

10, 11

960106

REPORT ON LOCAL GOVERNMENT
AID DISTRIBUTION PROGRAMS
AND GOVERNMENT SERVICE DELIVERY

January, 1996

001020

**Notice required by Minnesota Statutes, sections 3.195, subdivision 2;
3.302, subdivision 3a**

This report was prepared pursuant to the requirements of 1995 Minnesota Laws, chapter 264, article 2⁸, section 42²². The report was drafted by the Subcommittee and was published on February 1, 1996 in St. Paul, Minnesota.

The cost of preparing the report, as required by Minnesota Statutes, section 3.197, was \$540.54. This represents the cost of Subcommittee members' per diem, postage and similar expenses. It does not include the opportunity cost of the staff time and resources provided by the legislature, or others who served the Subcommittee without an explicit charge against the budget.

RECEIVED

FEB 23 1996

LEGISLATIVE REFERENCE LIBRARY
STATE OFFICE BUILDING
ST. PAUL, MN 55155

CONTENTS

Page

1	Preface
2	I. Subcommittee Activity
4	II. Survey Results
17	III. Subcommittee Conclusions
20	IV. Subcommittee Recommendations
22	V. Conclusion
23	Appendix A
45	Appendix B
78	Appendix C

PREFACE

The Subcommittee on Local Government Aid and Service Delivery was created pursuant to Chapter 264, Article 8, Section 22, 1995 Session Laws, with a duty to report to the Legislative Commission on Planning and Fiscal Policy as well as to the House and Senate Tax Chairs by February 1, 1996. The charge to the subcommittee was to study: (1) alternative methods of distributing general purpose aids to units of local government, and (2) approaches to maximizing the efficiency and effectiveness of local government service delivery.

Five members of the House of Representatives and five members of the Senate were appointed to the subcommittee on August 16, 1995, by Sen. Roger Moe, Chair of the Legislative Commission on Planning and Fiscal Policy.¹ The subcommittee held four meetings on August 24, 1995, December 14, 1995, January 4, 1996, and January 12, 1996. The following report contains the activities, survey results, conclusions and recommendations of the subcommittee.

The subcommittee wishes to express its deep appreciation for the hard work of the House Research Department in preparing the survey, analyzing the survey responses, and staffing the subcommittee hearings. In addition, the subcommittee would like to acknowledge the effort of 113 cities and counties who took the time to respond to our survey.

¹Reps. Andy Dawkins, Kevin Goodno, Tim Pawlenty, Jean Wagenius, Ted Winter; Sens. William V. Belanger, John Hottinger, Jane Krentz, Steve Novak, Gen Olson.

I. Subcommittee Activity

The subcommittee held four meetings. At the first meeting we reviewed the enabling legislation; we voted to have Sen. Hottinger and Rep. Dawkins act as co-chairs; and we agreed to add seven local officials to our subcommittee as advisers.² A subcommittee of the subcommittee was set up to prepare a survey instrument. This survey was mailed on September 9, 1995 to all cities in Minnesota with a population over 5,000, the 15 most populous counties, and the Metropolitan Council.³

Finally, at this first meeting the subcommittee discussed various ideas that might be pursued within the subcommittee's charge. Included amongst the ideas were: how to add a factor of accountability into state aid formulas; how to measure social overburden and experimentally fund nongovernment organizations addressing those burdens; how to assess which level of government best delivers which service; how to move towards an income-sensitive homestead credit; how to initiate a better dialogue between taxpayers and policy makers regarding the results of various government programs; how to enunciate and reinforce the underlying principles to state aid programs; and how to fit our work into a total property tax reform package. At a minimum, members felt that this subcommittee could build a record of where local governments are performing efficiently and effectively and uncover the barriers they face to achieve greater efficiencies and effectiveness.

At the second meeting we ratified the appointment of the seven local officials; we reviewed a sampling of survey responses, and we agreed upon a plan for cataloging and analyzing responses. Finally, we tentatively decided to focus on two ideas to pursue:

1. How would we design an LGA formula that is performance-based, i.e., one that rewards smart spending or effective, efficient practices?
2. What might the state do to remove barriers which inhibit greater cooperation, collaboration or more efficient and effective local government?

At the third meeting we reviewed survey responses for police services, both for numerical data and anecdotal information. We discussed

²The seven local officials are: John Ellenbecker, St. Cloud Councilman; Susan Haigh, Ramsey County Commissioner; Tom Hedges, City Administrator, Eagan; Doug Peterson, Mayor of Bemidji; Eric Sorenson, City Manager, Winona; Greg Sparks, City Administrator, Owatonna; Elwyn Tinklenberg, Mayor of Blaine.

³Copies of the survey instrument, a set of model answers, and the list of all local governments that received the mailing are attached as Appendix A.

possible recommendations to deal with the two foci agreed upon at the second meeting, and we heard a presentation by Mr. James Gelbmann, Executive Director, Board of Government Innovation and Cooperation.

At the fourth meeting we composed this report and adjourned to the call of the chairs. Finally, the subcommittee notes that the following local governments failed to respond to the survey: The cities of Andover, Cambridge, Cedar, Chaska, Cloquet, Corcoran, Crystal Bay, Fridley, Hastings, Hibbing, Hugo, Hutchinson, Lake Elmo, Litchfield, Little Falls, Marshall, Monticello, Morris, Mound, New Hope, Roseville, St. Peter, Sauk Rapids, Shakopee, Virginia, Waite Park and Waseca, and the County of Olmsted.

This report was adopted by signature assent after circulation to all 10 committee members and the seven local officials. We received 17 assents. One of the assents felt the report didn't go far enough. Another assent was concerned with legislative recommendation #3 (county-school board collaboration regarding social work).

II. Survey Results

There were 99 cities that responded to the survey, 59 large cities from the metro area, 34 large cities from the non-metro area, and 6 smaller cities that answered voluntarily. Fourteen counties responded to the survey, seven in the metro area and seven in the non-metro area. Highlights of summary information and individual comments from the surveys are listed below. A detailed report of the tabulated information gleaned from the surveys is in appendix B. ⁴ The metropolitan council also responded to the survey but its responses are not tabulated.

1. Level and kinds of Cooperation

Most cities and counties currently cooperate in a number of ways in delivering public services.

Road, street and bridge services

- About two-thirds of the responding **cities** do some cooperative service delivery with the county and the state. Eleven indicated that they have no cooperative service delivery in this area of streets and roads.
- The three most often cited types of cooperation by **cities** for road and street services were joint/cooperative provision of a major task such as snow plowing or street sweeping (52 cities), shared equipment (33 cities), and sharing responsibility for joint or boundary roads (24 cities). Shared materials purchasing was also relatively common (18 cities) and backup/ emergency assistance was listed by ten of the metro cities.
- All the responding **counties** indicated that they do at least some cooperation in the area of roads and streets, usually with cities and towns. Additionally 5 of the 14 also have cooperative arrangements with other counties.
- The most common types of cooperation listed by metropolitan **counties** were shared materials purchasing (5), and providing road maintenance for roads under the control of another government (4). There was no common type of cooperation listed by counties outside the metropolitan area.

⁴ Data for Part III of the survey was only tabulated for local governments that discussed fire services. This service was chosen by 49 out of the 99 cities as the optional service included in their returned survey.

Police services

- About 60 percent of **cities** cooperate with the counties in delivering police services; this was especially true for non-metro cities (29 out of 35). Many metro area cities cooperated with other cities (27) but this was much rarer in the outstate cities (5).
- The most common area listed by **cities** for cooperation was in joint dispatch services (53 cities). About one-third of the cities also jointly provided or contracted out for drug enforcement, and emergency response teams and other special units. One third of the cities outside the metropolitan area also jointly provide or contract out for record keeping and one third shared buildings with another governmental unit (usually the county).
- All **counties** in both the non-metro and metro areas indicated some cooperation with other jurisdictions in providing police services. Dispatch services was listed as a joint effort by all thirteen. Six of the metro counties also jointly provide jail/detention space and six of the outstate counties jointly provide for drug enforcement.

Fire services

- Of the 49 **cities** that provided information on fire services, all but nine are in some cooperative arrangement for fire protection. The most common area of cooperation is in overload/backup assistance (26 cities). Seven cities indicated that they contracted to another jurisdiction for all fire services.

2. Areas that were identified as services that could be provided at a regional level

- 77 cities and 8 counties indicated satisfaction with the current means of delivering road, street, and bridge services. Only 15 cities and 4 counties indicated a need for greater cooperation or consolidation. No major task in this area was identified as something that should be done at a regional level.
- 37 cities and 5 counties indicated that they thought police dispatch services should be delivered on a regional rather than city level. Other areas of police services that cities and counties indicated should be delivered regionally were
 - detention jail space (18 cities, 4 counties),

- emergency response and other special units (20 cities, 2 counties),
 - crime labs and/ or forensics (14 cities, 2 counties), and
 - record keeping (14 cities, 2 counties).
- Eleven cities indicated that they thought all police services should be delivered at a regional level. However, 40 cities indicated that the thought all police services should be delivered at the city level.
 - Of the 49 cities that responded regarding fire services, 32 thought that the current delivery method was about right while 9 indicated a desire for more cooperation. There was no consensus on tasks that should be delivered at a regional level.

