,482	$1,414	$1,131
Signs	$117,092	$93,674	$74,939
Grand totals	**$145,405**	**$116,552**	**$93,241**

Calculation of savings

Pipe

Municipality	Vendor cost	County Cost	Savings	Amount Purchased in feet	Cost from Vendor	Cost from County	2017 Savings	2018 Projected Savings	2019 Projected Savings	2017-19 Savings
Village of Cattaraugus	$6.76	$6.30	$0.46	318.73	$2,154.61	$2,008.00	$146.62	$117.29	$93.83	$357.74
Seneca Nation of Indians	$6.76	$6.30	$0.46	467.62	$3,161.11	$2,946.01	$215.11	$172.08	$137.67	$524.86
Town of Coldspring	$6.76	$6.30	$0.46	235.75	$1,593.67	$1,485.23	$108.45	$86.76	$69.40	$264.61
Town of Ellicottville	$6.76	$6.30	$0.46	646.51	$4,370.41	$4,073.01	$297.39	$237.92	$190.33	$725.64
Town of Great Valley	$6.76	$6.30	$0.46	440.13	$2,975.28	$2,772.82	$202.46	$161.97	$129.57	$494.00
Town of Humphrey	$6.76	$6.30	$0.46	183.81	$1,242.56	$1,158.00	$84.55	$67.64	$54.11	$206.31
Town of Little Valley	$6.76	$6.30	$0.46	106.77	$721.77	$672.65	$49.11	$39.29	$31.43	$119.84
Town of Machias	$6.76	$6.30	$0.46	408.57	$2,761.93	$2,573.99	$187.94	$150.35	$120.28	$458.58
Town of Mansfield	$6.76	$6.30	$0.46	645.29	$4,362.16	$4,065.33	$296.83	$237.47	$189.97	$724.27
Town of Otto	$6.76	$6.30	$0.46	76.83	$519.37	$484.03	$35.34	$28.27	$22.62	$86.23
Town of Randolph	$6.76	$6.30	$0.46	414.73	$2,803.57	$2,612.80	$190.78	$152.62	$122.10	$465.49
Town of Salamanca	$6.76	$6.30	$0.46	395.75	$2,675.27	$2,493.23	$182.05	$145.64	$116.51	$444.19
Totals				4340.49	$29,341.71	$27,345.09	**$1,996.63**	**$1,597.30**	**$1,277.84**	**$4,871.77**

Note: This analysis assumes 2018 expenses will be roughly equal to those in 2017. The actual distribtion of expenses may vary across municipalities, but the level of expenditure would remain relatively constant.

Calculation of savings
Sand/Salt

Municipality	Vendor cost	County Cost	Savings	Amount Purchased ton	Cost from Vendor	Cost from County	2017 Savings	2018 Projected Savings	2019 Projected Savings	2017-19 Savings
Village of Little Valley	$65.81	$57.11	$8.70	98.01	$6,450.04	$5,597.35	$852.69	$682.15	$545.72	$2,080.56
Olean City School District	$65.81	$57.11	$8.70	29.07	$1,913.10	$1,660.19	$252.91	$202.33	$161.86	$617.10
Randolph Central School District	$65.81	$57.11	$8.70	17.91	$1,178.66	$1,022.84	$155.82	$124.65	$99.72	$380.19
Olean Housing Authority	$65.81	$57.11	$8.70	5.20	$342.21	$296.97	$45.24	$36.19	$28.95	$110.39
Town of Little Valley	$65.81	$57.11	$8.70	454.25	$29,894.19	$25,942.22	$3,951.98	$3,161.58	$2,529.26	$9,642.82
Town of Randolph	$65.81	$57.11	$8.70	1340.45	$88,215.01	$76,553.10	$11,661.92	$9,329.53	$7,463.63	$28,455.07
Totals				1944.89	$127,993.21	$111,072.67	**$16,920.54**	**$13,536.43**	**$10,829.15**	$41,286.12

Note: This analysis assumes 2018-9 expenses will be roughly equal to those in 2017. The actual distribtion of expenses may vary across municipalities, but the level of expenditure would remain relatively constant.

Savings are reduced 20%/year in 2018 and 2019 over 2017 to reflect potential increase in cost of commodities and other expenses

Calculation of savings
Drug/alcohol testing

Municipality	Average Vendor cost	Average County Cost	Savings	Usage of Contract	Cost from Vendor	Cost from County	2017 Savings	2018 Projected Savings	2019 Projected Savings	2017-19 Savings
Village of Little Valley	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	5.75	$373	$218	$155	$124	$99	$379
City of Salamanca DPW	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	43.36	$2,818	$1,648	$1,171	$937	$749	$2,857
City of Salamnca BPU	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	22.59	$1,468	$858	$610	$488	$390	$1,488
Village of Gowanda	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	26.98	$1,754	$1,025	$728	$583	$466	$1,777
Village of Allegany	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	82.26	$5,347	$3,126	$2,221	$1,777	$1,421	$5,419
Village of portville	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	5.71	$371	$217	$154	$123	$99	$376
Village of South Dayton	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	5.86	$381	$223	$158	$127	$101	$386
Village of Ellicottvile	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	2.19	$142	$83	$59	$47	$38	$144
Town of Allegany	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	18.98	$1,234	$721	$512	$410	$328	$1,250
Town of Ashford	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	7.75	$504	$295	$209	$167	$134	$511
Town of Carrollton	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	5.82	$378	$221	$157	$126	$101	$384
Town of Dayton	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	2.05	$133	$78	$55	$44	$35	$135
Town ofg Franklinville	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	6.27	$408	$238	$169	$135	$108	$413
Town of Freedom	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	1.48	$96	$56	$40	$32	$26	$98
Town of Hinsdale	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	12.03	$782	$457	$325	$260	$208	$793
Town of Humphrey	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	6.49	$422	$247	$175	$140	$112	$428
Town of Leon	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	6.45	$419	$245	$174	$139	$111	$425
Town of little Valley	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	5.80	$377	$220	$157	$125	$100	$382
Town of Mansfield	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	5.83	$379	$222	$157	$126	$101	$384
Town of Napoli	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	2.16	$141	$82	$58	$47	$37	$143
Town of Olean	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	3.61	$235	$137	$97	$78	$62	$238
Town of persia	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	4.35	$283	$165	$117	$94	$75	$287
Town of Portville	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	5.76	$374	$219	$156	$124	$100	$380
Town of Salamanca	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	2.05	$133	$78	$55	$44	$35	$135
Town of Yorkshire	$65.00	$38.00	$27.00	1.48	$96	$56	$40	$32	$26	$98
Total				293.07	$19,050	$11,137	**$7,913**	**$6,330**	**$5,064**	**$19,308**

Note: This analysis assumes 2018-19 expenses will be roughly equal to those in 2017. The actiual distribtion of expenses may vary across municipalities, but the level of expenditure would remain relatively constant.
Savings are reduced 20%/year in 2018 and 2019 over 2017 to reflect potential increase in cost of commodities and other expenses

Calculation of savings
Parts (Hydraulic hoses, couplings)

Municipality	Average Vendor cost	Average County Cost	Savings	Monthly Average Usage of Contract	Cost from Vendor	Cost from County	2017 Savings	2018 Projected Savings	2019 Projected Savings	2017-19 Savings
Village of Little Valley	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	6.41	$465.08	$128.30	$336.78	$269.42	$215.54	$821.74
Town of Mansfield	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	3.42	$247.94	$68.40	$179.54	$179.54	$143.63	$502.72
Town of Dayton	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	1.33	$96.09	$26.51	$69.58	$69.58	$55.67	$194.84
Town of East Otto	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	0.21	$15.42	$4.25	$11.17	$11.17	$8.93	$31.27
Town of New Albion	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	2.18	$157.99	$43.58	$114.41	$114.41	$91.53	$320.34
Otto Fire District	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	0.46	$33.00	$9.10	$23.90	$23.90	$19.12	$66.92
Town of Leon	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	0.69	$50.35	$13.89	$36.46	$36.46	$29.17	$102.09
Allegany Fire Department	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	0.33	$23.82	$6.57	$17.25	$17.25	$13.80	$48.29
Village of Cattaraugus	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	3.15	$228.23	$62.96	$165.27	$165.27	$132.22	$462.76
Town of Conewango	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	0.49	$35.78	$9.87	$25.91	$25.91	$20.73	$72.55
Cattaraugus-Little Valley School District	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	0.04	$3.14	$0.87	$2.28	$2.28	$1.82	$6.37
New Albion -Cattaraugus Fire District	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	0.21	$14.90	$4.11	$10.79	$10.79	$8.63	$30.21
Little Valley Fire District	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	0.12	$8.61	$2.38	$6.23	$6.23	$4.99	$17.46
Little Valley Fire District	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	1.29	$93.45	$25.78	$67.67	$67.67	$54.14	$189.48
Salamanca DPW	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	0.32	$22.96	$6.33	$16.62	$16.62	$13.30	$46.54
Salamanca BPU	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	2.47	$179.12	$49.41	$129.71	$129.71	$103.76	$363.18
Town of Otto	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	1.04	$75.53	$20.84	$54.70	$54.70	$43.76	$153.15
Town of Coldspring	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	1.04	$75.55	$20.84	$54.71	$54.71	$43.77	$153.18
Town of Perrysburg	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	1.21	$88.03	$24.29	$63.75	$63.75	$51.00	$178.49
Town of Persia	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	1.04	$75.05	$20.70	$54.35	$54.35	$43.48	$152.18
Town of Salamanca	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	0.67	$48.29	$13.32	$34.97	$34.97	$27.98	$97.92
Town of Little Valley	$72.50	$20.00	$52.50	0.12	$8.75	$2.41	$6.33	$5.07	$4.05	$15.45
				28.24	$2,047	$565	**$1,482**	**$1,413.75**	**$1,131.00**	**$4,027.12**

Note: This analysis assumes 2018 expenses will be roughly equal to those in 2017. The actiual distribtion of expenses may vary across municipalities, but the level of expenditure would remain relatively constant.
Savings are reduced 20%/year in 2018 and 2019 over 2017 to reflect potential increase in cost of commodities and other expenses

Calculation of savings
Signs

Municipality	Vendor cost	County Cost	Savings	Usage of Contract	Cost from Vendor	Cost from County	2017 Savings	2018 Projected Savings	2019 Projected Savings	2017-19 Savings
Cattaraugus Little Valley School	$70	$18	$52	6.49	$454	$117	$338	$270	$216	$824
Chautauqua County	$70	$18	$52	21.06	$1,475	$379	$1,095	$876	$701	$2,672
Chautauqua County Airport	$70	$18	$52	8.64	$605	$156	$449	$359	$287	$1,096
City of Olean	$70	$18	$52	211.20	$14,784	$3,804	$10,980	$8,784	$7,027	$26,792
City of Salamanca	$70	$18	$52	61.04	$4,273	$1,099	$3,173	$2,539	$2,031	$7,743
East Otto Fire District	$70	$18	$52	1.11	$78	$20	$58	$46	$37	$141
Salamanca Fire	$70	$18	$52	26.13	$1,829	$471	$1,359	$1,087	$870	$3,315
Seneca Nation of Indians	$70	$18	$52	174.41	$12,208	$3,141	$9,067	$7,254	$5,803	$22,124
Town of Allegany	$70	$18	$52	41.64	$2,914	$750	$2,165	$1,732	$1,385	$5,282
Town of Ashford	$70	$18	$52	62.85	$4,400	$1,132	$3,268	$2,614	$2,091	$7,973
Town of Carrollton	$70	$18	$52	40.77	$2,854	$734	$2,119	$1,696	$1,356	$5,171
Town of Coldspring	$70	$18	$52	20.02	$1,401	$361	$1,041	$833	$666	$2,540
Town of Conewango	$70	$18	$52	16.79	$1,176	$302	$873	$698	$559	$2,130
Town of Cuba	$70	$18	$52	3.00	$210	$54	$156	$125	$100	$380
Town of East Otto	$70	$18	$52	66.78	$4,674	$1,203	$3,472	$2,777	$2,222	$8,471
Town of Ellicottville	$70	$18	$52	33.84	$2,369	$609	$1,759	$1,407	$1,126	$4,292
Town of Farmersville	$70	$18	$52	1.07	$75	$19	$56	$45	$36	$136
Town of Franklinville	$70	$18	$52	30.66	$2,147	$552	$1,594	$1,275	$1,020	$3,890
Town of Freedom	$70	$18	$52	7.10	$497	$128	$369	$295	$236	$901
Town of Gerry	$70	$18	$52	4.62	$323	$83	$240	$192	$154	$586
Town of Hinsdale	$70	$18	$52	8.31	$582	$150	$432	$346	$277	$1,054
Town of Hinsdale-Historical	$70	$18	$52	4.90	$343	$88	$255	$204	$163	$622
Town of Leon	$70	$18	$52	21.82	$1,528	$393	$1,135	$908	$726	$2,768
Town of Lyndon	$70	$18	$52	132.40	$9,268	$2,385	$6,884	$5,507	$4,406	$16,796
Town of Machias	$70	$18	$52	3.91	$274	$70	$203	$163	$130	$496
Town of Mansfield	$70	$18	$52	27.56	$1,929	$496	$1,433	$1,146	$917	$3,496
Town of Napoli	$70	$18	$52	8.75	$613	$158	$455	$364	$291	$1,110
Town of Olean	$70	$18	$52	9.65	$675	$174	$502	$401	$321	$1,224
Town of Otto	$70	$18	$52	143.35	$10,034	$2,582	$7,453	$5,962	$4,770	$18,184
Town of Perrysburg	$70	$18	$52	8.88	$621	$160	$462	$369	$295	$1,126
Town of Persia	$70	$18	$52	11.04	$773	$199	$574	$459	$367	$1,400
Town of Portville	$70	$18	$52	64.32	$4,502	$1,158	$3,344	$2,675	$2,140	$8,159
Town of Randolph	$70	$18	$52	30.99	$2,169	$558	$1,611	$1,289	$1,031	$3,931
Town of Red House	$70	$18	$52	18.17	$1,272	$327	$945	$756	$605	$2,305
Town of Salamanca	$70	$18	$52	12.66	$886	$228	$658	$526	$421	$1,605
Town of Yorkshire	$70	$18	$52	675.44	$47,281	$12,165	$35,116	$28,093	$22,474	$85,683
Village of Allegany	$70	$18	$52	7.50	$525	$135	$390	$312	$249	$951
Village of Cattaraugus	$70	$18	$52	1.28	$90	$23	$67	$53	$43	$163
Village of Delevan	$70	$18	$52	25.01	$1,751	$450	$1,300	$1,040	$832	$3,173
Village of Ellicottville	$70	$18	$52	4.48	$314	$81	$233	$186	$149	$568
Village of Franklinville	$70	$18	$52	31.77	$2,224	$572	$1,652	$1,321	$1,057	$4,031
Village of Gowanda	$70	$18	$52	105.45	$7,382	$1,899	$5,482	$4,386	$3,509	$13,377
Village of Little Valley	$70	$18	$52	14.43	$1,010	$260	$750	$600	$480	$1,831
Village of Silver Creek	$70	$18	$52	1.28	$90	$23	$67	$53	$43	$163
Village of Sinclairville	$70	$18	$52	22.01	$1,541	$396	$1,144	$915	$732	$2,792
Village of South Dayton	$70	$18	$52	17.63	$1,234	$318	$917	$733	$587	$2,236
Total					$157,654	$40,562	**$117,092**	**$93,674**	**$74,939**	**$210,766**

Note: for purposes of this analysis it has been assumed that these are Regulatory signs
This analysis assumes 2018 expenses will be roughly equal to those in 2017. The actual distribtion of expenses may vary across municipalities, but the level of expenditure would remain relatively constant.
Savings are reduced 20%/year in 2018 and 2019 over 2017 to reflect potential increase in cost of commodities and other expenses

County of Cattaraugus

2017

Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Jointly procuring and/or accessing self-funded health insurance programs by municipalities

Contact person: Various ***Title***:

Organization: ***Email***:

Phone:

Interested/participating municipalities: (Cattaraugus County, Village of South Dayton, Village and Town of Franklinville, Town of Farmersville, Town of Freedom, Town of Hinsdale, Town of Ischua, Town of Little Valley, Village and Town of Allegany, Village of Cattaraugus, Town of Otto, City of Olean, Town of Ashford, Town of Leon, Town of Olean, Town of South Valley, Town of Randolph, Town of Conewango, Town of Napoli, Town of New Albion, Town of East Otto, Town of Salamanca and Town of Humphrey)

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

_X_ Elimination of duplicative services

_X_ Shared services

_X_ Reduction of back-office administrative overhead

_X_ Improved coordination of services

Project Description: One the driving costs in most municipal budgets is associated with fringe benefits paid to employees. In the midst of an ongoing debate about health care, a large component of this fringe benefit cost is the cost of health insurance for employees. It was recently estimated that 50% of spending, on average, for employee benefits goes to pay for health insurance. Nationally, on average, this

amount increased by 107% between the period 1995 and 2005, an average increase of 7.5% annually.

Currently, health insurance services are procured by local municipalities individually. This cost to these municipalities, is driven both their NYS required community experience rating (both positive and negative) as well as their small pool of covered lives. Providing health insurance coverage is expensive.

