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Executive Summary

This report provides evidence of the broad appeal service delivery collaboration has among state and local governments. Evidence was gathered from states that have developed policies to promote local service collaboration and from local governments that have formed collaborations with one or more communities to deliver better, more and less costly services to their citizens. The research project also surveyed local governments across Ohio about their perceptions of collaboration as a smart strategy for achieving service delivery efficiencies and streamlining local government.

Finding 1 Interest in local collaboration in the United States has escalated almost in parallel with the transformation and globalization of the economy. Among the states, New York, Wisconsin and New Jersey stand out for their support for local government collaboration. Moreover, local governments acting together extends beyond declining core cities to counties, townships and suburban communities.

Finding 2 Collaboration requires local government to recognize shared interests, mutual dependency, and the need to move beyond ad hoc arrangements that are typically short-lived and one-time agreements to collaborate.

Finding 3 Local government collaboration has the potential for significant service cost savings. According to a New Jersey study, service sharing “saves municipalities hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars a year” (LUARCC, 2009, p. 3). The Wisconsin Policy Research Institute (2002) summarized the advantages of collaboration to include the following:

- Collaboration achieves efficiencies with less bureaucracy;
- Collaboration focuses on services best suited for merger or sharing;
- Collaboration among two or more local governments can expand to the region;
- Collaboration preserves citizen access to local government that may be lost in jurisdictional consolidations; and
- Collaboration leaves open opportunities for increased citizen responsibility for themselves and others.

Finding 4 The State can play a vital role in removing barriers to collaboration and helping communities surmount obstacles, such as demographic difference and interlocal economic competitiveness, which too often thwart collaborative efforts.

Finding 5 Ohio cities and counties with populations of 100,000 or more were required by House Bill 66 (126th General Assembly) to complete an inventory of cooperative agreements. Four inventories were retrieved and evaluated. The inventories indicated that collaborations were extensive and involved other public interest organizations, including the federal government (e.g., Wright Patterson Air Force Base); collaboration could be fostered through many different types of associations (e.g., First Suburbs and planning organizations); and collaboration was seldom measured in terms of cost savings or other measures that indicated service quality.

Finding 6 The research team conducted a survey of Ohio local governments and received over 400 responses. In general, most counties, cities, villages and townships reported some form of collaboration. The following summarizes the survey findings:

- Only 7.7% of the communities reported they did
not have any type of collaborative arrangement. Among the more than 25 shared services identified, fire, dispatch, EMS, public health, police, economic development, water, planning, and road maintenance ranked highest.

- Almost 97% of the localities indicated collaboration could produce benefits to the participants. Reduced service costs and duplication, better coordination, increased service quality, expertise, responsiveness and economic growth, and less need for additional tax revenues were listed as the top benefits derived from collaboration.
- More than half of the local governments reported no barriers to collaboration. For those who said there were barriers to formal collaboration, “reduced control over services;” “threat to employees;” and legal structural issues (ORC, form of government etc.) ranked highest.
- How residents might react to collaboration was also a concern, especially confusion over who to hold accountable for services, loss of future support for tax levies, and loss of connections to the community were cited most often.
- It was also discovered that less tenured officials were most likely to be more negative about collaboration.

Finding 7 The research team also conducted two focus groups. Key thoughts from local officials about collaboration include: 1) collaboration is a way of life for communities; 2) citizens do not always support collaboration even if there is cost savings; 3) the State does not fully understand the range of local collaborations; and 4) communities would like to collaborate more but want to do it on their own terms and believe the State has been more of a barrier than supporter of collaboration.

Recommendations
State policy that promotes increased local collaborations is an idea whose time has come. The State of Ohio can play a much more aggressive role in encouraging service collaborations. The following provides six broad areas of need.

- Provide a guide for collaboration and shared service agreements. New York, Wisconsin and New Jersey already provide such assistance. Ohio could adopt similar local government guides that would stand the test of Ohio laws and regulations.

- Incentivize service collaboration through grants that pay all or part for: 1) local feasibility studies; 2) one-time startup costs; 3) regional collaborations that entail more than simple cooperation with their immediate neighbors; and 4) regional-based nongovernmental organizations that promote more extensive collaborations.

- Mitigate the barriers to more extensive collaboration. Present-day state law can add to the costs of collaboration and inhibit the willingness of locals to undertake innovative joint service arrangements.

- Become a model of collaboration. State agencies need to define regions with greater consistency and provide a common geographical basis for joint action.

- Standardize local government accounting to better measure performance and critically evaluate inventive collaborative arrangements. The Ohio Department of Education’s Education Management Information System (EMIS) could be a start for local governments.

- Support regional processes that inform and invite public participation when discussing possible service delivery collaborations. Processes should 1) create a vision that acknowledges mutual dependency, common goals, and the need to share services; 2) adopt metrics to measure service delivery performance and change; and 3) establish a coordinating body that provides oversight to analyses and shared service implementation.
Introduction: The New Interest in Local Government Collaboration

States and local governments across the United States pursue intergovernmental collaboration pragmatically and continuously. Local governments utilize collaboration to lower service delivery costs and increase service quality. Collaboration may also produce cost savings through joint purchased goods and services or shared expertise such as emergency management (Thurmaier and Wood, 2002; Chen and Thurmaier, 2009). Collaboration spans a wide spectrum of public interests from front line services (solid waste collection and code enforcement) to back office functions (information technology and buying road salt). Almost anything government does has been provided by some form of collaboration among jurisdictions.

For over two decades, collaboration has been proposed by both academics and practitioners in the United States and among other developed democracies as a means to better serve taxpayers and residents (Browne Jacobson, LLP, 2008). Writing in National Civic Review, David Walker argued that a range of collaborative approaches could offset such trends as fragmented government, shrinking federal assistance and uncertain aid to local governments from the states. His top three approaches, meaning the easiest to achieve, were informal cooperation, interlocal service contracts and joint power agreements (1987).

Multijurisdictional approaches to problem solving in Ohio have been around since Dayton and other local governments impacted by the Miami, Mad and Stillwater rivers formed the Miami Conservancy District to prevent another 1913 flood (Sealander, 1988). Collaboration continued throughout the 20th century, especially in hard times. After mid-century until the 1980s, the federal government supported regional coordination and broad scale local government collaboration (Porter and Wallis, 2002).

Interest in local collaboration in the United States has escalated almost in parallel with economic transformation and globalization of the economy over the last decade. Among the states, Wisconsin and New York have rejected for the most part consolidation of local government for the less controversial collaboration approach. In 1998, the University of Wisconsin Extension-Cooperative Extension developed a guide for sharing government services (Faust and Dunning). Responding to a county-city consolidation approach to the City of Milwaukee’s economic problems, the Wisconsin Policy Research Institute released a report titled “Cooperation Not Consolidation: The Answer for Milwaukee Governance” (2002). Further, Alan Hevesi, the Comptroller for the State of New York, released reports in 2003 and 2005 detailing the practical merits of collaboration.

Collaboration is often called cooperation and sometimes it is called ad hoc regionalism. Collaboration typically is sparked by some type of special need such as natural disasters or economic hardships. The Lincoln Land Institute convened a national forum in 2001 to explore advantages and learn from different cases of collaboration. Ad hoc regionalism was seen as an inventive and experimental means of achieving the benefits of economies of scale, creating a unified leadership, and responding to threats of economic loss or pollution (Porter and Wallis, 2002).

Local government acting together extends well beyond declining core cities. Collaboration involves counties, townships and suburban municipalities. For...
example, the National League of Cities issued a special report in 2002 titled, “Unifying Voices, Confronting Challenges: A Resource Guide for Developing Regional Collaborations of FIRST TIER SUBURBS.” This report illustrated the broad appeal collaboration has among local governments and the recognition that problems facing local governments require multijurisdictional solutions.

Recently, Dustin and Levine completed a study of “fragmented government in Ohio” for Greater Ohio and the Brookings Institution. The authors found consolidation to be feasible in few cases. Collaboration, on the other hand, offered many benefits such as lower costs, improved coordination, and higher quality service delivery and avoided loss of citizen access to government and retained elements of positive local competitiveness.

This report to the Ohio Commission on Local Government Reform and Collaboration provides information and analysis to help the State of Ohio determine how to encourage and support interlocal government collaboration. The report is divided into four sections. The first section has three parts. The first part discusses the logic of collaboration using academic and practitioner reports and studies. The second part describes Ohio local government collaboration using inventories produced by counties and cities with populations of 100,000 as was required by Ohio House Bill 66 from the 126th General Assembly (Section 557.12.01). And the third part provides geospatial information that tests the argument that collaboration could overcome inefficiencies, service duplication, and poor program and planning coordination.

The second section provides a review of the best collaborations identified by organizations concerned with local government innovation and through research teams search of community websites. The authors have created a matrix by which to summarize and compare the collaborations. Cost savings, when available and verifiable, are provided. This section is supported by an appendix (Appendix 1) of agreements that could help Ohio jurisdictions form new collaborations.

The third section utilizes two methods to measure impediments to collaboration from the perspective of local government. A survey was created (Appendix 2) and sent by email to county, municipal and township elected officials and chief administration officers. School districts and special districts were not sent the survey. The project team also conducted two discussion groups with local officials representing counties, municipalities and townships from Southeast and Southwest Ohio.

The fourth and final section of the report provides a multi-part conclusion that summarizes the findings from Sections 1 through 3 and then offers recommendations for supporting, incentivizing, and rewarding future collaboration. The recommendations include suggestions that make forming and assessing collaborations easier and an interlocal model for continuously forming collaborations.

**SECTION 1**

**The Logic of Local Government Collaboration**

Local governments collaborate extensively with one another in service provision in a number of functional areas. Collaborative or cooperative agreements, these terms will be used interchangeably throughout the report, may be relatively simple or complex. For instance, residents of different localities may share library resources, or, they may develop an industrial park and share future revenues. Collaborative agreements may also be guided by larger public safety concerns that are extraterritorial, such as mosquito abatement, or safety concerns that maximize life saving capacity such as police and fire emergency response agreements.

Local government collaboration is a normal feature of the U.S. system of government. Yet, “collaboration” implies more than “easy” cross border partnerships that typify ad hoc regionalism. Collaboration denotes actions that are more methodical, intentional, and strategic. Collaboration exists when governmental organizations come to recognize their interdependence and the necessity of cooperating on a continuing, sustained basis. Collaborations form when governments recognize they needed additional capacity to serve the public’s
interest; when they share a “collective responsibility” for problem solving and when they gain benefits from working in partnership with another government or governments. Collaboration, then, entails more than just a series of ad hoc cooperation arrangements. Collaboration is a continuing and evolving partnership, a “dynamic” process as opposed to a “static,” one-shot cooperative arrangement (O’Leary et al., 2009, pp. 4-5).

Local government collaboration has the potential for great significant savings. A Rutgers University study made this point in a summary of finding for the New Jersey Local Unit Alignment, Reorganization, and Consolidation Commission:

There is ample evidence that service sharing saves municipalities hundreds of thousands, if not millions of dollars a year and that the State should continue to promote these arrangements as a matter of public policy (LUARCC, 2009, p. 3).

In Waukesha County, outside of Milwaukee (Wisconsin), the high cost of replacing obsolete communications equipment helped prompt a local drive to consolidate the area’s 911-emergency system and also better serve the area’s 37 municipalities and 370,000 residents. An analysis, based on the cost of replacing the communications equipment, determined that the new interlocal arrangement would produce a savings of $22 million over eight years (Smith, Henschel, and Lefeber, 2008).

A large body of “feasibility studies” prepared by various consultants further underscores the potential for “significant savings” through interlocal service sharing. For example, in New Jersey five municipal courts were combined into one joint municipal court. The joint service produced efficiencies in operations such as training and scheduling and saved costs in maintaining and developing facilities. The new joint court system was expected to save participating communities an estimated $2.54 million over ten years (LUARCC, 2009, p. 18).

Collaboration also offers opportunities to correct deficiencies and inequalities in service delivery. Massachusetts, for instance, estimated that it lacked sufficient staffing in “over 70 percent of local health offices” (LUARCC, 2009, p. 12). Greater collaboration then could allow for sharing of staff and other resources and thereby raise the level of service provision.

New Jersey’s Effort at Promoting Local Collaboration

New Jersey has been a leader in seeking to use state assistance to leverage greater cooperation and collaboration by the state’s counties, municipalities, school districts, and fire districts. Grant awards are even given to nonprofit organizations for actions that promote shared local services.

The State’s SHARE (SHaring Available Resources Efficiently) Program is administered by the Department of Community Affairs (DCA). It seeks to streamline local government operations in order to “reduce costs and property taxes” (NJ Department of Community Affairs, 2007, p. 1).

SHARE provides funds, on a reimbursement basis, for “the study or implementation of” (p. 2) regional service agreements, interlocal program coordination, and functional program and municipal consolidation. Implementation grants to localities of up to $200,000 are dispensed to support the start-up and expansion of shared services or the consolidation of services. In special cases, where there are a large number of participants or the complexity of the project requires, even larger grant requests are considered. No funds may be used to cover the costs of early retirements and no local match is required.

New Jersey’s feasibility study grants to localities of up to $20,000 (with a 10 percent required local match) help local governments decide if a shared service arrangement makes financial or legal sense. Financial assistance to counties for new regional service arrangements or for efforts that facilitate cooperative ventures by a county’s towns and school districts, can reach $100,000 per year for a maximum of three years. State assistance can help promote a wide variety of regional service arrangements, as underscored by the Rutgers University research report presented to the State of New Jersey:

For services that show economies of scale, such as infrastructure based services (water
utilities, for example) or specialized services (crime labs, for example), contracting with a regional provider (including shared services), regionalized special districts, centralized services, joint boards, or regional policy groups may all be more efficient and effective than directly delivered services. If regional coordination is beneficial to the delivery of the service, such as land use planning, regional efforts are more appropriate than local efforts. This could take the form of regional policy groups, joint boards, regionalized special districts, or county or other centralized services (quoted by LUARRCC, 2009, p. 9)

State assistance is especially crucial in helping local governments hire consultant services. Consultant reports often project future costs and savings that drive the debate over alternative service arrangements and show whether or not a proposed collaboration actually makes sense. The New Jersey Department of Community Affairs on its web site provides advice to communities as to how to negotiate an intergovernmental service agreement. [Note: Wisconsin provides also step-by-step processes and sample agreements for communities contemplating intergovernmental service agreements (Elsass, 2003 and Faust and Dunning 1998).]

The SHARE program awarded $4.2 million in grants in its first two years. It even dispensed assistance to nonprofit organizations that facilitated regional partnerships. The Somerset County Business Partnership was the first civic organization to receive such a grant award. The Business Partnership worked with 39 local participants and saved over $13 million through shared services in just a single year (NJ Department of Community Affairs, 2006; Somerset County Business Partnership, 2005).

In summary of the evidence, collaboration fosters invention and experimentation without the high investment of economic and political capital expended when jurisdictions consolidate. The Wisconsin Policy Research Institute (2002) perhaps summarizes the advantages of collaboration best:

- Collaboration achieves efficiencies with less bureaucracy;
- Collaboration focuses on services best suited for merger or sharing;
- Collaboration among two or more local governments can expand to the region;
- Collaboration preserves citizen access to local government that may be lost in jurisdictional consolidations; and
- Collaboration leaves open opportunities for increased citizen responsibility for themselves and others.

Evidence of Collaboration in Ohio

The 126th Ohio General Assembly adopted House Bill 66 in 2005. This legislation required counties and cities with a population of 100,000 or more to submit to the State Auditor a report that: (1) described efforts to reduce costs by consolidating services and engaging in regional cooperation; (2) specified cost savings resulting from the consolidation of services and regional cooperation; and (3) described future plans with respect to consolidating services and engaging in regional cooperation (Section 557.1201).

The research team attempted to obtain these documents from the State Auditor. However, the Auditor did not have record of the reports. Four reports were obtained for this report. They included inventories from the 57 communities that comprised the Cuyahoga Community; the 49 communities that comprised Hamilton County; the City of Dayton; and 26 member communities from the Miami Valley (Dayton area). The City of Dayton reported twice to the State Auditor; once in 2004 through the inventory conducted by the Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission and then again individually in 2005. The Cuyahoga Communities and Hamilton County reports also provided an inventory of collaborations that existed in 2004.

The four inventories described collaborative projects and units of government involved in the projects. In some cases, nonprofit organizations were partners (e.g. Cleveland Foundation, Dayton Area Mayors and Managers Association, and Greater Cincinnati Chamber of Commerce). Only the City of Dayton offered some evaluation of benefits derived from collaboration: however, these benefits in most cases lacked useful specifics.

The data can be only summarized because little information was provided about when the partnerships were created, whether they will continue in the future,
and what fiscal impact the collaborations had in aggregate or for each jurisdiction. The reports varied in how they classified the projects. In aggregate, the three regional reports, excluding Dayton, listed collaborations functionally as administration, aging, arts, building, courts, development, environment, finance, fire/EMS, health, human services, insurance, parks, property maintenance, police/safety services, public works, purchasing, recreation, road maintenance, and zoning. The Miami Valley Regional Planning Commission reported 427 collaborations for the region, two counties specifically, and 24 municipalities and townships. were classified as follows:

- 137 Administrative (e.g., purchasing, insurance, technology, marketing, health etc.)
- 105 Public Works (e.g., water, sewer, road construction and maintenance);
- 72 Fire/EMS (e.g. fleet maintenance, dispatch, training, emergency planning);
- 70 Police (e.g. training, facility, task forces, data network, jail services etc.);
- 43 Other, Recreation, Parks, Finance, Zoning, and Human Services

The Cuyahoga Community Collaboration report identified 618 collaborations for 58 municipalities and townships. The list included only eight collaborations for the City of Cleveland and did not list county collaborations or any jurisdictions outside of Cuyahoga County. The Cuyahoga Community Inventory included the following collaborations:

- 194 Safety (e.g. dispatch, rescue teams, hazardous material operations, warning systems, jails, mutual aid, training, collaboration studies, enforcement COG etc.);
- 133 Service (e.g. water, wastewater, waste disposal, shared equipment, fuel and salt joint purchasing);
- 71 Purchasing (e.g., utility aggregation, state cooperative, insurance);
- 49 Finance (e.g., income tax collection)
- 48 Aging/Seniors (e.g., transportation, elder-friendly project);
- 41 Administrative (e.g., first suburbs, food assistance);

- 34 Recreation (e.g., programs, fields, leagues);
- 16 Environment (e.g., watershed action plan, airport noise control);
- 22 Building, Human Resources, Health Arts, development and unclassified

The Cuyahoga Community inventory fits into a much shorter list of collaborations than Miami Valley communities. For example, the 49 finance collaborations really represent one large collaboration to collect municipal income tax or the 48 Aging and Senior collaborations a really two programs encompassing many Cuyahoga County local governments. While there is some degree of overlap among Miami Valley communities, the overlap is much less. Hamilton County collaborations repeat the same pattern as Cuyahoga County collaborations. There are 549 collaborations; however, there were only 19 collaborative programs identified. About 47% of Hamilton County’s collaborations were associated with nine government alliances that included chambers of commerce, the Ohio Municipal League, the Township Association and other councils. The Hamilton Regional Planning Commission recognized this issue and conducted a survey with the 49 local governments to provide a better inventory of collaborations and potential collaborations. Of the 49 communities, 17 responded to the survey. The results provided information richer in detail. For example, Maderia estimated that it saved from $50,000 to $75,000 per year through an insurance pool; and Mariemont saved $25,000 per year through shared street maintenance and fire service. The communities also identified 18 services that communities would consider sharing such as fire, solid waste, water, fleet maintenance, and joint purchasing. The report concluded with a table of similar services offered by the City of Cincinnati and Hamilton County. The table identified fourteen functional areas that were “duplications.”

The City of Dayton report also provides richer detail, and no doubt reports from Cleveland or Cincinnati would be similar. The inventory has similar collaborations that result from federal and state funding streams that require local cooperation and consensus building; for example, emergency management, hazardous materials response teams, and medical response systems. There are also many more collaborations that were developed with the school district, community college, convention...
center, other local governments for fleet maintenance and specific types of services, regional economic development, ombudsman services, and a broad range of social and health services. In most cases, Dayton identifies the savings achieved as “reduced cost,” access to funding, more effective performance, greater access to information or expertise within other organizations, specialized training, and in a few cases dollars saved.

The conclusions that can be reached after studying the inventories are these:

- Collaboration involves local governments and many other public interest organizations, including the federal government (e.g., Wright Patterson Air Force Base);
- Collaboration can be fostered through many different types of convening associations (e.g., First Suburbs and planning organizations);
- Collaboration is seldom measured in terms of cost savings or other measures that indicate service quality;
- Collaboration inventories no doubt underestimate the magnitude and potential of collaboration in Ohio, as demonstrated by the Dayton and Miami Valley inventory;
- Collaboration appears to be driven functionally, such as public safety, and increasing collaboration in the future may, or perhaps should, take other paths in the future that make collaboration a policy goal.

**Geo-Spatial Examples of Need for Greater Collaboration**

Taking a look at various maps of Ohio’s functional regions provides insight into how the state is structured for regional collaboration. The State of Ohio has created functional regions composed of different groupings of counties. This diversity of functional maps may discourage local government collaboration. Figure 1 and 2 below illustrate two very different regional structures for promoting Ohio’s future economic transformation and for investing in a future workforce that will support economic change and growth. Figure 1 geographically defines the state’s “economic development regions” or EDRs. Ohio’s EDRs were created by the Ohio Department of Development (ODOD). The EDR regions are based roughly on economic inputs and outputs such as labor and goods and services. According to ODOD’s strategic plan, the regions “encompass pools of knowledge that become the seeds for new products and services” (p. 11). Each of the state’s twelve EDRs has “its own strengths and assets” (p. 11).

It seems logical that strategies to develop the state’s workforce would be closely aligned with the geography of the state’s economic regions, or vice versa. Yet, Figure 2 does not tell us that
Figure 1: Ohio’s 12 Economic Development Regions

Figure 2: Ohio’s 20 Workforce Investment Areas

workforce and economic development are aligned. Comparing the two maps of Ohio: 1) there is no similarity between the two maps; 2) there are twelve EDRs and twenty workforce investment areas; 3) there are seven single county workforce investment areas but no single county ERDs; and 4) workforce investment area 7 comprises 43 counties and almost spans the state from north to south and from east to west.

**Overlapping Geographies in Ohio**

Figure 3 below illustrates how changing political boundaries can cause the segmentation of locally maintained roadways. In the early 1950’s, this section of Harshman/Needmore Road was maintained almost entirely by Montgomery County. Today, the roadway flip flops form one jurisdiction to next. The roadway is now segmented into fourteen pieces that are the responsibility of four different jurisdictions (Moorman, 2008). Maintaining the roadway requires collaboration.

---

**Figure 3: Needmore Road Maintenance Responsibility, 2007**
or creating a new structure to maintain roadways.

Figure 4 below illustrates another type of problems faced by many communities in Ohio. The City of Centerville and Washington Township overlap one another. The communities are demographically alike and share fire, library, recreation and other services. However, they operate separate government buildings, independent road maintenance and other services. Voters in the township turned down a merger commission study in

Figure 4: Example of Township and City Service Area Overlapping
2008. The only near term alternative is more robust collaboration to streamline services and reduce costs.

**SECTION 2**

Collaborations That Work

Section 2 sets out to identify the potential of collaboration, by exploring examples found in other states. It should be stated clearly that Ohio has exceptional examples of collaboration, including the Economic Development/Government Equity program created by Montgomery County in 1991 and more recently the Fund for Our Economic Future initiative in the Cleveland-Akron-Youngstown region. This section of the report provides an overview and compendium of examples. We start by focusing on the state role in promoting collaboration. We then continue by illustrating the innovative arrangements that have been undertaken by local governments. The section concludes with a matrix that summarizes our findings.

The State Role in Promoting Local Collaborations

The State of Ohio has a role to play in promoting local government collaboration in order to reduce the cost of government, to raise the standard of local service delivery and reshape city-regions so that they will be more competitive in their pursuit of jobs and economic growth. Aside from the formal associations and federal and state programs requiring regional consensus, Ohio’s communities routinely cooperate with one another on an *ad hoc* basis (this will be treated more thoroughly in Section 3). Yet, such *ad hoc* arrangements are not capable of realizing the full potential of cost savings and other benefits that may result from collaboration. More far-reaching and sustainable collaborations are difficult to arrange.

The State has an important role to play in removing barriers and helping communities surmount obstacles that too often thwart collaborative efforts. The State’s involvement is particularly important in helping communities overcome barriers posed by *demography*. State support is also essential for *larger scale collaborations* and for regional efforts aimed at *economic development*. State action is also needed for more extensive collaborative action in the *provision of social services*.

*Differences in demography* pose a barrier to effective interlocal initiatives. Studies have shown that collaboration is most easily arranged among communities that have similar social and economic characteristics (Farmer, 2009). While a suburb may often be willing to cooperate with neighboring communities with a similar demographic makeup, that same suburb will be a bit more hesitant to enter into arrangements with the core city or with a less wealthy neighbor or township. Smaller communities often are reluctant to enter into relationships with larger communities. Such barriers were evident in the pre-Katrina New Orleans region, where the city’s neighbors were unwilling to enter into workable arrangements with the central city for emergency evacuation. Even when agreements for joint action existed, the partners did not live up to their responsibilities to conduct scheduled disaster preparedness exercises and to put in place new procedures to enhance public safety (Kiefer and Montjoy, 2006).

