

**County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan
Submittal to the and the New York Department of State
and the New York State Division of the Budget
As Approved, September 8, 2017
Submitted September 15, 2017**

NARRATIVE

On April 10, 2017, Governor Cuomo signed into law Chapter 59, Laws of 2017, enacting the New York State Budget for Fiscal Year 2017-18. Among the bill's provisions unrelated to appropriations was the creation of a new State mandate upon each county to convene a Shared Services Panel, comprised of representatives from each city, town and village within a county, with optional participation by school districts, BOCES and special improvement districts.

With little notice, and on an abbreviated timeline, Chapter 59 charged these Panels, led by each County's Chief Executive Officer, with identifying collaborative opportunities for shared services that would yield property tax savings for County residents.

On April 21, the Yates County Administrator, as Chief Executive Officer pursuant to Chapter 59, invited town supervisors, village mayors and school superintendents to attend the first meeting of the Yates County Shared Services Panel on May 8, 2017. In an effort to facilitate discussion, the County Administrator included with the invitation copies of Chapter 59's provisions creating the Panels, the New York State Department of State (DOS) Countywide Shared Services Document and the New York State Association of Counties (NYSAC) Shared Services Report, "Working Together."

On May 8, the Shared Service Panel convened with a total of 27 present, including seven out of nine Town Supervisors, all four Village Mayors and four members of the Yates County Legislature. The Chairman narrated a presentation setting forth the Panel's goals under Chapter 59 and the responsibilities of the Members and Chair.

Panel Members reviewed the type of shared services discussed in both the NYSAC and DOS publications, including combined justice courts, health insurance consortia, real property tax assessment and collection, police services, trash collection, information technology and animal control.

Following discussion of the merits and challenges of the opportunities presented, the Panel determined to proceed with consideration of two major initiatives: consolidation of justice courts and developing or joining a health insurance consortium. Panel members formed working groups to consider financial and legal feasibility of each of the two initiatives. Members agreed to schedule a follow-up public hearing for the evening of May 30.

On May 30, the Shared Service Panel convened with a total of 18 present, including six out of nine Town Supervisors, two School Superintendents, one Town Councilmember, one County Legislator and seven members of the media and public.

The public hearing evolved into a dialogue between members of the public and members of the Panel, during which the merits and shortcomings of suggested shared services were thoroughly discussed. With public input, and following discussion, the Panel determined to continue its

focus on consolidation of justice courts and health insurance consortia. The Panel determined to meet again during the month of July.

On July 27, the Shared Services Panel reconvened, with a total of 19 present, including eight out of nine Town Supervisors, one Mayor and eight County Legislators, to discuss its recommendations for a Draft Shared Services Plan to be submitted to the Yates County Legislature.

Workgroups reported back to the Panel on the two previously-designated topics of consolidation of justice courts and the establishment of a health insurance consortium.

With respect to the consolidation of justice courts, the workgroup advised that in two of the nine Town Courts, revenues exceeded expenses. For the remaining seven Town Courts, expenses exceeded revenues by a total of approximately \$58,000 on total Court costs of approximately \$200,000 in those seven towns.

The workgroup also discussed County costs, primarily the appearance costs of prosecution and defense attorneys as well as Sheriff's Department costs for prisoner transport. Given current staffing for the District Attorney's Office and the County's indigent defense offices, reduction in personnel costs appeared unlikely to result from court consolidation. Projected savings in mileage and transport costs were not fully available.

Factors noted as barriers to the establishment of a countywide district justice court included the need for such a district to be comprised of contiguous towns, as well as the division of two of the County's villages among multiple towns, each of which might or might not choose to participate in a district court. The Panel also discussed the role of State legislation in easing barriers to establishment of a district court.

With respect to developing or joining a health insurance consortium, the workgroup advised that the county's status as an experience-rated insured would preclude the County from taking advantage of the community-rating status enjoyed by towns and villages. The workgroup was awaiting further information about the possibility of towns and villages acting together with a single broker to combine their purchasing power, if not their risk rating.