It makes sense to attempt to reduce costs while maintaining quality coverage. Some ways to do this could be to collectively procure health insurance services and/or to have access to a self-insured plan to attempt to blunt cost increases through either larger group procurement or pooling of risk, while still insuring quality care for plan participants.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: As discussed below, this would be a long labor intensive effort, under the current NYS regulatory environment, which, effectively, discourages these types of efforts, through the structure of current regulations. This is discussed in detail under the section entitled: "What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal?", below and in the attachment entitled *Cooperative health insurance purchasing: Article 47 impediments.*

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal?

Currently, municipalities New York State have two primary options for health care. They can secure an insured plan (e.g., Blue Cross Blue Shield) or they can participate in a self-insured plan.

If selecting the insurance plan option, plan premiums are set according to the size of the plan. By state law, local governments with fewer than 50 covered employees (the number increases to 100 if starting after 2016), must be, by State law, be community rated. Employers with more than 50 covered employees (the number has increased to more than 100 employees starting after 2016) can be experience rated, based on recent claims. These limits imposed by State Law effectively both limit availability of plans and have the effect of potentially driving costs higher.

Another option is to select a self-funded plan through a 3rd Party Administrator, self-administered or through an insurance company. Approximately 30 counties are self-funded, including Cattaraugus County for health insurance. Similar situations occur in school districts, generally coordinated by the local Board of Cooperative

Educational Services (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 ERISA regulations.

Unfortunately, when two or more municipalities come together for the purpose of providing employee health insurance, they are subject to Article 47 of the NYS Insurance Law. Further, municipalities that have fewer than 100 employees cannot buy stop loss insurance.

The process for achieving Article 47 compliance, for self-insured programs, is both time consuming and costly. Only one County has been able to achieved this, namely Tompkins County. This process took more than 3 years to complete with the liabilities fully funded. A summary of the impacts of Article 47 of the NYS Insurance Law upon cooperative insurance purchasing is delineated in a document attached entitled *Cooperative health insurance purchasing: Article 47 impediments*. Effectively, the requirements of Article 47 compliance upon a self-insured program significantly impact cost effectiveness.

Health insurance coverage, in New York State, must mandatorily be negotiated in a collective bargaining arena. Any movement in this area would need to be timed to allow for this process and could only move forward once that process is addressed.

While there is the potential for savings in either group purchasing of health insurance or membership in a self-insured plan, the impediments placed in the way of doing this by New York State effectively limit options. The need is there but effectively State regulations, currently prevent this from happening.

What is needed are State reforms targeted at purchasing stop loss insurance, either by municipalities or by self-insured plans on behalf of municipalities in their plan. Further, if exploring the option of joining a self-insured plan, New York State reforms address integration without triggering Article 47 of the State Insurance Law provisions. Again, currently, self-insured programs are not subject to NYS Department of Financial Services oversight and/or Article 47 provisions.

What is the timeline for this effort? Under current State laws this process is both arduous and time consuming, taking, optimistically, at least three years to achieve.

What are the local advantages to this effort? The ability to provide cost effective services targeted at one of the large cost centers in every municipal

budget. A better ability to project and manage costs associated with this budget driver.

How would savings be realized? If health insurance costs were able to be procured jointly across a series of municipalities, the savings would be calculated by comparing the current premium costs versus those of the jointly procured product.

If exploring the self-insured option, savings would be calculated by comparing current contracted costs versus premium equivalents in the self-insured program.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

While this is a pressing and important need, current State law effectively does not allow for time timely and cost effective implementation of this effort. What is required is NYS reform. Once that happens savings could be calculated.

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Property Tax Assessing by the County

Contact person: Daniel T. Martonis *Title*: Director of Real Property

Organization: Cattaraugus County *Email*: dtmartonis@cattco.org

Phone: 716-938-2324

Interested/participating municipalities:

Towns of Allegany, Ashford, Conewango, Dayton, Farmersville, Franklinville, Hinsdale, Humphrey, Ischua, Leon, Little Valley, Mansfield, Persia, Randolph, Red House, Salamanca, South Valley; and City of Olean

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

____**Elimination of duplicative services**

_X_**Shared services**

_X_**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

_X_**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description:

The County would take over the assessing duties from the above towns and proceed to bring all of those towns to 100% equalization rate and keep them there. The County would proceed to work with the towns to make sure that their needs are met; for instance, having hours at the town, supplying a monthly report to board meetings, etc.

What is needed for this proposal to become operational:

The Towns and County Legislators need to be on board; also, the Assessor's terms do not expire until October 2019.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal?

Currently, assessing is the responsibility of towns. In some manner towns now need to address this issue. In the future there is projected to be a shortage of assessors.

This effort focuses upon developing an option for towns. But, the Cattaraugus County Legislature must closely consider whether they are interested in expanding an existing department to accommodate this need. Further, there may be concerns raised by assessors currently employed regarding this transition. These issues all need to be resolved prior to full implementation.

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 is similar to when the villages dissolved their assessing. If this is not done, then it would be a disaster if towns buy-in 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.

What is the timeline for this effort?

This effort would be phased in over a three year period, starting with a full workforce and plan in 2019. Focus would start with smaller municipalities to work out any issues that may be identified. The last entity considered would be the City of Olean, this would not occur until 2010 or after, depending on appropriate timing and success of the effort in other municipalities.

What are the local advantages to this effort?

- The taxpayer would have someone to call Monday through Friday, 8am-5pm, as well as email. As it is now, assessors are part-time and can be hard to contact.
- Assessing would be done the same way for every town that the County has. Currently, you can have Assessors that assess in different fashions; for example, one may assess sheds or pools while the assessor in the next town does not.
- Assessing values won't stop at town lines. Currently, assessors are somewhat limited in valuing property within their own town. The boundaries

would not be relevant if we are looking at the county as a whole. We currently have real life examples of neighboring identical houses having large assessing discrepancies just because a town line runs between them.

- All towns would be brought up to, and kept, at 100% equalization rate. This will make it easier for the taxpayer and the town board to compare tax rates, will make sure that EVERYONE is paying their fair share of the tax, and will guarantee that the residents are getting the most from their exemptions.
- The amount of lost revenue from corrections and lawsuits will decrease. As it stands now, most of the errors and lawsuits stem from assessor mistakes. This can be minimized through a professional county service.

How would savings be realized?

See the chart below. Savings would be seen differently per town as each pays their assessor vastly different amounts. The figures below represent what each town's costs are for their assessor, plus what 1/3 of a revaluation would cost them (most pay over 3 years). This figure is then compared to what the county's costs would be for the personnel to handle all these towns and contracting out the revaluation cost per year. The figures below represent the yearly savings per town if they were to go with the county.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Towns	Savings Per Year for Town	
Ashford	$	10,985.37
Allegany	$	8,646.60
Conewango	$	6,239.24
Dayton	$	7,172.26
Ellicottville	$	28,090.03
Farmersville	$	3,085.15
Franklinville	$	9,426.75
Hinsdale	$	8,911.62
Humphrey	$	4,564.33
Ischua	$	2,762.05
Leon	$	8,929.06
Little Valley	$	7,722.43
Mansfield	$	10,548.26
Persia	$	11,560.05
Randolph	$	9,153.75
Red House	$	1.69
Salamanca T	$	5,104.12

South Valley	$	2,207.63	
		$145,110.39	**TOTAL COST**

Estimated three (3) year phased-in approach resulting in:

2018	$48,370.13
2019	$48,370.13
2020	$48,370.13

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Participation in the Municipal Electric and Gas Alliance (MEGA) for cost savings in utilities used by municipalities

Contact person: Varies with Municipality ***Title***:

Organization: ***Email***:

Phone:

Joe Pillittere, Commissioner, Cattaraugus County Department of Public Works, jtpillittere@cattco.org, 716-938-2483

Bill Aiello, Mayor, City of Olean, 716-376-5615, waiello@cityofolean.org

Applying to MEGA,

John Hare, Supervisor, Town of Allegany, 716-373-0120, jhare@townofallegany.com

Ann Rugg, Supervisor, Town of East Otto, 716-257-3568, eottosupervisor@gmail.com

Matt McAndrew, Supervisor, Town of Ellicottville, 716-699-2240, mjmellicottville@wny.twcbc.com

Lorrie Fisher, Supervisor, Town of Franklinville716-353-6723, franklinvillesupervisor@gmail.com

Daren Whitacre, Supervisor, Town of Freedom, Supervisor, 716-492-1203, freedomsupervisor@gmail.com

Thomas Hooper, Supervisor, Town of Hinsdale, 716-474-6883, Hinsdale.supervisor@gmail.com

Frederick Filock, Supervisor, Town of Leon, 716-548-5087, frado@netsync.net

Pete Wrona, Supervisor, Town of Little Valley, 716-938-6641, townlv1@yahoo.com

Melissa Kish, Supervisor, Town of Napoli, 716-358-3217, mmkish4napoli@aol.com

Dale Senn, Supervisor, Town of Randolph, 716-358-6727, dwsenn@windstream.net

Mark Burch, Supervisor, Town of South Valley, 716-354-2090, svalley@windstream.net

Wirt Smith, Mayor, Village of Cattaraugus, 716-257-3661, trustee.wsmith@gmail.com

Harvey Soulvie, Mayor, Village of Franklinville, 716-676-3010, hsoulvie@verizon.net

David Smith, Mayor, Village of Gowanda, 716-532-3353, dsmith@gowcsd.org

Paula Stockman, Village of South Dayton, 716-988-3833, snowman4ps@gmail.com

Interested/participating municipalities:

Cattaraugus County; the City of Olean; Towns of: Allegany, East Otto, Ellicottville, Franklinville, Freedom, Hinsdale, Leon, Little Valley, Napoli, Randolph, South Valley; Villages of: Cattaraugus, Franklinville, Gowanda, and South Dayton

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___Elimination of duplicative services

___Shared services

_X__Reduction of back-office administrative overhead

_X__Improved coordination of services

Project Description: The Municipal Electric and Gas Alliance (MEGA) is an energy aggregator operating in New York State specifically dealing with municipalities. By participating in MEGA, members are able to joint procure electric and gas services, in conjunction with hundreds of other municipalities, school districts and businesses. This buying power generates competitive prices for municipalities for these utilities. This program complies with all public bidding requirements in New York State.

By participating in MEGA local municipalities are able to leverage group purchasing for electric and gas utilities.

Two municipalities in Cattaraugus County are members of MEGA, namely Cattaraugus County and the City of Olean. A number of additional municipalities have expressed an interest in joining MEGA.

What is needed for this proposal to become operational: To join MEGA a municipality needs to review the service and complete an application form from MEGA where they indicate they are interested in opting into the MEGA program.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? There are no known Federal or State impediments to join MEGA. They operate in complete compliance with State laws. MEGA is endorsed by the New York State Association of Counties (NYSAC), NYS Conference of Mayors (NYCOM) and the NYS Association of School Business Officials (NYASBO).

Locally each panel member interested in participation needs to become familiar with MEGA, make a decision on joining MEGA, complete and submit the application form. This process may be somewhat different between municipalities.

What is the timeline for this effort? Six (6) months, depending upon the decision making process that would exist within a given municipality. In all probability this would require a local presentation from MEGA on the services they provide, prior to a municipality making a decision to join MEGA. In part this will depend upon the availability of MEGA to participate in this process.

What are the local advantages to this effort? By participating with MEGA, each individual municipality is able to avail themselves of the competitive power of group purchasing of utilities. Traditionally, the larger the number of municipalities participating in a bid for services, the lower the costs. Currently, many municipalities, due to their size and potential location, are paying a premium for these utilities. Group procurement allows the possibility of lower costs.

Once individual municipalities are members of MEGA, a member is able to access professional energy consultants at no cost. Access to these types of consultants are often beyond the means of local unaffiliated municipalities.

There is no cost to join MEGA and the application process is relatively easy and can be done online.

How would savings be realized? MEGA has secured the services of a firm called the Energy Research Consulting Group. This group has estimated that MEGA can generally save at least 3% off the cost of gas and electric bills from non-affiliated panel members. The nature of individual municipal utility usage and the parameters associated with individual municipality participation could increase or decrease this estimated figure.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal: The savings associated with being a member of MEGA have been calculated by MEGA for Cattaraugus County and the City of Olean.

For the Towns of Allegany, East Otto, Ellicottville, Franklinville, Freedom, Hinsdale, Leon, Little Valley, Napoli, Randolph, South Valley, and the Villages of: Cattaraugus, Franklinville, Gowanda and South Dayton the estimated savings is derived by taking

three percent (3%) of last year's annual electric and gas charges. Attached is a spreadsheet showing the derivation of projected savings.

At this time, the 2017 savings across municipalities in Cattaraugus County is estimated at $25,701 for 2017, $36,810 for 2018, and $36.810 for 2019.

Projected Savings 2017	**$25,701**
Projected Savings 2018	**$36,810**
Projected savings 2019	**$36,810**

With a three year total projected savings of $97,174.

Please note that there is a considerable amount of additional interest in MEGA participation in Cattaraugus County. Many existing town and villages are tied into existing contracts that will lapse after this plan is due to the State. It is fully expected that these municipalities will explore the option of MEGA at a later date. Effectively, this will increase the projected savings amount.

MEGA Savings analysis

Municipality	2017 Actual	2017 Utility bills	2017 Projection	2017 Total	2018 Actual	2018 Utility Bills	2018 Projected	2018 Total	2019 Actual	2019 Projected	2019 Total	2017-9 Actual	2017-9 Projected	Total 2017-19
County of Cattaraugus	$9,326	$0	$0	$9,326	$9,326	$0	$0	$9,326	$9,326	$0	$9,326	$27,978	$0	$27,978
City of Olean	$12,521	$0	$0	$12,521	$12,521	$0	$0	$12,521	$12,521	$0	$12,521	$37,563	$0	$37,563
Town of Allegany	$0	$4,399	$132	$132	$0	$10,557	$317	$317	$0	$317	$317	$0	$765	$765
Town of East Otto	$0	$923	$28	$28	$0	$2,214	$66	$2,214	$0	$2,214	$2,214	$0	$2,308	$2,308
Town of Franklinville	$0	$5,649	$169	$169	$0	$13,557	$407	$407	$0	$407	$407	$0	$983	$983
Town of Freedom	$0	$3,687	$111	$111	$0	$8,847	$265.40	$265	$0	$265	$265	$0	$641	$641
Town of Ellicottville	$0	$13,471	$404	$404	$0	$53,883	$1,616	$1,616	$0	$1,616	$1,616	$0	$3,637	$3,637
Town of Hinsdale	$0	$7,093	$213	$213	$0	$17,022	$511	$511	$0	$511	$511	$0	$1,234	$1,234
Town of Leon	$0	$2,179	$65.37	$65	$0	$5,230	$156.90	$157	$0	$157	$157	$0	$379	$379
Town of Little Valley	$0	$2,569	$77	$77	$0	$6,166	$185	$185	$0	$185	$185	$0	$447	$447
Town of Napoli	$0	$693	$20.78	$21	$0	$1,662	$50	$50	$0	$50	$50	$0	$120	$120
Town of Randolph	$0	$9,855	$296	$296	$0	$23,652	$710	$710	$0	$710	$710	$0	$1,715	$1,715
Town of South Valley	$0	$3,054	$92	$92	$0	$7,330	$220	$220	$0	$220	$220	$0	$531	$531
Village of Cattaraugus	$0	$1,560	$47	$47	$0	$3,744	$112	$112	$0	$112	$112	$0	$271	$271
Village of Franklinville	$0	$33,838	$1,015.14	$1,015	$0	$81,211	$2,436.33	$2,436	$0	$2,436	$2,436	$0	$5,888	$5,888
Village of Gowanda	$0	$27,025	$811	$811	$0	$162,150	$4,865	$4,865	$0	$4,865	$4,865	$0	$10,540	$10,540
Village of South Dayton	$0	$12,483	$374	$374	$0	$29,960	$899	$899	$0	$899	$899	$0	$2,172	$2,172
Totals	$21,847	$128,476	$3,854	$25,701	$21,847	$427,185	$12,816	$36,810	$21,847	$14,963	$36,810	$65,541	$31,633	$97,174

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for Consideration

Proposal Title: Computerized coordinated Public Works equipment listing and equipment sharing platform

Contact person: Joe Pillittere — ***Title***: Cattaraugus County Commissioner of Public Works

Patricia Davision — Cattaraugus County Director, Information Services

Organization: Cattaraugus County — ***Email***: jtpillittere@cattco.org
padavison@cattco.org

Phone: 716-938-2483, 716-938-2208

Plus participating municipalities, namely:

John Hare, Supervisor, Town of Allegany, 373-0120, jhare@townofallegany.com

Charles Davis III, Supervisor, Town of Ashford, 942-6016, toasupervisor@yahoo.com

Wayne McGuire, Supervisor, Town of Conewango, 358-9577, conewangosupervisor@windstream.net

Lorrie Fisher, Supervisor, Town of Franklinville, 353-6723, franklinvillesupervisor@gmail.com

Thomas Hooper, Supervisor, Town of Hinsdale, 474-6883, hinsdalesupervisor@gmail.com

Carrie Childs, Supervisor, Town of Humphrey, 557-2334, humphrey.supervisor@gmail.com

Jeffery Goodyear, Supervisor, Town of Ischua, 640-2886, jgoodyear@gmail.com

Fredrick Filock, Supervisor, Town of Leon, 548-5087, frado@netsync.net

Pete Wrona, Supervisor, Town of Little Valley, 938-6641, townlv1@yahoo.com

Robert Keis, Supervisor, Town of Mansfield 257-5170, robertkeis2@gmail.com

Melissa Kish, Supervisor, Town of Napoli, 358-3217, mmkish4napoli@aol.com

Anette Parker, Supervisor, Town of Olean, 373-0582, drvrad@verizon.net

Ronald Wasmund, Supervisor, Town of Otto, 532-4090, ronwas@msn.com

Dale Senn, Supervisor, Town of Randolph, 358-6727, dwsenn@windstream.net

Michael Phillips, Supervisor, Town of Salamanca, 945-1469, map4306@gmail.com

Mark Burch, Supervisor, Town of South Valley,354-2090, svalley@windstream.net

Bill Aiello, Mayor, City of Olean, 376-5615, waiello@cityof olean.org

Greg Pearl, Mayor, Village Allegany, 373-1460, gpearl@allegany.org

Wirt Smith, Mayor, Village of Cattaraugus, 257-3661, trustee.wsmith@gmail.com

John Burrell, Mayor, Village of Ellicottville,699-2100, mayorevl@gmail.com

Interested/participating municipalities:

Cattaraugus County, Towns of: Allegany, Ashford, Conewango, Franklinville, Hinsdale, Humphrey, Ischua, Leon, Little Valley, Mansfield, Napoli, Olean, Otto, Randolph, Salamanca, and South Valley; City of Olean; and Villages Allegany, Cattaraugus, & Ellicottville

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

_X_**Shared services**

___**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

_X_**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description:

Many municipalities in the County own public works equipment. Local Supervisors and Mayors have expressed an interest in having a master listing of available information compiled and updated, especially to facilitate the shared usage of specialty equipment and to assist in the coordination of shared DPW projects between municipalities. It has also been noted that this listing might also be invaluable when decisions are made by a municipality, or possibly a group of municipalities, to purchase replacement or specialty equipment and to coordinate projects.