*Larger scale collaborations* often prove especially difficult to organize, imposing limits on voluntary regional action (Farmer 2009). A local jurisdiction that is willing to enter into a cooperative agreement with one or two of its neighbors may be reluctant to join in a regional agreement that entails joint responsibility by a greater number of governments. When a voluntary arrangement has a large number of participants, a locality may fear the loss of control, control that is not sacrificed when a locality enters into a cooperative undertaking with just one or two of its neighbors. As the number of local governments in a proposed regional arrangement increases, individual local governments become less and less certain about their purpose in the future. Even more problematic, when a voluntary association has many members, a local jurisdiction will likely be more suspicious that all the members might not live up to future responsibilities, especially when called on to undertake difficult actions.

The results of the survey of greater Milwaukee communities underscore the difference between *ad hoc*
interlocal cooperation and true regional collaboration. Over one-third (23) of the responding communities had shared service agreements with only one other community (Public Policy Forum, 2006).

The difficulty of establishing collaborations for economic development stems from the substantial “transaction costs” (commitment of members’ time in seemingly endless negotiations) and “free-rider problem” (while all members share from a region’s economic development, there is no way to assure that each member will pay a fair share of development costs). As Feiock, Steinacker and Park (2009, p. 256) detail:

While the potential benefits from cooperation in economic development can be large, the transaction costs tend to be correspondingly high, making economic development one of the toughest cases for institutional collective action. As in all collective action situations, incentives to free-ride exist, as well as to engage in opportunistic defection from voluntary agreements. The inability to agree on a “fair” division of the gains from regional economic development, uncertainty about other cities’ trustworthiness, and the uneven distribution of costs and benefits over time and across cities are additional reasons that cooperation in economic development is a challenge.

Unlike simple agreements involving two governments that want to share services such as snow plowing, regional collaborations for economic development are eminently more complex. Regional economic development efforts require the involvement of local governments, the county (or counties) in the region, and various private actors and business groups (Chen and Thurmaier, 2009, p. 537).

Feiock, Steinacker and Park’s national survey further revealed that residential suburbs were less willing to participate in joint ventures for economic development than were communities with more diverse economic bases (p. 264). In the all-important arena of Ohio’s continued economic development, state incentives may be required to promote interlocal collaboration for growth.

Changes in state law are essential to maximize local collaboration. When it comes to such innovative practices as service contracting with a private firm that can provide service across local border, local governments will often work together to the extent permitted by state law. Other changes in state statutes may also be required. For instance, local willingness to cooperate in economic development may, to some extent, be the product of state laws that assigns different taxing authority to different types of jurisdictions, e.g. municipalities, counties, and townships. In Ohio, municipalities rely heavily on the earned income tax, while townships rely on the property tax and counties rely on the sales tax. Tax structure, then, acts as a barrier to regional development projects; a situation that may be remedied by a change in the state tax law or by the introduction of some form of shared revenue from development.

Social service collaborations vary in number significantly from other functions. A survey of 63 governments in seven southeastern Wisconsin counties found that fire protection, emergency services, libraries, and law enforcement were the functional areas in which communities most frequently shared services. In contrast, collaboration among greater Milwaukee communities for social service provision was almost non-existent. While 78 percent of the responding communities reported shared fire services and 69 percent indicated shared emergency services, only three communities identified cooperative agreements for youth services and human services (Public Policy Forum, 2006).

Local Collaboration: Five Illustrative Case Studies

The following discussion provides an overview of best practices from outside Ohio. Summaries of five award-winning collaborations will point to the potential inherent in joint action, especially the cost saving and other benefits that resulted.

The City of Lancaster and the Village of Potosi, Wisconsin: The Potosi Branch Library. This program won the 2008 ICMA Community Partnership Awards in the less-than-10,000 population. It shows how even
small communities can collaborate both to save money and to improve service quality. Such collaboration is especially helpful in maintaining the quality of small town life, especially when a community lacks the capacity to provide a service, or a high-quality service, on its own. The collaboration also allowed for the sharing of expertise that a small village could not otherwise afford.

**Why the Collaboration Occurred:** Residents of Potosi, a small Wisconsin village with a population of only 726, lost library service when bookmobile visits were discontinued. The closest library, 15 miles away, was nearly inaccessible. The village’s small budget did not allow the village to operate a library independently. Cooperation with the nearby City of Lancaster enabled Potosi to construct a small branch for Lancaster’s Schreiner Memorial Library. This collaboration resulted in “one of the state’s smallest yet most highly used facilities” (ICMA, 2008, p. 12).

**Description:** The Lancaster Common Council approved the Potosi Branch Library agreement in June 2006. By 2007, the Potosi Branch library opened in the kitchen and meeting room of an old fire station. The room was remodeled (at a cost of $40,000 plus an additional $16,000 for equipment and furnishings) for use as a library, with an ADA-compliant bathroom. The project relied greatly on book donations and volunteer hours. The Village of Potosi bore the total development cost, $56,000, for establishing the library, and agreed to pay operational and utility costs. The branch library was run by a part-time librarian, working 15 hours per week. The Lancaster Library Board, responsible for hiring and training personnel and assuring the provision of adequate service, charged Potosi $2,000 for administrative service. The City of Lancaster provided accounting services and has established a separate special purpose revenue account for the Potosi Branch Library; the city also provided an annual report of expenditures from this account to the village (Schreiner, 2009).

**Outcome:** The library project has proved to be a success. The initial 3-year agreement was extended for two additional years to cover 2010-2011. Residents use the branch library. In 2007 alone, 240 library cards were issued to residents who did not have one (ICMA, 2009). Circulation at Potosi Branch Library grew from 5,077 in 2007 to 7,765 in just the first months of 2009, an increase of more than 50 percent in just two years (Schreiner, 2009).

The two communities shared the cost of the $26,000 annual operating expenses of the two libraries, allowing each to pay less than the cost of running a stand-alone library (ICMA, 2009, p. 12). The partnership allowed the small Village of Potosi to save on administrative costs and to save by hiring only a part-time library assistant instead of a full-time certified librarian. As the Schreiner Library handled all administrative services for a fee of $2,000 per year, the Village of Potosi was not saddled with having to devote the time and money on operational expenses such as library training, continuing education, and library board operations and development.

Lancaster benefited financially from the arrangement, as Wisconsin state law requires that the county help pay a local library for access by nonresidents. This meant that county funding for the Lancaster library jumped from $43,000 to $63,000 annually to help defray a portion of the city’s and the village’s cost for providing library service (Schreiner, 2009). The branch library has also helped reinforced a sense of community, with books delivered to homebound residents. The library has become a vital asset to Potosi, as the village continues to be a site of new home construction (ICMA, 2009).

**The City of Granger and the City of Wapato, Washington: Inmate-Trustees in a City Clean-up Project.** The intergovernmental agreement between the cities of Granger and Wapato provides another example of how relatively small communities can benefit by initiating innovative joint ventures. The program was a 2009 winner of an Association of Washington Cities (AWC) Excellence Award. The program was halted in March 2008 due to a change in jail contracts; however, it was reinstated in November 2009.

**Why the Collaboration Occurred:** The City of Granger has utilized inmate-trustees from the Wapato City Correctional Facility since 2005 to pick up trash, clean restrooms in the local park, help with painting and tree trimming, assist in flood clean up, and perform other labor-intensive tasks. This work performed by inmate-trustees saved the city money and allowed municipal work crews to concentrate on other projects.

**Description:** The City of Granger requested workers from Wapato on a daily basis; usually three or four
inmate-trustees per day. Granger was responsible for transporting the workers, supervising them, and providing them lunch and materials such as safety glasses, gloves, and sunscreen. Written approval was necessary if an inmate-trustee was needed to work longer than eight hours (up to a maximum of 12 hours of work per day). An inmate-trustee had the right to refuse work at any time; and Granger was then responsible for returning the worker to Wapato Correctional Facility.

**Outcome:** A five-year financial analysis of the program documented the benefit to the City of Granger was substantial. Data from the most recent three years demonstrated the cost savings. In 2007, the city utilized 539 inmate workers for a total of 3,321 hours, at an average cost to the city of $0.93 per hour plus $5.67 per meal—far below the minimum wage of $7.35 per hour. In 2008, the city utilized less inmate labor, yet the savings were still substantial: 164 workers were employed for 1,076 hours at a cost of only $0.91 per hour and $6.00 per meal. Data for the first three months of 2009 showed similar figures: an average hourly cost per to the city of only $0.76 per hour plus $6.07 per meal—again, well below the minimum wage of $8.55 (City of Granger, 2009a).

The announcement that accompanied the AWC award summed up the savings as approximately $71,720 in wages (AWC, 2009). Wapato, too, saved money as well because they did not have to feed inmate-trustees while they worked for Granger. However, the savings did not take into account the need for an additional staff person, added in 2006 to the Department of Public Works, to help supervise the inmate-trustee program (City of Granger, 2009b).

**New London, Newbury and Sunapee, New Hampshire: Property Assessment Program.** The Tri-Town Property Assessment Intergovernmental Agreement won the 2007 ICMA Community Partnership Award in the less-than-10,000 population category. The collaboration illustrated the cost saving and upgrading of services that can result when communities share administrative tasks and processes.

**Why the Collaboration Occurred:** In 2004, the towns of New London, Newbury, and Sunapee needed to reassess properties to market value, a process made more difficult as none of the communities had a full-time, professional assessor.

**Description:** The three towns standardized property assessment procedures and adopted the same appraisal software. An intergovernmental agreement created a joint property assessment department. The partners established a joint board that hired a new assessor and approved operations and budgets. The board was responsible for establishing the department’s annual operating budget, for setting compensation levels, and for instituting performance review evaluations for two assessing positions. The agreement could be renewed every three years.

The intergovernmental agreement detailed the members’ financial obligations. Newbury paid for the total cost of the department, but was compensated by the other two participating communities on a quarterly basis. The agreement also equalized assessor services. While short-term dictated that the assessor spend more time in one town as opposed to the others; the agreement stipulated a more balanced division of the assessor’s time over the long term (ICMA, 2007).

**Outcome:** The shared service arrangement produced substantial savings for each town while increasing the professionalism and effectiveness of assessment services. In 2007 alone, the agreement saved the communities $74,100 compared to the costs of operating the old system. Newbury saved an estimated $23,200; Sunapee saved $36, 317; and New London saved nearly $24,600. Service quality increased, as errors in assessment and property tax appeals both decreased. Service quality to citizens was also improved, especially compared to the old system where the towns contracted with private assessors who were not readily available to meet with citizens in response to their concerns (Bernaiche et al., 2006).

**Brown County and Villages of Howard and Allouez, Wisconsin: Police Contracting.** This Wisconsin example provides an illustration of how service contracting with the county can produce cost savings for localities in service delivery. The arrangement was cited as a “best practice” in the merger of village and township services by the University of Wisconsin-Extension (Elsass, 2003).

**Why the Collaboration Occurred:** As their populations grew, the Villages of Howard and Allouez, near the City of Green Bay, faced growing service responsibilities. The villages needed to improve law enforcement,
and confronted the problem of developing their own departments, building new police stations, purchasing equipment, and hiring police officers and staff. In order to reduce the costs, the villages decided to contract with county for police services.

**Description:** Brown County agreed to provided police/sheriff services to the Villages of Allouez and Howard on a contract basis for over 30 years. Every three years, the villages had to decide whether or not to continue the contract with the County. The County provided the officers, overall administration, and training. Officers were rotated among the communities, but officers had the ability to select community assignments based on seniority. The villages were responsible for providing the police vehicles, radios, and other equipment. Patrol cars displayed both municipal and county names. The contract specified a formula, with costs tied to the number of officers and the actual number of hours officers worked. The Village of Howard retained a degree of local control with a “right of removal” clause that gave the village the ability to remove a specific officer from service in the community. The contract contained a “dissolution” clause that allowed members to disband the agreement in case it proved unsatisfactory. The agreement also provided for a “cooling off” period of two years after governing boards vote to dissolve the arrangement (Elsass, 2003).

**Outcome:** Since the agreement was first drafted in 1970s, no community had withdrawn from the arrangement. County officials contend that spending time to attend community meetings was a critical factor in maintaining citizen support for the arrangement and for such policies as officer rotation. The collaboration allowed the villages to save a significant amount of money. Comparative figures underscore the cost savings. In 1998, residents of Allouez paid only $36 per capita and Howard paid $72 (due to the village’s demand for a greater presence of officers). In both cases, the cost was far less than the $165 per capita paid by villages statewide in Wisconsin for similar services (Elsass, 2003. p. 21). A longitudinal comparison of per capita law enforcement expenditures also shows that, compared to other villages in the state, the Brown County arrangement has contained growth in law enforcement spending (p. 22).

The collaboration also resulted in an upgrading of service. Police officers in all participating communities received training and were supported with the same technology. Brown County paid higher wages than the typical township, thus attracting more qualified employees. Officers working in the villages also had access to the county’s criminal justice information and record system. Further, the arrangement provided for back-up to the villages in terms of staff, officers, and vehicles in times of emergency, and the agreement helped Brown County take a more “unified” and coordinated approach to crime control (Elsass, 2003).

**The City of Chandler and Town of Gilbert, Arizona: Joint Water Treatment Plant.** The cities of Chandler (population 247,140) and Gilbert (population 216,449), Arizona, illustrate the potential of collaboration for large, fast growing communities. Chandler and Gilbert decided to jointly build a new water treatment plant, an important and costly operation in the water-scarce Southwest. The example points to the major cost savings that can be realized from shared infrastructure. The project won the 2008 National League of Cities Award for Municipal Excellence.

**Why the Collaboration Occurred:** Both the City of Chandler and the Town of Gilbert needed to improve water delivery and treatment—to increase the availability of drinking water—while reducing the costs of service provision in this vital area.

**Description:** In 2006, the Chandler City Council and Gilbert Town Council approved an intergovernmental agreement (IGA) for the construction and operation of a jointly owned Surface Water Treatment Plant. The plant was to be located in and operated by Gilbert. Construction occurred in two phases. The first phase supplied 12 million gallons per day (mgd) of drinking water to each community. The second phase, to be completed by 2014, will add an addition 12 mgd. Under the agreement, the two communities jointly own the plant and waterlines. Each community paid half of the construction cost and was entitled to half of the plant’s capacity. Each community also shared half of the liability (NLC, 2008).

**Outcome:** This Chandler-Gilbert partnership expanded water treatment and the availability of drinking water in the two communities. The partnership also mitigated the need to individually construct surface water plants. The agreement also saved both communities tax dollars. Chandler estimated that it saved $22 million in construction costs by not having to build its own facility.
Chandler also saved an additional $600,000 annually as a result of joint operations of the plant (League of Arizona Cities and Towns, 2009). Annual savings when Phase II comes online are estimated at $1 million.

The matrix below summarizes the case studies discussed above. The case studies range from small to large communities; from slow growth to fast growth communities; and from rural to urban and suburban communities; and from simple to complex collaborations. The cases illustrate service efficiencies, extending services, reducing costs, and improving service quality. Above all, residents and tax payers benefitted from the collaborations and each community retained its independence.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Project</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Time</th>
<th>Collaboration Partner</th>
<th>Sustain-ability</th>
<th>Set-up Cost</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Cost-savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Potosi Branch Library</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>2007</td>
<td>City of Lancaster Village of Potosi Schreiner Memorial Library Board</td>
<td>2007-2011</td>
<td>$56,000</td>
<td>Potosi: Local residents have access to library access, computer room, circulation of Potosi branch library increase 50% in 2009, compared to 2007 Lancaster: Generate more county funding to purchase more materials, or open more hours for local residents</td>
<td>Savings to library: hiring a librarian, training employees, library administration, funding increase, sustaining the library</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utilize Inmate-trustees in City Clean-up Effort</td>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>City of Granger City of Wapato</td>
<td>2005-present</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Granger: Inmate workers clean-up, so that public workers can concentrate on larger public work project</td>
<td>Savings to Granger: substantial savings on wage (average cost per hour is $0.76, compared to minimum wage in 2009, $8.55), transportation savings (the city use army-surplus truck for transportation)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Water Treatment Plant</td>
<td>Arizona</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>City of Chandler Town of Gilbert</td>
<td>2006-2014</td>
<td>$106 million</td>
<td>Chandler: A new independent surface water-the Central Arizona Project (CAP) canal, reduced the number of wells dug, increase 12 million gallons per day by June, 2009 and will increase additional 12 million by 2014, provide emergency source of water Gill: Increase water supply to meet growing demand, reduce the number of wells to dig</td>
<td>Savings to Chandler: $22 million in construction costs, $60,000 annual on maintenance and operation annual costs in Phase I, $1 million annual in operating costs on Phase II, additional savings on well drilling</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Property Assessment Program</td>
<td>New Hampshire</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>Town of New London Town of Newbury Town of Sunapee</td>
<td>2005-present</td>
<td>$213,000</td>
<td>Three towns share a full-time assessor and a full-time assessor assistant, effectiveness of service achieved by having experienced employees, errors and inaccurate assessments are reduced, property taxes are assessed fairly and equitably, residents are more satisfied and confident with the service</td>
<td>Savings: on regular assessment tasks, legal costs of requests for abatements, general assessing issues requiring legal advice for each town, evaluation/statistical update, administrative cost</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$75,000 total cost savings for three towns</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$75,000 total cost savings for three towns (Newbury save $23,199, New London $24,592, Sunapee $26,317)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Police Service</td>
<td>Wisconsin</td>
<td>1972-1976</td>
<td>Brown County Village of Allouez Village of Howard</td>
<td>30 Years</td>
<td>N/A</td>
<td>Villages: uniform and extensive training of officers, back-up personnel, vehicles, and officers, experienced Investigative Division available, computerized records processing maintained at the county level; County: greater law enforcement consistency, fewer individual communications systems, creation of a larger employee pool to draw from for specialization, emergency officer backups with consistent policies and procedures</td>
<td>Savings: on maintain individual departments, different level of supervision, hiring administrative and support staff, training</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1998: Wisconsin village per capita spending for law enforcement was approximately $165. In Allouez, it was about $36 per person, and in Howard, it was $72</td>
<td>1998: Wisconsin village per capita spending for law enforcement was approximately $165. In Allouez, it was about $36 per person, and in Howard, it was $72</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
SECTION 3

Impediments to Collaboration in Ohio: A Survey and Discussion with Public Officials

This section of the local government collaboration report provides quantitative data from an email survey of Ohio local officials and qualitative data from two focus groups conducted with local officials in southeast and southwest Ohio. Section 3 begins with a brief review of prior surveys that collected information about local government collaboration. Next, the research team provides technical information about the survey that was conducted and then summarizes the results from the survey. Section 3 concludes with details and findings from the two focus groups.

Prior Surveys of Local Government Collaboration

Broad shared or collaborative service surveys were found in New Jersey and Wisconsin. Special surveys were found for information technology services and, as mentioned above in Section 1, we review the Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission survey of member governments.

In 2006, the State of New Jersey’s Division of Local Government Services conducted a statewide email survey of shared services among municipalities. All 566 municipalities in New Jersey received the survey. Mayors, other elected officials, or top administrators responded to the survey. Participation was voluntary, not mandatory. The Division received 545 responses to questions that asked about: “Services received and provided by/to other municipalities;” “Description of Shared Services;” “Provider Agency;” “Recipient Agency;” “Year Started;” “Estimated Annual Savings;” and “Formal/Informal Collaboration.” Local governments essentially filled in blank boxes with the above headings. In addition, local officials were asked if they received “special shared programs” that included public works equipment, geographic information systems, internet services, public health services or 9-1-1 or emergency dispatch services. Responses showed a great deal of shared services among the local governments. Collaboration existed in different areas, such as parks and recreation, police services, animal control, water treatment, road maintenance, fire services, and code enforcement among many others. Collaboration partners included counties, cities, townships and villages; however, the data base we obtained did not provide information about annual savings or when the agreements started.

Also in 2006, the Public Policy Forum (located in the City of Milwaukee) conducted a survey of local government shared service agreements throughout the seven county area in southeastern Wisconsin. The Forum invited all county executives or administrators, city mayors or managers, village presidents or administrators, and town clerks to participate in an online survey. The total population surveyed was 175 individuals, and researchers received 63 valid responses (26 towns, 24 villages, 10 cities and 3 counties) to the survey. The respondents identified fifteen types of shared services and 145 different shared service agreements. On average, each respondent had 4.8 agreements with 3.4 partners. Among the shared services, 78% listed fire protection, 69% emergency services, 51% library services, 37% law enforcement, 34% animal control, 22% public health and 16% recreation and culture. Social services such as youth and human services, and public housing were seldom shared. As in New Jersey, very few respondents were able to provide real numbers when asked about cost savings as a result of their agreement.

In 2007, Government Technology magazine conducted a survey of shared services for information technology or IT. The target population was state and local technology decision-makers. The entire population was the sample; a total 16,710 surveys were been sent out. Only 220 responses were received from all levels of government: 34% from states; 23% from cities; 14% from counties, 6% from public higher education institutions; 3% from school districts, 3% from special districts, and the remaining number from “other.” The survey had 13 questions. Twelve of them are multiple choices and one was an open-ended question. Questions ask about issues related to implementing a shared IT service, service providers, functions that the organizations perform on a shared service basis, factors that influence decisions to share services, barriers to shared services, and others. The findings pointed out that 50% of state and local executives were interested in, or planned, or implemented shared services. However, 31% respondents also indicated that they did not know what shared services meant and 18% respondents would not consider sharing services. Email, portal, web applications and web services were
most frequently functions that organizations performed under a shared service basis. Cost savings was the major factor influencing shared services, and cost was the principle barrier to shared services.

Browne Jacobson conducted research of shared services in the United Kingdom (UK) in 2008. One hundred seventy eight public sector managers were asked to participate in the survey. The sample was drawn from UK’s health, local authorities, and social care, education, and fire services sectors. Interviewees were senior (113) and middle (65) managers. The survey had 68 questions that asked about how public sectors define shared services, functions that organizations considered appropriate for sharing, key drivers of shared service, barriers and risks to plans to implement shared services and financial challenges. Respondents identified cost efficiencies as a key driver of shared services. The top barriers included financial challenges, lack of sufficient accountability between partners, legal regulation, inadequate communication and consultation with staff, employees’ fear of job losses, disagreement and lack of cooperation in long-term project. The report also provides suggestions on how to overcome the risks of shared services.

Finally, the Hamilton County Regional Planning Commission sent a survey to members in 2005. Seventeen of the Commission’s 49 members responded to the survey: 13 municipalities and 4 townships. The commission asked five questions:

1. Does your community cooperate with other jurisdictions to provide service? If so, what are these services and which communities?
2. Does your community cooperate with other jurisdictions on programs that reduce administrative or capital costs?
3. Has your community privatized any services? If so, what are those services?
4. Have you estimated or documented the cost saving of any joint service or programs? If so, what are the savings?
5. What other services would your community consider collaborating with others to provide?

The seventeen respondents most identified solid waste management, property maintenance, fire and EMS services, and police. Health insurance was another common shared service. The report stated “many communities achieved substantial cost savings through their agreements;” however, only two examples were provided (this information was cited in Section 1).

The above surveys were used to design the Ohio survey. Details follow below.

**Ohio Survey of Collaborative Services**

Wright State University’s Center for Urban and Public Affairs (CUPA) used two separate methods—an email survey and focus groups—to gain insight from Ohio local officials about collaborative service and the barriers to future collaboration. Appendix 2 provides the text of the survey and Appendices 3 -5 provide data on questions and open-ended responses. The focus group questions and a record of participants’ responses can be found in Appendices 6 and 7.

An electronic survey was sent to county, municipal (city and village) and township elected and administrative officials. Personal contact information for our population was collected from there sources: the Ohio City/County Management Association; the Center for Public Management and Regional Affairs provided Ohio township administrators and trustees information; and the County Commissioners Association of Ohio. The databases often lacked email contact information and therefore CUPA obtained additional information from the Ohio Secretary of State. In total, 1,924 e-mail addresses were collected and questionnaires were sent to all of the addresses. Ten percent of the addresses were not valid or could not be delivered.

The questionnaire contained twenty questions: eleven questions pertaining to the use of collaboration to deliver services, barriers to collaboration and the benefits and cost savings of collaboration; six demographic questions; two very detailed questions about specifics of informal and formal collaboration; and an open-ended “comments” question. A letter accompanied the survey that explained the purpose of the survey and provided a definition of collaboration. The questionnaire provided definitions of formal and informal collaboration:

**Definition:** Formal agreements include contracts approved by elected officials or signed agreements with two or more local governments.
Definition: *Informal agreements* may be practices or agreements achieved through a handshake. They depend upon persons occupying local government positions.

An analysis of the responses follows below.

**Demographics of Survey Respondents**

Figure 5 displays the number of responses we received from each county. The largest percentage of respondents represented townships (49.3%). Nearly a quarter of the respondents (22.9%) represented cities, 19.0% represented villages, and the remaining 8.6% represented county governments. By region, Southwest local officials returned 111 questionnaires followed by 101 from the Northeast, 93 from the Northwest, 84 from central and 25 from the Southeast. Jurisdictions within metropolitan areas responded more frequently than non-metropolitan areas. Metro area counties that accounted for 10 or more respondents included Butler, Clermont, Cuyahoga, Delaware, Fairfield, Franklin, Greene, Hamilton, Licking, Montgomery, Stark Summit and Warren counties. Franklin County officials returned the most questionnaires (20) followed by Hamilton County (19) and Montgomery County (18). Fourteen counties did not return questionnaires.