3. Barriers to cooperation

In the survey responses, local governments identified the following list of barriers to greater cooperation. The lists are in descending order from the most often mentioned barrier to the least mentioned barrier. Both city and county responses are included.

Roads, street and bridge services

- Different internal standards/demands for a level of service (16)
- Problems setting up joint/administrative procedures or controls (8)
- Loss of control or jurisdictional identity (i.e. turf) (8)
- Start-up costs and time needed to cooperate (7)
- Reluctance of citizens to have service delivery changed (5)
- Problems merging work force (i.e. union or labor contract differences) (5)
- Reluctance of agency staff to cooperate (4)
- Problems with legislative or judicial mandates (4)
- Increased administrative burden due to cooperation (3)
- No cost savings or identified increased efficiencies (3)
- Resistance of other jurisdictions to cooperate (2)
- Concerns about timeliness of service delivery (2)
- Uncertainty or lack of information (1)
- Other barriers (12)

Police services

- Start-up costs and time needed to cooperate (15)
- Loss of control or jurisdictional identity (i.e. turf) (13)
- Problems with legislative or judicial mandates (12)

- Different internal standards/demands for a level of service (7)
- Problems merging work force (i.e. union or labor contract differences) (6)
- Problems setting up joint/administrative procedures or controls (4)
- Resistance of other jurisdictions to cooperate (3)
- Reluctance of citizens to have service delivery changed (2)
- No cost savings or identified increased efficiencies (2)
- Concerns about timeliness of service delivery (1)
- Uncertainty or lack of information (1)
- Other barriers (9)

Fire Services

- Loss of control or jurisdictional identity (i.e. turf) (3)
- Pension statutes (3)
- Concerns about timeliness of service delivery (3)
- Problems with legislative or judicial mandates (3)
- Different internal standards/demands for a level of service (2)
- Problems merging work force (i.e. union or labor contract differences) (2)
- Problems setting up joint/administrative procedures or controls (1)
- Problems caused by governmental subdivision boundaries (1)
- No cost savings or identified increased efficiencies (1)
- Other barriers (3)

Not all barriers that were identified led easily to subcommittee recommendations or legislative solution. Also, the subcommittee did not have enough time to brainstorm solutions for every barrier identified.⁵

4. Measures for Ensuring effective and efficient service delivery

- Satisfaction indicators are the major way local governments ensured efficient and effective service delivery. About two-thirds of cities and counties use some type of evaluation process to measure efficiency. About 60 percent of cities and counties use some type of quantitative outcome or cost measures, including

⁵Some barrier identification came from subcommittee discussions, not necessarily from survey responses. For example, Mayor Tinklenberg expressed the view that competition sometimes results in inefficiencies. That is, when a county passes a service on to a city only to make the county's bottom line look better, or when a city uses TIF financing to lure an existing enterprise to move.

comparisons with other governments and the private sector, to evaluate service efficiency.

- Seventeen cities and five counties indicated that they had established performance measures/ outcome goals for evaluating road, street, and bridge services. Seven cities and five counties also had performance measurements in place for police services.
- Another 17 cities and 5 counties indicated that they used historic cost/outcome data (i.e. cost per mile of maintenance or personnel per capita) in evaluating the road and street service although they did not indicate that they had established goals or benchmarks in this area. The same was also true for 20 cities and 1 county in the area of police service.

5. Factors leading to higher and lower service costs

Outstate Cities

- The main factor listed for **higher service costs in non-metro cities** was a city's role as a regional center. Serving a large post-secondary student population was also a high cost factor, especially in the area of police services (listed by 12 cities). A large tourist population was also listed by a number of non-metro cities (8) as contributing to higher police costs.
- There was no one factor that led to **lower service costs in non-metro cities**. Three cities mentioned the use of volunteer fire fighters as one factor that lowered costs, while two cities indicated that preventive measures decreased police costs.

Metropolitan Area Cities

- There was no common factor listed by **metro cities** regarding factors that led to **higher service costs**. Several cities stated that they were regional centers and therefore had higher costs due to serving non-residents. Seven cities stated that one cause of high road and street costs in their city was the level of service delivery. Demands from a business area (downtown or mall) were listed by six cities as contributing to higher police costs and six also listed the age of infrastructure as leading to higher road costs.
- Five metro cities listed volunteer fire fighters as contributing to **lower fire service costs**. Two cities listed the use of volunteer and private sector involvement in lowering police service costs.

6. Verbatim Comments

Some of the information in the survey responses gets lost in the translation to tabulated data. Individual comments help to provide depth in understanding the issues raised by the survey. Highlights of comments from individual cities include:

Ideas for providing services more cooperatively

- The City should maintain all streets, roads and highways within the corporate limits under maintenance agreements with the state and county... the county should maintain all county roads and state highways outside the corporate limits. The state should not be in the business of providing highway maintenance services. Use cooperative agreements like the state of Wisconsin" (Rochester)
- "The Dispatch services, Holding services, Forensic services and Records services could all be better provided through a larger government body..." (Apple Valley)
- "The cities in the northwest suburban area.... should seriously consider consolidating police services to more cost effectively and efficiently provide the same level of police services... by eliminating much of the duplication involved..." (Crystal)
- "The Anoka-Champlin [fire protection] operation could efficiently be expanded to amortize administration costs over a broader area (e.g. 60,000 population vs. current 30,000)" (Champlin)

Barriers to cooperation

- "The barriers of 'turf' and personalities has at times arisen but have been overcome. Most people in Greater Minnesota recognize....need to cooperate for the sake of our residents i.e. taxpayers." (Luverne)
- "... the barriers identified had [a] relationship to current structure of public works union contracts... which would not allow for cross utilization of personnel..." (Edina)
- "The question of liability becomes a concern without a clear definition of jurisdiction. Example - Someone tripped on bituminous on the state highway and attempted to sue the city... If the city had been assisting MnDOT on an intermittent basis the city could have been held liable." (Thief River Falls)

- "... barriers include concerns over insurance and liability issues for potential lawsuits and differences in opinions over the cost benefits for cooperative efforts. Finally, political concerns and 'bureaucratic red tape' for the timely delivery of services can be a barrier." (Elk River)
- "The second barrier is cost. A [records] system designed to accommodate a large number of cities will be very expensive to implement." (Apple Valley)

Local efforts to measure efficiency and effectiveness

- "Effectiveness is judged by citizen complaints for example, with respect to snow plowing or seal coating." (Crystal)
- "We compare maintenance costs/mile of roadway and compare that to other jurisdictions. Would be nice to have a standardized format in place." (Ramsey)
- "The following outcome measures [for fire services] are currently employed: a) adherence to established response time standards, b) reduction of property loss due to fire, c) educational programs are measured by semi-annual student testing and evaluation, and d) insurance premiums and ISO class rating" (St. Cloud)

"The city of Minneapolis has utilized performance measures as part of the budget process for over a decade. We will be piloting the use of outcome measures (results) in the 1997 budget process. The transition from workload measurement tools (unit costs, hourly costs) for activities to results and outcomes was identified as an organizational priority during budget redesign efforts two years ago." (Minneapolis)

Local government actions that lead to more efficient service delivery

- "...equipment upgrades have cut costs by reducing manpower, i.e. several years ago we had 15 men in the street department and now have only 9." (Bemidji)
- "... cross-training employees for work in three different departments." (Thief River Falls)
- "As important is a City/County Liaison Committee composed of elected officials from both entities that meet almost monthly to insure that communication remains open ... This

allows greater possibility of joint ventures and cost savings." (Luverne)

- "The city is slowly moving toward performance standards whereby services must be successfully and competitively delivered or services delivery groups will be phased out and services purchased elsewhere." (St. Louis Park)

Suggestions for legislative changes needed to increase efficiency

- "... legislative changes needed to make annexation easier - Montevideo has a population base of 5,500 pay for services used by 7,500." (Montevideo)
- "The laws for special assessments need to be reviewed for appropriate usage by State, County, and Cities [for road reconstruction]." (Plymouth)
- " City council has advised legislators of the need for an orderly annexation process and the need for additional Local Government aid to assist in offsetting our expenditures which provide substantial benefit to those living in outlying townships that do not participate in the costs...." (Winona)
- "Grants for seed money for such [cooperative] projects in the past have been for sums in the tens of thousands of dollars, but the actual start-up costs are in the millions of dollars." (Apple Valley)

These examples are not exhaustive of all the information included in the surveys. Some of the comments have been included in abbreviated form in memo fields contained in the tabulated survey database.⁶

7. Additional information

Part IV of the survey asked local governments for any additional comments. We have collected all this in book form and it is available by contacting Rep. Andy Dawkins at 296-5158. Some highlights include:

Mounds View

In 1995 the city converted from a rollover line items budget to a zero based program/performance budget. Each program details goals, objectives and performance measures that are evaluated

⁶ Copies of the completed surveys are available in the Minnesota Legislative Reference Library for review of all comments.

quarterly. Costs have been reduced, productivity increased and accountability to the public enhanced.