This equipment largely resides in various local Public Works areas located throughout the county under the purview of various Highway Superintendents, some of which are themselves elected. These Highway Superintendents have a long history of providing shared services in a public works arena.

In 2009, an inventory of this equipment was compiled by the Cattaraugus County Department of Emergency Services primarily for a clearer understanding of the local resources available in an emergency situation.

This listing of equipment needs to be updated to include equipment available in 2017. The various Highway Superintendents in the County have agreed to assist in the updating of this list of equipment. This updated listing, will, in turn be shared with the Cattaraugus County Department of Emergency Services.

Once updated it is proposed that this data be placed in a computerized database format that will be searchable. Using an information management software package, local highway superintendents will be able to access this software online and be able to search for needed equipment and generate an email to the owner of the equipment requesting the use of the equipment. In turn, the owner of the equipment will be able to respond to the requestor municipality regarding availability. There may also be the opportunity for calendar integration which would assist with planning of joint projects.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational?

As a starting point the core database of equipment needs to be updated. Cattaraugus County is currently exploring a computer based information management system (Laserfiche) and is looking for initial projects to place on this platform. This would be one of those projects, but, the software would need to be acquired.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal?

The loan of equipment, especially specialty equipment would need to be reviewed as to legal questions/concerns especially in the arena of liability. This practice, however, has gone on for a number of years. Generally, specialty equipment (pavers, bucket trucks and vacuum trucks) are often in use for long periods of time; and they may not be available for other municipalities. However, with preplanning and use of this database, this obstacle may be lessened, if not avoided.

The computer equipment available to municipalities varies across Cattaraugus County. This proposal addresses a computer/software based application. Local municipality computer compatibility with this application will need to be researched.

Further, as repeatedly noted in many other forums, the widespread accessibility to high speed internet in Cattaraugus County is spotty at best. This lack of critical infrastructure could impact successful and timely rollout of this effort.

What is the timeline for this effort?

The updating of the existing database is already in progress and would probably be completed within six months. Cattaraugus County continues its pursuit of an information management software package. These two items could be combined and operational within a year.

What are the local advantages to this effort?

Local municipalities would quickly be able to identify available equipment and streamline the coordinated shared service use of this equipment across municipalities. This would include, but is not limited to:

- Searchable equipment database with open access for all municipalities
- Increased efficiency in planning and scheduling construction projects
- Reduced equipment costs (not renting or contracting for equipment that may be available from another municipality
- Reduced labor costs (prevailing wage rates do not apply in these shared service areas

How would savings be realized?

Some municipalities are currently unaware of the equipment available in the county. They know that they need a particular piece of equipment, however, without good updated knowledge on what is available, they oftentimes secure the needed equipment from private sources at a premium cost. An updated listing of available equipment could, potentially, reduce the costs of securing needed equipment.

In a less tangible fashion, by creating a platform for equipment requests, this will facilitate better communication and shared planning across municipalities.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

EQUIPMENT

Tandem Axle Truck (over 62,000 pounds, 6 x 4)	$76.91/hour/truck
Contractor/Rental Costs	$120.00/hour/truck
Shared Services	
32 (towns) + 9 (villages) x 16 (hours) x (120 – 76.91) =	**$28,267.04**

**Most towns and villages will need two-to-three trucks per job.*

4-Wheel Articulated Loader (4 cubic yard)	$50.11/hour/loader
Contractor/Rental Costs	$92.13/hour/loader
Shared Services	
32 (towns) + 9 (villages) x 8 (hours) x (92.13 – 50.11) =	**$13,782.56**

LABOR

Municipal CDL Driver (Tandem Axle)	$21.00/hour
Prevailing wage rate	$36.38/hour
Shared Services	
32 (towns) + 9 (villages) x 16 (hours) x (36.38 – 21.00) =	**$10,089.28**

**Most towns and villages will need two-to-three trucks per job.*

Municipal Operator (4-Wheel Articulated Loader)	$21.00/hour
Prevailing wage rate	$36.38/hour
Shared Services	
32 (towns) + 9 (villages) x 16 (hours) x (36.38 – 21.00) =	**$10,089.28**

Potential Total Savings	**$62,228.16**

In all practicality, this effort may experience a phased startup. This would impact projection figures. For purposes of this effort, it is assumed that the project would be fully functioning by calendar year 2018.

It is also possible that as this effort is successful, more municipalities in the County will participate in this effort. The reciprocal is also true. This also would impact projections. For purposes of this analysis only those expressing interest were used as a basis for the calculation. This could increase or decrease, however.

Estimated 2018 savings=$62,228

Estimated savings 2019:

There will continue to be year over year savings associated with this effort. This will clearly be able to be documented more accurately through this effort. Overtime, equipment wears out and is either replaced or not replaced depending upon a number of factors (including local budgets). As municipalities struggle to stay within the tax cap and as State mandates continue largely unfettered, priorities need

to be made, to spend available funds raised through capped levy dollars. Public works services are not a state mandate, but, they are critical to living in Cattaraugus County and in the municipalities affected. Given these factors, the savings figure is reduced in 2019 over 2018, by 20%, to reflect this flux. For this effort to continue to yield savings there must be the equipment available and the willingness of municipalities to participate in this effort.

The 2019 estimated savings would be calculated as follows:

$62,228 (2018 projected savings)*80%=$49,782.

Estimated 2019 savings: $49,782

County of Cattaraugus

2017

Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: A proposal to explore the consolidation of Justice Courts

Contact person:	Matthew McAndrew	***Title***:	Supervisor, Town of Ellicottville
	John Burrell		Mayor, Village of Ellicottville
	Robert Keis		Supervisor, Town of Mansfield
	Lorrie Fisher		Supervisor, Town of Franklinville
	Ronald Wasmund		Supervisor, Town of Otto
	Supervisor		Supervisor, Town of Farmersville
Organization:	Town of Ellicottville	***Email***:	
	Village of Ellicottville		
	Town of Mansfield		
	Town of Franklinville		
	Town of Otto		
	Town of Farmersville		

Phone:

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Ellicottville, Village of Ellicottville, Town of Mansfield, Town of Franklinville, Town of Otto, Town of Farmersville

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

X **Elimination of duplicative services**

X **Shared services**

X ___ **Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

X ___ **Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: Several municipalities in Cattaraugus County are interested exploring the consolidation of Justice Courts. According to a document issued by the NYS Comptroller's Office entitled Cost saving ideas: Justice Court consolidation in Villages in Towns (found at http://www.osc.state.ny.us/localgov/costsavings/justicecourtbrochure.htm) there are a number of steps that must be followed to achieve this consolidation. The above named municipalities are interested in pursuing this consolidation initiative.

Villages are not required to have a Justice Court. The Village of Ellicottville may dissolve its' Justice Court by resolution or local law, subject to permissive referendum. This dissolution can only take effect upon the expiration of the justices' term of office. In the case of the Village of Ellicottville, there is currently one justice, whose term will expire on April 1, 2019. Active Village cases will then be transferred to the Town of Ellicottville. This may deprive the Village of Ellicottville of a portion of their Justice Court revenue.

In addition, there is interest in also combining the Towns of Mansfield, Franklinville, Farmersville and Otto Justice Courts with the Town of Ellicottville Justice Court per the NYS Uniform Justice Court Act Section 106-b (described in detail below).

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational:

NYS is restrictive and prescriptive about how the consolidation of Justice Courts are to be handled.

For the dissolution of the Village of Ellicottville Justice Court, the Village must pass a resolution or local law indicating the intent to dissolve into the Town of Ellicottville Justice Court, subject to permissive referendum. This dissolution can only take effect upon the expiration of the current justices' term, April 1, 2019.

The Towns of Ellicottville, Mansfield, Franklinville, Farmersville and Otto may consolidate per NYS Uniform Justice Court Act Section 106-b. This option is only available for Towns. 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. This plan preserves the identity of each Justice Court, and its separate administration and jurisdiction.

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-106-b

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? 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.

The dissolution of the Village of Ellicottville Court is subject to permissive referendum.

What is the timeline for this effort?

While the process delineated could start very quickly, it would probably be initiated when there is opportunity, especially as judges are prepared to retire and/or run for new elected terms. This will vary depending upon the individual scenarios presented across participating municipalities.

What are the local advantages to this effort?

There would be greater efficiencies, as well as cost savings.

How would savings be realized?

Reduction in fixed and variable costs. There is a potential for additional savings to Cattaraugus County for both District Attorney expenses as well as Public Defender's Office expenses. These savings have not been calculated at this time.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Overall Savings: $109,292.32

A savings will be realized for each of these municipalities, the exact allocation of costs and savings is yet to be determined by these municipalities, upon the enactment of the consolidation.

Sources consulted:

NYSAC informational document. **Consolidating Justice Courts in New York State.**

NYS Comptroller's Office publication entitled **Cost savings ideas: Justice Court consolidation in Villages and Towns.** Found at:
http://www.osc.state.ny.us/localgov/costsavings/justicecourtbrochure.htm

County of Cattaraugus

2017

Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: A proposal to explore the consolidation of Justice Courts

Contact person: Carrie Childs — *Title*: Supervisor, Town of Humphrey

Jeffrey Goodyear — Supervisor, Town of Ischua

Thomas Hooper — Supervisor, Town of Hinsdale

John Hare — Supervisor, Town of Allegany

Annette Parker — Supervisor, Town of Olean

Organization: Town of Humphrey — *Email*:

Town of Ischua

Town of Hinsdale

Town of Allegany

Town of Olean

Phone:

Interested/participating municipalities: **Town of Humphrey, Town of Ischua, Town of Hinsdale, Town of Allegany, Town of Olean**

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

X Elimination of duplicative services

X Shared services

X Reduction of back-office administrative overhead

X Improved coordination of services

Project Description: Several municipalities in Cattaraugus County are interested exploring the consolidation of Justice Courts. According to a document issued by the NYS Comptroller's Office entitled Cost saving ideas: Justice Court consolidation in Villages in Towns (found at http://www.osc.state.ny.us/localgov/costsavings/justicecourtbrochure.htm) there are a number of steps that must be followed to achieve this consolidation. The above named municipalities are interested in pursuing this consolidation initiative.

There is interest in consolidating the Towns of Humphrey, Ischua, Hinsdale, Allegany and Olean Justice Courts per the NYS Uniform Justice Court Act Section 106-b (described in detail below).

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational:

NYS is restrictive and prescriptive about how the consolidation of Justice Courts are to be handled.

The Towns of Humphrey, Ischua, Hinsdale, Allegany and Olean may consolidate per NYS Uniform Justice Court Act Section 106-b. This option is only available for Towns. 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. This plan preserves the identity of each Justice Court, and its separate administration and jurisdiction.

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-106-b

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? 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.

What is the timeline for this effort?

While the process delineated could start very quickly, it would probably be initiated when there is opportunity, especially as judges are prepared to retire and/or run for new elected terms. This will vary depending upon the individual scenarios presented across participating municipalities.

What are the local advantages to this effort?

There would be greater efficiencies, as well as cost savings.

How would savings be realized?

Reduction in fixed and variable costs. There is a potential for additional savings to Cattaraugus County for both District Attorney expenses as well as Public Defender's Office expenses. These savings have not been calculated at this time.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Overall Savings: $67,845.36

A savings will be realized for each of these municipalities, the exact allocation of costs and savings is yet to be determined by these municipalities, upon the enactment of the consolidation.

Sources consulted:

NYSAC informational document. **Consolidating Justice Courts in New York State**.

NYS Comptroller's Office publication entitled **Cost savings ideas: Justice Court consolidation in Villages and Towns.** Found at:
http://www.osc.state.ny.us/localgov/costsavings/justicecourtbrochure.htm

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

***Proposal Title*:** **A proposal for the joint procurement of building demolition services by various municipalities**

***Contact person*:** ***Title*:**

Organization*:** ***Email:

Phone:

Joe Pillittere, Commissioner, Cattaraugus County Department of Public Works

716-938-2483 jtpillittere@cattco.org

John Hare, Supervisor, Town of Allegany, 716-373-0120, jhare@townofallegany.com

Charles Davis III, Supervisor, Town of Ashford, 716-942-6016, toasupervisor@yahoo.com

Matthew McAndrew, Supervisor, Town of Ellicottville 716-699-2240, mjmellicottville@wny.twcbc.com

Lorrie Fisher, Supervisor, Town of Franklinville 716-353-6723, franklinvillesupervisor@gmail.com

Dale Senn, Supervisor, Town of Randolph, 716-358-6727, dwsenn@windstream.net

Bill Aiello, Mayor, City of Olean, 716-376-5615, waiello@cityofolean.org

Greg Pearl, Mayor, Village of Allegany, 716-373-1469, gpearl@allegany.org

John Burrell, Mayor, Village of Ellicottville, 716-699-2100, mayorevl@gmail.com

Harvey Soulvie, Mayor, Village of Franklinville,716-676-3010, hsoulvie@verizon.net

David Smith, Mayor, Village of Gowanda, 716-532-3353, dsmith@gowcsd.org

Scott Kerr, Mayor, Village of South Dayton, 716-988-5940,
snowman4ps@gmail.com

Interested/participating municipalities: Cattaraugus County, Towns of Allegany, Ashford, Ellicottville, Franklinville, Randolph; City of Olean; Villages of Allegany, Ellicottville, Franklinville, Gowanda and South Dayton.

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

_X_ **Elimination of duplicative services**

_X_ **Shared services**

___ **Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

_X_ **Improved coordination of services**

This project would eliminate duplicative services that are now being done individually in each municipality. By jointly bidding these services there is a potential for reduced costs while simultaneously improving coordinated services. There is also the potential, if this is phased correctly, that municipalities would be able to better budget for costs of this type of work rather than either budgeting blanket amounts or reacting to these needs on an emergency basis.

Project Description: Many municipalities in Cattaraugus County experience the need to demolish properties within their municipal boundaries. For example, in 2017 the City of Olean has experienced $6,000 for asbestos reports and $49,652.85 in demolition costs for a total of $55,652.85 to demolish three (3) properties within the City limits. This averages out to $22,217 per property. The Town of Randolph, has demolished five (5) properties at approximately $90,000, or $18,000 on average per property in 2017. Between the two municipalities, $145,652.85 was spent for these services, or an average cost of $18,206.61 per house.

It has been noted that the Town of Ashford currently has three (3) properties in need of demolition, The Town of Randolph has an additional property, Town and Village of Franklinville have at least one property each, and the City of Olean has potentially five (5) more buildings in need of demolition. Taken together the expressed need for these services would combine to:

City of Olean	10 structures
Town of Randolph	6 structures

Town of Ashford	3 properties
Village of Franklinville	1 structure
Town of Franklinville	1 structure
Totals	21 potential structures in 2017, eight (8) of which have been demolished already

Twenty-one (21) structures at an average cost of demolishment of $18,206.61 per structure yields a levy impact, in aggregate of $382,338.81, potentially in 2017. Currently, the expenses associated with these demolition services are borne by the municipality but are also procured *individually* by the municipality, oftentimes, on an emergency basis at a premium cost.