**Figure 5: Respondents to the Survey by County**
The jurisdictions that returned questionnaires can also be analyzed by population. Figure 6 below categorized the responses as follows: 45.0% of the responding communities had populations of less than 5,000 people; 17.5% had populations of 5,000 to 9,999 people; 13.0% had populations of 10,000-14,999 people; 7.3% had populations of 15,000-24,999 people; 9.8% had populations of 25,000-49,999 people; 3.5% had populations of 50,000-99,999 people; and 4.0% had populations of 100,000 or more people.

Nearly three-fourths of the respondents were elected officials and one-quarter were administrators (72.0% vs. 24.1%, while 3.9% identified themselves as “other”). Respondents most commonly reported office tenure of 5 to 10 years (32.9% had this length of tenure in their “current office”), while 32.5% had worked in their current office for less than 5 years. The remaining 34.6% worked in their current office for over 10 years.

Beyond describing the characteristics of respondents to the survey, demographic information has been used below to add depth to the analysis. Demographics will be added to the analysis when differences among groups are statistically significant at the 0.01 level. The analysis tested the data using a statistic to determine if the differences in the data were due to random error or due to factors such as size of the community. The .01 number means that there is only 1% chance that the differences in the data we report are due to random error. This stringent threshold was selected to counter lower sample sizes.

![Figure 6: Survey Response by Jurisdiction Size](image-url)
Perceptions of Collaboration

From Figure 7 below, it can be seen that most counties, cities, villages, and townships in Ohio—52.5%—reported formal and/or informal collaborative agreements with at least one other local government. In fact, only 7.7% of the local governments reported that they did not have formal or informal agreements with other jurisdictions. Over one-quarter (27.7%) had at least one or more formal collaborative agreements; while 12.2% had one or more informal collaborative agreements.

Townships and villages were more likely to report that they have no formal or informal collaborative agreements (10.3% and 8.8%, respectively vs. 5.6% for counties and 2.1% for cities). Similarly, counties were more likely to report that they have both formal and informal agreements (75.0% vs. 59.4% of cities, 53.8% of villages, and 44.6% of townships). Furthermore, communities with larger populations are more likely to have both formal and informal collaborative agreements. For example, representatives serving communities with 50,000 or more people were two times more likely to say they have both formal and informal agreements as representatives serving communities with less than 5,000 (85.7% vs. 41.6%). On the other side of that coin, 28.1% of representatives serving the smallest communities said they have either informal or no collaborative agreements vs. 0% of representatives serving communities with over 100,000 people.
Overall, 19.8% of local governments in Ohio—or 1 in 5 jurisdictions—have only informal or no collaborative agreements with other jurisdictions. The most common reason given for having no formal or informal collaborative agreements was that there were too many barriers to doing so. While only 9.2% of respondents provided this reason, it was still the most common reason. Barriers were studied according to whether they were internal or external barriers to the organization, and whether the barriers were different for formal and informal agreements.

In general, more than half of the jurisdictions reported no internal or external barriers to informal or formal collaborations. Figure 8 below displays this finding. The figure also indicates that there are fewer concerns for barriers to informal than formal collaboration. Interestingly, tenure played a role in the responses. Two-thirds (67.9%) of those with longer tenure in their positions indicated that there were no external barriers to formal collaboration vs. 46.7% of those with less than 5 years who said that there were no barriers. Furthermore, elected officials were more likely than administrators to say there were no barriers to formal collaboration than administrators (56.2% vs. 37.0%, respectively).

Regarding formal collaboration, the most common barrier internal to the organization was the perception that formal collaboration reduced control over service delivery. This response had two times more prevalence than any other response to the barrier question.
Representatives of cities were more likely than others to cite this concern (30.2%). Organizing the state into five regions—Central, Northeast, Northwest, Southeast and Southwest—showed that a significantly higher percentage of representatives in Southwest Ohio were concerned that collaboration reduced control over service delivery (13.4% vs. 9.6%, 4.8%, 4.0%, and 1.0% in the Northwest, Central, Southeast, and Northeast regions).

It should be noted that cities were more than two times as likely to be concerned that formal collaboration threatened their employees (19.8% vs. 7.2%, 3.8%, and 2.8% for townships, villages and counties, respectively). And larger communities (e.g., communities with 50,000 to 99,999 people) were more likely to be concerned that collaboration threatened employees than smaller ones (21.4% vs. 4-14% for all others) with the exception of communities with 10,000-14,999 people (23.1%).

The most common external barrier to formal collaboration was “other” (19.1%), indicating that there was greater variation in the reasons for external barriers than internal barriers. “Other” comments included, the complexity of navigating both the legal and the territorial (turf) obstacles, Ohio Revised Code is often too restrictive, problems of partnering with other governmental structures, politics, and smaller jurisdictions feel threatened that their collaboration will result in a reduction in their budget and control, and a loss in identity. Survey respondents also cited the possible reduction in state fiscal assistance such as revenue transfers (10.1%), possible reduction in state program assistance such as road maintenance (10.6%), possible reduction in federal program assistance (8.2%), and possible reduction in federal fiscal assistance (7.1%).

Responses were also organized according to their host county typology—Metropolitan, Rural Appalachian, Rural, and Suburban. Rural Appalachian communities were two times more concerned with reductions in federal and state program assistance, such as road construction or maintenance, than any other community type (21.2% vs. 11.5%, 7.3%, and 2.2% for Rural, Suburban, and Metropolitan communities, respectively).

Demographics also revealed that representatives with shorter tenure, such as those who have worked in their current offices for less than 5 years, were more concerned with formal collaboration leading to reductions in state fiscal assistance (15.6% vs. 13.1%, 3.3%, and 2.4% for those with 5-10 years, 11-15 years, and over 15 years of experience, respectively). In fact, those with less tenure were consistently more concerned about negative reaction from collaboration than those with longer tenure.

In regards to informal collaboration, the most common barrier – internal to the organization – was the same as for formal collaboration, “Collaboration reduces control over service delivery.” However, only 8.9% of respondents cited this. All in all, 39.8% of respondents said there were internal barriers to informal collaboration and the responses were distributed fairly evenly across concerns that collaboration threatened employees (4.9%), required too much time and effort (5.2%), sacrificed control over procurement of goods and services (5.9%), did not really save tax payer dollars (6.6%), other (8.2%), and reduced control over service delivery (8.9%).

Responses regarding external barriers to informal collaboration were also distributed across a broad range of reasons. For example, nearly 1 in 10 said that an external barrier to informal collaboration was the reduction in state fiscal assistance (8.2%). Other concerns included the possible reduction in state program assistance (7.1%), federal program assistance (5.9%), and reduction in federal fiscal assistance (5.4%). Another 12.7% of respondents cited “other” reasons such as politics, restrictive statutes and legal issues, collective bargaining agreements, and fear.

All in all, the most common internal barrier to formal and informal collaboration was the concern that collaboration reduced control over service delivery. Yet, while that is the most common reason, it was not selected by a large proportion of respondents. The variation of reasons regarding external barriers was even greater than for internal barriers.
Perceptions of Residents’ Views about Collaboration

Local government officials were asked to identify the barriers, if any, to informal or formal collaboration from the viewpoint of local residents. Most local governments in the survey believed that collaboration may cause residents to be confused about whom to hold accountable for services (51.1%). Many (33.9%) believed that collaboration may cause citizens to be less supportive of future tax levies. Over one-quarter (27.3%) thought that collaboration may cause residents to believe that their needs were not being met. A smaller percentage (7.5%) thought that collaboration may cause residents to be less involved in local government.

Reviewing results for all demographic cohorts uncovered that only length of tenure significantly affected perceptions of residents’ views of collaboration. Respondents with less than 5 years or 5 to 10 years in their current position were about two times as likely to perceive that collaboration may cause residents to believe their needs were not being met (35.6% and 31.4%, respectively vs. 16.7% for those with 10+ years).

Benefits that Interlocal Governmental Collaboration can Produce

Moving beyond the discussion of barriers, local governments were asked to indicate the benefits that could be produced by interlocal governmental collaboration. Nearly all respondents (96.5%) cited benefits while 3.5% reported no benefits to such collaboration. Figure 9 below presents the benefits cited, from most common to least. The three top reasons pertain to service delivery.

Several demographic variables had a bearing on responses. For example, in Figure 10 it can be seen that respondents that represented county level governments were more likely to indicate that increased service quality was a benefit of collaboration (86.1% vs. 65.6%, 56.5%, and 56.3% of cities, townships, and villages, respectively). Counties were also more likely to say that improved policy decision making is a benefit (44.5% vs. 17.5% among those who represent villages, e.g.). Representatives of counties and cities are also more likely than representatives of townships and villages to perceive that a benefit to collaboration can be a reduced need for additional tax revenues (63.9% and 66.7% vs. 44.0% and 51.3%, respectively). Townships were the least likely to believe that collaboration can increase economic growth or reduce duplication in services. For example, 85.4% of City representatives believed that collaboration can reduce duplicated services while 58.0% of Township representatives thought so.

Responses regarding benefits to collaboration were influenced by whether the respondent represents a large or small community. When asked if coordination among local governments for programming was a benefit of collaboration, 100% of the largest communities believed that, but only 54.4% of the smallest communities did. Similarly, over 80% of larger communities believed that coordination could reduce the duplication of services while 57.8% of the smallest communities believed that. More administrators than elected officials believed that collaboration could reduce the duplication of services (81.0% vs. 62.9%). Interestingly, the belief that coordination could increase economic growth, in relation to the size of the community, had a bell-shaped curve, with representatives of communities with 10,000-14,999 people being more likely to believe that was a benefit than other communities.

Length of tenure, again, had a bearing on responses. Those with more tenure were more likely to perceive that collaboration benefited coordination. For example, those with longer tenure were more likely to say that collaboration could improve responsiveness to residents’ needs (62.8% vs. 47.7% of those with less than 5 years of tenure); could provide coordination among local governments for programming (75.6% vs. 52.3%); and could reduce duplicate services (79.1% vs. 53.8%). Among county types, those responding from metropolitan counties were more likely to believe that collaboration could reduce the need for additional taxes (62.7% vs. 53.2%, 48.1%, and 38.5% for suburban, rural Appalachian, and rural counties, respectively).
Figure 9: Benefits from Interlocal Governmental Collaboration

Benefits from Interlocal Governmental Collaboration

- Reduce service delivery costs (efficiency) - 68.0%
- Reduce duplication of services - 67.1%
- Provide coordination among local governments... - 66.1%
- Improve service quality (effectiveness) - 60.7%
- Bring additional expertise to local problem solving - 57.4%
- Increase economic growth - 54.6%
- Improve our responsiveness to our resident’s... - 54.4%
- Reduce the need for additional tax revenues - 52.0%
- Produce more equality in service delivery - 31.8%
- Improve policy decision making - 26.4%
- Other - 5.6%

Figure 10: Benefits of Collaboration by Jurisdiction

Benefits of Collaboration by Jurisdiction Type

- Increase service quality - County: 86.1%, City: 56.6%, Township: 56.5%, Village: 56.3%
- Improve policy decision making - County: 44.4%, City: 36.5%, Township: 21.7%, Village: 17.5%
- Reduce need for additional tax revenues - County: 63.9%, City: 44.0%, Township: 51.3%, Village: 66.7%
- Increase economic growth - County: 75.0%, City: 42.5%, Township: 69.8%, Village: 60.0%
- Reduce duplicated services - County: 80.6%, City: 85.4%, Township: 58.0%, Village: 63.8%
**Current Collaborative Efforts**

Next, respondents were provided with a list of service areas in which jurisdictions might collaborate. Local government officials were asked to identify if their jurisdiction had a formal or informal collaborative agreement to provide each service, and if so, with whom and how long this agreement had been in place. Figure 11 provides a chart of this data.

Respondents were most likely to identify formal collaborations related to fire and emergency medical services, specifically fire (62.0 %), EMS (54.1 %) and emergency dispatch (44.0%). Additionally, respondents indicated collaborations for police services (34.2%), water (32.1%), planning (32.1%), and economic development (31.5%). Respondents indicated that they were most likely to partner with townships (51.6% of fire collaborations, 41.0% of EMS collaborations). However, jurisdictions were most likely to partner with county governments (37.0 %) for dispatch services. When looking at other examples, such as water services, planning, tax collection, and economic development, respondents from all jurisdictions (not just townships) were most likely to partner with county governments to provide this service.

When asked to discuss informal collaborations that their jurisdiction participated in, considerably fewer respondents indicated such partnerships (as opposed to formal collaborations). The highest percentage of respondents (15.5 %) indicated that they had informal partnerships related to road maintenance (e.g. share salt or share equipment). Fire (14.4%) and EMS (12.8%)
had the next highest percentage of responses, with most communities indicating that they have informal mutual aid agreements with neighboring jurisdictions. Figure 12 below profiles the percentage of respondents who selected each option.

**Additional Comments**

Finally, respondents were provided with a space in which to include open-ended comments related to local government collaboration. Many comments—please see Appendix 5—were supportive of collaboration and cited examples of jurisdictions working collaboratively. Several comments were made regarding using townships as a model, as several respondents felt townships do a good job of working collaboratively with county and city governments.

Concerns expressed in the open-ended comments primarily dealt with the loss of identity of their jurisdiction if too many of their services were shared with neighboring jurisdictions, or fear that their jurisdiction (mainly townships) would be eliminated as part of an agreement. Other respondents expressed apprehension as to whether collaborative services would meet the needs of residents as well as the current level of service.

---

**Figure 12: Informal Collaboration Agreements with Other Local Governments**

![Bar chart showing informal collaboration agreements with other local governments.](image-url)
**Southeast and Southwest Ohio Focus Groups**

Focus groups were conducted in two regions: Southeast and Southwest Ohio. The data from the Southeast focus group was collected and analyzed by the Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs at Ohio University. This data helps supplement views of local officials from Southeast Ohio where survey returns were much lower than the rest of the state.

**Focus Group Method**

Fourteen local elected officials and chief administrators representing counties, townships and municipalities in Southwest Ohio participated in focused discussion on collaboration. The discussion was facilitated by two graduate students and observed by two of the three co-principal investigators. There were representatives from counties, townships and municipalities. The jurisdictions participating ranged in population from 5,103 to 534,626. Complete results from this focus group can be found in Appendix 6. In Southeast Ohio, a focused discussion on collaboration was conducted with a different composition of participants using identical questions. Six of the participants were local officials, three participants were representatives from state agencies, and one participant was a representative from the Voinovich School. Complete results for this focus group can be found in Appendix 7.

**Defining Collaboration: A Positive Alternative to Consolidation**

Participants were initially asked to define collaboration. Local officials defined collaboration in terms of “partnership,” “working together,” “mutual beneficial relationships,” “sharing common resources,” achieving efficiencies, and “banding together for a common interest.” They were clear that consolidation was not collaboration. They viewed collaboration as “a more positive alternative” to consolidation.

The officials also saw limits to collaboration. They argued that they cooperated extensively across local boundaries “when it makes sense.” They saw “mandated collaboration” as quite different, meaning less desirable, from voluntary collaboration.

**The Virtues of Collaboration: Efficiencies Win Support from Residents**

Officials were asked about what was positive about collaboration among local governments. Participants saw the virtues of collaboration primarily in terms of efficiency: “economies of scale,” “cost savings,” “cost sharing,” the “removal of “redundancies,” and “resources sharing” (e.g., wastewater treatment). Interlocal arrangements can allow for the “full utilization of resources,” for instance, by having communities in the region jointly utilize an existing sewage processing plant that has excess capacity.

Collaboration enabled the building of better interlocal relationships, as both managers and elected officials from various jurisdictions meet and begin to work together. Cooperation enabled a community to tap the skills and expertise of its neighbors. A collaborative culture could reduce mistrust and misunderstanding and even costly litigation.

Collaboration was also seen as helpful to a community’s efforts to secure outside grant monies. Some communities found it difficult to compete for grant dollars due to the application process or terms of the grant. The managers expressed the opinion that “residents will support cooperation” that result in the provision of more or higher-quality services, “services you would not be able to provide if you were not sharing the costs.” There were concerns, too, that citizens had to be brought into the process for collaboration to succeed. Voters were often distrustful of change and loss of community control. Local resident also feared that their locality could be the “loser” in a new cooperative arrangement. Voter support for collaboration could be obtained but was it was not automatic. Local leaders had to educate citizens about collaboration and demonstrate the savings and other benefits of a particular cooperative venture.

**Where Collaboration Takes Place—and Where Collaboration Is Less Common**

The local managers were asked to review their successful collaborations and where they saw future opportunities for collaboration. Their responses indicated that shared or joint action—collaborative efforts—were largely concentrated in a few service areas:

- Administrative services, grant writing services, systems maintenance services, and training programs (joint purchasing agreements; centralized dispatch services);
• Joint income tax collection administration; public access television; building inspections; road maintenance personnel; Physical/infrastructure provision and provision of expensive equipment (i.e. water provision; wastewater treatment; offices; trash and snow removal; road maintenance);
• Insurance pools and risk management;
• Specialized services: Communities cannot on their own afford to provide quality response in areas, such as the operation of SWAT teams, that necessitate specialized skills;
• Agreements to back up one another’s protective services and information technology.

In each of these areas, the cost savings and efficiency gains were “obvious.” There was a much weaker history of collaborative action in the provision of social services (although cooperative arrangements do exist in such program areas as dealing with domestic violence). While collaboration for economic development was also mentioned, it did not receive the same emphasis that was given shared infrastructure services; indicating, perhaps, a degree of local competitiveness. Local leaders acknowledged the Dayton region’s innovative ED/GE program but still expressed concerns regarding tax sharing.

Negative Aspects of, and Barriers to, Collaboration

The participants were also asked what was negative about collaboration and barriers to collaboration. Local officials were quite aware of the difficulties that often stand in the way of arranging more complex and formal collaboration: the fears of a loss of local control in regional arrangements; the perception by some residents that its locality is the “loser” in a new cooperative arrangement; a lowering of the quality of services as compared to the standard that residents are accustomed to receiving under local service provision. Residents were also distrustful of entering into a joint arrangement, especially when there were “negative perceptions of other communities.” Oftentimes, residents simply may not want to have services delivered by some other local government; for example, the county instead of the locality. Some residents might also perceive a loss to their local identity. At times, attempts at collaboration could also lead to expensive legal fights.

The sharing of equipment can create a barrier when there is an equal demand and urgency for a particular type of equipment (e.g. snow plows). Insurance and liability is another potential barrier to equipment sharing. Multiple operators and frequent use of equipment may result in reduced equipment life. The devaluation of equipment by each user should be calculated when determining the loss of value. The sharing of equipment operators also can be difficult between cities and villages due to union pay scale.

Forced cooperation can even result in lost efficiency, as bigger can also be more bureaucratic, less responsive to citizens, and more open to ratcheting-up of wages and benefits. The local officials saw public service unions as a particularly difficult barrier to collaboration. Local workers fearful that consolidation or joint action could jeopardize their job position can raise a storm of protest, as evidence of the controversy that engulfed Montgomery County’s effort to merge 9-1-1 emergency call centers in the region. New interlocal service arrangement can entail the “merging of union contracts,” which one local official deemed a “nightmare.” The unions were the first topic that local administrators raised when asked to discuss the barriers to collaboration.

The self-interest of local officials, both elected and appointed, and the protection of local offices and “turf,” too, at times can undermine new collaborative actions. A candidate seeking local office may seek to win votes by promising to preserve local authority and identity and upon gaining office the official will be locked in by election promises and will find it difficult to support collaborative agreements.

The Ohio Revised Code (ORC) was mentioned as a special source of frustration as its requirements (as well as those of municipal charters) at times barred localities from engaging in specific collaborative actions. The different state statutes governing the authority of municipalities and townships, including their reliance on different forms of taxation, served to give communities quite different perspectives as to the desirability of establishing partnerships and committing to particular development projects. Larger regional efforts that cross county lines increased the difficulty of developing collaborative arrangements.
Overcoming the Barriers to Collaboration, with Special Emphasis on the State’s Role

When jurisdictions can no longer afford to maintain separate and high-quality services, they turn to joint service provision. As one official explained, “economic necessity” leads local leaders to seek joint service arrangements even when proposed collaborations are difficult. “Incrementalism” also helped to produce future collaboration. For example, an initial cooperative success in a small venture could help pave the way for more extensive future partnerships. The local managers discussed a number of more specific reforms at the state level to support regionalism:

• The Need for the State of Ohio to Reinforce Regional Identities. The local officials emphasized the importance of clear state action in supporting regionalism. Why, they argued, should local governments take seriously the more difficult efforts at collaboration when that State has not “cleaned its own house,” as state departments continue to operate in silos and do not cooperate with one another on a regional basis. The State, through its own actions, needs to demonstrate collaboration and give stronger identity to urban regions, if the State expects localities to give similar priority to regional action.

• Changing Local Tax Authority to Strengthen the Interest in Joint Action. The local managers were insistent that state legislators needed to make changes in both the ORC and in city charters to allow for greater regional action. Townships cannot gain income tax revenues while municipalities, a situation that also leads to conflicting perspectives as to who will be the “winner” and “loser” in a partnership arrangement.

• Relaxing Prevailing Wage and Binding Arbitration Provisions. The managers identified the State’s prevailing wage requirements as a barrier to collaboration, that a locality is often reluctant to enter into a new joint service arrangement if it entails bringing up wages to the “prevailing wage” levels. They suggested that the State modify the law to exempt new collaborations from prevailing wage requirements, a reform that the managers recognized would be politically difficult to enact. They urged SERB to make changes in collective bargaining requirements.

The managers also sought relief from requirements for binding arbitration, requirements that they saw as driving up future costs and hence an impediment in communities getting together to arrange innovative police and fire collaborations.

• State Incentive to Award Local Risk-Taking in Establishing Collaborations. The managers were in agreement as to the importance of state funding, that the State needed to “reward risks,” to reward those communities where officials undertook the risks of extending collaborations to more difficult-to-arrange areas.

The managers saw the State as primarily pursuing a different path toward interlocal collaboration—punitive actions that withdraw assistance to localities that refuse to form collaborative arrangements. The local managers saw the punitive approach as the equivalent of a mandate and a loss of local control.

Officials in Southeast Ohio indicated that assistance in grant writing, municipal planning, and energy audits would be helpful. Training session in human resources issues was also identified as being helpful for both public employees and elected officials.

• Changes in ODOT, ODOD, Ohio Department of Taxation, and Ohio EPA. The managers were critical of the lack of timely responsiveness of the ODOT to their requests. They argued that the necessity of top-down approvals for roadway projects reflected a degree of state control that inhibited the ability of localities to get together and organize their own cooperative actions in road construction and maintenance. ODOT was seen as too “bureaucratic” in an approach that lengthened the required time and costs of establishing cooperation. ODOT has equipment and resources that could be utilized by local entities.

The managers similarly argued that ODOD needed to streamline its response, as delays...
often frustrated local managers who attempted to work with employers to keep jobs from moving to Indiana and other competitor states.

The managers saw the Department of Taxation as slow to approve the creation of TIFs, hurting the quick responsiveness needed to retain jobs in Ohio.

Ohio EPA mandates for collaboration often lack supporting incentives or penalties. For instance, EPA mandates shared water but does not seek to compensate communities that abandon wells for joint water provision. Nor does the agency compel communities to share water when surplus capacity exists; hence, despite the agency’s state commitment to collaboration, a community still has the ability to build its own water (or sewage processing) plant rather than share the costs of an existing facility.

Regional Tax Sharing and the Matter of Urban Townships. According to the local managers, if the State were serious about creating a true “regional mind set,” it should demonstrate its commitment by enacting some form of regional tax sharing, especially for schools, and eliminating the autonomy of the larger urban townships. One participant suggested a “trigger” mechanism; when a township reached a certain size, it would automatically become a municipality with new service responsibilities and taxing authority, or it would have to seek merger with an existing municipality.

Modifying Local Term Limits. Interestingly, the discussion also raised the possibility that local term limits served to reduce interlocal cooperation. Term-limited officials lack the tenure in office necessary to build relationships based on trust with officials in other communities in a region.

In conclusion, local governments are engaged in many different kinds of collaborations that were not identified in Section 1. For local governments taking part in the focus groups, collaboration is a way of life. Collaboration allows local jurisdictions to provide more efficient and effective services. Collaboration also provides local residents access to services that may not be provided otherwise.
SECTION 4

Ohio: The State Role in Local Collaborations

State policy that promotes increased local collaborations is an idea whose time has come. The interest in service sharing and innovative local collaborative arrangements now extends beyond a few state capitols in the United States to other developed democracies. As noted in Section 1 and 2 the UK too is searching for ways to encourage shared services across all levels of government (Entwistle and Martin, 2005; Browne Jacobson, 2008). Further, in 2008, the authors of this report hosted a group of local practitioners, elected officials and private sector leaders from Umeå, Sweden who were searching for new ways to lower local government costs without reducing service quality.

Just what broad steps then can the State of Ohio initiate in order to increase local collaboration? The following recommendations are based on the evidence presented in this report and to some degree on prior research the authors have conducted on “fractured government in Ohio” (2009) and the potential of shared or merged services for a “creative” City of Dayton and surrounding communities (2006).