Red Wing

Red Wing's strategic plan recommended that the city develop a total quality management program. Work teams are actively working to consider new ways to provide city services and deal with issues and concerns. Active work teams include: Joint meter reading and billing with NSP; Reduce election polling places; Joint emergency dispatch and law enforcement with Goodhue County; Housing code enforcement.

Oakdale

The city has developed an internal Innovations Committee. It is the role of the committee to receive suggestions from staff to improve either external or internal service delivery.

Little Canada

Little Canada has dramatically cut back on consulting costs by building expertise in-house and not appreciably increasing costs to do so.

Falcon Heights

A combination of reduced revenue and a desire to provide good service has encouraged and will continue to encourage government agencies to develop cooperative relationships particularly in the metropolitan area where geography makes sharing services workable.

East Bethel

Resources are shared extensively with other neighboring cities in almost all departments which increases efficiencies and lowers costs.

East Grand Fords

City is presently considering the following consolidation plans:

1. Combine Economic Development authority with the Housing and Redevelopment Authority.
2. Combine the operations of the park system with the Public Works Department.
3. Combine waste water operation with water operation.

Albert Lea

Employees are cross-trained in building inspections and fire prevention and fire department shift personnel carry out other inspections.

All of this change resulting from an excellent enforcement program and the implementation of building and fire codes has allowed the City of Albert Lea to consider developing a

department with a lower number of full-time fire fighting personnel and greater dependence on volunteers.

Willmar

Numerous agreements between the city and county have eliminated duplication of service and saved money as well. Witness the dispatch center, public library, airport, and soon-to-be-completed City Council/County Commission joint meeting room.

Vadnais Heights

The city is disappointed about Ramsey County consolidation efforts. There was considerable savings identified in areas such as police dispatching, merging county and St. Paul libraries, and merging Ramsey County and St. Paul health departments. Vadnais Heights believes there was an approximate savings of \$1,000,000 per year in each of these categories, but nothing was done.

Bloomington

Bloomington contracts on a fee-for-service basis to provide the City of Richfield with plumbing and mechanical inspections and code enforcement; environmental health inspections and code enforcement, including inspection of food service establishments, lodging, swimming pools and diseased trees. Bloomington also contracts to provide both Richfield and Edina with resident health services, including home health, family health, disease prevention/control, and health promotion.

The benefit to Bloomington is that it can maintain a larger, better trained work force without significant increase in its administrative overhead for the services provided. The benefit for Richfield and Edina is that they have access to the precise quantity of service that they desire in these areas at a lower cost than if they staffed these functions with their own employees.

The benefit to customers is that similar standards are enforced and similar services provided across the community boundaries.

Shorewood

The City of Shorewood contracts with the private sector for the following services: City Assessor, City Attorney, Prosecuting Attorney, Auditing, Janitorial, Drug Testing, Election Equipment Maintenance, Project Engineering, Recording Secretary Services, Recycling, All Sewer and Water System Maintenance.

The South Lake Minnetonka Public Safety Department cooperative approach to providing public safety services clearly results in low costs for Shorewood residents. There is a fine line to walk, however, because with the concept of community policing it is important that residents and youth of the area know who their police officers are.

Even though Shorewood is currently involved in a major joint effort in public safety, it is also working with the Metropolitan Council and 13 other Lake Minnetonka area cities to find additional ways to cooperate to more effectively provide services to its residents.

Woodbury

The City of Woodbury makes extensive use of volunteers to assist government to provide services to the citizens. Without the services of these volunteers, costs of government services would increase substantially. In addition, by utilizing volunteers, a greater sense of "community" and trust in government is created.

North St. Paul

The city provides a regular city newsletter to keep citizens of its community informed as to what is happening within their city government.

Vadnais Heights (again)

Vadnais Heights recently purchased a Jet-Vac machine for cleaning sanitary sewers. They are willing to rent this piece of equipment to surrounding communities.

Washington County

In Washington County, some of the most extensive efforts at service coordination and collaboration have taken place in the area of social services where they have joined with schools and a wide network of private service providers and community groups to improve the effectiveness of various services. This is also the area where they have used outcome-based evaluations to help them determine whether their programs are achieving their stated goals. Social services is an area that needs to be included when looking at local government aid as they require a significant portion of the county levy and the corresponding state aid, such as HACA.

Rice County

The county's goal is to link (via computer) all six cities in Rice County to the County Courthouse. They intend to enable citizens to conduct most county business at any of the six city halls in the county by harnessing available technology.

In reaction to our survey Rice County said: "If the State Legislature is interested in improving the efficiency and effectiveness of county services, the most fundamental change would be to grant more autonomy for organizational decision making to the elected County Board of Commissioners. There are numerous sections of state statute that "handcuff" the elected commissioners from the ability to consolidate departments within the county system. One primary example is the limited discretion afforded to the commissioners to consolidate or

reorganize departments currently under elected department heads (Auditor, Treasurer, Recorder, Sheriff and Attorney); and/or to fill these positions based on qualifications instead of election."

Clay County

Clay County listed 86 key collaborative activities/Joint Powers projects undertaken by the county and other units of local government in an effort to contain costs and to improve the efficiency of service delivery.

Scott County

On 8/16/95 Scott County held a public meeting regarding collaborative efforts. A portion of the agenda follows. (Each administrator sent along to this subcommittee a memorandum on his or her department's collaboration efforts.)

"Possibilities for collaborative efforts:

Jim Berg, Associate Administrator of Finance

Brad Larson, Associate Administrator of Public Works and Land

Eileen Moran, Associate Administrator of Community Services

Brian Nasi, Associate Administrator of Employee Relations

Janet Williams, Library Director"

Anoka County

Anoka County says it has historically been a leader in promoting effectiveness and efficiency. For example, the county reorganized the Auditor, Treasurer, Recorder and Assessor departments several years ago, into a Division of Property Records and Taxation. The Division Manager has responsibilities in all areas of the property taxation system: from assessing to tax calculation and on through tax billing and collection. This organizational structure led to the development of a "one-stop shopping" concept. One window serves all customers with property records or tax questions, and one clerk can answer questions in all disciplines. The customer is not shuffled back and forth between windows. One phone number is also available to callers, and, again, any questions from appraisals to tax figures are answered by the employee who picks up the phone.

Anoka County, working in harmony with the City of Blaine, built and manages a Human Service Center which houses 23 United Way agencies, three state agencies and several county functions. Clients of any of these agencies typically were referred to another agency for further assistance. That meant driving (or trying to find public transportation) to get to another appointment. Now, most of the clients needs can be met under one roof. Day care is available too, again under the same roof.

In order for Anoka County to continue to provide services to its residents without imposing a significant property tax increase, Anoka County believes it is imperative that the state continue to provide property tax relief through the HACA program. This is especially true at a time when Congress is debating substantial reductions in federal funding. The combination of federal cuts and the elimination or reduction of HACA would be devastating, according to the county.

III. Subcommittee Conclusions

Based on all the data collected, having read the survey responses, and based on subcommittee discussion and analysis, the subcommittee makes the following conclusions:

1. Further dissemination of the subcommittee's report and the valuable information contained in the survey responses would be useful as a way to describe the collaborative and innovative approaches being employed by local government officials to address local needs. Two groups in particular that could benefit from broader dissemination would be state policy makers who may not be fully aware of local efforts at innovation, cooperation and efficiency, and local policy administrators who could use the information to identify approaches that may work in their communities.

2. The Western Area City/County Cooperative⁷ (WACCO) is an excellent example of the efficiencies that can be achieved by collaboration amongst adjoining jurisdictions.

WACCO's goal is to improve local government services, while reducing costs, in a time of increased demands and increased resistance to taxes. In 1994 WACCO had a budget of \$48,000 but saved its members \$280,000. The savings came from shared expenses, joint purchasing, shared personnel, joint training, and shared equipment. Quite simply, buying street sweepers in bulk saves money, as does having a joint staff training session in the vicinity where people live rather than in the Twin Cities. The essence of WACCO is the sense of "turflessness" amongst members.

Learning about WACCO led one subcommittee member to suggest that we set up an address on the Internet to list what equipment any one jurisdiction might have available for sharing with others.

3. Cooperation and consolidation is not the only way to be effective and efficient. Some services are most effectively and efficiently delivered at the most local level. On the other hand, survey results indicate that greater regionalization of some services, such as police dispatch, fire investigation, emergency medical response, equipment purchasing, and staff training, would lead to more effective and efficient practices.

⁷The Cooperative includes seven counties and 18 cities in Western Minnesota.