What is being proposed is that there be a group procurement of the services needed to demolish identified properties.

To do this, the properties to be demolished would need to be identified by a municipality and their associated Building/Codes Inspector. Once properties are identified a central organization (possibly the Cattaraugus County Land Bank), would then bid both their own demolition work and that of the participating municipalities simultaneously as a group, avoiding the need for this to be done individually by the municipality.

It is expected that the purchasing power associated with a larger volume of potential work *may* lower the individual costs of demolishing the structures upon the individual municipality. Under this proposal the actual bid cost of the demolished properties would continue to be borne by the municipality, but, would potentially be lower than costs currently experienced.

It is important to note, that there will always be demolition costs tied to emergency or emerging situations. This option would only address those structures that could be handled that are not related to emergency situations.

Actual contracts for service between the companies doing the demolishment work would be between the municipality responsible for the property and the vendor, not the entity issuing the bid. The bid issuing entity would simply act as the conduit for group procurement of these services.

There was also discussion regarding costs associated with hauling debris to local landfills. It was felt that if there is a possibility that this municipal debris could be

hauled to a local municipality owned landfill at lower rates for the first 200 tons of material, this would reduce costs further.

What is needed to become operational: Cattaraugus County, Village and Town of Franklinville, Village and Town of Ellicottville, City of Olean, Town of Ashford, Village and Town of Allegany, Town of Randolph, Village of Gowanda and maybe the Village of South Dayton have all expressed interest in participating in this effort. These entities would need to formalize the number of structures to be addressed in 2018. Each participating municipality would need to provide clear and concise descriptions of the properties to be demolished provided to the entity preparing the bid in a timely manner. It is recommended that the municipality building inspector be involved in this description process. This information would be complied and bids let for services at a designated time. Once bids are opened the contractor and the municipality would need to go through their processes to generate a contract for service with one another. Once this contract is in place the work could begin and reimbursement for services proved per the awarded contract.

All bids received for work and resulting contracts for work to be done within a municipality are subject to approval by the municipality.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? This proposal requires interested municipalities and a willing partner to prepare and issue bids. If this partner is a municipality the bids would need to be issued so that they are able to be used by other municipalities. If this coordinating entity simultaneously is involved in demolishment activities tied to their needs, then this procurement could simultaneously include both demolition work for the issuing entity and participating municipalities.

What is the timeline for this effort? Assuming approval of all parties the timeline for this effort could be very quick and certainly within a year. Given that this proposal is being developed mid-year 2018, a probable start-up time frame may be early to mid-year 2018.

What are the local advantages to this effort? Properties that need to be demolished for any variety of reasons are able to be addressed in a cost effective manner. Once structures are addressed, the remaining properties may be more marketable and more appealing for investors, thus enhancing the tax base over time. In the short term, this addresses health and safety hazard issues. In the long term, it creates opportunity for tax base growth and better quality of living in a municipality.

Please note that there will always be the need to respond to emergency situations that may present themselves as the result of natural disasters, fires, etc.

How would savings be realized? Savings would be realized by the dynamics of large group versus small group purchasing (costs generally go down when the amount of the work increases), by competitively bidding services and by being more deliberate in addressing these expenses. It is anticipated that these expenses will vary per procurement, because the level of need for these services will ebb and flow across municipalities as these properties are addressed and parcels of land become more marketable. It seems reasonable that a group procurement could potentially save twenty (20) percent over the cost of individually procured demolition services.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal: Savings will vary from year to year and from procurement to procurement. Hypothetically, the first year a municipality participates in this effort; there will be a greater savings because they may be able to realize lower costs, especially if the costs are compared to a procurement by a single municipality. Once a property is demolished, however, the municipality may not have the need to again avail themselves of this municipality because their stock of buildings in need to demolishment will have been reduced. Savings will vary, and it is possible, depending on a variety of factors that there would be no savings generated by this joint procurement.

Using data collected from municipalities in 2017, there is a need for twenty-one (21) structures to be demolished. The average cost per structure, as noted above, is $18,206.61. The estimated cost to demolish these structures in 2017 is $382,338.81. If there is a twenty (20) percent savings realized by group procurement, this would yield a savings to municipal participants of **<$76,467.76.**

Potential savings 2017= $0.00

Potential savings 2018=$76,467.76*

***assumes participation as described**

Assuming this service is useful, cost effective and timely, savings will be reoccurring in subsequent years, but, the level of the savings is anticipated to vary widely over time as fixed costs increase and as municipalities may or may not have properties they want or are able to demolish in a given year. A year over year program could vary widely with potential savings degrading over time. Each year projected the impact of this factor grows and the validity of

the estimate, which is already based on a series of assumptions, becomes more and more inaccurate and unreliable.

To accommodate this flux and for purposes of this effort it is projected that there would be a 20% per year degradation in the savings figure. Applying this methodology, the savings in 2019 would drop to $61,174.

Savings in 2019=$61,174.

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: **Joint Procurement of Professional Engineering Services**

Contact person: Title:

Organization: Email:

Phone:

This effort will be to coordinate services for the participating municipalities:

Joe Pillittere, Commissioner, Cattaraugus County Department of Public Works, 716-838-2483, jtpillittere@cattco.org

Other interested parties include:

Charles Davis III, Supervisor, Town of Ashford, 716-942-6016, toasupervisor@yahoo.com

Ann Rugg, Supervisor, Town of East Otto, 716-257-3568, eottosupervisor@gmail.com

Pete Wrona, Supervisor, Town of Little Valley, 716-938-6641, townlv1@yahoo.com

Carol Evans, Supervisor, Town of Lyndon, 716-676-9928, lyndonsuper@yahoo.com

Loyd Chilson, Supervisor, Town of New Albion, 716-257-3661, newalbionclerk@hotmail.com

Dale Senn, Supervisor, Town of Randolph, 716-358-6727, dwsenn@windstream.net

Bill Aiello, Mayor, City of Olean, 716-376-5615, waillo@cityofolean.org

Greg Pearl, Mayor, Village of Allegany, 716-373-1460, gpearl@allegany.org

Wirt Smith, Mayor, Village of Cattaraugus, 716-257-3661, trustee.wsmith@gmail.com

David Smith, Mayor, Village of Gowanda,716-532-3353, dsmith@gowcsd.org

Scott Kerr, Mayor, Village of South Dayton, 716-988-5940, snowman4ps@gmail.com

Municipalities interested in participating in this proposal:

Towns of Ashford, East Otto, Little Valley, Lyndon, New Albion, Randolph; City of Olean; and the Villages of Allegany, Cattaraugus, Gowanda and South Dayton.

Most municipalities, large or small, will need to have their drawings reviewed and stamped when designing in-house construction projects. A Professional Engineer's hourly rate can cost between $150 to $250 per hour, not including administrative add-ons (i.e., mileage, printing, etc.). For small municipalities already struggling with funding issues and other municipalities that must adhere to other funding mandates, paying for these types of services can become prohibitive. This issue impacts a majority of the County's 32 towns and 9 villages.

While the County has two Professional Engineers on its staff, they do not use their credentials for projects outside of the County's jurisdiction, and do not stamp drawings/designs from other municipalities. This is a legal issue from a liability stand point. They will review in-house work and assist with research, design issues, scope of work, and paperwork. This does save municipalities money.

This addresses the need to have access to an engineer for projects that may be developed in the towns, cities and villages of the County.

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

_X_ Elimination of duplicative services

_X_ Shared services

_X_ Reduction of back-office administrative overhead

_X_ Improved coordination of services

Project Description:
To help offset the cost of hiring a Professional Engineer, municipalities could:

Option 1:
To have municipalities "piggyback" on the County's current five-year contract with Wendel Engineering and Hunt. Both of these firms have expertise in a variety

of areas to meet the needs of any municipality. The research, evaluation, bidding and other administrative actions have already been done by the County, which saves those upfront costs to any municipality. These current contracts are good until December 2019. Also, because the County has contracted to use these two firms over the next five years, there is a discount of some type applied to their rate/hour schedule.

Option 2:
Advertise a joint bid for this type of service. A joint bid will divide the cost for this service among all participants. The results would be two-fold: 1) lowers the cost considerably for each participant; and 2) allows even the smallest municipalities the ability and access to professional engineering services.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational?

A group of municipalities would need to be identified in order for this shared service initiative to move forward. Once identified, the group can decide on what option or combination would obtain the best results and greatest savings. In addition, the County's Professional Engineer, Procurement Specialist, and Attorney would review the bid document to ensure it will solicit the necessary needs of all those involved.

What are the impediments to implementing this proposal?

There needs to be enough participants in order to lower the cost per municipality; Otherwise, there will be no cost-savings if there are not enough participants.

What is the timeline for this effort?

Based on a normal bid process, this could be accomplished by early 2018. The key to completion is getting a bid document developed that is agreed to by all municipal participants.

What are the local advantages to this effort?

The ability to obtain approval for in-house construction projects at a lower cost saves the taxpayers money. In addition, a stamped drawing signifies that the design will function properly and that safety will not be jeopardized. With this savings,

municipalities can maximize their dollars to include additional in-house projects for the betterment of their communities and the quality of life for their residents.

How would savings be realized?

Savings would be realized by taking the total cost for this type of professional service and dividing it among several participants. This would also allow municipalities to perform more of their work in-house, which results in additional savings from using their own equipment, labor and resources. If you add on shared services with other municipalities for these in-house projects, there is even more savings.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Use of County's Professional Engineer (Research, Review, Admin.)-Option 1

County Engineers (2)	$74.04/hour (average hourly rate for two P.E.'s)
Outside Firm Ave.	$200/hour
	$125.96/hour in savings

Piggyback on County's 5-Year Contract-Option 2

Savings will be dictated by the nature of the work that needs to be done by a respective participant. A number cannot be placed at this time. The need for this type of service will vary from year to year across municipalities. Generally, the larger the entity, the more frequently this type of service could be used.

There is an expressed interest by participants in this project, but until the pool of participants are identified in a given year for projects to be done, savings figures cannot be generated associated with this proposal. Much of this savings will be realized through joint procurement of these professional services.

Savings:

2017: $0.00 (not started)

2018: Unknown (will vary with the nature of projects and participants)

2019: Unknown (will vary with the nature of projects and participants)

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Shared services costs associated with the production of the Countywide Shared Services Plan

Contact person: Jack Searles ***Title***: County Administrator

Organization: Cattaraugus County ***Email***: jrsearles@cattco.og

Phone: (716) 938-2577

Interested/participating municipalities: All municipalities in Cattaraugus County

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

_____**Elimination of duplicative services**

_X__**Shared services**

_____**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

_____**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: New York State mandated the development of the Countywide Shared Services Plan with its associated timelines. Counties were to opt into either development of this Plan in 2017 or 2018. The Cattaraugus County Panel opted to prepare a Plan for a 2017 submission. With the tight timelines mandated by the State, considerable effort had to be applied to identify, prepare, quantify and fully develop Plan elements while simultaneously affording input from Panel members, the County Legislature, Highway Superintendents, Union representative, the media and the General Public. This effort generated costs that have been donated to facilitate the development of the Plan in the State specified format and on the State specified timeline. In communications with New York State, it has been made clear that New York State, while mandating this process, provided no financial assistance to facilitate Plan development. Effectively, there

is an expectation that a Plan will be developed, but, not assistance provided to facilitate this effort. This is the classic definition of an unfunded mandate.

With this said there remain easily quantifiable costs associated with Plan development specifically in the arenas of: staff time for non-mandated employees to participate in Plan development, copies, office supplies, room rental, refreshments, mileage and advertising. The costs associated with these items are a shared service by participants to facilitate Plan development.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: Operational and ongoing

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? None

What is the timeline for this effort? The State mandated timeline associated with Plan development and submission.

What are the local advantages to this effort? Local convenient meeting spaces were made available for Panel meetings and Public Hearings. Staff with expertise in the area being discussed provided assistance and input into Plan development and the estimation of savings. This facilitation provided the environment for the development of the Plan.

How would savings be realized? Calculation of actual costs associated with key areas noted above. It is important to note, this figures is probably understated, and is certainly conservative in nature. The costs associated with mandated Panel members were not included in this calculation. If these costs were included this figure would be much larger.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Calculation of costs associated with Preparing County-Wide Shared Services Plan	Column 1
Item	**Amount**
Non-mandated staff time	$10,198
Copies	$324
Office Supplies	$325
Room Rental	$2,400
Refreshments	$300
Mileage	$150
Advertising	$225
Total	$13,922

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Merge the Village of Cattaraugus with the Town of New Albion

Contact person: Wirt Smith ***Title***: Mayor

Organization: Village of Cattaraugus ***Email***: trustee.wsmith@gmail.com

Phone: (716)257-3661

Loyd Chilson, Supervisor, Town of New Albion, 716-257-3661, newalbionvclerk@hotmail.com

Interested/participating municipalities: Village of Cattaraugus and Town of New Albion

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

_X_Elimination of duplicative services

____Shared services

_X_Reduction of back-office administrative overhead

___Improved coordination of services

Project Description: The Village of Cattaraugus will seek a dissolution study to merge with the Town of New Albion.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: Article 17-A of the NYS Municipal Law prescribes different processes for either consolidation or dissolution. This process can basically be either Board or Citizen initiated. A New York State Department of State publication entitled "The reorganization of local government: A summary of the Government reorganization process" (see attachment) delineates the prescribed process.

The Village of Cattaraugus is currently interested in pursuing a dissolution study that would explore all aspects of this effort. Currently, there is a State grant available to assist municipalities plan and study this process in an effort to determine if this would be in the best interests for both the Village of Cattaraugus and the Town of New Albion. This grant is 90% State/10% local monies if the process is started by petition on referendum. It is 50% State/50% local if the village board starts the process. More

information on this grant can be found at https://www.dos.ny.gov/funding/rfa-15-creg-01/index.html.

This process has been initiated by the Village of Cattaraugus.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? The NYS prescribed timelines and processes required to initiate this effort.

What is the timeline for this effort? Ongoing

What are the local advantages to this effort? These need to be analyzed but key issues would be cost savings, efficiencies and continued quality services.

How would savings be realized? Comparing current operating costs to those that would be achieved in a consolidation. It is believed that New York State would be very prescriptive in the manner in which these saving would be derived.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal: This is currently in process. The dissolution study will determine the issues and benefits of this effort.

At best, this would probably move forward in FY'2018.

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Reduced insurance costs due to enrolling in an insurance dividend program by the Village of Delevan and the Town of Yorkshire.

Contact person: John Stumpf — ***Title***: Mayor

Marcia Spencer — Supervisor

Organization: Village of Delevan — ***Email***: delevanclerk@roadrunner.com

Town of Yorkshire — yorkshiresupervisor@roadrunner.com

Phone: 716 244-1115 (Delevan), 716-492-1640 (Yorkshire)

Interested/participating municipalities: Village of Delevan and the Town of Yorkshire.

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

_X_**Shared services**

_X_**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

___**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: During its recent procurement process for insurance coverage, the Village of Delevan and the Town of Yorkshire explored the option of purchasing an insurance policy that pays dividends.

Basically, some insurance policies allow for the payment of dividend based upon good experience rating, loss experience, etc. with the insured, in this case the Village and the Town. These policy dividends are basically a "return of premium", whereby if the insurer and the insured have a good year the municipalities will receive part of the premium paid back as a dividend.

After reviewing the policies available the Village of Delevan and the Town of Yorkshire chose to enroll in a Selective Insurance Dividend program.

What is needed for this proposal to become operational:

Both municipalities opted to enroll in a Selective insurance dividend program.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal?

None. This is a local decision based upon locally evaluating options available.

What is the timeline for this effort?

18 months

What are the local advantages to this effort?

This will reduce insurance costs by receiving a more tailored policy that better meets the needs of the two municipalities and, given good performance, there is the possibility of a dividend payment.

How would savings be realized?

Dividend check issued back to the municipalities

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

It is estimated by the insurance agent that both the Village of Delevan and the Town of Yorkshire would generated an $800 per year savings by participating in this coverage.

Savings calculation:

2018

Village of Delevan	**$800/year**
Town of Yorkshire:	**$800/year**
---	---
Total for 2018	**$1,600**
Total for 2019	**$1,600**

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: GIS County Shared Service - Allegany

Contact person: John Hare *Title*: Town Supervisor

Organization: Town of Allegany *Email*: jhare@townofallegany.com

Phone: 716-373-1540 ext. 110

Daniel Martonis, Director, Cattaraugus County Department of Real Property Tax Services and GIS, 716-938-2324, dtmartonis@cattco.org

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Allegany and County of Cattaraugus

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

_x_**Shared services**

___**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

_x_**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: The County GIS Department will extract GPS data collected by the Town, and use the data to set up a mobile based mapping system to update infrastructure inventory for future collection.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: ESRI (Environmental Systems Research Institute) licensing, County-based GIS server infrastructure – both of which are already in use by Cattaraugus County. Trimble Pathfinder software is also needed to extract data from the GPS unit – also owned by the County.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? Local users will need to learn the application prior to using it. Aid will be available from the Cattaraugus County Real Property and GIS Department.

What is the timeline for this effort? Implementation can begin immediately. Creating a system for each town (web map(s), creation of services, etc.) would take no longer than a few days.