#1 The State of Ohio has a vital role to play in helping to pay for local feasibility studies that can help document the savings to be gained from a new service sharing agreements and other collaborative arrangements. The critical nature of consultant studies in helping localities initiate new collaborations was not only cited by the Ohio officials we interviewed; the University of Wisconsin-Extension Local Government Center highlighted it as its first recommendation in its list of recommended “best practices” for interlocal local cooperation (Elsass, 2003). A consultant’s study can prove essential in helping member governments to reach an agreement as to how to fairly apportion costs of a shared service and how costs apportionment can equitably be made the reflect a locality’s population size and service needs: “Organizations often need help form an independent third party to help calculate costs and forge a workable and acceptable funding formula” (Smith, Henschel, and Lefeber, 2008). A consultant’s study may also highlight just how similar regional arrangements are governed elsewhere, helping member governments to come to an agreement as just what constitutes a fair and effective governing structure for their new collaboration.

The merit of this recommendation will be tested soon as feasibility studies support by the Ohio Department of Development (ODOD) grants in 2008 reach completion. ODOD made fourteen grants to local collaborations dealing with a broad range of services across the state.

#2 State grants can help communities with one-time startup costs, short-run costs that are a barrier to establishing new collaborative arrangements that save money in the long run. A $600,000 New York State “Local Government Efficiency Grant” helped the Village of Millbrook and the Town of Washington to develop a single water and sewer system, with the grant helping to pay for the engineering and remediation activities required for joint operation (New York Governor, 2009).

The costs of initiating a service consolidation further means that many new service sharing arrangements will not save money in their first year or two, especially where new investment is needed to build capacity. Instead of looking for “instantaneous” savings, a state will do well to judge the success of collaboration over a period of three to five years or even longer (Elsass, 2003, p. 10).

This recommendation will also be tested by grants recently made by Northeast Ohio’s Fund for Our Economic Future.

#3 State grants can help spur the establishment of regional collaborations that include a number of local partners, helping municipalities to move into larger-scale partnerships that entail more than simple cooperation with their immediate neighbors. As we have seen, local governments are often quite willing to enter into cooperative agreements with one or a select few neighboring communities. Arrangements that encompass a larger area, especially those that encompass the entire region, by contrast, are not very easy to
form. The greater the number of independent local units involved, the less the tendency for voluntary cooperative arrangements to be effectively organized. State support is needed for regional cooperation. The State will likely be necessary if localities are going to be able to move beyond ad hoc cooperation to more extensive regional partnerships.

This recommendation too will be tested by ODOD’s feasibility study grants. Seven the grants involved eight or more communities that were seeking regional solutions for service delivery. For example, Ashland County is investing the feasibility of a county wide high-speed internet services; Lorain County will study storm water management plan that will meet state and federal laws; and Greene, Miami and Montgomery counties and their local governments will study the feasibility of a regional economic and workforce development program.

#4 The State should consider awards to regional-based nongovernmental organizations, not just local units of government, for the purposes of promoting more extensive collaborations. As New Jersey’s experience has shown, private economic organizations can be a catalyst for promoting joint action involving a number of local government partners at the county or regional level. As the Fund for Our Economic Fund in Northeast Ohio demonstrates, business-led public-private partnerships have a record of success in organizing collaborative actions that can cut costs, foster service efficiency and develop plans aimed at regional economic transformation and growth. Ohio’s economic growth too could be served by public-private partnerships on a regional level.

In an effort to encourage local government collaboration in Northeast Ohio, the Fund for Our Economic Future, a collaboration of members across all sectors, contributed $300,000 to be given out to three local government collaborations in Northeast Ohio that promote cost savings and efficiency.

Local governments participated in a competitive grant process, where after a public vote; $300,000 was awarded among three collaborations. After starting with 65 abstracts, the pool of applicants narrowed to 39 submitted full proposals. Of those 39 proposals, nine were selected to participate in the public vote.

The “Rollin’ on the River: Mahoning River Corridor Redevelopment Project” was first in the public vote and received $57,451 for their collaboration project. This project is collaboration among nine local communities (Lowellville, Struthers, Campbell, Youngstown, Girard, McDonald, Niles, Warren, and Newton Falls) to create a website that will enhance economic competitiveness and more efficiently use local government resources. Currently, property information on community websites is lacking and the costs for each community to maintain and create a website with all pertinent information is large. Through collaboration, these communities will save have a one time savings of $24,721 and a recurring savings of $6,750 per community.

The second place collaboration was the Westshore Regional Fire District Project among Cuyahoga and Lorain Counties, which received $100,000. This collaboration is among seven communities (Bay Village, Fairview Park, Lakewood, North Olmsted, North Ridgeville, Rocky River, and Westlake) to create a regional fire district. This fire district will provide fire and EMS services across 75 square miles and to more than 250,000 residents.

The collaboration that came in third was the Mahoning-Youngstown Regional Information System which received $120,000. This collaboration consists of six entities including cities, townships, and a county office. This collaboration will reduce local government spending and increase economic competitiveness.

#5 The State must offer incentives of sufficient size to leverage local action and encourage local risk taking. New Jersey found it necessary during the initial years of its Shared Service
program to increase the level of assistance being offered communities. Some observers might object that it is nonsensical for a state to increase its grant spending when the goal is to save taxpayer money by reducing spending. But spending in the short term can help bring about new arrangements that yield greater efficiency in the long term.

The evidence reported from New York State shows that the initial investment more than paid for itself by leveraging new cost savings. During the first three years, New York’s Shared Municipal Services Incentive (SMSI) grant program awarded 161 collaboration grants totaling $29.8 million. According to reports filed by the recipient governments (2008), the grants were projected to yield $245.1 million in cost savings, or, a return of $8.23 for every grant dollar spent.

These figures are likely to be overly optimistic. Also, the grants would not really produce savings in instances where local governments would have enacted the new efficiency arrangements without the grant award. But, if we assume that 50 percent of the claimed savings were questionable, meaning the projects will not produce cost savings as projected or would have completed without the grant, the gains are nonetheless quite substantial. Assuming the projects are 50% less productive, the New York State local government incentive grants would still produce $122.6 million in cost savings and a return $4.11 for every grant dollar spent. The point here is that local collaboration incentive grants save taxpayer’s money.

## The State needs to mitigate the barriers to more extensive collaboration.

Present-day state law can add to the costs of collaboration, inhibiting the willingness of locals to undertake innovative joint service arrangements. As we reported in Section 3, Ohio local officials point to the costs of prevailing wage and other labor-oriented regulations that act to inhibit consolidations as well as innovative service arrangements. Labor is but one structural issue among others that are difficult to overcome at the local level, and Ohio is by no means alone in confronting structural barriers. In New Jersey, for instance, the Somerset County Business Partnership called on the state to modify “Regulatory restrictions on health care plans and legislative restrictions on the sharing of health care programs.” It will be up to the state legislature to decide just where existing barriers can, and cannot, be modified and relaxed.

### The State can provide models of intergovernmental contracts as a guide for local collaborations.

Existing interlocal agreements can aid localities seeking to find a collaborative model that fits their needs. Appendix 1 provides examples of agreements and Wisconsin’s guide for local governments; however, Ohio needs examples that fit the state’s statutes and culture. New Jersey and New York, as well as Wisconsin, also provide useful models of how the state can assist local governments from early to late stages of forming share services agreements. The State of Ohio can do the same. The publication of existing interlocal contracts will also help to reduce one particular barrier to cooperation: local fears of the liability and legal risks that result from poorly drafted contracts. As the State of Wisconsin has recognized, “Well-crafted legal agreements may prevent future problems” (Elsass, 2003, p. 7).

### Learn from the collaborative arrangements developed by Ohio’s local governments and tell their story.

Ohio can learn from other states what practices bring the greatest chances of success and what practices are likely to result in problems, frustration, and failure. However, as Ohio based collaborations become better known and understood or as new collaborations form and develop, the state then can develop its own “book” of best practices.

The State of Wisconsin provides one such example of a state that has studied past local service consolidation and collaboration efforts to identify and share best practices with other local governments (Elsass (2003). While limitations of space prevent us from presenting in depth the logic and supporting examples for each recommendation, we use the report’s own
language to communicate the exact flavor of each recommended best practice. The full report can be found at http://lgc.uwex.edu/intergovt/bestpracticesbook.pdf:

1. A private feasibility study may be the best starting point.

2. Consider appointing a joint advisory board to review service options.

3. Have a clear vision and firm objectives in mind before the proposal goes public.

4. Err on the side of maximum public participation before adoption.

5. Well-crafted legal agreements may prevent future problems.

6. Agreements should contain clear and equitable funding formulas covering members’ obligations.

7. Appoint permanent joint administrative boards to monitor service levels, personnel and finances.

8. Include key personnel in the planning and transition processes.

9. Most joint operations require a fiscal agent.

10. Conduct a complete appraisal of all participants’ assets before merging.

11. Consider a “dissolution” or “disbanding clause” in case things do not work as planned.

12. A mandatory cooling off period prior to dissolution is a good idea.

The State can be a model of collaboration. If the State wants local governments to take regional collaboration more seriously, it should lead by example. As state Economic Development Regions and Workforce Investment Area maps presented in Section 1 illustrate, state programs too often work in “silos;” each with their own definition as to what constitutes the regions in Ohio. To facilitate interagency and interlocal cooperation, state agencies need to define regions with greater consistency and provide a common geographical basis for joint action.

The State should standardize local government accounting to better measure performance and critically evaluate inventive collaborative arrangements. This report mentioned many times the problems of obtaining data on cost savings from local government collaborations. Local governments account for revenues and expenditures in such different ways that it nearly impossible to verify service efficiencies. Further, the cost savings of share or consolidated services should include factors such as “go-away costs” that provide a more accurate accounting of the benefits of collaboration. This problem was discovered first by the research team several years ago when CUPA tried to compare service costs across jurisdictions for Dayton and surrounding communities (Creative Government, 2006). The International City and County Management Association also piloted a project that asked local governments across the United States to adopt a common accounting system.

Ohio may already have a model it could use or
modify for general purpose governments. The Ohio Department of Education’s Education Management Information System (EMIS) could be a model for other local governments. EMIS was established by law in 1989 to provide a common structure and standardized reporting to the Ohio Department of Education (ODE). It is a statewide data collection system for Ohio’s primary and secondary education system, collecting data concerning staff, students, district/building, and finances. EMIS serves four major functions: state and federal reporting, funding and distribution of payments, an academic accountability system, and the generation of statewide and district report cards. Education Management Information System reporting standards and instructions are accessible from ODE’s website. The Ohio Department of Education makes available an online manual which provides data definitions, requirements, and procedures for reporting and transferring data. The manual also acts as a record of revisions made to the Education Management Information System. A handbook is also accessible on ODE’s website. The EMIS handbook was developed as a collaborative effort between the Ohio Department of Education and a variety of EMIS stakeholders. The EMIS handbook provides an overview of the Education Management Information System, but does not contain the same technical detail as the manual. An EMIS type system for local governments would offer accounting for evaluating the effectiveness of local government programs and services and establish a measure for collaboration that does not currently exist.

Cost savings had been documented, other factors became more important. This experience could have a dampening effect on future collaborations and it also demonstrates the need for processes that include more of the stakeholders.

Voters are open to the possibilities of service arrangements that reduce costs and save taxpayers’ money. Yet, voters often mistrust new arrangements, especially arrangements that are imposed top-down, sensing that reorganization and collaboration can result in diminished service quality and reduced local control over service delivery. Ohio’s local officials were clear in their recognition of the importance of the process by which collaboration is brought about. Collaboration must be instituted in ways that earn the citizens’ trust. Strong procedures for public participation are required. We can only affirm the critical importance of the best-practice recommendation made by the WU-Extension from its review of new service collaborations in Wisconsin: “Err on the side of maximum public participation before adoption” (Elsass, 2003, p. 6).

Figure 13 below illustrates a process proposed to make collaboration a continuous discussion versus an ad hoc event. Key features of the process below include the following:

- Studies that justify expending time on collaboration;
- Stakeholders, including the state, who engage in regular discussions that acknowledge interdependency, common goals, and need to share services;
- Vision of communities that are globally competitive, provide quality living for residents, and serve the public interest;
- Continuous measurement of service delivery performance before and after experiments to share services;
- Coordinating body that provides oversight to demand analyses, shared service implementation, and performance analyses.

#11 Establish processes that inform and invite public participation when discussing possible collaborations. Ohio officials, as evident in both our survey and focus groups, recognize the political risks that often accompany service consolidation and collaboration. Montgomery County’s experience creating a regional dispatch system in 2008 illustrates this point. Unity among local governments quickly broke down when community employees and constituents began to organize opposition in several jurisdictions. A regional dispatch system was formed but with fewer jurisdictions than hope for. Even though unity among local governments quickly broke down when community employees and constituents began to organize opposition in several jurisdictions. A regional dispatch system was formed but with fewer jurisdictions than hope for. Even though Unity among local governments quickly broke down when community employees and constituents began to organize opposition in several jurisdictions. A regional dispatch system was formed but with fewer jurisdictions than hope for. Even though
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APPENDIX 1

COOPERATIVE AGREEMENTS

This Appendix contains the following documents that could provide models for future collaborative services agreements.

- POTOSI BRANCH LIBRARY AGREEMENT


See http://www.wright.edu/cupa/ssd/index.htm

- VILLAGE OF HOWARD POLICE SERVICES CONTRACT

- NORTH SHORE FIRE DEPARTMENT COOPERATIVE FINANCING FORMULA (DISTRIBUTION OF COSTS) - participating municipality’s annual financial contribution to the North Shore Fire Department’s operating and capital budget

- KIMBERLY-LITTLE CHUTE PUBLIC LIBRARY - joint library board draft charter

- INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITY OF WAPATO AND THE CITY OF GRANGER

- ECONOMIC DEVELOPMENT INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE CITIES OF CHANDLER, PHOENIX, AND TEMPE

- WAUKESHA COUNTY SHERIFF’S DEPARTMENT CONTRACT COVERAGE FOR POLICE SERVICES

- V.A.L.U.E IN OCAL GOVERNMENT OF SOUTHEASTERN WISCONSIN – Letter of Understanding for Cooperative Purchasing

- SAMPLE RESOLUTION establishing policy relating to public purchasing
POTOSI BRANCH LIBRARY AGREEMENT

This agreement entered into by and between the City of Lancaster, a Wisconsin Municipal Corporation located in Grant County, Wisconsin, (hereinafter referred to as “City”); the Village of Potosi, a Wisconsin Municipal Corporation located in Grant County, Wisconsin, (hereinafter referred to as “Village”) and the Schreiner Memorial Library Board, (hereinafter referred to as “Library Board”).

WHEREAS, the parties hereto have determined that it is in the best interests of each of the parties hereto that library services provided by the Schreiner Memorial Library be expanded to service residents of the Village and surrounding areas; and

WHEREAS, Wis. Stat. sec. 66.0301 allows municipalities to enter into intergovernmental cooperation agreements in order to promote the furnishing of services to its residents;

NOW, THEREFORE, IT IS HEREBY AGREED AS FOLLOWS:

1. **Purpose:** In order to provide better library services to its residents, the City, Village and Library Board hereby agree to establish a branch of the Schreiner Memorial Library within the Village.

2. **Term:** This agreement shall commence January 1, 2007 and shall continue through December 31, 2009. On or before January 1, 2009, the parties shall begin negotiations for a renewal of this agreement. Any renewal of this agreement shall be completed and executed by all parties on or before May 31, 2009 or this agreement shall terminate on December 31, 2009.

3. **Acquisition of Site:** The Village shall identify and acquire rights to use a suitable facility within the Village for the establishment of the branch library. The facility must be acceptable and approved by the City and Library Board.

4. **Site Costs:** The Village shall be responsible for all costs of obtaining rights to use and all costs of operating the facility including but not limited to acquisition costs, rent, heat, electricity, utilities, telephone, insurance, cleaning, maintenance, repairs and any wiring and site preparation necessary to enable the facility to effectively operate as a branch library. In addition, the Village shall be responsible for all costs of acquiring and maintaining all furniture, fixtures, furnishings and equipment necessary for the operation of the library unless specifically excluded herein. These costs shall include but not be limited to any necessary automation equipment needed for connecting the branch library to the Schreiner Memorial Library system, any other required telecommunication systems between the branch library and the Schreiner Memorial Library and those specific start-up costs set forth on the attached Addendum A and incorporated herein by reference.

5. **Insurance:** The Village shall obtain and retain a policy of insurance covering the premises and the operation of the Potosi Branch Library. The coverage shall insure against personal injury and property damage in the amount of at least ____________________ per person and ____________________ per occurrence.

   The insurance certificate shall name the City of Lancaster and the Schreiner Memorial Library Board as additional insureds.

6. **Personnel:** The Library Board shall hire and employ sufficient personnel to provide adequate service to the branch library. The Library Board shall train and supervise all personnel assigned to the branch library.
7. Hours of Operation: The Library Board shall provide sufficient personnel to allow the branch library to be open at least 12 hours per week. Library hours may be extended by using volunteers at the discretion of the Library Board. The schedule shall be determined by the Library Board after consultation with the Village President.

8. Library Operations: The Library Board shall be responsible for promulgating any and all policies for branch library use. These policies shall be the same as those used for the Schreiner Memorial Library. The Library Board shall be solely responsible for administering these policies. In addition, the library board shall have the sole authority to select and obtain the books and other materials for the branch library collection. The Library Board shall also provide any and all supplies necessary to support the library operations except those required for building or site maintenance.

9. Library Reports: The Library Board shall, no later than March 1 of each year, submit an annual report detailing the levels of service and expenditure of funds relating to the operation of the branch library. The library board shall also submit a monthly report setting forth the circulation and other use statistics for the branch library.

10. City Obligations: The City shall establish a separate special purpose revenue account for the Potosi Branch Library and shall provide an annual report of the expenditures from this account to the Village. The City further agrees to provide all necessary accounting services for the operation of the branch library.

11. Representation on the Library Board: Commencing with the term effective July 1, 2007, the City agrees to appoint a representative of the Village as one of the two non-resident members of the Library Board as allowed in Wis. Stat. sec. 43.54(1). The Village representative appointed to the Library Board shall be selected by the Village Board after nomination by the Village President. The City agrees to continue to appoint a Village representative to the Library Board throughout the term of this agreement.

12. Ownership of Facilities and Equipment: The Village shall retain ownership of the facility, all fixtures, furnishings and equipment except and any all computers and computer equipment. Schreiner Memorial Library will be the owner of all computer equipment, books and audio visual materials for as long as Potosi Branch Library is in operation. If for any reason, the Potosi Branch Library ceases to operate, the computers, computer equipment, books and other audio visual materials assigned to the branch library will become the property of the Village.

13. Payments by the Village: As consideration for the services being provided for the branch library, the Village agrees to pay to the Library Board the sum of Fifteen Thousand Dollars ($15,000.00) no later than March 1, 2007, the sum of Fifteen Thousand Four Hundred and Fifty Dollars ($15,450.00) by March 1, 2008 and the sum of Fifteen Thousand Nine Hundred Dollars ($15,900.00) by March 1, 2009. Any costs required to operate the branch library in excess of those set forth in this agreement shall be paid by the Library Board.

14. Payments by Library Board: On or before April 1, 2009, the Library Board shall pay to the Village a sum equal to 65% of the increase in county revenue paid to Schreiner Memorial Library by Grant County for non-resident borrowing from the Village of Potosi, Village of Tennyson and Potosi Township residents. In determining the amount of increased revenue, the parties will use calendar year 2006 as the base year for the total number of Schreiner Memorial Library circulations from the Village of Potosi, Village of Tennyson and Potosi Township and then subtract this number from the calendar year 2007 totals for the same entities. The resulting number will then be multiplied by the amount of reimbursement per circulation paid in 2009. The totals for both years will come from the computer generated report of non-resident borrowing prepared by the Southwest Wisconsin Library System.

15. Additional Funding: Nothing contained herein shall preclude the parties from seeking funding.
from other sources for the operation of the Potosi Branch Library. Any gifts or grants designated for Branch operations or materials shall be used exclusively for the Potosi Branch Library.

16. **Damages:** Should any party fail to fulfill its duties and obligations as set forth herein, any party may pursue any and all damages as allowed by Wisconsin law. In addition, the Village hereby agrees to reimburse the City for any unemployment costs incurred as a result of a layoff of staff personnel assigned to the Potosi branch should this agreement be terminated prior to December 31, 2009 irregardless of fault by any party.

17. **Assignability:** The rights and obligations set forth herein may not be assigned to any other party without the express, written consent of the other parties.

18. **Severability:** Should any provision herein be deemed invalid under the laws of the State of Wisconsin, said invalidity shall not affect any other provision of this agreement.

19. **Amendments:** This agreement may only be amended by written, mutual agreement.

Dated this ___ day of _____________, 2006.

CITY OF LANCASTER BY:

______________________________
Jerome Wehrle, Mayor

ATTESTED:

______________________________
Dave Kurihara, City Clerk
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INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT BETWEEN THE TOWN OF GILBERT AND THE CITY OF CHANDLER CONCERNING THE DESIGN, CONSTRUCTION AND OPERATION OF A JOINT CAP WATER TREATMENT PLANT

This Intergovernmental Agreement (Agreement) is entered into this ___ day of __________, 2006, between the Town of Gilbert, an Arizona municipal corporation ("Gilbert") and the City of Chandler, an Arizona municipal corporation ("Chandler"), (collectively the “Parties”).

RECITALS

WHEREAS, Gilbert and Chandler have determined that they need to increase the capacity of their respective surface water treatment facilities to make use of their respective CAP Water allocations and to provide potable water to their respective residents; and

WHEREAS, Gilbert and Chandler also desire to develop the appropriate level of water system redundancy, or back-up, to lessen the impact of an operational emergency; and

WHEREAS, Gilbert and Chandler believe that they can both realize lower unit costs on their independent water treatment plant construction activities by partnering to construct a jointly owned water treatment plant rather than constructing two separate, individually-owned, plants; and

WHEREAS, Gilbert and Chandler have entered into agreements to jointly fund a pipeline alignment study and a pre-design phase services for Phase I of the Joint Plant; and

WHEREAS, each of the Parties has a CAWCD Agreement providing for the conveyance of their respective CAP Water allocations to the delivery points that they designate; and

WHEREAS, Arizona Revised Statutes Section 11-951 et seq., provides that public agencies may enter into intergovernmental agreements for the provision of services or for joint or cooperative action.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises and covenants of each to the other contained in this Agreement and other good and valuable consideration, receipt of which is hereby acknowledged, the Parties do hereby covenant and agree as follows:

ARTICLE II

General Agreement Provisions

2.1 PURPOSE. The purpose of this Agreement is to set forth the Parties’ respective rights, duties and obligations associated with the acquisition of the Plant Site and the design, construction, maintenance and operation of the Joint Plant.
2.2 **TERM.** The term of this Agreement shall commence and become effective on the Effective Date and, unless renewed, amended or terminated early, expire on July 1, 2104. This Agreement shall be automatically and continuously renewed for additional twenty-five (25) year terms unless the Party who does not wish to renew gives the other Party notice of that intent at least two (2) years prior to the original expiration of this Agreement or, as applicable, any renewal thereof. A Party that opts not to renew this Agreement, or that terminates its rights and obligations under this Agreement pursuant to Sections 4.4, 6.6 or 7.3, forfeits all of its rights to the Joint Plant, other than its interest in the Joint Water Transmission Line and its Finished Water Line Pumps, to the other Party and such other Party may use and operate the applicable portions of the Joint Plant in any lawful manner without payment of any fee or cost of any kind to the other Party. Chandler shall also be permitted to use the Chandler Finished Water Line located within Gilbert pursuant to Exhibit E of this Agreement and all terms relating to the use of the Chandler Finished Water Line that remain applicable to such continued use shall survive the expiration of this Agreement.

2.3 **AUTHORIZED REPRESENTATIVES.** Within thirty (30) calendar days of the Effective Date, the City Manager for Chandler and the Town Manager for Gilbert shall each appoint an Authorized Representative and an alternate Authorized Representative to administer the provisions of this Agreement for which the Authorized Representatives have responsibility, and notify each other of those appointments. The alternate Authorized Representative shall act only when the Authorized Representative is absent or otherwise unable to perform his or her duties under this Agreement. Any decision or agreement required to be made or entered into by a Party’s Authorized Representative shall be binding on a Party only if it is in writing and signed by the Party’s Authorized Representative. Each Party shall immediately notify the other Party of any change in the identity of its Authorized Representative or alternative Authorized Representative. The Authorized Representatives shall also provide to each other a point of contact that can be reached in case of emergency or during times outside of normal business hours. The Parties shall notify each other of any change in emergency contact person information.

2.4 **NOTICES.** Unless otherwise provided in this Agreement, all notices, demands, requests, consents, approvals and other communications (collectively, “Notices”) required hereunder shall be given by certified U.S. mail, postage prepaid or personally delivered, against receipted copy to the Authorized Representative for the Party to receive notice. Notices shall be deemed received upon receipt, which shall be evidenced by a receipted copy (in the case of notices that are personally delivered), or as evidenced by the postal service receipt. Notices regarding matters requiring immediate attention of the Party to whom the notice is to be provided shall be by telephone with an electronic mail follow-up.

**ARTICLE III**

**Property Issues**

3.1 **JOINT OWNERSHIP.** The Joint Plant shall be jointly owned by the Parties as tenants in common upon Chandler’s payment of its share of Site Acquisition and Interim Maintenance Costs.