4. Many local governments (22 of the 113 who responded to our survey) are beginning to use performance measures to evaluate program effectiveness. The dialogue between taxpayers and policy makers would benefit from better information about the results of various government programs. To quote Jim Miller, Executive Director of the League of Minnesota Cities, "We must.....begin to measure program results and budget on a program basis far more extensively than ever before."⁸

5. In the main, cities are doing what's possible and within their control to achieve maximum efficiency and effectiveness. It's inherent to being a good public official. However, the underlined phrase "within their control" is key -- there are barriers to greater efficiency and effectiveness that are beyond the control of any one jurisdiction.

In some cases the state may be able to provide the impetus to achieve greater efficiency and effectiveness or eliminate the barriers to achieving greater efficiency and effectiveness.

Some examples of where maximum efficiency and effectiveness is not being realized include:

a.) Situations where adjoining cities were not providing a service cooperatively when it was clear that there would be cost savings if they would provide the service jointly. Often the only reason cited for lack of cooperation was a lack of willingness by one of the governing bodies to give up any control over service delivery, i.e., a "turf" issue.

b.) Situations where some cities in a county were contracting with the county to provide a service, often with impressive cost savings compared to providing the service independently. And yet the survey response would go on to say that other cities that could also take advantage of a county providing the service frequently don't, again mostly explained as the governing body's unwillingness to give up turf.

c.) Occasionally survey responses pointed out that the state may have some complicity in encouraging inefficient behavior by rewarding cities that have higher spending with more state aid.

6. The original rationale underlying local government aid (LGA) continues to be a good one -- to equalize disparate tax bases and need overburdens. Other general purpose aid programs share with LGA the goal of providing property tax

⁸A 1993 State Auditor's report titled "Case Studies of City Spending" reached a similar conclusion. Quoting from the Executive Summary: "Few cities measure the effectiveness of their services to determine whether they are receiving optimal value for their dollars." Page 25 of the Auditor's report contains the detailed discussion.

relief. To the extent that current programs or allocations do not reflect that rationale or achieve that goal, they are vulnerable to attack. This subcommittee believes that stabilizing the state revenue sharing system is superior to imposing greater reliance on property taxes to pay for needed local programming that is effective and efficient.

IV. Subcommittee Recommendations

The following recommendations flow from our survey responses, discussions and conclusions:

A. Non-Legislative Recommendations

1. That this report and the valuable information contained in the survey responses be further disseminated to state and local policy makers.

2. That there be an ongoing process and central repository for local governments to identify barriers to greater cooperation, consolidation, effectiveness and efficiency.

B. Recommendations for Legislation

1. That additional resources be provided to the Board of Government Innovation and Cooperation to increase the scale of the Board's impact on removing barriers, encouraging cooperation and consolidation, and improving efficiencies.

2. That a portion of non-school HACA (Homestead and Agricultural Credit Aid) be distributed as "performance-based aid" to those cities that deem themselves to have established or be in the process of establishing "performance measurement". Progressing towards performance measurement would be the "determinator" for awards of performance-based aid.⁹

3. That associations representing counties, school boards, and educators, in consultation with the Department of Children, Families and Learning, study the issue of how best to provide for social services in the schools and develop a model (with an implementation plan) that best serves children with

⁹The per capita amount each city would contribute is left to the Legislature to determine. As an example, \$2 per capita would raise about \$6 million. What constitutes "performance measurement" is also left to the Legislature to determine. Three examples of the type of performance measurement this subcommittee would like to see every city and county have in place by the time 1997 HACA funds are distributed can be found in Appendix C. These examples came from Hennepin County, Ramsey County, and the City of Woodbury. If every city and county deems itself to have such measurements in place, then HACA would be distributed just as it is now. If some do and some don't, then the cities and counties that do have such measurements will get proportionately more HACA than those who don't. Ideally, every city and county will have performance measurements, no HACA will shift, and lower levies will result from greater efficiencies.

the least duplication of effort; and that these associations, in collaboration, will report their findings to the Legislative Commission on Planning and Fiscal Policy prior to the start of the 1997 legislative session. The Legislative Commission on Planning and Fiscal Policy (or this subcommittee) should then consider whether progress towards implementation of that model would become the next "determinator" for distribution of "performance-based aid".¹⁰

4. In order to encourage efficient delivery of water or sewer services, if the Minnesota Pollution Control Agency orders the extension of those services to unincorporated areas, those areas and any intervening areas should become part of the city.

¹⁰Other possibilities for future determinators of performance-based aid include regional or cooperative delivery of the following services: police dispatch, forensic laboratories, emergency medical response, and fire investigation. More subcommittee time needs to be given to studying the "universality" and "objective measurement" of these "determinators." In other words, can it be universally said, without exception, that providing police dispatch on a regional basis is more effective and efficient; and can it be determined by objective measurement whether or not this is being done in any particular locality?

V. Conclusion

The subcommittee found this process to be a worthwhile one, particularly the gathering of data and information and having both local policy makers and state policy makers at the same table discussing these issues. There appear to be good reasons to continue the subcommittee's work. The subcommittee therefore adjourned to the call of the chairs.

APPENDIX A

1. The survey instrument
2. The set of model answers
3. The list of local governments that
were requested to respond to the survey

Date: _____

Name of city: _____

Name of person responding: _____

Title of person responding: _____

Names and titles of city staff and/or elected officials consulted when
filling out the survey:

Person to contact if there are questions regarding how the survey was
filled out:

Name: _____

Title: _____

Tel. No.: _____

PART I - STREETS, ROADS AND HIGHWAY SERVICES

Please answer the following questions with regard to how streets, roads and highway services are provided to residents of this city. But first please describe what's included under "streets, roads and highway services" for purposes of this survey. For example, is maintenance included? paving? construction? etc.

1. Current Service Provision

(1a) Who provides this service to residents and businesses in this city?

- ☐ this government entity only (please skip to question 1c)
- ☐ the city and county separately (please skip to question 1c)
- ☐ this entity through a cooperative arrangement with other governmental entities
- ☐ another government entity only; the entity is _____
(please skip to question 3a)
- ☐ other _____

(1b) If the service is provided cooperatively with other units of government, please describe the nature of the cooperation or collaboration.

(please skip to question 2a)

City name _____

PART I - STREETS, ROADS AND HIGHWAY SERVICES

(1c) If the service is not provided cooperatively, have options for joint efforts or collaboration been explored? If so, describe the process.

(1d) If barriers to cooperative service provision have been identified, please describe those barriers.

2. Effectiveness and efficiency

(2a) If this city provides the service, how do you ensure that it is provided effectively and efficiently?

City name _____

PART I - STREETS, ROADS AND HIGHWAY SERVICES

(2b) Is this program evaluated by some one other than the service provider? If so, whom? (For example, the evaluation might be done internally by a department separate from the unit providing the service, or it might be done by an entity outside of government.)

(2c) Has this city established any outcome measures to link spending to results? If so, what are they?

(2d) Are there any unusual or unique circumstances in this city that result in unusually high or low costs for providing this service?

City name _____

PART I - STREETS, ROADS AND HIGHWAY SERVICES

3. Who should provide the service

(3a) Which level and/or mix of local governments should provide this service to residents of this city? Please explain your answer in terms of economies of scale, consumer preferences, and other relevant factors.

(3b) If this service is not currently being provided as you suggested it should be in (3a) above, what steps are being taken so that the service is provided appropriately in the future, or alternatively, what obstacles have been encountered in trying to provide the service in the most appropriate manner?

City name _____

PART II - POLICE SERVICES

Please answer the following questions with regard to how police services are provided to residents of this city. But first, just as in Part I, please describe what's included under "police services" for purposes of the survey.

1. Current Service Provision

- (1a) Who provides this service to residents and businesses in this city?
- ☐ this government entity only (please skip to question 1c)
 - ☐ the city and county separately (please skip to question 1c)
 - ☐ this entity through a cooperative arrangement with other governmental entities
 - ☐ another government entity only; the entity is _____
(please skip to question 3a)
 - ☐ other _____
- (1b) If the service is provided cooperatively with other units of government, please describe the nature of the cooperation or collaboration.

(please skip to question 2a)

- (1c) If the service is not provided cooperatively, have options for joint efforts or collaboration been explored? If so, describe the process.

City name _____

PART II - POLICE SERVICES

(1d) If barriers to cooperative service provision have been identified, please describe those barriers.

2. Effectiveness and efficiency

(2a) If this city provides the service, how do you ensure that it is provided effectively and efficiently?

(2b) Is this program evaluated by some one other than the service provider? If so, whom? (For example, the evaluation might be done internally by a department separate from the unit providing the service, or it might be done by an entity outside of government.)

City name _____

PART II - POLICE SERVICES

(2c) Has this city established any outcome measures to link spending to results? If so, what are they?

(2d) Are there any unusual or unique circumstances in this city that result in unusually high or low costs for providing this service?

3. Who should provide the service

(3a) Which level and/or mix of local governments should provide this service to residents of this city? Please explain your answer in terms of economies of scale, consumer preferences, and other relevant factors.

City name _____

PART II - POLICE SERVICES

- (3b) If this service is not currently being provided as you suggested it should be in (3a) above, what steps are being taken so that the service is provided appropriately in the future, or alternatively, what obstacles have been encountered in trying to provide the service in the most appropriate manner?