What are the local advantages to this effort? Town users can update this data quickly and easily through a smartphone app, which is connected directly to the data stored on the County GIS server. This updated data will be available for the Town to access as well as the County in any future mapping endeavors.

How would savings be realized? Towns will not need to purchase GIS software or GPS software to extract the previously collected data; also, the Town will not need to obtain a GIS professional to maintain the system

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Data Stored/Maintained Internally

Server Purchase: $4,000

Software License: $10,000

In-house GIS Professional: $50,000

Total Cost: $64,000

Data Stored/Maintained through Consulting Firm

Flat Rate Consultant Charge: $100/hour

Estimated time: 15 hours/week * 52 weeks = 780 hours

Total Cost: $78,000

Data Stored/Maintained by County

Data collection by consulting firm (if data does not already exist): $100/hour

Estimated time: 100 hours

Analysis:

County cost for this Project: $64,000

Outside cost to do this project is: $78,000+$10,000 (storage)=$88,000

$88,000 (outside)-$64,000= $24,000

This cost is a savings of $24,000, by not using an outside firm, assuming that this is a priority for the Town and included in their budget. This saving would be a one time savings projected to occur in 2018. There would be efficiency savings in later years (faster response times, better documentation, ability to plan future projects, etc) but these cannot be ascertained until the project is implemented.

Savings 2018: $24,000

Savings 2019: unknown

County of Cattaraugus

2017

Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: GIS County Shared Service – Village of Little Valley

Contact person: Norm Marsh ***Title***: Mayor

Organization: Village of Little Valley ***Email***:clerktreasurer@atlanticbb.net

Phone:716-938-6620

Dan Martonis, Director, Cattaraugus County Real Property Tax Services & GIS,

716-938-2324, dtmartonis@cattco.org

Interested/participating municipalities: Village of Little Valley and Cattaraugus County

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___Elimination of duplicative services

_x_Shared services

____Reduction of back-office administrative overhead

_x_Improved coordination of services

Project Description: Utilize the county GIS to assist town in mapping and maintenance/planning of their infrastructure, use mobile mapping to collect data.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: ESRI (Environmental Systems Research Institute) licensing, county based GIS server infrastructure – both of which are already in use by Cattaraugus County.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? Local users will need to learn the application prior to using it. Aid will be available from the Cattaraugus County Real Property and GIS department.

What is the timeline for this effort? Implementation can begin immediately. Creating a system for each town (web map(s), creation of services, etc.) would take no longer than a few days.

What are the local advantages to this effort? Village based users can update current infrastructure data quickly and easily through the ArcGIS smartphone app, which is connected directly to the data stored on the county GIS server. This updated data will then be available for the town to access as well as the county in any future mapping endeavors.

How would savings be realized? The village will not need to purchase GIS software to update data or obtain a GIS professional to maintain the system.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Data Stored/Maintained Internally

Server Purchase: $4,000

Software License: $10,000

In-house GIS Professional: $50,000

Total Cost: $64,000

Data Stored/Maintained through Consulting Firm

Flat Rate Consultant Charge: $100/hour

Estimated time: 15 hours/week * 52 weeks = 780 hours

Total Cost: $78,000

Data Stored/Maintained by County

Data collection by consulting firm (if data does not already exist): $100/hour

Estimated time: 100 hours

Analysis:

County cost for this Project: $64,000

Outside cost to do this project is: $78,000+$10,000 (storage)=$88,000

$88,000 (outside)-$64,000= $24,000

This cost is a savings of $24,000 over using an outside firm, assuming that this is a priority for the Town and included in their budget. This saving would be a one time savings projected to occur in 2018. There would be efficiency savings in later years (faster response times, better documentation, ability to plan future projects, etc) but these cannot be ascertained until the project is implemented.

Savings 2018: $24,000

Savings 2019: unknown

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: GIS County Shared Service – Town of Ellicottville

Contact person: Matthew McAndrew ***Title***: Supervisor

Organization: Town of Ellicottville ***Email***: mjmellicottville@wny.twcbe.com

Phone: 716-699-2100

Dan Martonis, Director, Cattaraugus County Real Property Tax Services & GIS,

716-938-2324, dtmartonis@cattco.org

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Ellicottville

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

_x_**Shared services**

____**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

_x_**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: Utilize the County GIS to assist Town in mapping and maintenance/planning of their infrastructure, use mobile mapping to collect data.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) licensing, County-based GIS server infrastructure – both of which are already in use by Cattaraugus County.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? Local users will need to learn the application prior to using it. Aid will be available from the Cattaraugus County Real Property/GIS Department.

What is the timeline for this effort? Implementation can begin immediately. Creating a system for each town (web map(s), creation of services, etc.) would take no longer than a few days.

What are the local advantages to this effort? Town based users can update current infrastructure data quickly and easily through the ArcGIS smartphone app, which is

connected directly to the data stored on the County GIS server. This updated data will be available for the Town to access as well as the County in any future mapping endeavors.

How would savings be realized? The Town will not need to purchase GIS software to update data or obtain a GIS professional to maintain the system.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Data Stored/Maintained Internally

Server Purchase: $4,000

Software License: $10,000

In-house GIS Professional: $50,000

Total Cost: $64,000

Data Stored/Maintained through Consulting Firm

Flat Rate Consultant Charge: $100/hour

Estimated time: 15 hours/week * 52 weeks = 780 hours

Total Cost: $78,000

Data Stored/Maintained by County

Data collection by consulting firm (if data does not already exist): $100/hour

Estimated time: 100 hours

Analysis:

County cost for this Project: $64,000

Outside cost to do this project is: $78,000+$10,000 (storage)=$88,000

$88,000 (outside)-$64,000= $24,000

This is a cost savings of $24,000 instead of using an outside firm, assuming that this is a priority for the Town and included in their budget. This savings would be a one-time savings projected to occur in 2018. There would be efficiency savings in later years (faster response times, better documentation, ability to plan future projects, etc.) but these cannot be ascertained until the project is implemented.

Savings 2018: $24,000

Savings 2019: unknown

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: GIS County Shared Service - Ashford

Contact person: Charles Davis III *Title*: Supervisor

Organization: Town of Ashford *Email*: toasupervisor@yahoo.com

Phone: 716-942-6016 ext. 5

Chris Holewinski, Cattaraugus County GIS Coordinator, 716-938-2322, cdholewinski@cattco.org

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Ashford, County of Cattaraugus

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

_x_**Shared services**

___**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

_x_**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: Utilize the County GIS to assist Town in mapping and maintenance/planning of their infrastructure, use mobile mapping to collect data.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) licensing, County-based GIS server infrastructure – both of which are already in use by Cattaraugus County.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? Local users will need to learn the application prior to using it. Aid will be available from the Cattaraugus County Real Property and GIS Department.

What is the timeline for this effort? Implementation can begin immediately. Creating a system for each town (web map(s), creation of services, etc.) would take no longer than a few days.

What are the local advantages to this effort? Town based users can update current infrastructure data quickly and easily through the ArcGIS smartphone app, which is connected directly to the data stored on the County GIS server. This updated data will

then be available for the Town to access as well as the County in any future mapping endeavors.

How would savings be realized? The Town will not need to purchase GIS software to update data or obtain a GIS professional to maintain the system.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Data Stored/Maintained Internally

Server Purchase: $4,000

Software License: $10,000

In-house GIS Professional: $50,000

Total Cost: $64,000

Data Stored/Maintained through Consulting Firm

Flat Rate Consultant Charge: $100/hour

Estimated time: 15 hours/week * 52 weeks = 780 hours

Total Cost: $78,000

Data Stored/Maintained by County

Data collection by consulting firm (if data does not already exist): $100/hour

Estimated time: 100 hours

Analysis:

County cost for this Project: $64,000

Outside cost to do this project is: $78,000+$10,000 (storage)=$88,000

$88,000 (outside)-$64,000= $24,000

This cost is a savings of $24,000 by not using an outside firm, assuming that this is a priority for the Town and included in their budget. This savings would be a one time savings projected to occur in 2018. There would be efficiency savings in later years (faster response times, better documentation, ability to plan future projects, etc.) but these cannot be ascertained until the project is implemented.

Savings 2018: $24,000

Savings 2019: unknown

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title:	GIS County Shared Service - Randolph		
Contact person:	Dale Senn	*Title*:	Town Supervisor
	Dave Fischer		Water/Sewer Superintendent
Organization:	Town of Randolph	*Email*:	dwsenn@windstream.net
Phone:	716-397-3316		water@randolphny.net

Chris Holewinski, Cattaraugus County GIS Coordinator, 716-938-2322, cdholewinski@cattco.org

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Randolph, County of Cattaraugus

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

_x_**Shared services**

___**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

_x_**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: Utilize the County GIS to assist Town in mapping and maintenance/planning of their infrastructure, use mobile mapping to collect data.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: Environmental Systems Research Institute (ESRI) licensing, County-based GIS server infrastructure – both of which are already in use by Cattaraugus County.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? Local users will need to learn the application prior to using it. Aid will be available from the Cattaraugus County Real Property and GIS department.

What is the timeline for this effort? Implementation can begin immediately. Creating a system for each town (web map(s), creation of services, etc.) would take no longer than a few days.

What are the local advantages to this effort? Town based users can update current infrastructure data quickly and easily through the ArcGIS smartphone app, which is

connected directly to the data stored on the County GIS server. This updated data will be available for the Town to access as well as the County in any future mapping endeavors.

How would savings be realized? The Town will not need to purchase GIS software to update data or obtain a GIS professional to maintain the system.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Data Stored/Maintained Internally

Server Purchase: $4,000

Software License: $10,000

In-house GIS Professional: $50,000

Total Cost: $64,000

Data Stored/Maintained through Consulting Firm

Flat Rate Consultant Charge: $100/hour

Estimated time: 15 hours/week * 52 weeks = 780 hours

Total Cost: $78,000

Data Stored/Maintained by County

Data collection by consulting firm (if data does not already exist): $100/hour

Estimated time: 100 hours

Analysis:

County cost for this Project: $64,000

Outside cost to do this project is: $78,000+$10,000 (storage)=$88,000

$88,000 (outside)-$64,000= $24,000

This is a cost savings of $24,000 instead of using an outside firm, assuming that this is a priority for the Town and included in their budget. This savings would be a one-time savings projected to occur in 2018. There would be efficiency savings in later years (faster response times, better documentation, ability to plan future projects, etc.) but these cannot be ascertained until the project is implemented.

Savings 2018: $24,000

Savings 2019: unknown

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Shared Salt/Sand Shed

Contact persons: Joseph Pillittere/Charles Davis *Title*: Comm./Town Supervisor

Organization: Cattaraugus County *Email*: jtpillittere@cattco.org

Town of Ashford toasupervisor@yahoo.com

Phone: (716) 938-2483/ (716) 244-3597

Interested/participating municipalities: Cattaraugus County and Town of Ashford

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

_X_**Shared services**

____**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

_X_**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description:

Cattaraugus County and Town of Ashford will work together to build a shared Salt/Sand Shed to be used during the winter season. The cost of this structure will be split 50/50.

What is needed for this proposal to become operational:

Funding for this $425,000 project is the biggest need. The Department of Public Works has received approval from its Legislature to submit a Water Quality and Improvement Project grant to support the construction of this project. It is estimated that the grant will be for $200,000, with the balance being split 50/50 between Cattaraugus County and the Town of Ashford.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal?

The only impediment in building this structure is funding. If the grant is not obtained, then the cost of this building would have to come from local dollars. The County and Town must fund their projects within the constraints of NYS' tax-reduction initiatives, and the prioritization of needs against available funding options.

What is the timeline for this effort?

The current schedule for this building is the summer construction season in 2019. This timeline allows the County and Town to plan, design, secure available grants, and if necessary, fund this project with local dollars if the grant is not obtained.

Grant applications are due on July 28, 2017.

What are the local advantages to this effort?

The greatest advantage is the cost-savings from splitting the funding share 50/50 for the facility.

Environmental stewardship is another advantage because a salt/sand shed will keep these materials covered and contained. This keeps the salt from getting into the local water table. Also, by keeping these materials covered there will be less waste from foreign items getting mixed into the salt and sand.

The County and Town will have easier and better access to snow-fighting materials, which will increase efficiency and productivity. Currently, the County and Town operate their own sand/sand piles. This solution can reduce the administrative burden and also reduce the use of equipment and manpower to load the materials.

Safety will also be improved. A shared salt/sand shed will provide quicker loading times for plow drivers, so they can be on their way sooner to clean and clear roadways for the traveling public.

How would savings be realized?

Purchase price of this building would be lowered by splitting the cost (shared service) and/or securing the Water Quality and Improvement Project grant. In

addition, there will be savings in manpower and equipment usage to operate one (1) facility verses two(2).

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Estimated Cost of Salt/Sand Shed:	$425,000 total cost for building
Cost split 50/50	$212,500/municipality **(Savings)**

Or

Total Cost of Building	$425,000
*Grant (if obtained)	$200,000 **(Savings)**
Cost split 50/50	$112,500/municipality **(Savings)**

***Water Quality and Improvement Project grant**

4-Wheel Articulated Loader (4 cubic yard)	$50.11/hour/loader
2 loaders x 5 months (Nov.-March) x 4 hours/day (min.)	$60,132

Shared Services

$60,132 ÷ 2 (one loader needed) =	**$30,066 (Savings)**

The savings associated with this will occur when this is complete. For purposes of this analysis it is assumed this will occur in 2018.

Savings 2018= $30,066

This savings will be reoccurring in subsequent years, but the level of the savings is anticipated to degrade over time as costs go up over time (e.g., cost of materials, labor costs). Each year projected, the impact of this factor grows, and the validity of the estimate, which is already based on a series of assumptions, becomes more and more inaccurate and unreliable.

For purposes of this effort it is projected that there would be a 20% per year degradation in the savings figure. Applying this methodology, the savings in 2019 would drop to $24,053.

Savings in 2019=$24,053.

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Asphalt Zipper equipment purchase.

Contact person: Annette M. Parker *Title*: Supervisor

Organization: Town of Olean *Email*: drrad@verizon.net

Phone: 716-378-0626

Interested/participating municipalities: Town and City of Olean

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

_X_**Shared services**

____**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

_X_**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: Shared lease agreement for an equipment purchase of an Asphalt Zipper by the Town and City of Olean. This machine grinds existing blacktop and allows the re-use of the material on site.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: Agreement to do a shared lease between the two municipalities for the purchase of an Asphalt Zipper Model number AZ-500B with a dual axle trailer.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? This is being done in accordance with State procurement laws and local purchasing policies in force in both the Town of Olean and the City of Olean.

What is the timeline for this effort? April, 2017. The joint lease is for a period of 5 years.

What are the local advantages to this effort? This affords better coordination of activities between the Town and City of Olean, while meeting the needs of each of these municipalities in a cost effective manner. By using an equipment and lease agreement, costs are able to be spread over 5 years for each municipality.

How would savings be realized? Savings are realized by efficiencies generated by the use of this equipment compared to operational costs experience prior to using this equipment.

These savings are both operational and logistical in nature.

Operationally, savings is based on comparisons between costs of doing business prior to using the zipper versus the costs of doing business using the zipper. For example, the use of this equipment saves on on-site trucking of what was considered waste asphalt as well as the costs of trucking, purchasing and applying new asphalt. The zipper re-uses/recycles old asphalt on site, and does not require the use of new asphalt. For example: the cost of replacing a 10'x100' swatch of road at a depth of 5" is approximately $2,000 using prior methods (removing pavement, hauling pavement, purchasing, hauling and applying new asphalt). By using the zipper this costs is estimated to be $500 for the same application. These costs are exclusively related, additional oil and stone needed to operate the zipper.

Logistically, this is a needed, but, expensive piece of equipment. The total cost of the equipment (Zipper and Trailer) is $135,990. If the Town and City of Olean each opted to purchase this equipment the total cost would be $271,800. By jointly leasing this equipment over a five year period the savings across the two municipalities effectively $135,990 over a five year period or $27,198 per year. Additionally, this lease allows the spread of the purchase price both over 5 years and across two municipalities; creating a more financially manageable scenario while simultaneously creating efficiencies and an ability to jointly address local needs. This would be a cost avoidance.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Operating assumptions

10'x100'=1,000 square feet

$2,000 (estimate cost using old methods)/1,000 square feet=$2.00 square foot

With the Zipper the cost is:

$500/$1,000 square feet=$.50/square foot

Savings calculation:

The savings would be $1.50 ($2.00-$.50) a square foot x 151,800 square feet in 2017=$227,700 compared to contracting work

2017 savings $227,700 compared to contracting work

2018 savings $227,700 (assuming reoccurring road program)

2019 savings $227,700 (assuming reoccurring road program)

To this savings would be added a cost avoidance of $135,990/5 years=$27,198 per year

2017 total Savings:

Savings over use of contractor:	$227,700
Cost avoidance:	$27,198
Total 2017	**$254,898**

2018 total Savings:

This savings will be reoccurring in subsequent years, but, the level of the savings is anticipated to degrade over time as costs go up over time (e.g., cost of materials, labor costs). Each year projected the impact of this factor grows and the validity of the estimate, which is already based on a series of assumptions, becomes more and more inaccurate and unreliable.