3.2 **PAYMENT FOR PLANT SITE.** Chandler shall pay to Gilbert Chandler’s share of Site Acquisition and Interim Maintenance Costs no earlier than July 3, 2006 and no later than July 10, 2006. Gilbert shall record a “Memorandum of Agreement” in a form acceptable to Chandler evidencing the joint ownership of the Joint Plant upon receipt of Chandler’s payment for its share of Site Acquisition and Interim Maintenance Costs.

3.3 **SALE OF SITE.** In the event the Parties agree to sell the Site, the SWTP Committee shall cause the Plant Site, or portion thereof, to be appraised by a licensed commercial land appraiser. The Parties shall share the costs incurred in selling the Site the proceeds from said sale in proportion to their respective share of

Dustin/Jones/Levine
Capital Costs and Capital Improvement Costs incurred by each as of the date of the sale. Each Party shall be responsible for its own Internal Costs.

**3.4 Joint Plant Replacement on Site.** If the Parties decommission or replace the Joint Plant, the Parties agree to consider whether to construct a new joint water treatment plant on the Plant Site with financial participation on terms substantially similar to the terms set forth in this Agreement. If the Parties agree not to construct a new joint CAP Water treatment plant at the Site as set forth in this Section 3.4, the Parties shall sell the Site in accordance with Section 3.3. If one Party wishes to construct a new CAP Water treatment plant at the Site, and the other Party does not, the Party that wishes to construct a new CAP Water treatment plant may purchase the Site from the other Party at appraised value and thereafter construct and operate a new CAP Water treatment plant at the Site. The appraiser shall be mutually selected by the Parties and all appraisal and other required real estate transaction costs shall be paid by the purchasing Party. Any dispute as to the selection of an appraiser or the appraised value shall be subject to the dispute resolution provisions set forth in Article XV. Nothing herein shall be deemed to preclude either Party from utilizing its interest in the Joint Water Transmission Line or, as applicable, the Finished Water Lines.

**3.5 Buy-Out.** Notwithstanding Sections 3.3 and 3.4 of this Agreement, nothing herein shall preclude the ability of one Party to buy out the interest of the other Party in the Joint Plant and/or Plant Site after the Joint Plant has been decommissioned. Neither Party shall, however, have any authority to force a buyout of the other Party’s interests except for the limited right to purchase the Site set forth in Section 3.4.

**3.6 Prior Rights.** To the extent that the Chandler Finished Water Line or the Joint Water Transmission Line need to be relocated to improve a roadway or for another public project in which Gilbert is involved, the Parties agree that the Chandler Finished Water Line and Joint Water Transmission Line shall be deemed to have common law prior rights and any required relocation thereof shall be provided and paid for as part of the roadway or other public project.

**3.7 Condemnation.** In the event that all or a portion of the Joint Plant is condemned by a third party, each Party shall be entitled to a share of all condemnation proceeds in proportion to their respective share of Capital Costs and Capital Improvement Costs incurred by each as of the date of condemnation. The Parties agree that they will not attempt to acquire the interest of the other Party through condemnation.
VILLAGE OF HOWARD
POLICE SERVICES CONTRACT

MEMORANDUM OF AGREEMENT made this 10th day of November 2008 by and between the VILLAGE OF HOWARD, a municipal corporation, in Brown County, Wisconsin (hereinafter referred to as "Village"), and BROWN COUNTY, a municipal corporation of the State of Wisconsin (hereinafter referred to as "County.")

WHEREAS, the Village is required to provide its own police protection services but does not have its own police department and does now contract with the County for the furnishing of such services under the provisions of 61.65, Wisconsin Statutes, and other provisions of law, and wishes to continue to contract with the County for such services; and the County does now furnish police protection services throughout Brown County, Wisconsin, and represents that it can and is willing to provide the Village with additional such services; now then,

IN CONSIDERATION OF the mutual covenants and promises hereinafter set forth, and other good and valuable consideration, the receipt of which is acknowledged by both parties, it is agreed that the County will provide full-time police services to the Village from the 1st day of January, 2009 to the 31st day of December 2012.

IT IS FURTHER AGREED:

1. The Village shall pay to the Brown County Treasurer one-fourth (1/4) of the total annual amount due for said services quarterly, in advance within 15 days of the end of the previous quarter except the payment for the fourth quarter which will be made by year’s end. The annual amount due are set forth in Attachment A and Appendix B.

In the event Brown County enters into a Police Services Contract with another municipality the terms of which are more favorable than this Agreement, this Agreement will be amended to incorporate those terms and conditions as of the effective date of the other Agreement.

2. The Village is designated as a separate and distinct section within the system utilized by the County which divides the county in geographical sections for the purpose of supervising police activities within the county; and that the assignment of officers to the Village from the Brown County Sheriff's Department shall be at the discretion of said Department, but shall be made on the same basis as assignments by the Sheriff's Department to other sections of the county, provided however that the hours of each daily shift shall be mutually agreed upon by the Brown County Sheriff's Department and the Village.
b. Be knowledgeable of community affairs and attend Village Board and committee meetings as *deemed necessary by the Village Board*.

c. A Patrol Lieutenant mutually agreed upon by both parties shall be assigned as Liaison to the Village and shall attend the monthly Village Board meetings *if requested by the Village Board or if the Patrol Lieutenant is desirous of attending*.

6. In the event the parties cannot agree on terms and conditions for a new or a renewal agreement by December 1, 2012, this agreement shall be extended for one (1) year on the same terms and conditions, except for the right to renew or extend, and the annual sum to be paid by the Village to the County shall be computed as follows: the annual sum shall be determined by dividing the 2012 contract amount by the United States Department of Labor Consumer Price Index - United States City Average for all urban consumers (CPI-U; base year 1982-84 = 100) for the month of October 2011, then multiplying that amount by the comparable index number for the month of October 2012, which sum shall be the annual sum due in 2013.

This agreement shall be for a 4-year term, commencing January 1, 2009 and ending December 31, 2012 unless terminated in accordance with the provisions hereof; and that either party shall have the right to terminate this agreement at any time on one (1) year's prior written notice to the other, either personally delivered or sent by certified U.S. mail postage prepaid to the County Clerk (if notice is given by the Village), or to the Village Clerk-Treasurer (if notice is given by the County), except that in no event can this contract be terminated prior to December 31, 2009.

**IT IS FURTHER AGREED BY THE COUNTY:**

*That the Sheriff or his/her designee shall promptly and timely notify the Village Administrator, or in his/her absence the Village President of each occurrence of serious incidents, and/or police action to be taken by the County and/or other law enforcement personnel within the Village of Howard. What constitutes a “serious incident” shall include but not be limited to homicides, sexual assaults, suspicious deaths, gang-related activity, taking of hostages, kidnappings and riots or escapes from the Green Bay Correctional Institution.*

1. Officers assigned to the Village shall be properly trained and supervised. Such training shall include an orientation session to provide the officers with specific knowledge of the Village, such orientation materials to be supplied by the Village.

2. The County will supply all necessary personal equipment for the officers assigned to the Village, including guns, ammunition, portable radios and soft body armor.

3. To provide a properly equipped squad car owned by the County in the event that the squad car(s) provided by the Village are unavailable because of damage, repair, maintenance or destruction.
IT IS FURTHER AGREED BY THE VILLAGE:

1. The Village will provide at its expense a properly marked squad car(s) equipped to County specifications which include at a minimum; an electronic siren, a 2-way police radio, a red and blue light bar, an oxygen unit and a fire extinguisher. All equipment added to the squad car(s) shall be approved by the Patrol Division Director of the Brown County Sheriff's Department. Maintenance and repair of the squad car(s) shall be the responsibility of the Village.

2. All vehicles removed or impounded pursuant to the Municipal Code of the Village shall be disposed of by the County, the Village shall reimburse the County for all costs of such removal, impoundment and disposal which are not covered upon disposal.

3. All patrol officers regularly assigned to the Village shall have a minimum of one (1) year law enforcement experience to maintain continuity of law enforcement within the community, unless both parties agree to waive the one (1) year requirement.

4. The Village shall provide all necessary arrest citations, affidavits, and other incidental and necessary forms for use of and by the officers assigned to the Village.

5. The Village shall provide automobile liability insurance covering the operation, maintenance and use of the squad car(s) provided by the Village in an amount of not less than $1,000,000 combined single limit for bodily injury and property damage, or such other amount as may hereafter be determined to be the maximum amount to be able to be recovered from either the Village or the County by statute, whichever sum is lesser, with the County named as an additional insured.

6. The Village will fully indemnify and hold harmless the County from any liability for defense expenses and for damages to person and property caused by any act or omission of an Howard employee in furtherance of the provisions of this agreement to the extent that the same are not covered by insurance.

This document constitutes the full and complete agreement by and between the parties and shall not be amended except in writing signed by the parties and attached hereto.

Attachment A and Appendix B are attached hereto and made part of this Agreement.
Financing Formula

(Distribution of Costs)

Each participating municipality's annual financial contribution to the North Shore Fire Department's operating and capital budget shall be based on the following:

Population

Thirty-three and 33/100 percent (33.33%) of the total budget contribution shall be shared among the municipalities in proportion to each municipality's percentage share of the total population of all the municipalities, as determined by the State of Wisconsin for the prior year and as adjusted as hereafter provided.

Equalized Valuation

Thirty-three and 33/100 percent (33.33%) of the total budget contribution shall be shared among the municipalities in proportion to each municipality's percentage share of the total equalized valuation, excluding land, of all the municipalities, as determined by the State of Wisconsin for the prior year and as adjusted as hereafter provided.

Total equalized valuation, excluding land, shall be divided into residential, commercial and industrial classifications. A multiplier of 1 for total residential valuation, 2 for total commercial valuation and 3 for total industrial valuation shall be applied. The total of the multiplied valuations for each municipality shall be divided by the total of the multiplied valuations for all the municipalities and multiplied by 100 to determine each municipality's proportionate percentage share.

Usage

Thirty-three and 34/100 percent (33.34%) of the total budget contribution shall be shared among the municipalities in proportion to each municipality's percentage share of usage. For the first three years of operation, usage shall be based upon each municipality's share of total calls for service over the five-year period between 1988 and 1992, subject to later adjustment as provided below. After the first three years of operation, each municipality's usage shall be determined based on each municipality's percentage share of the total usage averaged over the preceding three years.

Usage shall be calculated based on the actual number of personnel hours for each fire or E.M.S. run, rounded to the next one-tenth of one hour. Personnel hours are calculated from the time vehicles leave their stations to the time vehicles return to their stations. Usage is assigned to the municipality in which the call for service originated, without regard to where the personnel responding are stationed.
After three years of usage information has been calculated, the amounts paid by each municipality in the first three years of operation will be compared to what each community would have paid if usage had been calculated based on personnel hours for the first three years, using the three-year average as the percentage of usage for each of such years. The difference, if any, will be refunded to or paid by the municipalities in the fourth and fifth year of operation.

Library Board

A joint library board is hereby created under the provisions of Section 43.54, Wisconsin Statutes to administer the Kimberly-Little Chute Public Library.

1) The joint library board shall consist of eight (8) members, four (4) shall be appointed by the Kimberly Village President, subject to confirmation by the Kimberly Village Board, four (4) members appointed by the Village of Little Chute President, subject to confirmation by the Little Chute Village Board. Not more than one member of each municipal governing body shall at any one time be a member of the library board. Each Village President shall appoint as one of their members, the school district administrator, or his representative, to represent their school district.

2) Upon their first appointment, the members shall be divided as nearly as practicable into three equal groups to serve for two-, three-, and four-year terms, respectively. Thereafter, each regular appointment shall be for a term of three years, beginning on June 1st and ending on May 31st. Vacancies shall be filled for unexpired terms in the same manner as regular appointments are made.

3) Annually, a President, Vice-President, and Secretary shall be elected from among the board members within 30 days of the date designated as the beginning of terms.

4) A majority of the members of the library board shall constitute a quorum for the transaction of any business at a meeting of the board.

Library Board Powers and Duties

◊ The library board shall have the following duties and responsibilities as authorized by the Kimberly Village Board and the Little Chute Village Board.

◊ To exercise all powers and perform all duties authorized for library boards by Chapter 43, Wisconsin Statutes.

◊ To plan for, implement, and administer all library services and programs for the Kimberly-Little Chute Public Library.

◊ To control the expenditure of all funds collected, donated, or appropriated for the Kimberly-Little Chute Library.

◊ To annually prepare and submit an operating budget for the succeeding year to the Kimberly Village Board and the Little Chute Village Board.

◊ To make recommendations to the Village of Kimberly or the Village of Little Chute regarding improvements to the public library physical facility in each community.
INTERLOCAL AGREEMENT
BETWEEN THE CITY OF WAPATO AND THE CITY OF GRANGER
RELATING TO THE USE OF INMATE WORKERS

THIS IS AN AGREEMENT made and entered into this 1st day of January, 2008 between the City of Wapato, Washington, a municipal corporation of the State of Washington, which may hereinafter be referred to as “Wapato” and the City of Granger, Washington, a municipal corporation of the State of Washington, which may hereinafter be referred to as “Granger”.

WHEREAS, Wapato operates a correctional facility for the purpose of housing, educating and training persons convicted of criminal offenses;

WHEREAS, Wapato provides contract jail services to Granger for care and custody of prisoners that are arrested and/or convicted of criminal offenses;

WHEREAS, Wapato and Granger agree that inmates in the Wapato Correctional Facility are best served when provided work opportunities, allowing inmates opportunities to better themselves and remain on good behavior;

WHEREAS, Wapato and Granger find that it is in the public interest to utilize inmate workers for community projects;

WHEREAS, such agreements are authorized and provided for by the provisions of Chapter 39.34 RCW;

NOW THEREFORE, Wapato and Granger agree as follows:

1. **General Purpose**: Wapato will make available inmate workers that are housed in the Wapato Correctional Facility to Granger for the purpose of providing work on community projects.

2. **Definitions**:

   **Inmate Worker**, hereinafter referred to as a “worker” is a person convicted of a criminal act and confined with the Wapato Correctional Facility by a court of competent jurisdiction.

   **City Official** is a person that is a full time employee of the City and may include a Police Officer or Public Workers Employee.

   **Jail Administrator** is the person designated by Wapato as the person responsibility for administration of the Wapato Correction Facility.

3. **Worker Requests**: Granger will contact Wapato and request workers on a daily basis. Wapato has the right to allow or refuse the request based on the availability of acceptable inmates that are housed within the correction facility at the time of the request. Wapato
will generally rotate the workers between locations to prevent workers from becoming overly comfortable in a specific environment and potentially increasing the risk of escape by the worker.

A. Granger may request a specific inmate worker for a longer period of time when Granger is conducting a specific job function or service that would be completed more effectively by the same worker(s). Wapato will have the final decision about which workers and the number of workers being provided.

B. Workers must volunteer for work details. Any worker may refuse to work or refuse to continue working at any time. In the event that a worker refuses to continue working, Granger will immediately return the worker to the Wapato Correctional Facility.

4. **Number of Workers Allowed:** As a contract agency, Granger will be allowed between one and three workers on a daily basis, depending on the availability of workers as outlined above. If additional workers are needed for larger events or specific job tasks, a request may be made to the Jail Administrator one week in advance of the date the workers are needed.

5. **Worker Selection:** Wapato agrees to pre-screen workers to reasonably insure that violent or dangerous offenders are not assigned as workers.

6. **Tasks to be Performed by Workers:** Workers may be asked to perform general labor, such as painting, building, mowing, weeding or trash clean up.

7. **Tasks or Labor Prohibited by Workers:** Workers shall not drive any motorized vehicle, including riding lawn mowers, tractors, or forklifts.

8. **Worker Hours:** Workers are limited to an absolute maximum of 12 hours of work per day. Workers will only be allowed to work for more than eight (8) hours per day when a written request is provided to the Jail Administrator in advance and has approved the request.

   A. Workers must be picked up at the Wapato Correctional Facility by a City Official between 0800 and 1700 hours. The worker must be returned to the Wapato Correctional Facility between 0800 and 1700 hours unless different times are authorized in advance by the Jail Administrator.

   B. Workers will provided one ten (10) minute break after every two hours of work and one thirty (30) minute lunch period when the worker is on-site for six (6) hours or more.

   C. Granger will provide a lunch to each worker when a lunch period is required. The lunch contents will be determined by Granger but will provide for a lunch that is reasonable for an adult’s nutrition.
9. **Supervision**: Granger will provide continuous supervision of workers by a City Official for workers in their custody. Granger, through its police department, will file escape charges on any worker that escapes through the Yakima County Prosecuting Attorney.

10. **Termination of Workers**: Wapato or Granger may terminate the status of workers at any time without cause.

   A. Granger may return any worker at any time to the Wapato Correctional Facility.

   B. Workers that fail to act in an appropriate manner or refuse to work will be returned immediately to the Wapato Correctional Facility. The Jail Administrator will be advised of any inappropriate action(s) by any worker.

   C. When supervision is being maintained by a City Official other than a police officer, the supervisor shall notify the Granger Police Department, which shall take custody of the worker and insure their return to the Wapato Correctional Facility.

11. **Personnel, Equipment and Costs**: Each party to this agreement shall be responsible for their own personnel, equipment and costs incurred under this agreement. It is not anticipated or intended that any real or personal property will be jointly acquired or purchased because of this agreement.

12. **Legal Requirement**: Both parties shall comply with all applicable federal, state and local laws in performing this agreement.

13. **Implementation**: The chief officer of the Wapato Police Department and of the Granger Police Department shall be jointly responsible for implementation and proper administration of this Agreement, and shall refer problems of implementation to the governing body of Wapato and Granger for resolution as necessary.

14. **Provisions for Termination of this Agreement**: Either party may terminate this agreement, with or without cause, by providing the other party thirty (30) day written notice of termination.

15. **Term**: The term of this agreement shall commence on January 1st, 2009 and terminate on December 31st, 2009 unless sooner terminated by either party in accordance with section 14 of this agreement.

16. **Disclaimer of Liability and Hold Harmless**:

   A. Wapato agrees to hold harmless, indemnify, and defend Granger, its elected officials, officers, employees, and agents from and against all suits, actions, claims, liability, damages, judgments, costs and expenses (including reasonable attorney’s fees) (also including but not limited to claims related to alleged mistreatment, injury, or death to any prisoner, or loss or damage to prisoner
property while in Wapato Custody) which results from or arise out of the sole negligence of Wapato, its elected officials, officers, employees, and agents in connection with or incidental to the performance or non-performance of this Agreement.

B. Granger agrees to hold harmless, indemnify, and defend Wapato, its elected officials, officers, employees, and agents from and against all suits, actions, claims, liability, damages, judgments, costs and expenses (including reasonable attorney’s fees) (also including but not limited to claims related to alleged mistreatment, injury, or death to any prisoner, or loss or damage to prisoner property while in Granger Custody) which results from or arise out of the sole negligence of Granger, its elected officials, officers, employees, and agents in connection with or incidental to the performance or non-performance of this Agreement.

C. In the event that officials, officers, agents, and/or employees of both Wapato and Granger are negligent, each party shall be liable for its contributory share of negligence for any resulting suits, actions, claims, liability, damages, judgments, costs and expenses (including reasonable attorney’s fees).

D. Nothing contained in this Section or this Agreement shall be construed to create a right of indemnification in any third party.

PARTIES TO AGREEMENT:

City of Granger

\[Signature\]
Ramona Fonseca
Mayor

Attest:
Alice Koerner
City Clerk / Treasurer

City of Wapato

\[Signature\]
Jesse Farias
Mayor

Attest:
Susán P. Pearson
Clerk-Treasurer
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INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT
C2005-68

THIS INTERGOVERNMENTAL AGREEMENT is entered into this 3rd day of May, 2005 by and among the cities of Chandler, Phoenix and Tempe (collectively, the “Cities”), municipal corporations of the State of Arizona.

RECITALS

WHEREAS, pursuant to A.R.S. Sec. 11-951, the Cities are authorized to enter into intergovernmental agreements; and

WHEREAS A.R.S. Sec. 9-500.11 inter alia, authorizes cities to appropriate and spend public monies for and in connection with economic development activities; and

WHEREAS, the execution of this Agreement has been authorized by the City of Chandler, pursuant to Article I, Section 1.03, Chandler City Charter and Resolution No. 3843, the City of Phoenix, pursuant to Chapter II, Section 2, Phoenix City Charter and by formal action of the Phoenix City Council on April 6, 2005, the City of Tempe, pursuant to Article I, Section 1.03, Tempe City Charter and Resolution No. 2005.15; and

WHEREAS, all of the Cities have been approached to provide incentives to retail businesses looking to locate along their shared borders; and

WHEREAS, the purpose of this Agreement is to memorialize the understanding among the Cities with respect to such incentives.

AGREEMENTS

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the mutual promises, covenants and undertakings more particularly set forth below, the Cities hereby agree as follows:
1. **Definitions.** For the purposes of this Agreement, the following terms shall have the meanings ascribed to them below:

   “Incentive”: any waiver, exemption, deduction, credit, rebate, discount, deferral or other abatement, reduction or forgiveness of privilege tax liability.

   “No-Incentive Zone”: The area within the corporate boundaries of the Cities as of the date of this Agreement between Pecos Road, Guadalupe Road, 32nd Street and Rural Road, as depicted in Exhibit A attached hereto and incorporated herein by this reference, including all properties with frontage on both sides of the foregoing streets.

   “Retail”: Business activities subject to sections 415, 416, 450 and 460 of the Model City Tax Code in effect as of the date of this Agreement.

2. **Term.** The initial term of this Agreement will be for three years from the date of execution. With prior approval of all three City Councils, two one-year extensions are possible for a maximum of five years.

3. **No Incentives Agreement; Breach of Agreement.** The Cities all hereby agree not to provide Incentives to any Retail development within the No-Incentive Zone, except as expressly provided in paragraph 4 below. In the event that any City authorizes or agrees to provide any Retail Incentives in violation of the provisions of this Agreement, then this Agreement shall automatically terminate as of the date of such authorization and agreement and each of the other Cities shall retain the right to bring an action in a court of law and receive monetary damages for the breach of this Agreement.

4. **Exemptions.** The provisions of paragraph 3 above will not apply to development agreements entered into prior to January 1, 2005 or to expenditures in the amount of actual costs associated with:

   a. upgrades to existing landscape and hardscape improvements in the public right-of-way, such as sewer and storm drain facilities, water lines, curb and gutter improvements, lighting, traffic control devices or other traffic/street/freeway improvements and landscaping consistent with the City’s then current policies and standard requirements for development;

   b. environmental clean-up in accordance with the then current environmental clean up standards or programs;

   c. façade and landscaping improvements to existing Retail centers within the scope of the City’s then current policies/programs; and
d. improvements to maintain the historic significance and/or structural integrity of properties that are determined to be eligible for listing on the National Register of Historic Places.

5. Applicable Law. The laws of the State of Arizona shall govern the interpretation and enforcement of this Agreement.

6. Notices. All notices made or sent by any party hereto to other parties shall be deemed to have been fully given, made or sent when made in writing and personally delivered, transmitted by telefax or received by United States postpaid registered or certified mail and addressed as follows:

To Chandler: Economic Development Director  
City of Chandler  
215 E. Buffalo Street  
Chandler, Arizona 85225  
FAX: (480) 782-3040

To Phoenix: Director of the Community and Economic Development Department  
200 West Washington Street, 20th Floor  
Phoenix, Arizona 85003-1611  
FAX: (602) 495-5097

To Tempe: City Manager  
City of Tempe  
31 E. 5th Street  
Tempe, Arizona 85281  
FAX: (480) 350-8930

7. Conflict of Interests. The parties hereto acknowledge that this Agreement is subject to cancellation pursuant to the provisions of A.R.S. § 38-511.

IN WITNESS WHEREOF, the undersigned parties have executed this instrument as of the date first above written.

[SIGNATURES FOLLOW ON NEXT PAGES]
CITY OF CHANDLER a municipal

corporation
ATTEST:

[Signature]
CITY CLERK

[Signature]
Mayor

CORPORATE SEAL

ARIZONA

DETERMINATION OF LEGAL COUNSEL

The foregoing Intergovernmental Agreement has been reviewed pursuant to A.R.S. § 11-952 by the undersigned attorney who has determined that it is in proper form and within the power and authority granted under the laws of the State of Arizona to the respective public entity they represent.

April 28, 2005
Date

[Signature]
Chandler City Attorney
CITY OF PHOENIX, a municipal corporation
FRANK FAIRBANKS, CITY MANAGER

ATTEST:

By:

Mayor

By:

Robert Franco, Acting Director
Community and Economic
Development Department

DETERMINATION OF LEGAL COUNSEL

The foregoing Intergovernmental Agreement has been reviewed pursuant to
A.R.S. § 11-952 by the undersigned attorney who has determined that it is in
proper form and within the power and authority granted under the laws of the State
of Arizona to the respective public entity they represent.

5/3/05
Date

Margaret Wilson
Acting Phoenix City Attorney
DETERMINATION OF LEGAL COUNSEL

The foregoing Intergovernmental Agreement has been reviewed pursuant to A.R.S. § 11-952 by the undersigned attorney who has determined that it is in proper form and within the power and authority granted under the laws of the State of Arizona to the respective public entity they represent.

[Signature]
Date

Tempe City Attorney
2. Contract: Waukesha County Sheriff's Department

SHERIFF'S CONTRACT COVERAGE FOR POLICE SERVICE

Police contracting is a very important service offered to municipalities searching for an answer to increasing criminal activity in their community. By offering this service, the Sheriff is able to provide a viable alternative to communities who wish to expand their law enforcement service.