City name _____

PART III - CHOICE OF SERVICE

Please choose one of the following five services for your answers to Part III. Please circle the one you choose.

1. Fire protection
2. Parks and recreation
3. Libraries
4. Comprehensive planning and land use
5. Investment management and insurance/risk management

Please answer the following questions with regard to how your circled services are provided to residents of this city. But first, just as in Parts I and II, please describe what's included under your circled services for purposes of the survey.

1. Current Service Provision

(1a) Who provides this service to residents and businesses in this city?

- ☐ this government entity only (please skip to question 1c)
- ☐ the city and county separately (please skip to question 1c)
- ☐ this entity through a cooperative arrangement with other governmental entities
- ☐ another government entity only; the entity is _____
(please skip to question 3a)
- ☐ other _____

(1b) If the service is provided cooperatively with other units of government, please describe the nature of the cooperation or collaboration.

(please skip to question 2a)

City name _____

PART III - CHOICE OF SERVICE

(1c) If the service is not provided cooperatively, have options for joint efforts or collaboration been explored? If so, describe the process.

(1d) If barriers to cooperative service provision have been identified, please describe those barriers.

2. Effectiveness and efficiency

(2a) If this city provides the service, how do you ensure that it is provided effectively and efficiently?

City name _____

PART III - CHOICE OF SERVICE

(2b) Is this program evaluated by some one other than the service provider? If so, whom? (For example, the evaluation might be done internally by a department separate from the unit providing the service, or it might be done by an entity outside of government.)

(2c) Has this city established any outcome measures to link spending to results? If so, what are they?

(2d) Are there any unusual or unique circumstances in this city that result in unusually high or low costs for providing this service?

City name _____

PART III - CHOICE OF SERVICE

3. Who should provide the service

(3a) Which level and/or mix of local governments should provide this service to residents of this city? Please explain your answer in terms of economies of scale, consumer preferences, and other relevant factors.

(3b) If this service is not currently being provided as you suggested it should be in (3a) above, what steps are being taken so that the service is provided appropriately in the future, or alternatively, what obstacles have been encountered in trying to provide the service in the most appropriate manner?

City name _____

PART IV - OPTIONAL QUESTION

After having read and answered the previous questions for each of the major services provided by your unit of government, are there other things that you've done to promote overall effectiveness and efficiency in service delivery in your city that you would like to mention?

Thank you very much for taking the time to answer this survey. Please return by November 1, 1995, to:

State Rep. Andy Dawkins
Co-chair, Subcommittee on LGA and Service Delivery
Room 409, State Office Building
100 Constitution Avenue
St. Paul, MN 55155-1298

If you have any questions about this survey, how to complete it, or its purpose, please call:

State Sen. John Hottinger, (612) 296-6153

City name _____

SURVEY WITH MODEL ANSWERS

1. Current Service Provision

- (1a) Who provides this service to residents and businesses in this community?
- ☐ this government entity only (please skip to question 1c)
 - ☐ the city and county separately (please skip to question 1c)
 - ☐ this entity through a cooperative arrangement with other governmental entities
 - ☐ another government entity only; the entity is _____
(please skip to question 3a)
 - ☐ other _____

- (1b) If the service is provided cooperatively with other units of government, please describe the nature of the cooperation or collaboration.

Example A: The city participates in a large number of joint powers agreements for a variety of services. Joint powers currently in place are for computer services, human services, animal control and watershed to name a few. The service is performed by staff of the joint powers, by contract, or by staff from participating organizations depending on the organization and joint powers' structures.

Example B: We maintain a portion of Highway XXX for the state under state contract.

(please skip to question 2a)

- (1c) If the service is not provided cooperatively, have options for joint efforts or collaboration been explored? If so, describe the process.

Example A: Options for consolidating the treasurer's function in our county and city have been analyzed by both jurisdictions. The city has concluded that there are sufficient differences between the missions of the two offices that a consolidation at this time is not appropriate. There may be some benefit to our city or county from consolidation with another jurisdiction and those options will be explored. Other options that are possible include contracts with private entities for investment services in order to improve investment performance.

Example B: In the past the city studied an option of joint public safety dispatching. We have our own in-house dispatch. Staff studied this with four neighboring cities. One option was to build a five-city operation; the second was to use county dispatch. The

council determined that our community would be better served by continuing our own operation in-house; that the higher level of service was well worth the slightly higher cost.

- (1d) If barriers to cooperative service provision have been identified, please describe those barriers.

Example A: The dispatch operation option described in our earlier answer which was favored by all as the number one option was to have been a five-city operation. The barrier was cost. In order to have a five-city operation, the cities would have had to make a large capital investment to ensure the joint facility had appropriate equipment and facilities for the operation. Cost was the barrier in this case.

2. Effectiveness and efficiency

- (2a) If you provide the service, how do you ensure that it is provided effectively and efficiently?

Example A: We have consulted with the Legislative Auditor about "Best Practice Reviews" and we do allow for competitive pressures. For example, the Public Works Department did a cost-benefit analysis of the city's asphalt plant to determine the cost effectiveness of making versus buying asphalt materials for the maintenance of its streets. The analysis considered the total city costs and comparable total private costs. Under current market conditions, the results favored keeping the plant.

- (2b) Is this program evaluated by some one other than the service provider? If so, whom? (For example, the evaluation might be done internally by a department separate from the unit providing the service, or it might be done by an entity outside of government.)

Example A: The city is doing an annual survey of its business customers in the city. Although the survey is conducted by the city, the customers are doing the evaluation through the feedback they provide. Other programs can be evaluated by providing customers with comment cards. Evaluation of comments would then be made by management and the comments shared with staff.

Example B: The finance department requires periodic program evaluation of the service by the department that provides the service. Then we have an evaluation by a separate department on an occasional basis. For large programs, periodic reviews are conducted

by external program evaluation consultants approximately every three to five years.

- (2c) Have you established any outcome measures to link spending to results? If so, what are they?

Example A: The city has put its Design Section on a performance plan under which it must successfully serve its city customers or go out of existence. The results of the group are directly linked to spending. If they are unsuccessful in persuading city customers that their results are a good buy, the customers will buy the services they need from someone else.

- (2d) Are there any unusual or unique characteristics in this community that result in unusually high or low costs for providing this service?

Example A: Our city does have special needs which in some cases lead to higher costs. Probably the most apparent special need is the one presented by hosting a campus of the state university system. This results in the city having to provide services to a much greater number of people than simply the city's residents. As far as services more related to property than to people, the property on the campus generates no tax revenues despite its demand for city services. Our city is also a regional center, hence it serves as a center of commerce for the area, which again causes the number of people being served to be well in excess of those represented by just the population or household count of residents. A third cost factor for our city is the influx of non-English-speaking immigrants employed in the agricultural sector. These immigrants pose additional burdens on the city in any number of ways, including public health, housing, community education, etc.

3. Who should provide the service

- (3a) Which level and/or mix of local governments should provide this service to your community? Please explain your answer in terms of economies of scale, consumer preferences, and other relevant factors.

Example A: Proposals have been made suggesting that police services in our county, or at least some portion of police services such as investigation, would be more appropriately provided at the county level. The most well-developed proposal to accomplish this was put forward jointly by the county sheriff and the local chief of police in 1994. The proposal cited economies of scale as the main benefit,

primarily by eliminating functional overlap.

Example B: For six suburban cities, street maintenance and snow removal are being provided by the county.

- (3b) If this service is not currently being provided as you suggested it should be in (3a) above, what steps are being taken so that the service is provided appropriately in the future, or alternatively, what obstacles have been encountered in trying to provide the service in the most appropriate manner?

Example A: Discussions concerning consolidation of the city and county health departments are ongoing. A major obstacle standing in the way of consolidation is the difference between the titles of positions in each jurisdiction and the pay associated with those titles. Past attempts to bring the two departments together have not succeeded because of the reluctance of bargaining units of the affected employees in the two jurisdictions to support the changes needed to accomplish the unification of the two departments.