For purposes of this effort it is projected that there would be a 20% per year degradation in the savings figure. Applying this methodology, the savings in 2019 would be calculated as follows:

Savings over use of contractor (2017):	$227,700
Cost avoidance:	$27,198
Total 2018	**$254,898**
Less 20%	**<$50,979**
2018 Projected net savings	**$203,919**

2019 total Savings

Again, in 2019 this savings will be reoccurring, but, the level of the savings continues to degrade over time as costs go up over time (e.g., cost of materials, labor costs). Each year projected the impact of this factor grows and the validity of the estimate, which is already based on a series of assumptions, becomes more and more inaccurate and unreliable.

For purposes of this effort it is projected that there would be a 20% degradation per year in the savings figure. Applying this methodology, the savings in 2019 would drop to $24,053.

Projected savings in 2018=	$203,919
Less 20%	<$40,784
2019 projected net savings	**$163,135**

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Guard Rail Replacement – Town of Lyndon

Contact person: Carol Evans ***Title***: Town Supervisor

Organization: Town of Lyndon ***Email***: lyndonsuper@yahoo.com

Phone: (716) 676-9928

Joe Pillittere, Commissioner, Cattaraugus County Department of Public Works. 716-938-2483, jtpillittere@cattco.org

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Lyndon, Cattaraugus County

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

____**Elimination of duplicative services**

_X_**Shared services**

____**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

____**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: The Town of Lyndon has guardrail that needs to be replaced/installed; Cattaraugus County has a crew of individuals that regularly do guardrail replacement on County roads. There is a savings to the Town of Lyndon by having the County repair, replace and, if necessary, install guardrails versus doing this with their existing Town forces.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: Discussion between the Town of Lyndon and the County of Cattaraugus focused upon providing this service using County versus Town forces.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? None

What is the timeline for this effort? In 2017 and upcoming years, a plan is in place to replace and update guardrails by the County for the Town of Lyndon.

What are the local advantages to this effort? Resident safety and significant cost savings to the taxpayers.

How would savings be realized? We have an estimate that would cost the Town $15,671.56 if they did the work themselves. Working with the County, the total cost was $5882.32. *(See attachments)*

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

In-house cost -	$15,671.56
County Cost -	5,882.32
SAVINGS	**$9,789.24**

Projected savings in 2017= $9,789.24

Projected 2018 Savings*

***This savings will be reoccurring in subsequent years, but, the level of the savings is anticipated to reduce over time as costs go up (e.g., cost of materials, labor costs). Each year, the projected impact of this factor grows, and the validity of the estimate, which is already based on a series of assumptions, becomes more and more inaccurate and unreliable.**

For purposes of this effort it is projected that there would be a 20% per year reduction in the savings figure. Applying this methodology, the savings in 2018 would drop to $7,831.39.

Projected savings in 2018=$7,831.39.

Projected 2019 Savings*

***It is anticipated that initial savings continue to decrease as noted above. Future savings will be impacted by material and labor increases, and decisions made to continue this effort will impact these estimates. The availability of County staff to do this work will also be a factor. For purposes of this analysis, 2018 savings figures were reduced by 20% to accommodate these unknowns, again on the assumption that the program would continue roughly as projected. This reduction would yield a savings figure of $6,265.11.**

Projected savings in 2019=$6,265.11

W-BAND

GUIDE RAIL INSTALLATION MATERIALS

LOCATION/PROJECT: Est for town of Lyndon on North Center Road

DATE: 5/24/2016

CLASS	NYS ITEM #	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	COST/ITEM	PPI %	TOTAL
	80	GR-01: W-Beam Rail; 3' 1 1/2" O.C.		$62.92	1	$0
B	80	GR-02: W-Beam Rail; 6' 3" O.C.	116	$61.80	1	$7,168.80
B	81	GR-03A: W-Beam Rail; 10 ft. to 19 ft. Radius		$106.74	1	$0
B	82	GR-03B: W-Beam Rail; 20 ft. to 39 ft. Radius		$103.57	1	$0.00
B	82	GR-03C: W-Beam Rail; 40 ft. to 150 ft. Radius		$101.12	1	$0.00
B	83	GR-04: W-Beam Rail; Anchor Rail	2	$89.89	1	$179.78
B	84	GR-5:W-Beam Rail; Driveway Anchor Rail		$140.45	1	$0.00
		GR-6:Rounded End Section (SINGLE SIDED)		$29.21	1	$0.00
		GR-06: Rounded End Section (DOUBLE SIDED)		$53.93	1	$0.00
B	85	GR-07: Flared End Section	2	$28.09	1	$56.18
		GR-08: Galvanized Terminal Connector Parapet		$31.46	1	$0.00
		GR-12: Back-up Plate		$4.49	1	$0.00
		GR-17: W6 x 8.5 x 14" Offset Beam		$11.80	1	$0.30
E	109	GR-17W: Wooden 6" x 8" x 14 1/2" Offset Beam		$7.30	1	$0.30
D	106	GR-17P Plastic KING BLOCK 3"x 8" x 13 1/2" Offset Beam		$4.49	1	$0.00
A	113	GR-15:W6 x 8.5 Heavy Posts w/soil plate		$58.43	1	$0.00
A	78	GR-15A: W6 x 8.5 Heavy Post, 7 ft. long w/soil plate		$69.66	1	$0.00
A	77	GR-16:W6 x 8.5 Heavy Posts w/o soil plate		$36.24	1	$0.00
A	110	GR-19: S3 x 5.7 Intermediate Post w/soil plate	160	$39.33	1	$6,292.80
	133	GR-19A: S3 x 5.7 Inter. Post 7 ft. long w/soil plate		$49.44	1	$0.00
		GR-23: W6 x 15 x 8' Lg. Barricade Posts		$146.08	1	$0.00
D	93	GR-09: 5/8" x 1" Splice Bolt w/nut	960	$0.67	1	$643.20
	136	GR-10: 5/8" x 1 1/2" Hex Bolt w/nut & F.W.		$1.07	1	$0.00
D	96	GR-10W: CENTER Bolt for Wooden Blockout 5/8"x10"w/nut		$2.25	1	$0.00
	97	GR-13: 5/8" x 2" Button Bolt w/nut & F.W.		$1.69	1	$0.00
	103	GR-11: Rectangular Flat Plate Washer		$1.97	1	$0.00
D	95	GR-18: 5/16" x 1 1/2" Bolt w/nut,"M" washer, & F.W.		$0.67	1	$0.0
		GR-18A:5/16"x2 3/8"Hex Bolt w/2M washers,2nuts,1flat washer	160	$1.52	1	$243
		GR-22:1/2" x 1 1/2" Hex Bolt w/2 nuts	160	$0.73	1	$116.80
	136.147,153	1/2" X 1 1/2" HEX BOLT W/ 1 NUT &1 WASHER		$0.73	1	$0.00
E	107	GR-20: Concrete Anchor w/nuts & washers		$415.73	1	$0.00
		GR-20A: Meatel Anchor w/nuts and washers	4	$207.87	1	$831.48
		GR-14: "A","B", and "C" Brackets		$112.36	1	$0.00
		GR-21:Ground Bearing Angle Sets w/hardware (GBA)	4	$34.83	1	139.32
		TOTAL COST OF INSTALLATION MATERIALS =				$15,671.56

County Cost

W-BAND

GUIDE RAIL INSTALLATION MATERIALS

LOCATION/PROJECT:	Town of Lyndon on North Center Road
DATE:	4/27/2017

CLASS	NYS ITEM #	MATERIAL DESCRIPTION	QUANTITY	COST/ITEM	PPI %	TOTAL
	80	GR-01: W-Beam Rail; 3' 1 1/2" O.C.		$62.92	1	$0.00
B	80	GR-02: W-Beam Rail; 6' 3" O.C.	76	$61.80	1	$4,696.80
B	81	GR-03A: W-Beam Rail; 10 ft. to 19 ft. Radius		$106.74	1	$0.00
B	82	GR-03B: W-Beam Rail; 20 ft. to 39 ft. Radius		$103.57	1	$0.00
B	82	GR-03C: W-Beam Rail; 40 ft. to 150 ft. Radius		$101.12	1	$0.00
B	83	GR-04: W-Beam Rail; Anchor Rail	3	$89.89	1	$269.67
B	84	GR-05: W-Beam Rail; Driveway Anchor Rail	1	$140.45	1	$140.45
		GR-06 Rounded End Section (SINGLE SIDED)		$29.21	1	$0.00
		GR-06: Rounded End Section (DOUBLE SIDED)		$53.93	1	$0.00
B	85	GR-07: Flared End Section	4	$28.09	1	$112.36
		GR-08: Galvanized Terminal Connector Parapet		$31.46	1	$0.00
		GR-12: Back-up Plate		$4.49	1	$0.00
		GR-17: W6 x 8.5 x 14" Offset Beam		$11.80	1	$0.00
E	109	GR-17W: Wooden 6" x 8" x 14 1/2" Offset Beam		$7.30	1	$0.00
D	106	GR-17P Plastic KING BLOCK 3"x 8" x 13 1/2" Offset Beam		$4.49	1	$0.00
A	113	GR-15:W6 x 8.5 Heavy Posts w/soil plate		$58.43	1	$0.00
A	78	GR-15A: W6 x 8.5 Heavy Post, 7 ft. long w/soil plate		$69.66	1	$0.00
A	77	GR-16:W6 x 8.5 Heavy Posts w/o soil plate		$36.24	1	$0.00
A	110	GR-19: S3 x 5.7 Intermediate Post w/soil plate		$39.33	1	$0.00
	133	GR-19A: S3 x 5.7 Inter. Post 7 ft. long w/soil plate		$49.44	1	$0.00
		GR-23: W6 x 15 x 8' Lg. Barricade Posts		$146.08	1	$0.00
D	93	GR-09: 5/8" x 1" Splice Bolt w/nut	672	$0.67	1	$450.24
	136	GR-10: 5/8" x 1 1/2" Hex Bolt w/nut & F.W.		$1.07	1	$0.00
D	96	GR-10W: CENTER Bolt for Wooden Blockout 5/8"x10"w/nut		$2.25	1	$0.00
	97	GR-13: 5/8" x 2" Button Bolt w/nut & F.W.		$1.69	1	$0.00
	103	GR-11: Rectangular Flat Plate Washer		$1.97	1	$0.00
D	95	GR-18: 5/16" x 1 1/2" Bolt w/nut,"M" washer, & F.W.	152	$0.67	1	
		GR-18A:5/16"x2 3/8"Hex Bolt w/2M washers,2nuts,1flat washer		$1.52	1	
		GR-22: 1/2" x 1 1/2" Hex Bolt w/2 nuts	152	$0.73	1	
	136,147,153	1/2" X 1 1/2" HEX BOLT W/ 1NUT & 1WASHER		$0.73	1	
E	107	GR-20. Concrete Anchor w/nuts & washers		$415.73	1	
		GR-20A: Meatel Anchor w/nuts and washers		$207.87	1	$0.00
		GR-14: "A","B", and "C" Brackets		$112.36	1	$0.00
		GR-21: Ground Bearing Angle Sets w/hardware (GBA)		$34.83	1	$0.00
		TOTAL COST OF INSTALLATION MATERIALS =				$5,882.32

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Newton Street Submission (over stream/creek) 2018 Bridge N.Y. Program

Contact person:	Fred Light	***Title***:	Highway Superintendent
Organization:	Town of Salamanca	***Email***:	map4306@gmail.com
Phone:	(716) 397-0795		

Joe Pillittere, Commissioner, Cattaraugus County Department of Public Works, 716-938-2483, jtpillittere@cattco.org

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Salamanca and Cattaraugus County

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

_X_**Shared services**

____**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

___**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: It is necessary to replace Culvert No. 9 located on Newton Street, Town of Salamanca. This project has been submitted to the 2018 N.Y. Bridge Program. To prepare for this submission however, the actual project description, cost estimates and initial engineering need to be done for inclusion with the submission. The initial engineering assessment that allows for the project submission is not something able to be done by the Town of Salamanca. On a shared services basis, these services have been provided by Cattaraugus County.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: Engineers in the Cattaraugus County Department of Public Works have to do a preliminary engineering assessment.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? Engineering assessment, filing date, approval by New York State Department of Transportation; The New York State Department of Transportation controls the process and the procedure associated with the 2018 Bridge N.Y. Program. Part of the application process is a required engineering assessment. Whether this project will be funded or not, is determined by New York State Department of Transportation on their timelines and per their processes.

What is the timeline for this effort? Submission for the inclusion in the 2018 Bridge N.Y. Program; The approval of the project and the timelines for the program are generated by New York State.

What are the local advantages to this effort? Due to a shared services arrangement, Cattaraugus County will save the Town of Salamanca engineering costs associated with application to the 2018 Bridge N.Y. Program.

How would savings be realized? To submit an application to the 2018 Bridge N.Y. Program, a preliminary engineering study and cost estimate is required to be done by an engineer. The County provides this service without charge to the Town. If this did not occur, these services would need to be acquired by the Town through other vendors at a greater cost.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal: Cattaraugus County did the engineering and cost estimate for the Town of Salamanca. The total cost of the project is estimated to be:

Estimated Project Cost:

Engineering/Environmental NYSDOT/SEQR	$100,000 to $120,000
Construction Costs Structure Paving Guide Rail Rip-rap	$500,000 to $550,000
Inspection Costs Full-Time	$60,000 to $80,000
TOTAL COST	**$660,000 to $750,000**

Savings: Cattaraugus County did not charge the Town of Salamanca for the cost of the preliminary engineering estimate that is required by New York State Department of Transportation to be included with the application for funding to the 2018 Bridge N.Y. Program. Normally, the Town of Salamanca would have had to pay for the services if they were not provided by the County without charges. This savings is calculated as:

The average cost of an engineer in the Cattaraugus County Department of Public Works is $74.04/hour.

Private engineering company cost per hour is estimated at $200/hour.

The amount of hours to do this work is estimated at 32 hours.

Savings=$200/hour (cost of hiring a private firm)-$74.04/hour (County cost for an engineer) =$125.96/hour

$125.96*32 hours (estimated number of hours required to do the work) =$4,030.72 savings

Savings in 2017=**$4,032.72**

Savings 2018=$0

Savings 2019=$0

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Labor Savings as a result of a shared service arrangement between the Town of Salamanca and the Town of Little Valley.

Contact person: Fred Light ***Title:*** Highway Superintendent

Organization: Town of Salamanca ***Email***: map4306@gmail.com

Phone: (716) 397-0795

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Salamanca and Town of Little Valley

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

____**Elimination of duplicative services**

__X__**Shared services**

____**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

____**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: In 2017, the Towns of Salamanca and Little Valley have coordinated highway shared equipment and labor efforts and jointly helped each other complete scheduled highway projects. This has resulted in savings in equipment and labor costs for both municipalities.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: An agreement between the Town of Salamanca and the Town of Little Valley.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? None.

What is the timeline for this effort? Coordinated Highway's work is dependent upon inter-municipal coordination and the good weather.

What are the local advantages to this effort? The Towns are saving money and maximizing available resources.

How would savings be realized? Reduced costs by using labor and equipment between both Towns. The savings is calculated by comparing contracting out for this work versus the cost of coordinating efforts between the Towns of Salamanca and Little Valley.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Equipment:

Tandem Axle Truck	$76.91/hour/truck
Contractor/Rental Costs	$120.00/hour/truck
Roller/Trailer	$132.00/day
Contractor/Rental Costs	$200.00/day

Labor:

Municipal CDL driver	$21.00/hour
Prevailing wage rate	$36.38/hour

Town of Salamanca Savings:

Shared Services with Town of Little Valley	
Tandem Axle ($120-$76.91) + Driver ($36.38-$21) x 30 hours)	$1,754.10
2 Crew Members ($36.38-$21) x 30 hours	$922.80
Total Savings	**$2,676.90**

Town of Little Valley Savings:

Shared Services with Town of Salamanca	
Tandem Axle ($120-$76.91) + Driver ($36.38-$21) x 30 hours)	$1,754.10
Roller ($200-$132) x 5 (days)	$340.00
2 Crew Members ($36.38-$21) x 30 hours	$922.80
Total Savings	**$3,016.90**

Estimated 2017 savings: $3,017

2018-2019 Savings

This effort occurred in 2017 after the passage of the NYS Budget and the associated adoption of the Law requiring this plan.

This is characteristic of widespread efforts between municipalities to maximize resources and do needed work, not deemed to be a mandate by New York State, but core to the operation of local municipalities. The tax cap does not acknowledge nor address the strategic nature of road infrastructure at the county, town, city or village level. Resources are exceedingly tight, especially under a tax cap, and shared services are the absolute norm not the exception. This addresses one instance of this type of cooperative endeavor. Again, this is normal. Unfortunately, once the project is done, the shared service is finished and municipalities move onto other projects. This was a 2017 project, there will be no savings in 2018 and 2019, but eventually, these savings will manifest themselves in other yet to be identified projects of this type.