The actual agreement with any community consists of three separate contracts; salary (including fringe benefits) and vehicle costs, dispatching, and transcription or typist costs. All charges have been broken down and estimated on what it actually costs our department to provide this service. This includes administrative costs, ammunition, training, weapon, and MDT costs among others. The community that chooses to contract, is able to take advantage of our tremendous resources not only in bulk purchasing, but also in availability of staff and equipment. 1994-1995 mileage costs as example, are based upon 1.125 million miles driven.

The Sheriff's Department first began contracting for police services in 1980 with the Village of Sussex. Since then, we have seen the Sussex contract expand to four shifts (with a fifth shift currently being discussed). Recently the Towns of Merton and Delafield also began contracting for one eight hour shift. The Town of Eagle and the County Fair also contract for police services; Eagle for its summer boat patrol, the County Fair for its annual five day festival.

When the Sussex contract was initiated it was a new philosophy and approach for local government. Fortunately, farsighted leaders from both the Village of Sussex and the Sheriff's Department were able to see the advantages for each. The contracts have allowed municipalities to maintain local control over everything from enforcement of local ordinances to attendance at Town and Village Board meetings. Contract municipalities have even conducted employee interviews of our Deputy Sheriffs who are interested in working the contract car for that community. This gives the local officials an opportunity to review several candidates, seeing which will best fit the needs of their particular community.

AGREEMENT

THIS AGREEMENT is hereby entered into between WAUKESHA COUNTY, a municipal corporation, hereinafter referred to as "COUNTY" and the VILLAGE OF SUSSEX, a municipal corporation, hereinafter referred to as "VILLAGE" as follows:

1. The COUNTY shall furnish to the MUNICIPALITY police patrol services to be rendered by one deputy with all necessary equipment for a period of four (4) consecutive shift(s) for seven (7) days a week. Such services shall be performed during the following hours: from midnight to 8:00 a.m.; from 8:00 a.m. to 4:00 p.m.; from 4:00 p.m. to midnight and from 6:00 p.m. to 2:00 a.m. The MUNICIPALITY shall have the right to change this schedule of hours upon thirty (30) days written notice to the Sheriff of Waukesha County provided that the hours within a shift always remain consecutive.

2. The Sheriff shall have supervisory control over the personnel providing these services. The Sheriff shall retain the final authority to make decisions as to the manner in which services shall be rendered.

3. The Sheriff will provide patrol functions as follows:
   (a) During patrol hours, the patrol unit will provide continual patrol in the MUNICI-
       PALITY. The unit will be first responder to all dispatched events in the MUNICI-
       PALITY. The unit will begin and end its patrol tour from a location within MUNICI-
       PALITY boundaries mutually agreed upon by the MUNICIPALITY and the Sheriff. It
       will leave the boundaries of the MUNICIPALITY only in those situations that would
       require mutual aid assistance by the COUNTY.
   (b) Every effort will be made to respond to MUNICIPALITY needs and desires.
       The MUNICIPALITY will designate a liaison person (s) to provide the Sheriff with any
       information as to concentration of patrol efforts, special assignments, etc. the MUNICI-
       PALITY desires.
(c) To insure continuity, the Sheriff will assign officers to the MUNICIPALITY patrol on an annual basis whenever possible. The Sheriff will consider requests by the MUNICIPALITY for changes in assignment, but retains final authority in those assignments.

4. The MUNICIPALITY shall pay the COUNTY the sum of Thirty-Three Thousand Two Hundred Twenty Five Dollars and Eight cents ($33,225.08) each month. In addition to this monthly charge, the MUNICIPALITY shall reimburse the COUNTY for all additional gross salary paid to the deputy serving thereunder for overtime hours and time spent in court in connection with the prosecution of MUNICIPALITY ordinances.

5. The COUNTY reserves the right to increase such monthly charges to reflect contract settlements affecting deputy salaries, fringe benefits, and any other increased costs which have taken place during the contract period. In addition, the COUNTY will bill the MUNICIPALITY retroactively for any increased costs due to such contract settlements for previous years.

6. This Contract constitutes and contains the entire agreement of the parties, and supersedes any and all other contracts, agreements or understandings between the parties, whether oral or written.

7. All vehicles furnished by the COUNTY under this AGREEMENT shall carry the identifying marks of the Sheriff’s Office. All vehicles and other equipment shall remain the property of the COUNTY.

8. The officers will enforce all local ordinances. The officers will write citations on forms supplied to them by the MUNICIPALITY. The COUNTY will be responsible for first appearances on all MUNICIPALITY citations; the MUNICIPAL ATTORNEY will handle the prosecution of those matters in any proceedings after initial appearance. It is further agreed that the fines or forfeitures for State charges shall be turned over to the COUNTY and the fines and forfeitures for those offences that are violations of MUNICIPALITY ordinances will be turned over to the MUNICIPALITY.

9. Any violation by PURCHASER of any portion of this contract shall constitute a breach of this Contract by PURCHASER. In the event of such breach, PROVIDER shall have the option of declaring this Contract terminated. If this Contract is declared terminated by PROVIDER, PURCHASER shall pay PROVIDER for such police service as have been rendered through the date of termination, prorated on the basis of the monthly charge set forth above.

10. Any violation by PROVIDER of any portion of this contract shall constitute a breach of this Contract by PROVIDER. In the event of such breach, PURCHASER shall have the option of declaring this Contract terminated. If this Contract is declared terminated by PURCHASER, PURCHASER is not liable for any charges for police services rendered after receipt of written notice of termination by the PROVIDER, with payment for services rendered prior to receipt of that notice to be prorated on the basis of the monthly charge set forth above.

11. It is the intent of and is understood by the parties that the relationship of PROVIDER and PURCHASER is that of an independent contractor. The PROVIDER is not the employee or agent of the PURCHASER, and the PURCHASER is not the employee or agent of the PROVIDER. Each party will therefore be responsible for its own acts or omissions and neither party will be obligated to defend or indemnify the other for any claim, loss or liability that results from the other’s acts or omissions. Nothing in this paragraph is intended to preclude or foreclose the right of either party to bring a cross claim or third party claim against the other for contribution a joint tortfeasor.

12. The term of this Contract shall be from January 1, 1996, through December 31, 1996, regardless of the dates of the signatures set forth below.

   Dated this __________ day of ________________, 19____

   WAUKESHA COUNTY
3. Consortium: Purchasing Network

V.A.L.U.E. IN LOCAL GOVERNMENT Of Southeastern Wisconsin

LETTER OF UNDERSTANDING FOR COOPERATIVE PURCHASING

P. O. Box 14611, West Allis, WI 53214

Volume Acquisition and Large Uniform Expenditures

This letter of Understanding made this ___________ day of ____________, 19___, by and between: ________________ (agency) and V.A.L.U.E. in Local Government

In consideration of the mutual promises contained in the Letter of Understanding and the provisions of the By-Laws and of the mutual benefits to result therefrom, the participants agree as follows:

1. Commonly used material, equipment and services as designated by the participants to this agreement may be purchased jointly commencing with the execution of this agreement.

2. Representatives from each agency shall agree on the specific material, equipment and services that shall be cooperatively procured and shall set forth in writing, as a minimum, a description for each purchase, the quantity and quality required, the delivery date, and the location for delivery.

3. A designated lead agency shall assume the responsibility for preparing the Invitation for Bid and advertising for bids in accordance with the By-Laws and Administrative Procedures of V.A.L.U.E. in Local Government. Such jurisdiction shall also be designated to receive and open the bids at the time and in the manner acceptable to all participants.

4. The lead agency shall submit a complete tabulation of all bids to the appropriate authority of each jurisdiction participating in the joint purchase and shall certify as to the responsive bidder offering the most advantageous proposal as set forth in the specification.

5. The lead agency has the right to reject any and all bids where deemed appropriate. When the right is exercised to reject all bids, it shall furnish to each participant an explanation and report on its action along with a complete tabulation of all bids received.

6. Each participant shall be responsible for issuing and expediting its own purchase orders, receiving shipments, inspecting goods, verifying invoices, and paying bills. No participant shall, by execution of this agreement or by participation in any purchase contract, be liable for any material, supplies, or equipment ordered or received by any other participant.

7. Participation in any joint purchase is optional by each agency prior to release of the joint purchase documents. Thereafter, all agencies who elect to participate are governed by the provisions of the joint purchase.

8. Any dispute arising between any of the participants hereto and a successful bidder not relating to 1) the validity of the award of the purchase contract or 2) the rejection of the bids, shall be settled by and at the cost of that participant involved in the dispute.

9. This agreement shall take effect upon execution of the signatures.

10. Additional agencies may, from time to time, execute this agreement and such execution subsequent to the effective date of this agreement shall not require re-execution by the original participants.

The above Letter of Understanding has been read, duty considered, and discussed and is hereby adopted this ___________ day of ____________, 19___.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Participating Agency</th>
<th>A.L.U.E. in local government</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Signature</td>
<td>Signature</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Typed name and title</td>
<td>Typed name and title</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Sample Resolution

A Resolution Establishing Policy Relating to Public Purchasing

WHEREAS, the City/Village of ________________ expends a significant portion of its annual budget on the purchase of capital equipment and consumable material, and

WHEREAS, it is the policy of the City/Village of ________________ to obtain these goods and equipment in the most cost effective manner in order to maximize savings and reduce the burden to the property tax payer, and

WHEREAS, recent study by the Shared Services Council has resulted in a finding that the potential exists for significant savings and enhancement of quality through the participation in cooperative bidding and purchasing of goods and equipment with other public sector purchasers, and

WHEREAS, the recent formation of an organization (Volume Acquisition and Large Uniform Expenditures, V.A.L.U.E.) dedicated to coordinating joint purchasing between governmental agencies in Southeastern Wisconsin will greatly facilitate the realization of the City/Village of ________________’s goal to increase cooperative purchasing of goods and equipment, now therefore

BE IT RESOLVED, that the City/Village of ________________ hereby authorizes the execution of a letter of understanding for cooperative purchasing with V.A.L.U.E. in Local Government, a copy of which is attached, and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED, the head of each department and all staff members responsible for purchasing in the City/Village of ________________ are hereby directed to actively consider and participate in joint or cooperative purchasing efforts with V.A.L.U.E. where savings can be realized, and

BE IT FINALLY RESOLVED, that a copy of this resolution be transmitted to each department head and those directly responsible for purchasing in the City/Village of.

Passed and adopted this __________ day of ________________, 19__.
APPENDIX 2

OHIO LOCAL LEADER PERSPECTIVE SURVEY – SURVEY INSTRUMENT

Note: The term local government used in the questions below refers to county, city, village, township, school district, and special district. We did not include school districts or special districts in our survey. However, your local government might be collaborating with a school district or special district.

Formal agreements include contracts approved by elected officials or signed agreements with two or more local governments.

Informal agreements maybe practices or agreements achieved through a handshake. They depend upon persons occupying local governmental positions.

1. Please check the box that best describes your local government’s experience with collaboration. Choose one of the following options:

☐ Our government has at least one or more formal collaborative agreements with at least one other local government

☐ Our government has one or more informal collaborative agreement(s) with at least one other local government

☐ Our government has both formal and informal collaborative agreements with other local governments

☐ Our government has no formal or informal collaborative agreements with other local governments

2. What best describes the reason(s) why your local government does not have informal or formal collaborative agreements with other local governments? Select any of the following options that apply:

☐ There is no need to create collaborative agreements

☐ Our residents require unique services

☐ Collaboration reduces our control over providing quality services (i.e. parks and recreation, water, sewer, and police)

☐ Collaboration reduces our ability to control administrative matters in such areas as purchasing

☐ There are too many barriers to our collaborating with other local governments

☐ Other, please specify

3. Please identify barriers internally, if any, to your government collaborating with other local governments formally. Select any of the following options that apply:

☐ Formal collaboration threatens our employees (e.g. job security)

☐ Formal collaboration does not really save tax payer dollars

☐ Formal collaboration requires too much time and efforts to be effective

☐ Formal collaboration reduces our control over service delivery

Dustin/Jones/Levine
4. Please identify barriers internally, if any, to your government collaborating with other local governments informally. Select any of the following options that apply:

☐ Informal collaboration threatens our employees (e.g. job security)
☐ Informal collaboration does not really save tax payer dollars
☐ Informal collaboration requires too much time and efforts to be effective
☐ Informal collaboration reduces our control over service delivery
☐ Informal Collaboration reduces our control over procurement of goods and services
☐ Other, please specify
☐ There are no internal barriers to Informal collaboration

5. Please identify barriers externally, if any, to your government collaborating with other local governments formally. Select any of the following options that apply:

☐ Formal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in state fiscal assistance, such as revenue transfers
☐ Formal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in state program assistance, such as road maintenance
☐ Formal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in federal fiscal assistance, such as revenue transfers
☐ Formal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in federal program assistance such as road construction
6. Please identify barriers externally, if any, to your government collaborating with other local governments informally. Select any of the following options that apply:

- Informal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in state fiscal assistance, such as revenue transfers
- Informal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in state program assistance, such as road maintenance
- Informal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in federal fiscal assistance, such as revenue transfers
- Informal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in federal program assistance such as road construction

- Other, please specify
- There are no external barriers to informal collaboration

7. Please identify the barriers, if any, to informal or formal collaboration from the viewpoint of local residents. Select any of the following options that apply:

- Collaboration may cause residents to be less involved in local government
- Collaboration may cause residents to believe that their needs are not being met
- Collaboration may cause residents to be confused about who to hold accountable for services
- Collaboration may cause citizens to be less supportive of future tax levies
- Other, please specify
8. Please identify the benefits, if any, that interlocal governmental collaboration can produce for your community. Select any of the following options that apply:

- Collaboration DOES NOT PROVIDE ANY BENEFITS TO OUR LOCAL GOVERNMENT
- Collaboration can reduce service delivery costs (efficiency)
- Collaboration can improve service quality (effectiveness)
- Collaboration can improve our responsiveness to our resident’s needs
- Collaboration can produce more equality in service delivery
- Collaboration can provide coordination among local governments in terms of programs
- Collaboration can improve policy decision making
- Collaboration can reduce the need for additional tax revenues
- Collaboration can increase economic growth
- Collaboration can bring additional expertise to local problem solving
- Collaboration can reduce duplication of services
- Other, please specify

9. If you identified more than one benefit from the list of potential benefits above, what is the most important benefit that collaboration can achieve?

Most important benefit is:

10. If collaboration can produce benefits for your local government, how much is this benefit worth?
Collaboration saves us % of our annual budget

11. In your opinion, if barriers to collaboration were removed, what is the potential worth of collaboration?

POTENTIAL of collaboration is worth % of our annual budget

Please provide general information about you and your local government.

12. Which level of government do you work for? Choose one of the following options:

- Village
- Township
- City
- County
- Other, please specify

13. Please tell us in which the county your local government is located. THIS QUESTION WILL BE USED ONLY TO DETERMINE WHETHER SURVEY RESPONSES REPRESENT DIFFERENT AREAS OF THE STATE.

County of

14. What is the population of your local government?
15. What is your current position? Choose one of the following options:

- Elected official
- Administrator
- Other, please specify

16. How many years do you work in the current office? Choose one of the following options:

- Under 5 years
- 5-10 years
- 11-15 years
- More than 15 years

17. In your career, how many years have you been served as a state or local official in Ohio? Choose one of the following options:

- Under 5 years
- 5-10 years
- 11-15 years
- More than 15 years
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Agreement Fee (Select any of the following options that apply):</th>
<th>Years of Agreement</th>
<th>Select all of the collaborating partners that apply for each of the Collaborative Agreements you selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>□ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>□ Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>□ Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>□ Other, please specify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>□ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>□ Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>□ Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>□ Other, please specify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Five</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>□ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>□ Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>□ Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>□ Other, please specify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RMS</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>□ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>□ Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>□ Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>□ Other, please specify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income and Property Tax Collection</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>□ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>□ Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>□ Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>□ Other, please specify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>□ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>□ Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>□ Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>□ Other, please specify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>□ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>□ Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>□ Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>□ Other, please specify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>□ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>□ Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>□ Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>□ Other, please specify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Dispatch</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>□ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>□ Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>□ Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>□ Other, please specify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>□ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>□ Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>□ Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>□ Other, please specify.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>□ School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>□ Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>□ Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Maintenance</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Management</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash/Refuse Removal</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Area</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaborative Agreement for (Select any of the following options that apply):</td>
<td>Years of Agreement</td>
<td>Select all of the collaborating partners that apply for each of the Collaborative Agreements you selected</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income and Property Tax Collection</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Dispatch</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>County</td>
<td>Other, please specify</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>City</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Section</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Maintenance</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Management</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trash/refuse removal</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify:</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify:</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments:</td>
<td>Township</td>
<td>Village</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OHIO LOCAL LEADER PERSPECTIVE SURVEY – QUESTIONS 1-17

Note: The term local government used in the questions below refers to county, city, village, township, school district, and special district. We did not include school districts or special districts in our survey. However, your local government might be collaborating with a school district or special district.

Formal agreements include contracts approved by elected officials or signed agreements with two or more local governments.

Informal agreements maybe practices or agreements achieved through a handshake. They depend upon persons occupying local governmental positions.

1. Please check the box that best describes your local government’s experience with collaboration.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Experience Description</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our government has at least one or more formal collaborative agreements with at least one other local government</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our government has one or more informal collaborative agreement(s) with at least one other local government</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>12.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our government has both formal and informal collaborative agreements with other local governments</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our government has no formal or informal collaborative agreements with other local governments</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Total</td>
<td>419</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2. Reason(s) local government does not have informal or formal collaborative agreements:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>There is no need to create collaborative agreements</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our residents require unique services</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration reduces our control over providing quality services</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(i.e. parks and recreation, water, sewer, and police)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration reduces our ability to control administrative matters</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>in such areas as purchasing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are too many barriers to our collaborating with other local</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>9.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify: See Appendix 5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>14.8%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Internal barriers to formal collaboration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reason</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal collaboration threatens our employees (e.g. job security)</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal collaboration does not really save tax payer dollars</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal collaboration requires too much time and efforts to be effective</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal collaboration reduces our control over service delivery</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>18.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal collaboration reduces our control over procurement of goods</td>
<td>42</td>
<td>9.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and services</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify: See Appendix 5</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>11.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no internal barriers to formal collaboration</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4. Internal barriers to informal collaboration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal barriers to informal collaboration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal collaboration threatens our employees (e.g. job security)</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>4.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal collaboration does not really save tax payer dollars</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>6.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal collaboration requires too much time and efforts to be effective</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>5.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal collaboration reduces our control over service delivery</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>8.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal collaboration reduces our control over procurement of goods and services</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify: See Appendix 5</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no internal barriers to Informal collaboration</td>
<td>256</td>
<td>60.2%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. External barriers to formal collaboration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>External barriers to formal collaboration</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Formal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in state fiscal assistance, such as revenue transfers</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>10.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in state program assistance, such as road maintenance</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>10.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in federal fiscal assistance, such as revenue transfers</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Formal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in federal program assistance such as road construction</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify: See Appendix 5</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no external barriers to formal collaboration</td>
<td>215</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
6. External barriers to informal collaboration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Informal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in state fiscal assistance, such as revenue transfers</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>8.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in state program assistance, such as road maintenance</td>
<td>30</td>
<td>7.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in federal fiscal assistance, such as revenue transfers</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>5.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Informal collaboration could lead to possible reduction in federal program assistance such as road construction</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify: <em>See Appendix 5</em></td>
<td>54</td>
<td>12.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>There are no external barriers to Informal collaboration</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

7. Local resident viewpoint on barriers:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration may cause residents to be less involved in local government</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration may cause residents to believe that their needs are not being met</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>27.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration may cause residents to be confused about who to hold accountable for services</td>
<td>217</td>
<td>51.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration may cause citizens to be less supportive of future tax levies</td>
<td>144</td>
<td>33.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify: <em>See Appendix 5</em></td>
<td>55</td>
<td>12.9%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
8. Benefits from interlocal governmental collaboration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration DOES NOT PROVIDE ANY BENEFITS TO OUR LOCAL GOVERNMENT</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration can reduce service delivery costs (efficiency)</td>
<td>289</td>
<td>68.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration can improve service quality (effectiveness)</td>
<td>258</td>
<td>60.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration can improve our responsiveness to our resident’s needs</td>
<td>231</td>
<td>54.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration can produce more equality in service delivery</td>
<td>135</td>
<td>31.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration can provide coordination among local governments in terms of programs</td>
<td>281</td>
<td>66.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration can improve policy decision making</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>26.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration can reduce the need for additional tax revenues</td>
<td>221</td>
<td>52.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration can increase economic growth</td>
<td>232</td>
<td>54.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration can bring additional expertise to local problem solving</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>57.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Collaboration can reduce duplication of services</td>
<td>285</td>
<td>67.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify: See Appendix 5</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>5.6%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9. If you identified more than one benefit from the list of potential benefits above, what is the most important benefit that collaboration can achieve?

See Appendix 5

10. Percentage of the annual budget saved by collaboration:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5%</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>28.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10%</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>21.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25%</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>13.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 25%</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>71</td>
<td>23.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Total</td>
<td>304</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>121</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
11. Percentage of the annual budget that local collaboration is worth:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Percentage</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt;1%</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>6.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1-5%</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>13.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6-10%</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>19.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-25%</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>26.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater than 25%</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>12.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Don’t know</td>
<td>62</td>
<td>21.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>283</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

12. Which level of government do you work for?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Village</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>19.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>207</td>
<td>49.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>22.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>8.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify: See Appendix</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>420</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Refused | 142
TOTAL   | 425
13. Please tell us in which the county your local government is located.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Allen</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allen/Van Wert</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashland</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ashtabula</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Athens</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auglaize</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belmont</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Butler</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carroll</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Champaign</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clark</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clermont</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Clinton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbiana</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coshocton</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crawford</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cuyahoga</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Darke</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Defiance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Delaware</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairfield</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fayette</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Franklin</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fulton</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gallia</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geauga</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hamilton</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hancock</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Henry</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Highland</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Huron</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jefferson</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Knox</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lake</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Licking</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lorain</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>Frequency</td>
<td>Valid Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>---------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lucas</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Madison</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mahoning</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marion</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medina</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meigs</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mercer</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Miami</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Monroe</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>4.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Morrow</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Muskingum</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ottawa</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perry</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pickaway</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Portage</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Preble</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Putnam</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Richland</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ross</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandusky</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scioto</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seneca</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shelby</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stark</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Summit</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>three - h,c,w</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Trumbull</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tuscarawas</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Van Wert</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wayne</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Williams</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wood</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wyandot</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Total</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>425</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
14. What is the population of your local government?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5,000</td>
<td>180 45.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 - 9,999</td>
<td>70 17.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10,000 - 14,999</td>
<td>52 13.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15,000 - 24,999</td>
<td>29 7.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25,000 - 49,999</td>
<td>39 9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>50,000 - 99,999</td>
<td>14 3.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>100,000+</td>
<td>16 4.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Total</td>
<td>400 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

15. What is your current position?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elected official</td>
<td>299 72.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrator</td>
<td>100 24.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>16 3.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Total</td>
<td>415 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

16. How many years have you worked in your current office?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>135 32.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>137 32.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>60 14.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>84 20.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Total</td>
<td>416 100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
17. In your career, how many years have you served as a state or local official in Ohio?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Under 5 years</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5-10 years</td>
<td>99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11-15 years</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>More than 15 years</td>
<td>172</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid Total</td>
<td>414</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Refused</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TOTAL</td>
<td>425</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Typology and Geography Frequency Tables

Ohio Department of Health County or Ohio Department of Job and Family Services Typology Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ohio Department of Health County or Ohio Department of Job and Family Services Typology</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Metropolitan</td>
<td>134</td>
<td>31.5</td>
<td>32.4</td>
<td>32.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Appalachian</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>12.2</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Non-Appalachian</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>25.1</td>
<td>70.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>29.2</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>414</td>
<td>97.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Local Health Department Regions Table

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Health Department Regions</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Central</td>
<td>84</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>20.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>24.3</td>
<td>44.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northwest</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>22.1</td>
<td>22.6</td>
<td>67.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southeast</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>73.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southwest</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>416</td>
<td>97.9</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>425</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
OHIO LOCAL LEADER PERSPECTIVE SURVEY – QUESTIONS 18 & 19

Note: The term local government used in the questions below refers to county, city, village, township, school district, and special district. We did not include school districts or special districts in our survey. However, your local government might be collaborating with a school district or special district.