List of Cities Mailed Survey

Albert Lea	Crystal	Inver Grove Hts.
Alexandria	Crystal Bay	Lake Elmo
Andover	Detroit Lakes	Lakeville
Anoka	Duluth	Lino Lakes
Apple Valley	Eagan	Litchfield
Arden Hills	East Bethel	Little Canada
Austin	East Grand Forks	Little Falls
Bemidji	Eden Prairie	Mahtomedi
Blaine	Edina	Mankato
Bloomington	Elk River	Maple Grove
Brainerd	Fairmont	Maplewood
Brooklyn Center	Falcon Heights	Marshall
Brooklyn Park	Faribault	Mendota Heights
Buffalo	Farmington	Minneapolis
Burnsville	Fergus Falls	Minnetonka
Cambridge	Forest Lake	Montevideo
Cedar	Fridley	Monticello
Champlin	Golden Valley	Moorhead
Chanhassen	Grand Rapids	Morris
Chaska	Ham Lake	Mound
Chisholm	Hastings	Mounds View
Cloquet	Hermantown	New Brighton
Columbia Heights	Hibbing	New Hope
Coon Rapids	Hopkins	New Ulm
Corcoran	Hugo	North Branch
Cottage Grove	Hutchinson	North Mankato
Crookston	International Falls	North St. Paul

Northfield

Oakdale

Otsego

Owatonna

Plymouth

Prior Lake

Ramsey

Red Wing

Richfield

Robbinsdale

Rochester

Rosemount

Roseville

St. Anthony

St. Cloud

St. Louis Park

St. Paul

St. Paul Park

St. Peter

Sartell

Sauk Rapids

Savage

Shakopee

Shoreview

Shorewood

South St. Paul

Spring Lake Park

Stillwater

Thief River Falls

Vadnais Heights

Virginia

Waite Park

Waseca

West St. Paul

White Bear Lake

Willmar

Winona

Woodbury

Worthington

List of Counties Mailed Survey

Anoka

Blue Earth

Carver

Clay

Dakota

Hennepin

Olmsted

Otter Tail

Ramsey

Rice

St. Louis

Scott

Stearns

Washington

Wright

APPENDIX B

Tabulation of Survey Data

Summary of City Responses Regarding Street, Road, and Bridge Services

Number of cities responding: 99

Metro cities with a population of 5,000 or more: 59

Non-metro cities with a population of 5,000 or more: 34

Cities with a population under 5,000 (voluntary): 6

Part A - *Current Cooperation Level* : Description of how the service is currently provided (based on answers from questions 1a - 1b)

Number of cities who indicated they cooperated as follows:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
6	4	1	do not work with any other governmental entity in providing the service
41	29	4	do some cooperation with a county
35	5	1	do some cooperation with a city or cities
5	4	1	do some cooperation with a town or towns
33	28		do some cooperation with the state or other governmental entity
2	1		other or can't tell who cooperation is with
Number of cities who indicated that they used the following types of arrangement to cooperate:			
6	2		informal arrangement
15	1		joint powers arrangement
20	17	2	other formal arrangement
3	3	2	contract to sell or purchase goods/services with other governmental entities
37	24		other or "can't tell"

Summary of City Responses Regarding Street, Road, and Bridge Services, cont...

Part A cont....			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
Level of cooperation: Number of cities that indicated that services were provided as follows:			
19	5		Share or take responsibility for servicing boundary or joint roads (i.e. between two municipalities, includes minor city work on county roads within city boundaries)
4	9	2	Provide all or most road maintenance for all or a substantial portion of the roads controlled by another jurisdiction
	2	2	Contract out with another jurisdiction for them to provide all or most road maintenance on roads controlled by this jurisdiction
29	22	1	Jointly provide one or more of the major tasks under road services with another jurisdiction (i.e. snowplowing)
7	4	1	Shared planning/administration
11	6	1	Shared purchasing of materials
23	10		Shared equipment
10	1		Provide backup/emergency assistance
4	5		Swapping responsibilities for certain aspects of service provision with another jurisdiction
1	3		Shared facilities/ buildings
6	5		Shared labor force
8	7		other

Summary of City Responses Regarding Street, Road, and Bridge Services, cont...

Part B - *Barriers to Cooperation*: What are the barriers to cooperation or more cooperation (based on answers in questions 1c - 1d and 3b)

The number of cities that identified the following as barriers:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
13	3		different internal standards/demands for level of service
1	2		problems with legislative or judicial mandates
1	1		timeliness of service delivery
2	2		problems merging workforce (union/labor contract differences)
5	2		problems setting up joint administrative procedures/controls
2			reluctance of agency staff to cooperate
3	2		reluctance of citizens to have service delivery changed
2	1		no cost savings or no identified increased efficiencies
	2		increased administrative burden due to cooperation
4	1		start-up costs and time needed to cooperate
1			uncertainty/lack of information
	1		resistance by other jurisdictions
3	2	1	loss of control or jurisdictional identity (i.e. turf)
6	3		other barriers

Summary of City Responses Regarding Street, Road, and Bridge Services, cont...

Part C - *Effectiveness, efficiency and outcome measures*: How do they ensure that they provide the service as efficiently as possible? (Based on question 2a - 2c)

Number of cities that indicated that they used the following:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
Satisfaction Indicators:			
30	23	4	informal citizen responses (i.e. phone calls, letters, etc...)
11	11	1	review through the budget process
15	12	2	council/board oversight
17	10		formal citizen responses (i.e. survey)
Evaluations:			
22	15	1	internal departmental evaluation
12	10		evaluated by another department
8	7		evaluated by a paid consultant
3	3	1	evaluated by another governmental entity
1	2		evaluated by an independent non-governmental or citizen's group
12	5		"best practices" review
Cost/outcome measures:			
14	13	1	comparison with private sector costs
21	8		comparison of costs/outputs with other governments
7	2		per unit cost analysis
3	5		historical trend analysis
15	10		identify and evaluate outcome goals
9	5		other quantitative measures

Summary of City Responses Regarding Street, Road, and Bridge Services, cont...

Part D - *Unique city* factors leading to high or low service provision costs (Based on question 2d)

Number of cities that

- identified unique factors: 65
- indicated that there were no unique factors: 10
- did not respond: 24

Number of cities which indicated that this factor lead to higher costs:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
2			entity's geographic size
4	2		physical barriers (i.e. lakes, rivers , etc...) To service delivery
4	1		population or development density
6	10		is a regional/economic center
2	3		serves a large tourist population
	5		serves a large student population
1	4	1	large tax-exempt tax base
	1		population growth
6	3	1	age of city/city infrastructure development
7	1	1	level of service delivery
4			cul-de-sacs
2	2		gravel roads
	1		ability to pay (i.e. low average incomes or high tax capacity)
13	8		other factors
Number of cities that indicated that this factor lead to lower costs:			
1			entity's geographic size
1			age of city/city infrastructure development
7		1	other factors

Summary of City Responses Regarding Street, Road, and Bridge Services, cont...

Part E - *Recommended Changes*: How should the service be provided? (based on questions 1c and 3a - 3b)

Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
Number of cities who said that:			
45	28	4	the current provision is about right
9	6		a greater level of cooperation/consolidation is desirable
1			less cooperation/consolidation is desirable
Number of cities who indicated that they were:			
17	11		not pursuing more cooperation
16	11	2	actively working on increasing cooperation and/or consolidation
7	4		open to more cooperation but not actively pursuing options

Summary of County Responses Regarding Street, Road, and Bridge Services

Number of counties responding: 14

Metro counties with a population of 5,000 or more: 7

Non-metro counties with a population of 5,000 or more: 7

Part A - *Current Cooperation Level* : Description of how the service is currently provided (based on answers from questions 1a - 1b)

Number of counties who indicated they cooperated as follows:		
Metro	Non-metro	
0	0	do not work with any other governmental entity in providing the service
2	3	do some cooperation with a county
6	6	do some cooperation with a city or cities
5	6	do some cooperation with a town or towns
3	3	do some cooperation with the state or other governmental entity
1		other or can't tell who cooperation is with
Number of counties who indicated that they used the following types of arrangement to cooperate:		
2	2	informal arrangement
1	1	joint powers arrangement
5	6	other formal arrangement
1	2	contract to sell or purchase goods/services with other governmental entities
2	2	other or "can't tell"

Summary of County Responses Regarding Street, Road, and Bridge Services, cont...

Part A cont....		
Metro	Non-metro	
Level of cooperation: Number of cities that indicated that services were provided as follows:		
1	3	Share or take responsibility for servicing boundary or joint roads (i.e. between two municipalities, includes minor city work on county roads within city boundaries)
4	1	Provide all or most road maintenance for all or a substantial portion of the roads controlled by another jurisdiction
2		Contract out with another jurisdiction for them to provide all or most road maintenance on roads controlled by this jurisdiction
2	3	Jointly provide one or more of the major tasks under road services with another jurisdiction (i.e. snowplowing)
1		Shared planning/administration
5	2	Shared purchasing of materials
2	3	Shared equipment
1		Provide backup/emergency assistance
	2	Swapping responsibilities for certain aspects of service provision with another jurisdiction
	2	Shared labor force
2	3	other

Summary of County Responses Regarding Street, Road, and Bridge Services, cont...

Part B - *Barriers to Cooperation*: What are the barriers to cooperation or more cooperation (based on answers in questions 1c - 1d and 3b)

The number of counties that identified the following as barriers:		
Metro	Non-metro	
	1	problems with legislative or judicial mandates
	1	problems merging workforce (union/labor contract differences)
	1	problems setting up joint administrative procedures/controls
1	1	reluctance of agency staff to cooperate
	1	increased administrative burden due to cooperation
	2	start-up costs and time needed to cooperate
	1	resistance by other jurisdictions
	2	loss of control or jurisdictional identity (i.e. turf)
2	1	other barriers

Summary of County Responses Regarding Street, Road, and Bridge Services, cont...