Following presentation of these options, the Panel determined that each strategy offered the possibility of material cost savings to participating jurisdictions.

At the same time, the Panel determined that the process and timeline set forth in Chapter 59, combined with the limited resources available to the task, were insufficient to assure certifiable cost reductions and savings within the time allotted.

The Panel recognized the value of the process and the identification of possible opportunities for efficiency and cost reduction. Yates County's Town Supervisors and Village Mayors meet regularly during the year as the Yates County Community Readiness Initiative.

Through the Readiness Initiative, the Panel will in the future continue the work initiated under the Shared Services process and continue its pursuit of further options for service consolidation and cost reduction.

Local governments in Yates County, as represented by the Supervisors and Mayors on the Panel, and the County Legislators in attendance, have a long, strong record of collaboration in the taxpayers' best interest.

Following is a table including some of the initiatives already put in place by Yates County's town, village and county governments:

PARTNERS		AGREEMENT
County of Yates	All jurisdictions	Animal control enforcement
Keuka Lake Outlet Compact		Management by 8 municipalities of dam / gates of the Keuka Lake Outlet
Town of Barrington	Town of Starkey	Shared Tax Assessor
Town of Benton	Town of Torrey	Shared Tax Assessor
Town of Middlesex	County of Yates	Snow Plowing and Sanding
Town of Middlesex	County of Yates	Road Side Mowing
Town of Middlesex	State of New York	Snow Plowing and Sanding
Town of Milo	County of Yates	Snow Plowing and Sanding
Town of Milo	County of Yates	Road Side Mowing
Town of Milo	Keuka Watershed Improvement Cooperative	Uniform enforcement of wastewater regulations
Town of Milo	Town of Middlesex	Shared tax assessor
Town of Milo	Village of Dresden	Water service backup personnel and equipment
Town of Milo	Village of Dundee	Recreation program
Town of Milo	Village of Penn Yan	Water system services and monitoring
Town of Milo	Village of Penn Yan	Water and sewer billing
Town of Milo	Village of Penn Yan	Fire Department services
Town of Milo	Village of Penn Yan	Clean-Up Day
Town of Milo	Yates County Soil and Water Conservation District	Watershed Inspections
Town of Starkey	County of Yates / Various Towns	Hauling of road materials
Town of Starkey	Dundee Central Schools	Storage of bulk salt
Various Towns	Various Towns	Highway Labor and Equipment
Village of Dundee	County of Yates	Indemnification agreement
Village of Dundee	State of New York	Services, materials and equipment

PARTNERS		AGREEMENT
Village of Dundee	Towns of Milo, Starkey, Barrington and Tyrone	Youth Program
Village of Penn Yan	County of Yates	Generation of Real Property Tax Billing Data
Village of Penn Yan	County of Yates	Elections Process and Administration
Village of Penn Yan	County of Yates / Various Towns	Equipment sharing (informal)
Village of Penn Yan	Town of Jerusalem	Code Enforcement Backup
Village of Penn Yan	Town of Milo	Water service billing
Village of Penn Yan	Towns of Barrington, Benton, Jerusalem and Milo	Fire coverage
Village of Penn Yan	Towns of Benton, Jerusalem, Milo, Pulteney / Village of Dresden	Water Treatment Plant
Village of Penn Yan	Towns of Jerusalem and Milo	Wastewater Treatment Plant

In closing, the Panel also notes the significant impact of unfunded state mandates on local property taxes in New York State. Local costs for Medicaid, indigent defense and other programs and functions, whose eligibility and service levels are established in Albany and elsewhere, cost as much as 62 cents of every Yates County property tax dollar

This Plan was submitted to the Yates County Legislature for its consideration pursuant to the mandates of Chapter 59. On August 14, 2017, the Legislature adopted unanimously Resolution 221-17, an Advisory Report on the Draft Plan, endorsing its findings and noting that unfunded State mandates consume at least \$10,000,000 in property tax monies each year.