18. In the table below, please provide information about your current formal collaboration agreements with other local governments, the number of years that the collaboration has been enforce, and your collaborating partners. Please check all apply:

For a complete listing of the open-ended responses to the fields in questions 18 and 19, visit http://www.wright.edu/cupa/ssd/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Agreement for (Select any of the following options that apply):</th>
<th>Years of Agreement</th>
<th>Select all of the collaborating partners that apply for each of the Collaborative Agreements you selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Water&lt;br&gt;Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td>10.8 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 3.1 % Village</td>
<td>10.8 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 3.1 % Village&lt;br&gt; School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire&lt;br&gt;Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td>52.2 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 2.1 % Village</td>
<td>52.2 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 2.1 % Village&lt;br&gt; School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>EMS&lt;br&gt;Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td>42.6 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 1.9 % Village</td>
<td>42.6 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 1.9 % Village&lt;br&gt; School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Income and Property Tax Collection&lt;br&gt;Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td>8.2 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 2.8 % Village</td>
<td>8.2 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 2.8 % Village&lt;br&gt; School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Planning&lt;br&gt;Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td>14.4 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 2.1 % Village</td>
<td>14.4 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 2.1 % Village&lt;br&gt; School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Code Enforcement&lt;br&gt;Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td>7.3 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 0.5 % Village</td>
<td>7.3 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 0.5 % Village&lt;br&gt; School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Economic Development&lt;br&gt;Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td>13.2 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 2.6 % Village</td>
<td>13.2 % Towns&lt;br&gt; 2.6 % Village&lt;br&gt; School District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Type</td>
<td>Special District</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>44.5 % Emergency Dispatch</td>
<td>% Teams</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% lip</td>
<td>12.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>15.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>34.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>33.9 % Police</td>
<td>% Teams</td>
<td>14.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% lip</td>
<td>11.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>9.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.6 % Park and Recreation</td>
<td>% Teams</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% lip</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30.4 % Road Maintenance</td>
<td>% Teams</td>
<td>22.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% lip</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>17.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.4 % Information Technology</td>
<td>% Teams</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% lip</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.9 % Procurement</td>
<td>% Teams</td>
<td>8.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Commenter: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% lip</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Service Area</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Type</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>----</td>
<td>------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fleet Maintenance</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Solid Waste Management</td>
<td>24.2</td>
<td>Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>34.4</td>
<td>Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Touchtone removal</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>Towns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>%</td>
<td>Description</td>
<td>County</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.9</td>
<td>Public Transportation</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>10.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>Insurance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Facilities Maintenance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Facilities</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>Human Services</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>Other, please specify: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Other, please specify: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Community: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
19. In the table below, please provide information about your current informal collaboration agreements with other local governments, the number of years that the collaboration has been enforce, and your collaborating partners. Please check all apply:

For a complete listing of the open-ended responses to the fields in questions 18 and 19, visit http://www.wright.edu/cupa/ssd/
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Collaborative Agreement for (Select any of the following options that apply):</th>
<th>Years of Agreement</th>
<th>Select all of the collaborating partners that apply for each of the Collaborative Agreements you selected</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6.1% Water</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Towns 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.4% Fire</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>Towns 0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.5% EMS</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>Towns 0.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.9% Income and Property Tax Collection</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Towns 0.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6% Planning</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Towns 1.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3% Code Enforcement</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>Towns 0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comment: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.6% Economic Development</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>Towns 0.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Category</td>
<td>Example of City</td>
<td>% Population</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Emergency Dispatch</td>
<td>See URL listed above</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Police</td>
<td>See URL listed above</td>
<td>2.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parks and Recreation</td>
<td>See URL listed above</td>
<td>2.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Road Maintenance</td>
<td>See URL listed above</td>
<td>12.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Information Technology</td>
<td>See URL listed above</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement</td>
<td>See URL listed above</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1</th>
<th>Fleet Maintenance</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Town</th>
<th>1.6</th>
<th>Village</th>
<th>0.0</th>
<th>City</th>
<th>0.9</th>
<th>County</th>
<th>0.7</th>
<th>Other, please specify. See URL listed above</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Solid Waste Management</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Animal Control</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>Public Health</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>2.4</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>Libraries</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>Public Housing</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>Trash/Refuse removal</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>Town</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>Village</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>City</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.9% Public Transportation</td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>0.9% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.7% School District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>0.2% Special District</td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>0.9% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>1.4% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.2% Special District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>0.0% Special District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>0.5% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.2% Special District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.2% Insurance</th>
<th>% County</th>
<th>0.5% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</th>
<th>% Township</th>
<th>0.7% School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>0.0% Special District</td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>0.2% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.5% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>0.2% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.2% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0.9% Facilities</th>
<th>% County</th>
<th>0.2% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</th>
<th>% Township</th>
<th>0.2% School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>0.0% Special District</td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>0.2% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.2% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>0.2% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.2% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>2.1% Human Services</th>
<th>% County</th>
<th>0.2% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</th>
<th>% Township</th>
<th>0.2% School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>0.5% Special District</td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>0.2% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.2% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>0.2% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.2% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>1.6% Other, please specify: See URL listed above</th>
<th>% County</th>
<th>0.0% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</th>
<th>% Township</th>
<th>0.0% School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>0.0% Special District</td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>0.0% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>0.0% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>0.2% Other, please specify: See URL listed above</th>
<th>% County</th>
<th>0.0% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</th>
<th>% Township</th>
<th>0.0% School District</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>0.0% Special District</td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>0.0% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% Village</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
<td>% City</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>% County</td>
<td>0.0% Other, please specify. See URL listed above</td>
<td>% Township</td>
<td>0.0% Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other, please specify: See URL listed above</td>
<td>0.0 % City</td>
<td>0.0 % Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Comments: See URL listed above</td>
<td>0.0 % County</td>
<td>0.2 % Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| Other, please specify: See URL listed above | 0.0 % Township | 0.0 % School District |
| Comments: See URL listed above | 0.0 % Village | 0.0 % Special District |

| Other, please specify: See URL listed above | 0.0 % City | 0.0 % Regional Planning Agency/Council of Governments |
| Comments: See URL listed above | 0.0 % County | 0.0 % Other, please specify: See URL listed above |
APPENDIX 5

OHIO LOCAL LEADER PERSPECTIVE SURVEY – OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES

2. Reason(s) local government does not have informal or formal collaborative agreements: Please specify

- Agreements vary based on need & request.
- Collaboration with other cities is being discussed.
- Collaboration works both formally and informally
- Concern on not getting fair share of service for money paid.
- Cooperation from larger municipalities
- Differences as to approaches and means of handling issues and priorities
- Distance to other local governments - rural area of state - furthest township for county seat
- Does not apply
- Does not apply since we collaborate
- Egos of governmental leaders get in the way
- Green Twp. has many agreements
- Has not been a priority
- Have not had the Opportunity, work with the Village but no formal agreement
- It is difficult due to politics of the matter and some elected officials feel they are relinquishing their direct control or input
- Jackson Twp. has EMS contract with three other local governments.
- Just haven't pursued
- N/A (8)
- Never been discussed
- Never considered or have asked to collaborate
- No other opportunities
- Not sure where to begin.
- Ohio Revised code makes it difficult for a township and a city to collaborate
- Our collaboration would be with equipment and the problem is that both governments may need equipment at same time, and maintenance/repair of said equipment.
- Our residents prefer local control of essential services such as police, fire, water, sewer, and power
- Police and fire chiefs will not give up their control of their departments
- Reduction of services, loss of revenue to cities, counties
- Restrictions in law
- Sometimes our potential partners are not interested or lack funding
- Sometimes we collaborate when doing repairs on roads.
- The cities in our area seem to feel there nothing in it for them.
- There is no co-operation from local entities
- Too much red tape.
- Township does not want to co-operate
- Types and Level of service
- Unable to create equally agreeable services
- We attempt to collaborate whenever possible.
- We collaborate extensively
- We collaborate where appropriate
- We collaborate with road equipment and fire department assistance.
- We do collaborate with our residents
- We do have agreements (4)
• We do work together thru the county twp assoc., but nothing specific comes to mind just now

• We have 2 areas where we collaborate with another govt., but won't do any additional because of control issues.

• We have both formal and informal collaborative agreements

• We have both informal and formal agreements.

• We have collaborative agreements

• We have formal and informal collaborative agreements

• We have mutual aid for fire and police

• We have tried new collaborative approaches with other governmental entities, but have not been successful -- others do not want to lose their "identity"

• We participate in formal and informal

• We sometimes don't agree on how to approach things because of diversity of constituents.

3. Internal barriers to formal collaboration: Please specify

• Again the police and fire chiefs will not give up their control to another city

• Arduous process, but required.

• Budget control, co-mingling of tax revenues

• Can, depending on the service, reduce control over the delivery

• Councilmember reluctance to agreed to formal plans

• Egos of our own governmental leaders get in the way

• Fear that city will not get fair share of service for money provided

• Financing

• Formal collaboration can lessens local control over costs and rate setting

• Frustration dealing with Columbus Division of Water

• Funding

• Government is afraid of change and don't want to give up control

• Independently Elected Official Resistance

• Initial negotiation, administrative challenges, legal costs, small tax base

• Internal barriers, such as job security for employees, is an issue, but can be addressed

• It can reduce quality of service to our citizens

• It reduces the quality and frequency of service by increasing the service area

• Just the habit of doing our own thing

• Keep in mind we have formal collaborative agreements

• Lack of knowledge and understanding of the processes required to enter into formal agreements.

• Lack of leadership

• Legal Fee's to set up a formal collaborative agreement

• Legislatures should not require contracts or agreements...-i.e. - they need to legislate CYA that talks to insurance BWC problems etc..............

• Liability issues

• Local politics

• Loss of identity

• N/A

• No barriers from our experiences

• Not be enough time for short term collaborations if item has to be brought up at both meeting

• Officials having their own agendas

• On occasion up front dollars are needed and we do not have the cash flow to front the project.

• ORC; State Government forcing things down our throats

• Past experience is that such agreements can be Dustin/Jones/Levine
fragile (even when formal) if relationships break down

- Politics and parochialism is a major barrier to help to make collaboration happen.
- Politics, geography, size of community, type of neighboring government
- Primary barrier is turf and budget. Overarching challenge is control.
- Providential thinking among local government leaders deters collaboration
- Reduces control over costs
- Requires varying time/effort but generally worth it
- Resistance on the part of administration levels
- Simply requires additional work than what we may have done on our own
- Some individuals feel they lose direct influence or control over things. (i.e.; feel threatened)
- Some reluctance to do things differently among county office holders.
- Some residents in small communities feel they will be serviced faster and more effectively if they have their own services, such as fire protection and law enforcement.
- Statutory form of government
- The only barriers, if any, are political in nature
- The township is worried about annexation
- They can be very good for government entities. They can save both parties money
- Timing - legislation may not be passed in time to take advantage of the agreement
- Trust
- Unequal authority--don't want to feed the monster that can take you over.
- We do collaborate, but initially it takes a tremendous amount of time and does control things such as service delivery and procurement
- We have both informal and formal agreements.

- While we do collaborate formally & informally - often - with other governments we often find we have to involve the prosecutor's office to work around or through bidding issues and legal barriers. We do go to the effort but I know some communities have just felt it wasn't worth the hassle.
- Will inevitably create additional government as oversight.

4. Internal barriers to informal collaboration: Please specify

- Accurate division of costs to each entity, billing procedures, and accounting challenges
- Again, officials would lose local control of their individual agendas
- Can, depending on the service, reduce control over the delivery
- Collaboration should be formally spelled out in my opinion.
- Co-mingling of tax revenues
- Different goals, priorities, and differences in available revenue
- Government is afraid of change
- Histories of rivalries
- How to track fairness of share resources
- Informal collaboration can lessens local control over costs and rate setting
- Informal collaboration is not as limiting because the ability to modify or terminate collaboration is much easier when it is informal.
- Informal must be just as clear in understanding
- Initial negotiation, administrative challenges, legal costs, small tax base
- Leadership changes makes informal agreements a challenge
- Liability concerns if we have no written agreement
- Loss of identity

Dustin/Jones/Levine
• May not be legal, individuals change
• Mayor refuses to co-operate
• Mind set of both jurisdictions needs to be the same
• N/A
• No barriers from our experiences
• Past experience is that such agreements can break down as leaders change
• Politics of the situation
• Simply requires additional work than what we may have done on our own
• Takes time to establish relationships with other unit of government
• The only barriers, if any, are political in nature
• These agreement are only used when time allows
• time or context to work them out or awareness of the possibilities
• Timeliness, with limited resources.
• Trust
• Turf issues, ability to work together both internally and with other local government officials
• Unequal service levels.
• We are trying to form partnerships with other police departments for 911 services
• We have both informal and formal agreements.
• We have had contracts broken when officials change office.
• We only collaborate by contract
• When elected officials change, services may not be delivered in the same fashion as those previously agreed upon. In some instances, newly elected officials may choose not to offer the service at all.
• Will inevitably create additional government as oversight

5. External barriers to formal collaboration: Specify
• Above
• Assuring comparable cost and benefit to both entities
• Barriers in state statutes
• Being able to get our local government legal counsel to draw up a contract
• Cannot get formal agreement past "legal eagle" for other entity
• Cities and county governments are in financial trouble, township governments seem to be very sound
• Collaboration leads to additional funding
• Collaborations aren't always easy because there are inherent conflicts to deal with, some at the beginning of the process and others as the process moves forward.
• Collective Bargaining Agreements
• Collective bargaining laws may inhibit collaboration
• Different goals, priorities, and differences in available revenue.
• Different tax rates, levies and jurisdictions
• Differing priorities & levels of service
• Electorate may perceive collaboration is the first step to annexation
• Ever evolving process that may involve any of the above. Also, turf issues that can be strong with some entities on particular issues.
• Geography and/or statutory restrictions
• Getting "our share" is less certain. We have had two bad experiences with formal collaboration so far.
• Government is afraid of change
• I am unable to answer this because our formal collaborations do not hinder us in any of the above categories. However, I can see where this could happen because we have received federal and state money as a result of our high percentage of LMI residents.
• I don't think this question makes sense. I believe...
formal collaboration makes it possible to obtain more financial assistance

- I think the more communities can collaborate they would received more funding.
- If forced, formal collaboration could have a negative local economic effect.
- If township co-operated our area would be better
- Inability to control decisions that lead to greater costs
- It has already started with reduced funding from fed and state
- It is sometimes complicated and time consuming.
- It is time consuming to coordinate
- Joint Economic Development Agreements could result in income taxation of our residents or may affect school district property tax income.
- Legal impediments (ORC restrictions)
- Local entities are not willing to co-operate
- Local government has to manage money wisely
- Local Mayor Is An Ass
- Local politics, citizens are unaccustomed to collaborative agreements
- Loss of control over service delivery
- Loss of control to "big" government
- Loss of identity and annexation
- Loss of local identity/control
- Many other entities don't like to collaborate and lose control
- Most other potential collaborators are not willing
- N/A
- Need more information before answering
- No incentive to pursue
- No state law allowing a joint police district, Township group not sure if they want to go along with proposal
- None experienced
- Ohio Revised Code
- Ohio Revised Code is often too restrictive (2)
- Only limited by legal issues
- Other government’s failure to understand the benefits of collaboration.
- Other local governments are the barrier
- Political instability of other government
- Political Power Plays as to Control
- Politics (2)
- Politics and geography (i.e., distances from one another), type of neighboring government
- Politics and jealousy
- Politics of annexation, mistrust due to winner takes all sense AND MOSTLY statutory governments are restricted from doing so! Twp and County could do much more if the state eliminated restrictions...i.e. stop interfering with creativity OR just allow us flexibility of the home rule governments at least to the extent we could be a little creative!
- Poor leadership in city
- Poor question
- Powers authorized to different governmental entities (i.e. municipal vs. township)
- Public concerns for services
- Public Perception
- Reduce community pride and then service quality
- Requirement that we use prevailing wage on large projects costs all government entities significantly. Some projects, including ones of collaboration become not worth the cost or effort.
- Residents don’t want government to have anything to do with the other
- Restrictions in law
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- Services would cut
- Smaller jurisdictions unwilling to give up control of large operations
- Some community mistrust
- Some elected officials feel they want to control what they feel is best for their respective issues.
- Some of our neighbors do not want to collaborate with us because they perceive us to be a rapacious City, interested only in annexation.
- Some of the townships feel threatened that their collaboration with our city will reduce their budget, even though we provide many critical services such as fire and EMS coverage to them. They are not well informed about their budget and what their constituents need and the cost savings that would occur if they indeed shared the police protections with them.
- Some other branches of government become barriers
- Some statutory or political barriers
- Sometimes, acceptance of liabilities creates issues. This in turn creates challenges for insurance identification.
- State Government; ORC; Politics
- Statutory barriers exist to combine police services in two adjacent communities
  - The complexity of navigating both the legal and the territorial (turf) obstacles are imposing.
- The lack of continuity of statutes between government types, e.g., 6 month standard constituting abandonment of non-conforming use in a village, 2 year standard for abandonment in unincorporated township (the problem is the same for a village as it is for a township, and the issue is magnified when the non-conforming use is located along the border of unincorporated township and village (so why the double standard?) ; laws that prevent county and township collaboration due to lack of statutory authority of one government type of statutory form of government or the other to make it happen
  - The other local government
  - The process requires legal counsel.
- Time required
- Timing—it takes a long time to get legislation passed
- Too much government involvement when collaboration takes place.
- Tradition of local, autonomous governance
- Trust other cities want all the control
- Trying to convince other governmental entities that collaboration is good and that there are not any “hidden agendas”
- Unwillingness of 800 lb gorilla
- We have both informal and formal agreements.

6. External barriers to informal collaboration: Specify
- Ability to work together and job security
  - Again, none of our informal collaborations have this issue.
- As elected officials change so does the agreements
  - Barriers in state statutes
  - Blanket coverage by sheriff is a concern
  - Collaboration should be formally spelled out in my opinion.
- Collective Bargaining Agreements
- Collective bargaining laws may inhibit collaboration
  - Concerns over audit of use of funds
  - Confusion on agreement
  - Defining of expectations in informal setting
  - Differing priorities & levels of service
  - Difficult to keep track of costs and no formal mechanisms for reimbursement for services
  - Diminished responsiveness to our constituents
  - Ever evolving process that may involve any of the above and turf issues that can be strong with some
entities on particular issues.

- Funding for computer program replacement for one community (i.e. accounting, two cities have different programs, the larger city could oversee the smaller cities accounting but who pays for the program replacement?
- Geography and/or statutory restrictions
- Government is afraid of change
- I think the fear of all the above creates a reason to consider informal collaboration, and for collaboration to be successful, assistance to do so needs to be enhanced verses reductions that are bound to occur with status quo in Ohio
- Internal factors affecting the external jurisdiction.
  - It is time consuming to coordinate
  - Legal issues need resolved
  - Liability
  - Local entities will not co-operate
  - Loss of control over service delivery
  - Many other entities don’t like to collaborate and lose control
  - Minor situational ones which are not blocking our cooperation, more importantly are state prohibitions against doing anything the state has not already thought of and codified...not rocket science the state of Ohio prohibits many ideas by statute, by virtue of the statutory governments, stat city, twp, and county
  - Mistrust of county by smaller units of local government
  - N/A
  - Need more information before answering
  - No incentive to pursue
  - None known
  - Only limited by legal issues
  - Other government’s failure to understand the true benefits of collaboration.
  - Our surrounding townships are very territorial and it is hard for them to collaborate.
  - Personalities/ politics with the city and external entities
  - Political instability of other government
  - Political posturing
  - Political Power Plays as to Control
  - Politics
  - Politics and jealousy
  - Poor leadership in city
  - Poor question
  - Poorly drawn bid specs and supervision of road projects when we work with the county. Always result in cost over runs.
  - Public dissatisfaction with our use of their tax dollars to “help” some other jurisdiction
  - Public Perception
  - Radiation of local, autonomous governance
  - Reduction in tax revenue
  - Restrictions in law
  - State Government; ORC
  - The cost
  - The other local government
  - Time required
  - Too much government involvement when collaboration takes place.
  - Use of funds might lead to audit finds for recovery
  - We have both informal and formal agreements.
  - Willingness to negotiate by Columbus

7. Local resident viewpoint on barriers: Please specify

- Afraid of change
- Any of the above if not presented with a clear
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benefit to them.

- Citizens expect collaboration
- Citizens may have a lack of confidence in other agencies with which we may collaborate and that one community will somehow subsidize another
- Collaboration can be confusing at times.
- Collaboration may cause elected officials to feel they are relinquishing power or input
- Community identification, cost, lack of understanding
- Disparity in treatment - those who have may lose privileges
- Does not apply
- Don’t trust city leadership
- Fear of loss of control
- General mistrust of government in general, more so the farther the government is from their own backyard (local)
- Have received no reaction from local residents.
- I don’t think there are any barriers from a resident point of view.
- In some cases, the collaborating organizations have different boundaries and tax bases leading to questions of why the City would collaborate, alone, with the school district and not get participation from the township also served by the school district.
- Inherent township/village animus
- Leadership must understand ramifications and explain. Explanations not always readily accepted.
- Local council less in control of service
- Local residents really don’t care unless you are asking them for money.
- Loss of local control of costs
- Many residents like the idea of collaboration, at least at the beginning of the process
- My residents (city) have shouldered costs for townships
- Need to make taxpayers aware what is happening with the collaborative efforts on line, in the newspapers and on the television.
- Never discussed
- No barriers, the residents applaud collaboration
- No Interest of source
- No trust
- None of the above (11)
- Our residents are satisfied with our collaboration efforts with other local governments.
- Politics
- Politics, townships are archaic, trustees have little understanding of how different levels of government function
- Reduces community identity
- Residents are always concerned about change and the fear that change could impact services and/or cost them more
- Residents like to have local access to their municipal officials. They understand that county, state and federal holders cannot be reached as easily face to face
- Residents lose their ability to go directly to people they know and trust and feel their taxes are being used to support other communities
- Residents often want their own services, i.e. fire, police and may not want to be linked to neighboring governments
- Residents tend to be supportive of local services, but less supportive if they do not perceive the service is provided by their community. This is particularly true as to fire and rescue. There is a comfort in knowing the people serving and that these people also know the community.
- Services will not be the same quality
- So long as the job is done properly and it saved the Township money usually is their concern
- Some fear loss of identity
- Some residents fear metro government
Some residents may feel their benefits are being reduced or negatively affected for the betterment of the region or of other non-residents.

Unaware because have not been a part of yet

We strive to collaborate

Who gets credit/blame for projects

You need an n/a choice on all these questions

8. Benefits from inter-local governmental collaboration: Please specify

All of the above are possible - but need review on a case-by-case basis to truly understand the benefits to the community.

All of the items marked are possible with collaboration. The challenge is in assuring that entities “carry their own weight” and that one community is not subsidizing services for another. I’m working on a fire merger currently, and the biggest challenge is insuring a fair and equitable agreement for all aspects including cost allocations as well as the value of existing resources.

Benefits would not exist without collaboration.

Can reduce cost to provide the service which is different than reducing the need for future tax increases.

Can reduce misunderstanding between governments and provide the best services for community outreach with local groups working together with surrounding governments.

Collaboration can reduce response time by first responders

Collaboration has only been beneficial in the areas of police and fire/EMS services

Collaboration is a great idea; but how do we break down those barriers!

Collaboration tailored to our needs and strengths works the best

Compete collaboratively to compare to the 3 C’s for grants

Emphasis on economies of scale

If done well all of the above could happen. Professionalism of management would be key. Difficult to achieve. Travel time is increased for decision makers, administrators. There is a cost with this, too, in energy and time.

Improve working relationships with other government entities

It could reduce service. Bigger is not always better.

Most all

Need to look on a case by case basis - if it benefits your township

No Benefits

On a case by case basis any of the above could apply

Our work force is small only 2 workers

Provide greater in-service programs

Reduce accountability

Reduce duplication of personnel and equipment

Resident approval

Tax payers could see a real effort in reducing costs

There are rarely benefits - other than the perception by residents of “smaller government”

There is too much frivolous spending in government

These statements are not across the board accurate - but are accurate applied to voluntary collaboration when it is appropriate.

We support regional collaboration

Work with our Village but have no formal agreement

9. Most important benefit from local government collaboration is:

Additional expertise (5)
• Additional expertise to local problem solving
• All Checked
• All of the above are important. The goal must be effect, efficient services that are not compromised by collaboration. My experience has also been that some of the biggest forms of collaboration may not cut cost initially if service is not going to be compromised, but that savings is realized over time. Procurement type collaborations should be cost cutting from the beginning. Service delivery on the other hand needs to be looked at over a longer period of time for savings to be realized.

• Avoid duplication of services
• Being able to plan for the future
• Better delivery of services
• Better service
• Bringing additional expertise to local problem solving (2)
• Brings additional expertise to problem solving
• Budget saving and efficiency improvements
• Can bring additional expertise to solving problems
• Can improve responsiveness to our residents needs
• Can reduce duplication of services (3)
• Can reduce service delivery costs
• Can reduce service delivery costs (efficiency)
• Collaboration can help in problem solving less than 10% to increasing your costs
• Collaboration can improve our responsiveness to our residents needs.
• Collaboration can bring additional expertise to local problem solving
• Collaboration can improve our responsiveness to our resident’s needs
• Collaboration can improve service quality (2)
• Collaboration can increase economic growth (3)
• Collaboration can provide coordination among local governments in terms of programs
• Collaboration can reduce delivery costs.
• Collaboration can reduce duplication of services
• Collaboration can reduce duplication of services which reduces costs.
• Collaboration can reduce service delivery costs (3)
• Collaboration can reduce service delivery costs (efficiency)
• Collaboration can reduce the need for additional tax revenues (3)
• Combining resources to achieve more services
• Cooperation among local governments
• Coordination (4)
• Coordination among local governments (4)
• Coordination among local governments in terms of programs
• Coordination among local governments to improve service, adds expertise, and become more financially efficient for the greater good of the entire region.

• Coordination in terms of programs
• Co-ordination of services
• Cost (4)
• Cost containment
• Cost effectiveness
• Cost reduction (4)
• Cost reduction of equipment. Recently purchased a boom mower with another twp. - half the money and you only use mower maybe 7 or 8 months a year.

• Cost reduction/containment
• Cost savings (6)
• Cost sharing/savings

Dustin/Jones/Levine
Could save money by reducing the need for purchasing new equipment.