Part C - *Effectiveness, efficiency and outcome measures*: How do they ensure that they provide the service as efficiently as possible? (Based on question 2a - 2c)

Number of cities that indicated that they used the following:		
Metro	Non-metro	
Satisfaction Indicators:		
4	5	informal citizen responses (i.e. phone calls, letters, etc...)
2	1	review through the budget process
2	4	council/board oversight
3	1	formal citizen responses (i.e. survey)
Evaluations:		
3	1	internal departmental evaluation
5	2	evaluated by another department
	1	evaluated by a paid consultant
3	1	evaluated by another governmental entity
	1	evaluated by an independent non-governmental or citizen's group
2	1	"best practices" review
Cost/outcome measures:		
3	2	comparison with private sector costs
2	3	comparison of costs/outputs with other governments
3	2	per unit cost analysis
5		historical trend analysis
3	3	identify and evaluate outcome goals
1		other quantitative measures

Summary of County Responses Regarding Street, Road, and Bridge Services, cont...

Part D - *Unique county* factors: Are there unique county factors leading to high or low service provision costs? (Based on question 2d)

Number of counties that

- identified unique factors: 5
- indicated that there were no unique factors: 1
- did not respond: 8

Number of counties which indicated that this factor lead to higher costs:		
Leads to higher costs:		
Metro	Non-metro	
	1	entity's geographic size
	1	physical barriers (i.e. lakes, rivers , etc...) To service delivery
	2	is a regional/economic center
	1	large tax-exempt tax base
2		population growth
1		age of city/city infrastructure development
	1	ability to pay (i.e. low average incomes or high tax capacity)
	2	other factors

Summary of County Responses Regarding Street, Road, and Bridge Services, cont...

Part E - *Recommended Changes*: How should the service be provided? (based on questions 1c and 3a - 3b)

Metro	Non-metro	
Number of counties who said that:		
5	3	the current provision is about right
2	2	a greater level of cooperation/consolidation is desirable
0	0	less cooperation/consolidation is desirable
Number of counties who indicated that they were:		
2	2	not pursuing more cooperation
1	1	actively working on increasing cooperation and/or consolidation
2	0	open to more cooperation but not actively pursuing options

Summary of City Responses Regarding Police Services

Number of cities responding: 99

Metro cities with a population of 5,000 or more: 59

Non-metro cities with a population of 5,000 or more: 34

Cities with a population under 5,000 (voluntary): 6

Part A - *Current Cooperation Level* : Description of how the service is currently provided (based on answers from questions 1a - 1b)

Number of cities who indicated they cooperated as follows:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
14	5		do not work with any other governmental entity in providing the service
38	29	5	do some cooperation with a county
27	5	1	do some cooperation with a city or cities
1			do some cooperation with a town or towns
17	13		do some cooperation with the state or other governmental entity
13	8		other or can't tell who cooperation is with
Number of cities who indicated that they used the following types of arrangement to cooperate:			
15	14	1	informal arrangement
12	3		joint powers arrangement
27	19	3	other formal arrangement
17	6	3	contract to sell or purchase goods/services with other governmental entities
7	6		other or "can't tell"

Summary of City Responses Regarding Police Services, cont...

Part A cont....			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
Level of cooperation: Number of cities that indicated that services were provided as follows:			
9	1	3	Contract out to another jurisdiction for all police services
4			Provide all or most police services for other jurisdictions
27	24	2	Jointly provide or contract out for dispatch services
15	13		Jointly provide or contract out for detention/jail space
21	12		Jointly provide or contract out for drug enforcement
22	12		Jointly provide or contract out for emergency response or other special police units
8	11		Jointly provide or contract out for record keeping and/or other computer services
14			Jointly provide or contract out for crime lab and/or forensic services
8	5		Jointly provide training or training facilities
1	11	1	Shared facilities/ buildings
3	4	1	Joint purchasing of vehicles or equipment
17	12		other

Summary of City Responses Regarding Police Services, cont...

Part B - *Barriers to Cooperation*: What are the barriers to cooperation or more cooperation (based on answers in questions 1c - 1d and 3b)

The number of cities that identified the following as barriers:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
5	2		different internal standards/demands for level of service
4	3		problems with legislative or judicial mandates
	1		timeliness of service delivery
2	1		problems merging workforce (union/labor contract differences)
3	1		problems setting up joint administrative procedures/controls
2			reluctance of citizens to have service delivery changed
1			no cost savings or no identified increased efficiencies
8	3		start-up costs and time needed to cooperate
1	1		resistance by other jurisdictions
5	5	1	loss of control or jurisdictional identity (i.e. turf)
9	7	1	other barriers

Summary of City Responses Regarding Police Services, cont...

Part C - *Effectiveness, efficiency and outcome measures*: How do they ensure that they provide the service as efficiently as possible? (Based on question 2a - 2c)

Number of cities that indicated that they used the following:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
Satisfaction Indicators:			
23	14	1	informal citizen responses (i.e. phone calls, letters, etc...)
23	16	3	review through the budget process
28	12	3	council/board oversight
18	11	1	formal citizen responses (i.e. survey)
Evaluations:			
19	22		internal departmental evaluation
17	10	1	evaluated by another department
9	7	1	evaluated by another governmental entity
9	8		evaluated by an independent non-governmental or citizen's group
Cost/outcome measures:			
1			comparison with private sector costs
12	8	1	comparison of costs/outputs with other governments
5	4		per unit cost analysis
1	1		historical trend analysis
8	4		identify and evaluate outcome goals
13	4		other quantitative measures
3			qualitative measures (i.e. liveability ratings, etc...)
Number of cities who indicated that evaluations affected service delivery:			
5			

Summary of City Responses Regarding Police Services, cont...

Part D - *Unique city factors*: Are there unique city factors leading to high or low service provision costs? (Based on question 2d)

Number of cities that

- identified unique factors: 57
- indicated that there were no unique factors: 26
- did not respond: 16

Number of cities which indicated that this factor lead to higher costs:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	City Characteristic:
2			entity's size - in term of population
1	3		entity's geographic size
1			physical barriers (i.e. lakes, rivers , etc...) to service delivery
2			population or development density
3	9		is a regional/economic center
1	8		serves a large tourist population
1	12		serves a large student population
4	1		serves another type of transient population
	5		large tax-exempt tax base
2	1		population growth
2	2		a non-english speaking, immigrant population
2	2		socio-economic characteristics of residents
3	1		level of service delivery
2	2		ability to pay (i.e. low average incomes or high tax base)
3	1		a concentration of multi-family housing
3			a concentration of schools (k-12) in the city
1	1		a casino

Summary of City Responses Regarding Police Services, cont...

Part D cont...			
Number of cities which indicated that this factor lead to higher costs:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	City Characteristic:
6	1		a business area that generates a lot of traffic (downtown area or a mall)
3	6		other type of high traffic generator (i.e. zoo, airport, etc...)
9	10		other factors
Number of cities which indicated that this factor lead to lower costs:			
1	2		proactive/preventive government efforts
2			volunteer/ private sector involvement
6	1	2	other factors

Part E - *Recommended Changes*: How should the service be provided? (based on questions 1c and 3a - 3b)

Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
Number of cities who said that:			
39	25	5	the current provision is about right
11	9	0	a greater level of cooperation/consolidation is desirable
0	0	0	less cooperation/consolidation is desirable
Number of cities who indicated that they were:			
28	17	2	not pursuing more cooperation
11	8	2	actively working on increasing cooperation and/or consolidation
5	5	0	open to more cooperation but not actively pursuing options

Summary of City Responses Regarding Police Services, cont...

Part F - *Services that should be provided at a regional level:* Which services do they believe should be provided at a level higher than the individual city? (Based on questions 3a and 3b)

Number of cities which indicated that the service should be provided at the following level:						
At the city level:			At a regional level:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
24	13	3	9	1	1	all police services
	1		18	18	1	dispatch services
			10	8		detention/jail space
	1		6	6		drug enforcement
			11	9		emergency response or other special police units
			9	5		record keeping and/or other computer services
			12	2		crime lab and/or forensic services
			6	4		training or training facilities
			2	3	1	Joint purchasing of vehicles or equipment
		1	6	4		others

Summary of County Responses Regarding Police Services

Number of counties responding: 14

Metro counties: 7

Non-metro counties: 7

Part A - *Current Cooperation Level* : Description of how the service is currently provided (based on answers from questions 1a - 1b)

Number of counties who indicated they cooperated as follows:		
Metro	Non-metro	
0	0	do not work with any other governmental entity in providing the service
3	2	do some cooperation with a county
5	6	do some cooperation with a city or cities
1	2	do some cooperation with a town or towns
4	2	do some cooperation with the state or other governmental entity
2	3	other or can't tell who cooperation is with
Number of counties who indicated that they used the following types of arrangement to cooperate:		
4	3	informal arrangement
1	1	joint powers arrangement
4	3	other formal arrangement
2	4	contract to sell or purchase goods/services with other governmental entities
	2	other or "can't tell"

Summary of County Responses Regarding Police Services, cont...