The Resolution further expressed the Legislature's sentiments that adoption of a Final Plan would fully discharge the County's obligations under Chapter 59.

In addition to this submittal to the Yates County Legislature, the Shared Services Panel held Public Hearings on August 28 and 31 and September 5. One member of the public attended one of the Hearings, posing a question about health insurance for County employees and offering no direct comment in support of, or opposition to, the Plan.

Given the Panel's review of the options before it, the determination of its members to continue working together elsewhere on the issues raised during the Panel process, and their record of collaboration in the taxpayers' interest, the Yates County Shared Services Panel regards its Chapter 59 mandates as satisfied upon the adoption of this Final Plan.

The Yates County Shared Services Panel appreciates this opportunity to serve the public.

ADOPTED BY THE YATES COUNTY SHARED SERVICES PANEL, SEPTEMBER 8, 2017

Mr. Robert C. Lawton; Chief Executive Officer, County of Yates	Aye
Hon. Leslie Church; Supervisor, Town of Milo	Aye
Hon. Fred Cratsley; Mayor, Village of Dundee	Absent
Hon. Margaret M. Dunn; Supervisor Town of Italy	Absent
Hon. Wayne Dunton; Supervisor, Town of Middlesex	Aye
Hon. Patrick H. Flynn; Supervisor, Town of Torrey	Aye
Hon. William Hall; Mayor, Village of Dresden	Absent
Hon. Patrick Killen; Supervisor, Town of Jerusalem	Aye
Hon. George Lawson; Supervisor, Town of Starkey	Aye
Hon. Len Lisenbee; Supervisor, Town of Potter	Aye
Hon. Leigh MacKerchar; Mayor, Village of Penn Yan	Aye
Hon. John E. Prendergast; Supervisor, Town of Benton	Aye
Hon. John Sawers; Mayor, Village of Rushville	Absent
Hon Fred Wright; Supervisor, Town of Barrington	Aye

Members: 14 / Present and Voting: 10

Ayes: 10

Nays: 0



County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Appendix A

County of Yates			
County Contact: Robert C. Lawton			
Contact Telephone: 315-536-5509			
Contact Email: rlawton@yatescounty.org			
Partners			
Row 1 – 0 (total # of) Cities in Yates County			
Participating Cities		Panel Representative	Vote Cast (Yes or No)
1.			
Row 2 – 9 (total # of) Towns in Yates County			
Participating Towns		Panel Representative	Vote Cast (Yes or No)
1.	Barrington	Supervisor Fred Wright	Yes
2.	Benton	Supervisor John E. Prendergast	Yes
3.	Jerusalem	Supervisor Patrick Killen	Yes
4.	Middlesex	Supervisor Wayne Dunton	Yes
5.	Milo	Supervisor Leslie Church	Yes
6.	Potter	Supervisor Len Lisenbee	Yes
7.	Starkey	Supervisor George Lawson	Yes
8.	Torrey	Supervisor Patrick Flynn	Yes
9.			
Use Additional Sheets if necessary			
Row 3 – 4 (total # of) Villages in Yates County			
Participating Villages		Panel Representative	Vote Cast (Yes or No)
1.	Dresden	Mayor William Hall	
2.	Dundee	Mayor Fred Cratsley	
3.	Penn Yan	Mayor Leigh MacKerchar	Yes
4.	Rushville	Mayor John Sawers	
Use Additional Sheets if necessary			



County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Appendix A

Row 4 – 5 (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.			
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.	
		\$16,537,392	
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.	
		\$15,910,628	
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.	
		\$0	
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.	
		0%	



County-Wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Plan Summary

Appendix A

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.
	\$0
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.
	\$0
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.
	\$0
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 <u>September 8, 2017</u> , and it was disseminated to residents of the county in accordance with the County-wide Shared Services Property Tax Savings Law.	
<u>Robert C. Lawton</u>	<u>County Administrator</u>
(Print Name)	
<u></u>	<u>September 15, 2017</u>
(Signature)	(Date)