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC) acquiring fishing rights on Elton Creek from the Village of Delevan

Contact person: Jack Stumpf ***Title:*** Mayor

Organization: Village of Delevan ***Email:*** delevanclerk@roadrunner.com

Phone: 716 492-2645

Interested/participating municipalities:

Village of Delevan

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

_____ **Elimination of duplicative services**

_____ **Shared services**

_____ **Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

__X__ **Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: The Village of Delevan owns property on both sides of Elton Creek in the Village. The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation has approached the Village interested in establishing a public fishing area on Elton Creek on Village land. The DEC has offered to pay the Village $4,000 per year for fishing rights and the ability to develop a public access point onto this creek through Village lands. This effort needs to be formalized and a timeline established for the start of this effort.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational?

Approval by DEC and the negotiation of an equitable contract to allow for better public access to this creek for fishing.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal?

None other than this being a priority for NYS DEC with appropriate funds being included in the State Budget to accomplish this effort.

What is the timeline for this effort?

9 months

What are the local advantages to this effort?

This would both generate needed annual funds for the Village while simultaneously increasing fishing accessibility for both Village residents and the general public.

How would savings be realized?

Check from DEC

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

$4000, per the NYS DEC

New revenue for 2018: $4,000 (one time)

A letter is attached from New York Department of Environmental Conservation. Clearly this matter lies in the hands of the State, the Village of Delevan awaits the NYS DEC taking action on this matter.

New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
Division of Fish, Wildlife and Marine Resources, Region 9
182 East Union Street, Suite 3, Allegany, New York 14706-1328
Phone: (716) 379-6390 • **FAX:** (716) 372-2113

January 23, 2017

John Strumpf
Mayor, Village of Delevan
85 Main Street
Delevan, NY 14042

Dear Mr. Strumpf:

I am writing today regarding the NYSDEC Region 9 Bureau of Fisheries' interest in purchasing additional public fishing rights easements along Elton Creek. Public fishing rights are easements along streams that allow the angling public to walk along the streambed and banks for the purpose of fishing and only for that purpose. The brochure I have included gives more specifics on how the fishing rights program works. Please take time to read this over.

According to Cattaraugus County tax maps and satellite imagery, it appears that the Village owns approximately 950 feet of shoreline on both banks of Elton Creek, in the Town of Yorkshire (Parcel #12.044-3-20 and 12.044-3-19.3). Based on the length of shoreline the Village appears to own, the fishing rights would be worth approximately **$4,000.** I have included a card for you to return with your response to my inquiry. Please return this card, or give me a call at the above number. Thank you for your time.

Sincerely,

Scott C. C. Cornett
Fishery Biologist

encl.

County of Cattaraugus

2017

Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Reduction in number of Town Justices- Town of Persia

Contact person: Paula Schueler *Title*: Town Supervisor

Organization: Town of Persia *Email*: paulaschueler@yahoo.com

Phone: (716) 532-4042

Interested/participating municipalities: **Town of Persia**

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

X **Elimination of duplicative services**

___ **Shared services**

___ **Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

___ **Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: Reducing the Town Justices from two (2) Justices, to one (1) Justice.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: Resolution #40 dated May 11, 2017 (See attached copy) was passed by the Persia Town Board. This resolution shall be subject to permissive referendum as provided by New York State Town Law Article 7, Section 90 through Section 94.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? Subject to permissive referendum.

What is the timeline for this effort?

As the term of one (1) of the current Justices will expire on December 31, 2017, this will go into effect as of January 1, 2018.

What are the local advantages to this effort?

Reduced expenses

How would savings be realized?

Reduction of payroll expenses (wages, fringe) as well as a reduction of equipment and contractual expenses.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Justice Wages	$7,412
Clerk Wages	$4,844
Equipment	$1,325
Contractual	$3,500
	$17,081.00

County of Cattaraugus

2017

Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Reduction in number of Town Justices- Town of Freedom

Contact person: Daren Whitacre *Title*: Town Supervisor

Organization: Town of Freedom *Email*: FREEDOMSUPERVISOR@gmail.com

Phone: (716) 492-0961 Ext. 5

Interested/participating municipalities: **Town of Freedom**

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

X Elimination of duplicative services

____Shared services

____Reduction of back-office administrative overhead

____Improved coordination of services

Project Description: Reducing the Town Justices from two (2) Justices, to one (1) Justice.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: The Town board must pass a resolution indicating the intent to reduce the Town Justices from two (2) to one (1). This resolution shall be subject to permissive referendum as provided by New York State Town Law Article 7, Section 90 through Section 94.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? Subject to permissive referendum.

What is the timeline for this effort?

While the process delineated could start very quickly, it would probably be initiated when there is opportunity, especially as judges are prepared to retire and/or run for new elected terms.

What are the local advantages to this effort?

Reduced expenses

How would savings be realized?

Reduction of payroll expenses (wages, fringe) as well as a reduction of equipment and contractual expenses.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

$9,000.00

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Reduced cost of insurance coverages due to participation in the New York Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR) by Cattaraugus County, NY

Contact person: Julie J. Carr ***Title***: Personnel Director

Organization: Cattaraugus County ***Email***: jjcarr@cattco.or

Phone: 716-938-2241

Interested/participating municipalities:

Cattaraugus County

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

_X_ Elimination of duplicative services

_X_ Shared services

_X_ Reduction of back-office administrative overhead

____ Improved coordination of services

Project Description: The New York State Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR) is composed of 800 municipalities across New York State that combine their funds to provide reduced cost for property and liability insurance coverage for members. This reciprocal is only available and open to municipalities in New York State. A municipality can purchase NYMIR coverage through a municipality's present insurance agent.

Cattaraugus County annually reviews and renews its insurance coverages. This year NYMIR was invited to submit a proposal.

NYMIR's proposal was less costly and more inclusive in terms of coverage than proposals submitted by other firms. The NYMIR policy provided more comprehensive coverage which resulted in less of a need to secure niche policies, which tends to be quite expensive.

In July, 2017 Cattaraugus County again went out to the marketplace to secure insurance of the two nursing homes operated by the County. After researching our

options the County opted to switch this insurance from Sapphire Blue to a NYMIR product for insurance coverage in our nursing homes. Again, this product was less costly, more inclusive and a better overall fit for the insurance needs at these facilities.

What is needed for this proposal to become operational: Insurance coverage in both of these arenas have been procured by the County and bound by NYMIR. The County will begin realizing the benefits of this program almost immediately, in the form of lower premiums.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? Some past impediments to utilizing this program were the rates in comparison with private coverages and the need to provide Capitalization (Entrance Fees) to the Reciprocal upon entering into this State wide shared service.

What is the timeline for this effort? April, 2017 and July, 2017 respectively.

What are the local advantages to this effort? The advantages are lower premiums and access to the following benefits without incurring additional premium or consulting service fees:

- Aggregate losses will be calculated by location rather than per policy.
- Access to NYMIR Online University providing training in employment related topics, Fidelity & Public Sector Fraud Training for entire staff, training for your police/sheriff department with NYS accreditation for CEC for False Arrest, Pursuit, Use of Force, Employment Practices, and customized training.
- Appraisal Program Access as a value added service for all buildings valued over $50,000.
- Excess Flood and Earthquake protection for municipal buildings and their content
- Pollution Clean up
- Asbestos Clean Up, Abatement and Removal up to $50,000 of a result specific loss
- Valuation of Buildings and Contents
- Equipment Breakdown coverage for replacement or rental during repair up to $500 per day.
- No Lasers for specific groups such as Jail Staff or Healthcare Professionals in Health Department,
- Access to the Law Enforcement Advisory Committee.
- Up to $1000 reimbursement for physical damage to any municipal employee's personally owned vehicle while using in the course of municipal duties and responsibilities.
- Attendance at Safety Committees and provision of technical assistance and resources for safety committees

- Consulting Services for research concerning physical hazards, municipal activities, procedures or transportation concerns.

How would savings be realized? Lower Premiums and value added services

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

NYMIR provides better assistance in determining the value of the County's property than traditional insurers who rely upon calculations provided by our accounting software schedule of assets calculations.

In 2017 alone the County will realize a savings in premium of <$66,350 over the price of a traditional insurance product for the first policy procured. The comparisons are as follow:

Please see projected savings over 2017, 2018, and 2019:

Year	Next best quote	NYMIR quote	Savings
2017	$461,792	$394,942	<$66,350
2018	$448,292	$365,152	<$83,140
2019	$448,292	$365,152	<$83,140

The savings in 2017 is diminished by a one-time capitalization (entrance) fee into the reciprocal. .92=

For the nursing home coverage procured in July, 2017. The County will realize a savings of <$241,795

Year	Next best quote	NYMIR quote	Savings
2017-18	$393,402	$151, 607	<$241,795

Not included in this calculation at this time is valuation of the value added services provided in advantages listed above.

Savings for 2017 is calculated as:

<$66,360+<$100,747 (prorated share of savings for 2017)=<$167,107.92

Estimated Savings 2017=$167,108

Savings for 2018 will be calculated as:

<$83,140+<$241,795 (assuming renewal at same rate mid-year 2018)=<$324,935

Estimated Savings for 2018: $324,935

Savings for 2019 would be calculated as:

<83,140+$241,935 (assuming renewal at the same rate mid-year 2019)=<$324,935

Estimated savings for 2019=$324,935

It is important to note that if the County experiences claims against this insurance coverage, it is expected that the premiums will be modified to reflect experience. This factor has not been taken into consideration in this analysis.

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Reduced cost of property insurance due to participating in the New York State Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR) in the Town of Leon

Contact person: Fred Filock *Title*: Supervisor

Organization: Town of Leon *Email*: frado@netsync.net

Phone: 716-548-5087

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Leon

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

_X_**Shared services**

_X_**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

___**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: The New York State Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR) is composed of 800 municipalities across New York State that combine their funds to reduce property and liability insurance. This reciprocal is for municipalities in New York State only. You can purchase NYMIR coverage through your present insurance agent.

Recently, the Town of Leon received quotes for property insurance. NYMIR submitted a cost effective and tailored quote that addressed the needs of the Town of Leon. The Town of Leon secured this less costly coverage.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: Local contracting processes were followed that resulted in the Town of Leon securing this needed coverage.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? None. This is within the local preview of the Town.

What is the timeline for this effort? April, 2017.

What are the local advantages to this effort? This insurance coverage was less costly while simultaneously meeting existing needs with an entity that solely focuses upon the need of municipalities. The savings, in part, is generated by the large pool of municipalities whose resources combine to provide needed coverage.

How would savings be realized? Savings would be realized and documented by comparing the costs of insurance coverage before contracting with NYMIR versus the cost of the same coverage with NYMIR. This savings would be calculated from April, 2017 onward.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal: The Town of Leon reduced the costs of its Property Insurance by 15% after securing coverage with NYMIR. This represents a savings of $2,600.00/annually. The cost of property insurance coverage in the Town of Leon went from $17,100/year to $14,500/year.

This savings is calculated as $2,600 annually

2017 projected savings-$2,600

2018-projected savings-$2,600

2019-projected savings-$2,600

It is important to note, that if the Town of Leon experiences claims against this insurance coverage, it is expected that the premiums will be modified to reflect experience. This factor has not been taken into consideration in this analysis.

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Project title: New York State Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR) in the Town of Ashford

Contact person: Charles Davis III *Title*: Supervisor

Organization: Town of Ashford *Email:* toasupervisor@yahoo.com

Phone: 716-942-6016

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Ashford

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

_X_**Shared services**

_X_**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

___**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: The New York State Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR) is composed of 800 municipalities across New York State that combine their funds to reduce property and liability insurance. This reciprocal is for municipalities in New York State only. You can purchase NYMIR coverage through your present insurance agent.

Recently, the Town of Ashford received quotes for property insurance. NYMIR submitted a cost effective and tailored quote that addressed the needs of the Town of Ashford. The Town of Ashford secured this less costly coverage.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: Local contracting processes were followed that resulted in the Town of Ashford securing this needed coverage.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? None. This is within the local preview of the Town.

What is the timeline for this effort? April, 2017.

What are the local advantages to this effort? This insurance coverage was less costly while simultaneously meeting existing needs with an entity that solely focuses upon the need of municipalities. The savings, in part, is generated by the large pool of municipalities whose resources combine to provide needed coverage.

How would savings be realized? Savings would be realized and documented by comparing the costs of insurance coverage before contracting with NYMIR versus the cost of the same coverage with NYMIR. This savings would be calculated from April, 2017 onward.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal: The Town of Ashford reduced the costs of its insurance after securing coverage with NYMIR. This represents a savings of $4,000/annually.

This savings is calculated as $4,000 annually

2017 projected savings-$4,000

2018-projected savings-$4,000

2019-projected savings-$4,000

It is important to note that if the Town of Ashford experiences claims against this insurance coverage, it is expected that the premiums will be modified to reflect experience. This factor has not been taken into consideration in this analysis.

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Teamsters contract with Town of Yorkshire to reduce health insurance costs

Contact person: Marcia Spencer ***Title:*** Supervisor

Organization: Town of Yorkshire ***Email***: yorkshiresupervisor@roadrunner.com

Phone: (716) 244-1115

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Yorkshire

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

____**Elimination of duplicative services**

____**Shared services**

_X_**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

____**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: The Town of Yorkshire just negotiated and signed a contract with the local Teamsters Union to reduce insurance costs. This new contract takes effect June 1, 2017 and effectively lowers insurance premium costs by allowing members to opt out of coverage and to offer a composite rate for coverage.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational:

The contract amendment was negotiated and approved and goes into effect June 1, 2017

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? None

What is the timeline for this effort? Effective June 1, 2017

What are the local advantages to this effort? Reducing insurance costs for covered employees and the Town of Yorkshire.

How would savings be realized? Premiums are lower due to Teamster Union now offering a composite rate as well as letting members opt out.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Savings for 2017 are estimated to be: At least **$10,000** per year.

Estimated savings for 2018 are anticipated and calculated on an annualized basis, as:

Original Premium cost=$70,847.04

With changes in contract costs are projected to be: $49,892.43

The difference between these two figures is $20,955

This represents the annualized savings for 2018

Estimated savings for 2018 $20,955.

Estimated savings for 2019 are unknown as the contract may be renegotiated.

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Healthcare premium cost split

Contact person: Melissa Davis *Title:* Supervisor

Organization: Town of Coldspring *Email*: townofcoldspringsupervisor@outlook.com

Phone: (716) 640-3918

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Coldspring

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

_X_**Shared services** *(INTERNAL)*

_X_**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

___**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: The Town of Coldspring initiated a process where the employees agreed to pay part of the cost of the health insurance premium. This results in a savings for the Town in the amount of the cost shared contribution.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: Board motion and acceptance to agreement during Organizational Meeting.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? None.

What is the timeline for this effort? 2017

What are the local advantages to this effort? Lower cost to municipality and tax payers while maintaining quality coverage.

How would savings be realized? It saves the Town from paying full premium. Savings are calculated by the amount of money generated by the cost sharing arrangement.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

Monthly premium for 2 person plan	$1,087.34
Town pays	$800.00
Annual Town Savings	$3,448.08
2017 Savings	**$3448.08**
2018 Savings	**$3448.08**
2019 Savings	**Unknown**

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Animal Control Kenneling Agreement – Town of Coldspring

Contact person: Melissa Davis ***Title***: Supervisor

Organization: Town of Coldspring ***Email***: townofcoldspringsupervisor@outlook.com

Phone: 716-640-3918

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Coldspring

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

___**Elimination of duplicative services**

___**Shared services**

_X_**Reduction of back-office administrative overhead**

___**Improved coordination of services**

Project Description: Municipalities contract with the SPCA of Olean for their kenneling needs. The Town of Coldspring has the need for dog kenneling services. Rather than provide this service through a self-employed kenneler, they have contracted with the SPCA in Cattaraugus County.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: A contract between the Town of Coldspring and the SPCA of Cattaraugus County.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? None

What is the timeline for this effort? Immediate, 2017

What are the local advantages to this effort? Less costly provision of required services.

How would savings be realized? Savings would be realized by comparing the costs of a self-employed kenneler to those costs experienced under the contract with the SPCA of Cattaraugus County for the same services.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal: On average, the Town of Coldspring ACO takes in 2-4 dogs per year. The annual savings for the Town are

calculated based on 1 dog: (The 5 day holding fee would change depending on the number of dogs brought in)

Self-Employed Kennel

$450 (salary) = $100 ($20 per day for the 5 day holding fee) = $550

SPCA

$50 ($10 per day for the 5 day holding fee) = $50

Savings for the Town of Coldspring:

$550	Self-employed Contract
$50	SPCA Contract
$500	per year

Estimated 2017 savings: $500.00

Estimated 2018 savings: $500.00 (assuming no price increases in the contract)

Estimated 2019 savings: Unknown

County of Cattaraugus
2017
Countywide Shared Services Plan

Proposals for consideration

Proposal Title: Purchase of Materials from Cattaraugus County Department of Public Works.

Contact person: Fred Light ***Title***: Highway Superintendent

Organization: Town of Salamanca ***Email***: map4306@gmail.com

Phone: (716)397-0795

Interested/participating municipalities: Town of Salamanca and Cattaraugus County

What is the nature of the project? (Check all that apply)

_X_ Elimination of duplicative services

____ Shared services

____ Reduction of back-office administrative overhead

___ Improved coordination of services

Project Description: Cattaraugus County regularly has need for a variety of different highway materials. Given the level of usage of these materials by the County, they are able to get reduced costs for these materials. If a municipality in the County can use the items purchased by the County, these materials are made available to the municipality at County cost. The Town of Salamanca recently had a need for piping materials. They were able to use the pipe purchased by the County. This resulted in the Town of Salamanca being able to purchase pipe from the County at a reduced price.