Part A cont....		
Metro	Non-metro	
Level of cooperation: Number of counties that indicated that services were provided as follows:		
3	5	Provide all or most police services for other jurisdictions
6	7	Jointly provide or contract out for dispatch services
6	4	Jointly provide or contract out for detention/jail space
4	6	Jointly provide or contract out for drug enforcement
3	4	Jointly provide or contract out for emergency response or other special police units
	2	Jointly provide or contract out for record keeping and/or other computer services
4		Jointly provide or contract out for crime lab and/or forensic services
1	2	Jointly provide training or training facilities
	2	Shared facilities/ buildings
6		other

Part B - *Barriers to Cooperation*: What are the barriers to cooperation or more cooperation (based on answers in questions 1c - 1d and 3b)

The number of counties that identified the following as barriers:		
Metro	Non-metro	
2		problems with legislative or judicial mandates
1	2	problems merging workforce (union/labor contract differences)
2	1	start-up costs and time needed to cooperate
	2	loss of control or jurisdictional identity (i.e. turf)
	2	other barriers

Summary of County Responses Regarding Police Services, cont...

Part C - *Effectiveness, efficiency and outcome measures*: How do they ensure that they provide the service as efficiently as possible? (Based on question 2a - 2c)

Number of counties that indicated that they used the following:		
Metro	Non-metro	
Satisfaction Indicators:		
2	3	informal citizen responses (i.e. phone calls, letters, etc...)
2	2	review through the budget process
3	4	council/board oversight
2	1	formal citizen responses (i.e. survey)
Evaluations:		
5	3	internal departmental evaluation
1	3	evaluated by another department
5	1	evaluated by another governmental entity
2	1	evaluated by an independent non-governmental or citizen's group
Cost/outcome measures		
2	1	per unit cost analysis
1		identify and evaluate outcome goals
1	3	other quantitative measures

Summary of County Responses Regarding Police Services, cont...

Part D - *Unique county* factors: Are there unique county factors leading to high or low service provision costs? (Based on question 2d)

Number of counties that

- identified unique factors: 11
- indicated that there were no unique factors: 2
- did not respond: 1

Number of counties which indicated that this factor lead to higher or lower costs:		
Leads to higher costs:		
Metro	Non-metro	
1	1	entity's geographic size
	1	physical barriers (i.e. lakes, rivers , etc...) To service delivery
2	1	population or development density
	1	serves a large tourist population
1		population growth
2		level of service delivery
1		a casino
1		other type of high traffic generator (i.e. zoo, airport, etc...)
	1	other factors

Leads to lower costs:		
Metro	Non-metro	
1		volunteer/ private sector involvement
2		other factors

Summary of County Responses Regarding Police Services, cont...

Part E - *Recommended Changes*: How should the service be provided? (based on questions 1c and 3a - 3b)

Metro	Non-metro	
Number of counties who said that:		
2	4	the current provision is about right
0	2	a greater level of cooperation/consolidation is desirable
1	0	less cooperation/consolidation is desirable
Number of counties who indicated that they were:		
1	1	not pursuing more cooperation
1	3	actively working on increasing cooperation and/or consolidation
2	1	open to more cooperation but not actively pursuing options

Summary of County Responses Regarding Police Services, cont...

Part F - *Services that should be provided at the county level or higher:* Which services do they believe should be provided at a level higher than the individual city? (Based on questions 3a and 3b)

Number of counties which indicated that the service should be provided at the following level:				
At the city level:		At a regional level:		
Metro	Non-metro	Metro	Non-metro	
1		1		all police services
		2	3	dispatch services
		2	2	detention/jail space
		1		drug enforcement
		1	1	emergency response or other special police units
			2	record keeping and/or other computer services
		1	1	crime lab and/or forensic services

Summary of City Responses Regarding Fire Services

Number of cities responding: 49

Metro cities with a population of 5,000 or more: 28

Non-metro cities with a population of 5,000 or more: 17

Cities with a population under 5,000 (voluntary): 5

Part A - *Current Cooperation Level* : Description of how the service is currently provided (based on answers from questions 1a - 1b)

Number of cities who indicated they cooperated as follows:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
6	2	1	do not work with any other governmental entity in providing the service
4	3		do some cooperation with a county
14	4	2	do some cooperation with a city or cities
1	13		do some cooperation with a town or towns
12	4	1	do some cooperation with the state or other governmental entity
7	2	1	other or can't tell who cooperation is with
Number of cities who indicated that they used the following types of arrangement to cooperate:			
14	8		informal arrangement
9			joint powers arrangement
3	4		other formal arrangement
10	9	3	contract to sell or purchase goods/services with other governmental entities
Type of fire department			
13	7		volunteer
	9		combination volunteer/professional

Summary of City Responses Regarding Fire Services, cont...

Part A cont....			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
Level of cooperation: Number of cities that indicated that services were provided as follows:			
3	2	2	Contract out to another jurisdiction for all fire services
4	4		Provide all or most fire services for other jurisdictions
18	8		Provide mutual overload/backup coverage with other jurisdiction(s) (mutual aid)
3			Jointly provide or contract out for fire safety education
4	1		Jointly provide or contract out for emergency medical services (EMS)
4			Jointly provide or contract out for building inspection
3			Jointly provide or contract out for fire investigation
2	2		Jointly provide training or training facilities
2	3		Shared facilities/ buildings
2	1		Shared equipment
4	3		Joint purchasing of vehicles or equipment
5	3		other

Summary of City Responses Regarding Fire Services, cont...

Part B - *Barriers to Cooperation*: What are the barriers to cooperation or more cooperation (based on answers in questions 1c - 1d and 3b)

The number of cities that identified the following as barriers:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
1	1		different internal standards/demands for level of service
1	1		problems with legislative or judicial mandates
3			timeliness of service delivery
2	1		problems merging workforce (union/labor contract differences)
1			problems setting up joint administrative procedures/controls
	1		no cost savings or no identified increased efficiencies
	2	1	loss of control or jurisdictional identity (i.e. turf)
3			pension statutes
1			governmental subdivision boundaries
2		1	other barriers

Summary of City Responses Regarding Fire Services, cont...

Part C - *Effectiveness, efficiency and outcome measures*: How do they ensure that they provide the service as efficiently as possible? (Based on question 2a - 2c)

Number of cities that indicated that they used the following:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
Satisfaction Indicators:			
7	3	1	informal citizen responses (i.e. phone calls, letters, etc...)
10	6	1	review through the budget process
10	10	3	council/board oversight
5	2		formal citizen responses (i.e. survey)
Evaluations:			
15	6		internal departmental evaluation
8	3	1	evaluated by another department
5			evaluated by a paid consultant
7	2	1	evaluated by another governmental entity
3	1		evaluated by an independent non-governmental or citizen's group
Cost/outcome measures:			
8	7		insurance ratings
5	3		comparison of costs/outputs with other governments
17	5		response time or other performance measures
2	1		identify and evaluate outcome goals
2			other quantitative measures
5	7		indicated "training" or more training as an answer to this question
Number of cities who indicated that evaluations affected service delivery:			
1	3		

Summary of City Responses Regarding Fire Services, cont...

Part D - *Unique city factors*: Are there unique city factors leading to high or low service provision costs? (Based on question 2d)

Number of cities that

- identified unique factors: 29
- indicated that there were no unique factors: 16
- did not respond: 4

Number of cities which indicated that this factor lead to higher or lower costs:			
Leads to higher costs:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
1			entity's size - in term of population
3			entity's geographic size
	3		physical barriers (i.e. lakes, rivers , etc...) To service delivery
	1		is a regional/economic center
	2		serves a large tourist population
	3		serves a large student population
		1	large tax-exempt tax base
1			population growth
2	3	1	type of building in city (apartment, industrial, etc...)
2	2		age of buildings in city
2		1	level of service delivery
1			weather-related factors
6	1		other factors

Summary of City Responses Regarding Fire Services, cont...

Leads to lower costs:			Factor
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
1			proactive/preventive government efforts
5	3		use of volunteer firefighters
1	2		other factor

Part E - *Recommended Changes*: How should the service be provided? (based on questions 1c and 3a - 3b)

Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
Number of cities who said that:			
18	11	3	the current provision is about right
6	3	0	a greater level of cooperation/consolidation is desirable
0	0	0	less cooperation/consolidation is desirable
Number of cities who indicated that they were:			
3	3		not pursuing more cooperation
5	2		actively working on increasing cooperation and/or consolidation
5	3		open to more cooperation but not actively pursuing options

Summary of City Responses Regarding Fire Services, cont...

Part F - *Services that should be provided at the county level or higher:* Which services do they believe should be provided at a level higher than the individual city? (Based on questions 3a & 3b)

Number of cities which indicated that the service should be provided at the following level:						
At the city level:			At a regional level:			
Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	Metro	Non-metro	Voluntary	
5	5		2	2		all fire services
5	1		2			building inspection
			1			hazardous materials emergencies
			1			emergency medical services (EMS)
			1			fire investigation
			2			training or training facilities
			1	1		Joint purchasing of vehicles or equipment
			1			other