What is needed to for this proposal to become operational: The Town of Salamanca identified a need for pipe; they approached the County. The County had pipe available and provided this to the Town of Salamanca at County cost.

What are the impediments (Federal, State, local) to implementing this proposal? None

What is the timeline for this effort? None. This is done in real time as needed.

What are the local advantages to this effort? The Town of Salamanca can purchase small quantities of materials, yet get better pricing often associated with larger quantity purchasing.

How would savings be realized? The savings is the difference between the County cost and the buyer cost of purchasing in small quantities of pipe from alternate vendors.

Please calculate the savings generated by this proposal:

The Town of Salamanca has the need for 20' x 15" pipe.

Material Savings: Pipe (15") (Example)

- 20 feet @ $6.30/foot bought from the County = $126.00

The cost of purchasing the same material from a private vendor is:

- 20 feet @ $6.76/foot bought from Southern Tier Rate = $135.00

Town of Salamanca Savings:

$135.00	Southern Tier
$126.00	County
$ 9.00	per 20 feet of pipe

2017 savings= $9.00

Calculation of 2018-19 savings

It is expected that there will be additional savings generated in subsequent years associated with projects in a given year. At this time these savings cannot be calculated.

2018 estimated savings=Unknown

2019 estimated savings=Unknown

Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan

ATTACHMENT #4

Locations/dates and times of 3 Required Public Hearings

Cattaraugus County held three Public Hearings on this Plan. The locations, dates and times of these Public Hearings are as follows:

- Public Hearing #1 Ellicottville Town Offices, Parkside Drive, July 7, 2017, 7:00 p.m.
- Public Hearing #2 City of Olean John Ash Center Barry Street, Olean, NY, August 15, 2017, 7:00 p.m.
- Public Hearing #3: Little Valley County Office Building 3rd Floor Legislative Chambers, Little Valley, NY, August 23, 2017, 5:00 p.m.

Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan

ATTACHMENT #5

Vote tally from September 7, 2017 meeting of the Cattaraugus Shared Services Panel

THURSDAY, SEPTEMBER 7, 2017					
CATTARAUGUS COUNTY SHARED SERVICES PANEL VOTE					
28 PARKSIDE DR., ELLICOTTVILLE, NY					
7:00 P.M.					
	MUNICIPALITY	**OFFICIAL**	**YES**	**NO**	**ABSENT**
1	CITY OF OLEAN	BILL AIELLO	Y	N	A
2	CITY OF SALAMANCA	MICHAEL SMITH	Y	N	A
3	ALLEGANY	JOHN HARE	Y	N	A
4	ASHFORD	CHARLES DAVIS III	Y	N	A
5	CARROLLTON	JAMES STODDARD	Y	N	A
6	COLDSPRING	MELISSA DAVIS	Y	N	A
7	CONEWANGO	WAYNE MCGUIRE	Y	N	A
8	DAYTON	MARK SMITH	Y	N	A
9	EAST OTTO	ANN RUGG	Y	N	A
10	ELLICOTTVILLE	MATTHEW MCANDREW	Y	N	A
11	FARMERSVILLE	ROBERT KARCHER	Y	N	A
12	FRANKLINVILLE	LORRIE FISHER	Y	N	A
13	FREEDOM	DAREN WHITACRE	Y	N	A
14	GREAT VALLEY	DANIEL BROWN	Y	N	A
15	HINSDALE	THOMAS HOOPER	Y	N	A
16	HUMPHREY	CARRIE CHILDS	Y	N	A
17	ISCHUA	JEFFREY GOODYEAR	Y	N	A
18	LEON	FREDERICK FILOCK	Y	N	A
19	LITTLE VALLEY	PETE WRONA	Y	N	A
20	LYNDON	CAROL EVANS	Y	N	A
21	MACHIAS	STEPHEN CORNWELL	Y	N	A
22	MANSFIELD	ROBERT KIES	Y	N	A
23	NAPOLI	MELISSA KISH	Y	N	A
24	NEW ALBION	LOYD CHILSON	Y	N	A
25	OLEAN	ANNETTE PARKER	Y	N	A
26	OTTO	RONALD WASMUND	Y	N	A
27	PERRYSBURG	JENNIFER DABOLT	Y	N	A
28	PERSIA	PAULA SCHUELER	Y	N	A
29	PORTVILLE	GARY WOODHEAD (DEP)	Y	N	A
30	RANDOLPH	DALE SENN	Y	N	A
31	RED HOUSE	TAMARA BOOTH	Y	N	A

32	SALAMANCA	MICHAEL PHILLIPS	Y	N	A
33	SOUTH VALLEY	MARK BURCH	Y	N	A
34	YORKSHIRE	MARCIA SPENCER	Y	N	A
35	V OF ALLEGANY	GREG PEARL	Y	N	A
36	V OF CATTARAUGUS	WIRT SMITH	Y	N	A
37	V OF DELEVAN	JOHN STUMPF	Y	N	A
38	V OF ELLICOTTVILLE	JOHN BURRELL	Y	N	A
39	V OF FRANKLINVILLE	HARVEY SOULVIE	Y	N	A
40	V OF GOWANDA	DAVID SMITH	Y	N	A
41	V OF LITTLE VALLEY	NORMAN MARSH	Y	N	A
42	V OF PORTVILLE	EMILY WOODHEAD	Y	N	A
43	V OF SOUTH DAYTON	SCOTT KERR	Y	N	A
TOTALS			**40**	**0**	**3**

NEW YORK STATE OF OPPORTUNITY

County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Appendix A

Resubmission as required by the New York State Division for the Budget

County of Cattaraugus	
County Contact: Paula Stockman & Jack Searles	
Contact Telephone: 7169389111, extension 2577	
Contact Email: jrsearles@cattco.org	

Partners

Row 1 – 2 (total # of) Cities in Cattaraugus County

	Participating Cities	Panel Representative	Vote Cast (Yes or No)
1.	Olean	Bill Aiello	Absent
2.	Salamanca	Michael Smith	Absent
3.			

Row 2 – 32 (total # of) Towns in Cattaraugus County

	Participating Towns	Panel Representative	Vote Cast (Yes or No)
1.	Allegany	John Hare	Yes
2.	Ashford	Charles Davis III	Yes
3.	Carrollton	James R Stoddard	Absent
4.	Coldspring	Melissa Davis	Yes
5.	Conewango	Wayne McGuire	Yes
6.	Dayton	Mark Smith	Yes
7.	East Otto	Ann Rugg	Yes
8.	Ellicottville	Matthew J McAndrew	Yes
9.	Farmersville	Robert Karcher	Yes
10.	Franklinville	Lorrie B Fisher	Yes
11.	Freedom	Daren J Whitcare	Yes
12.	Great Valley	Daniel Brown	Yes
13.	Hinsdale	Thomas Hooper	Yes
14.	Humphrey	Carrie Childs	Yes

NEW YORK STATE OF OPPORTUNITY

County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Appendix A

15.	Ischua	Jeffrey Goodyear	Yes
16.	Leon	Frederick S Filock	Yes
17.	Little Valley	Pete Wrona	Yes
18.	Lyndon	Carol Evans	Yes
19.	Machias	Stephen J Cornwell	Yes
20.	Mansfield	Robert Kies	Yes
Use Additional Sheets if necessary			

Row 3 – 9 (total # of) Villages in Cattaraugus County

	Participating Villages	Panel Representative	Vote Cast (Yes or No)
1.	Allegany	Greg Pearl	Yes
2.	Cattaraugus	Wirt Smith	Yes
3.	Delevan	John Stumpf	Yes
4.	Ellicottville	John Burrell	Yes
5.	Franklinville	Harvey Soulvie	Yes
6.	Gowanda	David Smith	Yes
7.	Little Valley	Norman Marsh	Yes
8.	Portville	Emily Woodhead	Yes
9.	South Dayton	Scott Kerr	Yes
10.			
Use Additional Sheets if necessary			

Row 4 – 0 (total # of) School Districts, BOCES, and Special Improvement Districts in County

	Participating School Districts, BOCES, and Special Improvement Districts	Panel Representative	Vote Cast (Yes or No)
1.			
2.			
3.			
4.			
5.			
6.			
7.			

NEW YORK STATE OF OPPORTUNITY

County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Additional Towns			
Row 2 – (total # of) Towns in County			
Participating Towns		**Panel Representative**	**Vote Cast (Yes or No)**
1.	Napoli	Melissa Kish	Yes
2.	New Albion	Loyd Chilson	Yes
3.	Olean Town	Annette Parker	Yes
4.	Otto	Ronald Wasmund	Yes
5.	Perrysburg	Jennifer Dabolt	Yes
6.	Persia	Paula Schueler	Yes
7.	Portville	Gary Woodhead (Deputy Supervisor)	Yes
8.	Randolph	Dale Senn	Yes
9.	Red House	Tamara Booth	Yes
10.	Salamanca	Michael Phillips	Yes
11.	South Valley	Mark Burch	Yes
12.	Yorkshire	Marcia Spencer	Yes
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			
17.			
18.			
19.			
20.			
21.			
22.			
23.			
24.			
25.			
26.			
27.			
28.			

NEW YORK STATE OF OPPORTUNITY

County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Appendix A

8.			
9.			
10.			
11.			
12.			
13.			
14.			
15.			
16.			
17.			
18.			
19.			
20.			

Use Additional Sheets if necessary

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.**
	$147,118,225

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.**
	$83,778,927 (no School Districts, BOCES or Special Improvement Districts participated in the development of the Plan)

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.**
	2017-$648,703, 2018-$1,354,822, 2019-$1,310,240 2020 and beyond- Unknown (*some of these are 1 time savings

	and not reoccurring, the vast majority of amounts cited are projections based upon actual municipalities implementing or being able to implement the plan and finally this is based on projections that appear to be accurate at the time of submission but are subject to change) In response to a requirement by NYS Division for Budget, we have projected these figures through 2022 as noted in the deviation summary attached below. Please see further information on attached calculation of rows.
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.**
	2017-.76%, 2018-1.62%, 2019-1.56% 2020 and beyond-Unknown. In response to a requirement by the NYS Division for Budget, we have projected these figures through 2022 as noted in the deviation summary attached below. Please see further information on attached calculation of rows.
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.**
	2017-$7.57, 2018-$15.81, 2019-$15.29, 2020 and beyond-Unknown (2018, assumes 85,700 taxpayers and assumes the projections, which are subject to change for any variety of reasons are accurate). In response to a requirement by requirement of the NYS Division for Budget, we have projected these figures through 2022 as noted in the deviation summary attached below. Please see further information on attached calculation of rows.
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.
	Using the methodology suggested by NYSDOS, with County CPI rates as the comparison base, assuming no override of the tax cap by any participating municipality, and that all projected figures are realized as projected, the numbers would be 2017-<.08%, 2018-.22% and 2019-.45% 2020 and beyond- Unknown. In response to a requirement by the NYS Division for Budget, we have projected these figures through 2022 as noted in the deviation summary attached below. Please see further information on attached calculation of rows.
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.**
	Using the methodology suggested by NYSDOS, with County CPI rates as the comparison base, assuming no override of the tax cap by any participating municipality, and that all projected figures are realized as projected, the numbers would be 2017-<.08%, 2018-.22% and 2019-.44% 2020 and beyond-Unknown. In response to a requirement by the NYS Division for Budget, we have projected these figures through 2022 as noted in the deviation summary attached below. Please see further information on attached calculation of rows.

*There are several assumptions implicit in this Plan.

First, municipalities in the State and New York State itself operate on different fiscal years. The analysis applied here is projected on the fiscal year used by the County which is the calendar year. Assuming costs and revenues do not change on a year over year basis, impacts made in one calendar year may both impact the current calendar year and subsequent calendar years, unless saving are one time in nature. This plan does contain one time savings. It should be noted that the CPI component of the tax cap calculation does vary between municipalities depending upon their budget cycle.

Appendix A

Second, New York State did not provide the necessary denominators for calculation of Rows 5-9 of the above document or common means to calculate Row 10-1. This will cause variation from one County to another and seriously compromises the validity of comparing data across counties. This caused Cattaraugus County to make a set of assumptions about these figures. These include:

Row 5: Total taxes represent all taxes raised by all municipalities, school districts, BOCES and special assessment districts in Cattaraugus as determined by the Cattaraugus County Department of Real Property Tax Services.

Row 6: The taxes raised by participating entities are the total taxes less those levied by school districts, BOCES and special assessment districts in Cattaraugus as determined by the Cattaraugus County Department of Real Property Tax Services.

Row 7 The attached plan contains 31 different proposals. Some of these proposals contain actual savings, other rely on projections, and some of these items are one time in nature, while still others may be reoccurring. This represents a plan that s subject to modification and refinement. The numbers represent best projections at the time the plan was developed, however, they are certainly subject to change for any variety of reasons. The tight timeline afforded to counties by the State caused there to be a set of best estimate proposals on many of these items. They are subject to change and are not immutable or otherwise unchangeable. As a requirement of the NYS Division for budget, we have been directed to extrapolate these figures beyond 2019. Due to increasing concern for the validity of our calculations, we have only extrapolated thru 2022, by using a 25% reduction of the 2019 savings each year, and these numbers have not been included in the plan descriptions.

Row 8 The comments for Row 7 also apply here. Effectively you are estimating savings based on projections that will probably change. It is interesting that the denominator for this calculation is Row 6 or the 2017 Property Taxes. When projecting into the future, normally you want to adjust the denominator in the calculation rather than holding this as a constant. Effectively freezing the levy at 2017 levels over values the savings. Given the current methodology, the accuracy of this number as a predictor should seriously be questioned.

Row 9 Per the guidance from New York State, this is calculated by taking the amounts of savings and dividing this by the number of taxpayers in the County. According to the Cattaraugus County Department of Real Property Tax Services the number of taxpayers in the County are 85,700. This becomes the denominator for this item.

Row 10-11 The calculation in this row uses the product of Row 8, which is flawed as noted above. Further, this does not take into consideration the ability of a local municipality to override the tax

NEW YORK STATE OF OPPORTUNITY

County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Appendix A

cap. It also assumes all savings projections are absolute true and correct and able to be achieved. The guidance for this calculation provided by the State is exceeding confusing. Interpretation will vary between counties, effectively rendering already meaningless information useless.

CERTIFICATION

I hereby affirm under penalty of perjury that information provided is true to the best of my knowledge and belief. This is the finalized county-wide shared services property tax savings plan. The county-wide shared services property tax savings plan was approved on _____, 2017, and it was disseminated to residents of the county in accordance with the County-wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Law* AMENDED AS REQUIRED.by the NYS Division for Budget.

JOHN R SEARLES — County Chief Executive Officer

(Print Name)

(Signature) — 9/14/17 (Date)

Appendix A

As a requirement of the NYS Division for budget, we have been directed to extrapolate these figures beyond 2019. Due to increasing concern for the validity of our calculations, we have only extrapolated thru 2022, by using a 25% reduction of the 2019 savings each year. These numbers have not been included in the plan descriptions.

Derivation of

Calculations of Rows 8-11

Calculation of Row 8

2017= $63781/$83,778,927 (Row 6)=.76%

2018=$1,354,822/$83,778,927 (Row 6)=1.62%

2019=$1,310,240/$83,778,927 (Row 6)=1.56%

2020=$834,756/$83,778,927 (Row 6)=1%

2021=$556,504/$83,778,927 (Row 6)=.66%

2022=$278,252/$83,778,927 (Row 6)=.33%

Calculation of Row 9

2017 $648,703/85700=$7.57

2018 $1,354,822/85700=$15.81

2019 $1,310,240/85700=$15.29

2020 $834,756/85700=$9.74

2021=$556,504/85700=$6.49

2022=$278,252/85700=$3.25

NEW YORK STATE OF OPPORTUNITY

County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Appendix A

Calculation of Row 10

Year	County CPI %	Row 8%		Variance
2017	**.68% less**	**76%**	**=**	**<.08%**
2018	1.84% less	1.62%	=	.22%
2019	2.00% less	1.55%	=	.44%
2020	2.00% less	1%=		1%
2021	2.00% less	.66%=		1.34%
2022	2.00% less	.33%=		1.67%

Calculation Row 11

Year	County CPI %	Row 8%		Variance
2017	**.68% less**	**76%**	**=**	**<.08%**
2018	1.84% less	1.62%	=	.22%
2019	2.00% less	1.55%	=	.44%
2020	2.00% less	1%=		1%
2021	2.00% less	.66%=		1.34%
2022	2.00% less	.33%=		1.67%

Appendix A

Attached are a number of items including:

ATTACHMENT #1: Cattaraugus County Act 359-2017 entitled *Supporting Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan*

ATTACHMENT #2: Financial summary of Cattaraugus County Shared Services Plan

ATTACHMENT #3:: Individual descriptions of Plan proposals

ATTACHMENT #4: Dates/locations/Times of Public Hearings

ATTACHMENT #5: Vote Tally from the September 7, 2017 meeting of the Cattaraugus Shared Services Panel