Duplication of service/service quality
Duplication of services (7)
Economic benefit
Economic development
Economic growth (11)
Effective delivery of service at the lowest taxpayer cost possible.

Effectiveness
Effectiveness - there is rarely just one reason
Effectiveness and lowering cost
Efficiency (19)
Efficiency and duplication
Efficiency and effectiveness
Efficiency in delivery of services
Eliminate the duplication of large equipment expenses and bigger-better bids to vendors for road repair contracts

Emergency assistance
Equality
Expertise in problem solving
Financial
Getting people to work for a command goal for the best of everyone.

Improve our responsiveness to our resident’s needs (5)
Improve policy decisions
Improve quality, reduce cost
Improve responsiveness to our resident’s needs (2)
Improve responsiveness (4)
Improve responsiveness to residents
Improve Service (4)

Improve service delivery (3)
Improve service delivery costs
Improve service quality (19)
Improve service quality and reduce costs to all collaborators
Improve service quality and saving money
Improve the quality of decision making
Improved economic growth
Improved and or expanded service delivery
Improved chance of project approval
Improved efficiency and cost effectiveness
Improved responsiveness to residents’ needs
Improving responsiveness to our resident’s needs
Increase economic growth (11)
Increase professionalism if the right people are running the services/programs
Increase responsiveness to resident’s needs, particularly in emergency situations.

Increased economic development growth
Increased efficiency (2)
Increased income tax and cost savings
It can improve responsiveness to resident’s needs
It make all governments work together including State and Federal
It makes our work force bigger
Less need for additional tax revenues
Leveraging of dollars to provide services greater than what would be possible by either local government acting alone -- e.g., park amenities
Local problem solving (2)
Lower cost
Lower pricing
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• Lowering the need for additional tax dollars
• Making tax dollars go further
• Making us more effective
• More efficiencies and less taxes
• More efficient services to residents
• More equality in service delivery
• Mutual aid
• No benefit
• No duplication of equipment.
• None (2)
• Number 4-EMS runs
• Organizing shared responsibilities
• Our constituents expect us to be more efficient and collaboration permits us to demonstrate doing that.
• Partnership to conserve resources
• Provide better services
• Reduce additional tax revenues
• Reduce cost while increasing benefits.
• Reduce costs (16)
• Reduce delivery costs for residents
• Reduce duplication (7)
• Reduce duplication and costs
• Reduce duplication and reduce costs
• Reduce duplication of services (28)
• Reduce duplication of services and expenses as with fire equipment or specialized road equipment
• Reduce duplications of services (which should save money)
• Reduce need for additional tax revenues (8)
• Reduce need for more taxes and bring governments closer together
• Reduce service cost and improve quality

• Reduce service costs (5)
• Reduce service delivery cost (26)
• Reduce taxes
• Reduce the need for additional tax revenues (4)
• Reduced costs - combined Fire, EMS, etc.
• Reduced delivery cost that can forestall, reduce, or hold off additional tax revenue needs.
• Reduced need for additional taxes
• Reduces duplication and saves costs
• Reduces duplication of services
• Reduces technology & equipment expenses
• Reducing expenses
• Reduction in the need for additional tax revenues
• Relationship in EMS & FIRE, i.e. mutual aid
• Respond to resident’s needs
• Response time by first responders
• Responsiveness
• Responsiveness to our resident’s needs (8)
• Responsiveness to our residents
• Revenue sharing (2)
• Save dollars/work smarter
• Save raising taxes
• Saving money (2)
• Service
• Service cost
• Service delivery cost (4)
• Service quality
• Serving the residents well
• Shared resources
• Sharing
• Situational dependant - works best when tailored to our needs versus strengths
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• The reduction of duplication of services
• There are NO benefits to making government bigger and taking it further out of reach from the local people that benefit from it.
• To reduce service delivery costs
• Trust and cooperation = win - win
• Uniformity of services
• We trade plowing on one of our roads with an adjoining township because it is closer to them, and one of their roads is closer to us -- saving both townships time and fuel.
• Work together don’t reinvent programs
• Working together make our community better

10. Percentage of the annual budget saved by collaboration

• <10
• >1
• >5
• 0 (21)
• 0 to 5
• 0.05
• 0.1
• 0.18
• 0.25
• 0-1
• 1 (15)
• 10 (51)
• 100
• 10-15 (3)
• 10-40
• 12

• 1-2 (2)
• 1-4
• 15
• 1-5
• 15 (7)
• 2 (10)
• 20 (13)
• 20-30%
• 2-3
• 25 (11)
• 27
• 3 (9)
• 30 (2)
• 35 (2)
• 5 (46)
• 50 (2)
• 5-10 (3)
• 5-25%
• 6
• 60
• 7 (5)
• 75
• 8 (3)
• 90
• Less than 1%
• Less than 5
• Minimal
• NA (2)
• Not much
• TBD (2)
• Can’t quantify without specific examples
• Depends on the benefits
• Depends on the project(s) or program(s)
• Depends on the project. On project we save as much as 50% on that project
• Difficult to pin-down to specific % on all joint efforts
• Don’t know / not sure (59)
• It only benefits you if the work is done correctly.
• Not sure, but each case would have to be evaluated to see if it truly saves taxpayer dollars
• 12% without the cost benefits of county provided services, county services which are another 2 to 3%
• Without joint fire district we save approx. 12%

II. Percentage of the annual budget that local collaboration is worth:

• >1
• >10 (2)
• 0 (12)
• 0.1
• 0.15
• 0.25
• 0.4
• 1 (4)
• 1 to 5 %
• 1/3rd of budget
• 10 (42)
• 10 to 25
• 10+
• 100

• 10-15 (2)
• 10-20 (3)
• 10-25
• 10-40
• 1-2
• 12 (2)
• 15 (16)
• 2 (7)
• 20 (27)
• 20+ 20-30%
• 25 (15)
• 25 to 30 (2)
• 3 (3)
• 30 (9)
• 30-35
• 30-40
• 35 (4)
• 40 (4)
• 5 (21)
• 50 (8)
• 5-10 (2)
• 5-25%
• 60 (2)
• 7 (5)
• 7 to 10
• 75 (3)
• 8 (4)
• 9
• Hard to know
• Minimal
12. Which level of government do you work for? Other: Please Specify

- Mayor of Village

15. What is your current position? Other: Please specify

- Administrator of larger township, trustee in a smaller
- Also administrator duties
- Appointed Agency Administrator
- Citizen
- City Manager (4)
- Community development director
- Director of Public Works
- Fiscal Administrative Coordinator
- Fiscal Officer (5)
- Mid manager, reporting to Administrator
- Office manager

20. Do you have any final thoughts or recommendations about collaboration for the Ohio Council?

- I can cite many examples of local governments working cooperatively. Townships are by far the most fiscally responsible of any local governments. For example, we recently coordinated an 8 township chip and seal project which was economically feasible for everyone involved. Townships in our county have not laid off employees, we are not cutting services and we still continue to move forward. We are used to tough economic times, the LGF freeze in 2001 was a major signal; we immediately began to look at ways to ensure continuation of services. We only place levies when necessary. Very few townships in our county have road levies, most operate on road & bridge and gasoline tax monies. We think outside the box because if we didn’t, we’d still be traveling on dirt roads. We have the highest road mileage over 40,000 miles than either the state or the county.

- We applied for and got turned down for a collaborative grant with Perkins Schools and Erie County Parks. If you are really serious about collaborations you need to look at the process in place.

- A larger government entity will place the people further away from a contact representative and serve to increase nepotism and favoritism.

- A small amount of collaboration is good. People want local control over their Townships. How there roads are maintained and plowed in the winter. It is a fallacy that much money could be saved by going to county govt. The amount of equipment needed and how fast it wears out would grow not get smaller. We maintain our equipment and it last a long time. Counties loose that control. Our employees have an owner mentality to the township and its possessions therefore they are closer to the public and they appreciate it.

- Barriers could be eliminated to encourage voluntary collaboration to deliver the most effective and efficient services at the lowest tax-payer cost. However, voluntary is the key word. There are many areas where there is good argument to maintain local cost and local control.
Collaborative Local Government in the State of Ohio

• Collaboration can only take us so far. Bottom line is there are way too many government entities and OH should start by going to county school systems and merging suburban townships like ours.

• Collaboration can save time and money and prevent overlapping services

• Collaboration is a good thing! If conducted properly & without a drastic reduction in funding, etc.... Also some local officials feel threatened by what they may consider “outside” influence in matters that they would prefer to handle themselves. AKA (Politics)

• Collaboration is different from Consolidation

• Collaboration may be good in some instances, but in small communities like mine, the residents may lose their familiar prompt services to larger faceless services. Our small towns are communities of families, many who are multi-generational, and consolidation of many services leads to impersonalization of local government.

• Collaboration works well in Southwest Ohio. Check with the Center for Local Governments, Robert Johnson, Executive Director @ 513-741-7999

• Disband, save the taxpayers’ money

• Do away with all township trustee positions and convert to County Government. In the rural townships this would be a huge cost savings.

• Don’t necessarily believe this questionnaire hit the mark for a Village. Probably needed multiple paths dependent on what type of municipality you checked up front. Thanks!

• Ego problems, who is in control. Don’t use it as a reason to eliminate a government unit

• Eliminate prevailing wage requirements for large projects. Maintain and support local government units as being most responsive to local needs.

• Even though none of the above reference formal or informal collaboration with OKI (Regional Planning Organization/Council of Governments), there is a lot of sharing of information and cooperation that benefits this region through wide-range participation of 198 government and civic organizations. OKI has, in a number of cases, been a facilitator in working and coordinating with communities on regional issues. This is not always reflected in formal or informal efforts, but is an integral part of how we live, work and play in this region.

• Force accounting hurts all small Townships. We don’t have money to have big companies pave roads, but when we help each other we can afford to pave our roads.

• Funds are needed up front to establish collaborations i.e. Legal Fees, technology (programs such as accounting and building forms), equipment (dispatch, trucks, brine system. A fund should be put into place in which communities could draw upon for upfront money for Collaborations. Included should be a repayment by the communities by percentage or flat fee over a period of time back to the fund. Example: Our city and another city wanted to join Finance Depts. But the other city which was smaller had a different program. We needed legal fee money for the attorney to draw up the agreement, an accountant to oversee the transfer as one Finance Director retired and our Director would of been handling the set up. The accountant is needed to oversee the state requirements. The cost was $150,000 to join both Finance Departments together. It would of taken 2-3 years to pay back the complete $150,000 if need be. We could not get funding from any source and our cities did not have the upfront money

• I am very supportive of libraries but it is my personal opinion that Ohio has outspent most states in the U.S on our libraries. I understand they have taken a cut but still, even with the cut; they still outspend most state’s libraries. We definitely need to look into the libraries spending habits.

• I believe that collaborations or regionalization will become a necessity as tax revenues continue to decline. People are afraid of losing control of their own governmental services. Usually, because of financial differences and issue prioritization, people are reluctant to make that change. Instead of looking at the best service delivery and bringing others “UP” to that level, govt. has a tendency to bring service levels “down” to the lowest common denominator. Different communities have different norms.

• I can name at least two villages in our county that need to dissolve into the township. I can name a village and a city that need to consolidate to make better use of tax payer dollars. I believe that extremely small villages need to be under the microscope as there are a
lot of them out there barely getting by. This makes it difficult for them to move forward in a positive manner.

- I can see where some money can be saved on equipment if Townships share equipment, however I also can see some problems with scheduling and maintenance/repair. We do a little sharing with an adjacent township.

- I don’t really feel qualified to answer these questions. I have only been the fiscal officer for my township less than 2 years and we are a very small local government (population 1,319).

- I feel that collaboration is a good idea but could lead to loss of identity and possible annexation from larger surrounding local govt.

- I have found that the primary obstacles to collaboration involve trust and turf issues among elected officials. The reality is that elected officials who put their constituents in the forefront of their decision-making can make collaboration a very valuable tool in providing effective and efficient delivery of services.

- We welcome collaboration and believe it enhances both our bottom line and our service delivery. However, we believe that each jurisdiction should come to the table willingly and negotiate terms of each joint program. I believe our township is one of the leaders in doing this in Central Ohio

- I recommend you approach local leaders with a survey that asks questions which allow answers that are well thought out and articulated, not constrained to multiple choice answers that don’t allow reasoned response and miss the mark. This survey seems concerned only with financial considerations, and allows no input on issues like quality of life, autonomy, individual preferences, etc. Some things do not have a price, and some of our citizens express this quite plainly. The closer government is to the governed the more responsive it is, and the better it can represent their interests. Small local governments still utilize part time and volunteer labor and provide some services in a much more cost effective manner than larger entities. If governments are regionalized, which I am assuming is the underlying agenda here, levels of compensation will migrate to the highest levels of the original political entities, causing costs of services to rise while removing autonomy from local populations. Some collaboration is necessary, especially for townships which are constrained from providing some services by the ORC. The best agreements are those entered into voluntarily by entities that see needs and are willing to help one another meet them.

- I think that any city that has water built with tax money should be supplied to the townships. This makes the city water dept more efficient. I think there should be fire district. Our county has 18 fire dept a fire district could be more efficient. Just remember Bigger is not always better I must do thing correct or people show up at my house

- I think we already collaborate in many areas. I also feel we receive great help and support from both the State Auditor’s office and the County Auditor.

- I would like to have a copy of this survey after you have compiled the results. We have been contemplating a regional fire/EMS district and a regional law enforcement district. Our residents are very resistant to this type of thinking. Some say it is not cost effective. Others say they would not be served as quickly. I would be interested in information about communities with regional fire and law enforcement services. We are just starting to research the possibility. Our collaborative water agreement has certainly worked out well for both communities. It has also been looked upon more favorably by lending agencies, grant providers, and government regulatory agencies. The collaboration will probably save our residents $5.00 to $10.00 a month on their water bills. I am definitely a supporter of collaborative efforts. It is difficult to sell our residents, especially ones who have grown up in the community, that collaborative agreements and planning are helpful to residents in participating communities. It seems they want to hang on to their own ways and rely only on people in their community. For example, when we wrote our charter, the home grown locals wanted all their village employees to be village residents. In some cases, we have residents to fill positions, but, in other cases, it is better to seek applicants outside the village.

- Identify opportunities as lessons from other communities so we can leverage these opportunities if they benefit us. Do not force communities into arrangements - not your authority to do so.

- It is difficult to determine the value of services provided by the county, particularly to townships. Concerns about potential loss of state or federal dollars, if real, should be mitigated by removing any obstacles
in law. Incentives to cooperation already exist in grant procedures, similar incentives should be considered for government funds. Disincentives, if they exist, should be removed.

- It is important for officials to remember that change does not come easy but most times it is worth the effort if it is well planned and there are no private agendas but that the good of all is considered.

- It is something to consider, however we need to know the potential pros and cons before entering into formal arrangements.

- It needs to be explored and practiced where a cost or benefit is clearly defined. In most cases a great deal of trust must be established between the parties in order for the merger to take place and to become successful.

- Just do it

- Legislation to enable a Joint Law Enforcement between a municipality and a township would be very helpful. It should be very similar in legislation to that for a Joint Fire District. It would benefit small communities and townships to allow them to share policing forces.

- Local government does collaborate, it must to survive. State and Federal government mandates and underfunds local governments. I feel it a disservice to taxpayers not to include State and Federal government in this effort to change government. Government must change for the betterment of the taxpayers that includes State and Federal. The survey is aimed at local and is one-sided.

- Many areas of collaboration exist - the largest benefits can be in cost savings, but loss of local input or control if not managed well allows for problems to fall off the table and for addressing local problems directly. For instance - Road maintenance - one community places a strong emphasis on the quality and care of the traveling public and the taxpayers support that. But a neighboring community has a much lower expectation - either financially or ideally. Now combine the services - the second community is given a strong emphasis to repair and get the infrastructure in order, while now the first community is allowed to deteriorate, creating a larger problem. Local control has strong merits, but look for areas that collaboration is in the best interest of all.

- Medina County has an active Medina County Township Association, who networks, monthly with county officials and departments. We use our Ohio Township Association forum for resources and have individuals who update the group on updated legislation on State and Federal Levels. Collaboration has always been Medina County’s forte. We are proud of that. Our legislators come regularly to our meetings and keep us informed plus each winter they invite us to a gathering where they update us and ask questions on things they provide and do for township government. We work hard with collaborating with our cities and the township that surround those cities have been involved with their comprehensive plans and have sat on their committees. Their school boards involve us, as well. We function very well and complement each other with zoning, and providing services.

- Most of our residents have a high standard of living and desire excellent services. For example, we have a well-equipped, well-staffed police department. Our residents would not be happy if we had a joint police department with the adjoining large city or another suburb in our area. They feel their neighborhood would not be prioritized and they would get less police protection for their investment. In fact, many affluent residents of our neighboring city (Columbus) have called us and asked if they could pay us (the village) and get the police department to service their subdivisions. They know that Columbus focuses its police protection services in higher crime areas, as it should. Our residents have chosen to live in a community with higher standard of community services. I hope this opportunity will not be taken away from them.

- Must overcome turf barriers and cost allocations. Depends greatly on types of service, funding base, and level of expertise.

- No (7)

- Not Needed

- One way that collaboration could be enhanced would be standardization of legal authority among townships, municipalities and counties where standardization is possible. Also education -- perhaps through a website or workshop programs offered through CCAO, OTA, ML, OCMA, etc. EDUCATION

- Our relationship and collaboration with other governmental agencies is working just fine. Don’t mess
it up. Thanks.

- Research combining where townships and cities overlap each other, but definitely keep the township form of government. It is by far the most economical to Ohio residents. Cities carry a heavy overhead and a heavy tax burden on residents.

- Schools: We have several superintendents in our county making exorbitant amounts of money when our schools do not necessarily need individual superintendents. There must be a way to restructure the system to operate more efficiently. We need to closely examine our school’s operations. There is no cookie cutter fix for Ohio’s schools. Consolidating schools is not the answer in all cases.

- Seemed like a leading question J D Power & Association Poll.

- Small entities have an easier time collaborating with their neighbors....we all know each other and help each other be successful. Township government is an excellent example of collaboration and grass roots government.

- Some works others have not. Much arrogance in the details and loss of too much control

- Sounds like a good idea.

- Survey does not examine disputes and distrust that can form barriers to collaborative agreements over matters such as annexation, development, and water rights

- Thank you for giving me the opportunity to express my views.

- The direction of our children’s education was altered when the lawmakers created the proficiency testing requirement. Teachers today teach students to pass a test. Look at ACT and SAT scores prior to the proficiency era. I believe there are studies that substantiate the fact that we have dummed down our students. It seems to me that the proficiency test is used as a gauge to evaluate the school and its’ teachers. When will the state put the students first? Teachers have become robotic and students are being stifled for the sake of the proficiency test. I can’t help but wonder how much money is being spent in testing that could be spent in teaching.

- The first set of questions was hard, because there was so much room for interpretation of which department or task for which there would be collaboration.

- The form did not allow for all of the group efforts made between county agencies and the townships...i.e. projects not agreements...if we did not work well with other departments and agencies we could not provide the basic needs for our residents.

- The items listed on this page are informal - they should not have been listed on the formal page

- The main barrier for more collaboration in Ohio is dealing with Union Contracts. Union Contracts in Government are the single biggest hurdle for collaboration and cost savings. If that barrier was removed millions of dollars could be across the state.

- The more that we can work together the better the system will work, however, every entity must be willing to co-operate and work for the good of all.

- The most successful collaboration we have is in Miami Valley Risk Management, a group of 20 cities who pool risk. We self insure some risk and reinsure the rest. This has been a very successful and moneysaving collaboration. It has professional staff and that is key MVRMA’s success in insuring municipal risk.

- The multiple layers and various powers of local governments complicate collaboration. Reducing layers and redundancies would help facilitate greater efficiencies.

- The only way small Counties are going to be able to survive.

- The residents of our county like seem to favor Township Government.

- The State Cooperative purchasing program is great. While a little cumbersome it has permitted us to buy big ticket fire and road equipment without having to incur the expense of competitive bidding since it has already been done. The rock salt contract has saved us money. Keep up the good work

- There are a few concerns. What about existing special levies, and their future collection for defunct systems. Who gets the recently purchased fire truck that was purchased with another subdivision’s bond money? How do we transition specialized services? Who maintains vacated buildings and property?
• There are great efficiencies in regional water & sewage systems. The barriers are usually political in nature, and usually silly. The township form of government is a wasteful anachronism. It should be abolished. Townships do nothing county engineers could not do with fewer resources.

• There are many opportunities for collaboration between our public entities. Often we are thought of as not cooperating when in reality there are many wonderful examples of working together. The answer is not always metro government, but instead encouraging local governments to work together.

• There is currently a significant amount of intergovernmental collaboration taking place. The tone of the ongoing discussion at the State level seems to imply that local governments are reluctant to collaborate, but I have not found this to be the case.

• There is tremendous inertia to continue the status quo, particularly in the area of fire and EMS services. Local township governments are typically part-time and this also inhibits proactive initiative-taking. Anything that can be done to provide a template or road map to help get collaborative efforts started would help. Also, providing data that can inform the residents of the cost benefits of collaboration will help motivate reluctant elected officials.

• This is about the 3rd survey I have filled out. Perhaps you all should have collaborated a little. A concern in metro areas will be that collaboration will be a method for aiding the center city at the expense of the suburban communities. Personnel costs are usually the highest area of costs for many local governments. To save much money personnel costs must be addressed. The collective bargaining agreements may make that very difficult. An analysis of the effect of labor agreements on collaboration would be a very important part of your analysis.

• This study is about doing away with local government as we know it. Making government bigger is never the answer. Keeping it local with a “hands on” approach with the people of the township is always the best. We hire and do business locally which works very well in rural areas. I know that cities pose different needs, but so many times the rural communities are not considered. When they are, they are thought so many times as being a headache to big government. But that is only because our needs are different than city needs and people from the city can’t seem to understand why we won’t fit into their box. The answer lies in the fact that we are different and I state again our needs are different.

• Township government is the most efficient government in Ohio. We don’t have the money to waste on programs that don’t show results just to give someone a job.

• Township officials tend to stay in office longer; they don’t have the turnover that village and city councils seem to have. This may account for the success in township governing. That and the fact that there are only three people making the decisions compared the number of people who serve on council who many times cannot seem to agree.

• We need find a way to work across county and other boundaries.

• We need to do more with our Village 2 miles South, but pride from both Villages wanting to be independent retards those efforts.

• We try to share equipment, services among neighboring communities to cut costs for each township involved. I think by collaborating would be a disaster for the well being of all residents in each community. We sometimes don’t have the man power to service our roads and to think our employee would have to maintain more roads with less help and money.

• We were looking at combining facilities to reduce building maintenance costs, to start with. The other area to review is the Ohio Revised Code. It puts undue hardship on any entity wanting to collaborate.”

• Why is there a study of small government? If you look at our budgets you can see that we are the most efficient with our tax dollars. The larger cities, counties and the state are the agencies in trouble because of liberal spending practices.

• Will it really give the citizens better service?????

• Will probably need significant incentives to encourage collaboration (or disincentives if it is not done) otherwise, collaboration will not happen unless a crisis occurs to the point something different has to be done.

• With the willingness of local governments to work together through JEDD’s, CEDA’s, and
other formal agreements and contracts, each local government can save their tax base, can provide efficient and effective services, without compromising the “integrity” of their community.

- Worked for a city for 5 years, been with a township for two. No comparison between the two as far as collaboration with other entities. Townships do it for the good of both parties, but cities carry to much pride and power. Old school turf wars.

- You must find a solution to the loss of voter support when you pull good will agencies like Fire Districts into a process.

**Appendix 6**

**Ohio Commission on Local Government Reform and Collaboration**

**Focus Group**

**November 4, 2009**

*How would you define “collaborative among local government services”?*

- Partnerships
- Local jurisdictions working together
  - When it makes sense for all involved
- A mutually beneficial relationship
- Efficiencies
  - Services & financial
- Sharing common resources
- Consolidation—associated with collaboration
- There are areas of formal and informal, voluntary and involuntary collaboration
  - Should not be forced collaboration
- The connotation of collaboration is more positive than consolidation

*What is positive, if anything, about collaborating among local governments?*

- Cost Sharing
- Tax sharing
- Resource Sharing
  - Water Treatment
- Intellectual property
  - Not every jurisdiction needs every skill
- More services
  - Services can be provided that may not otherwise be available
- Less redundancy
- Residents seem to support it
- Cost savings
- Better end product
- Elected bodies working together
- Reduces litigation
- Full utilization of resources
- More competitive with grant applications

*What is negative, if anything, about collaboration among local governments?*

- There is the perception of a loser in the partnership
  - This is a citizen perception
- The creation of a new legal authority
- Can’t eliminate government
- The loss of local control
  - The loss of service being provided by the jurisdiction
- The loss of the quality of service
- There is a potential for reduced accountability
- Increased litigation

Dustin/Jones/Levine
Loss of jobs  
The merging of union contracts  
  - Dealing with different union contracts  
  - Different jurisdictions have different legal authority  
  - When collaboration is forced the negatives include:  
    - Less efficient services  
    - Bigger but not always better service  
    - Negative end products  
    - There are issues with tax sharing due to tax laws that make tax collection different among local levels of government  
    - People want services provided by the jurisdiction they live in  
      * The local service may be a reason to live in the jurisdiction  
    - Loss of local identity  
    - Citizens may not want to be associated with other local jurisdictions  
    - There are union issues that need to be considered

Can you tell us what collaborations you have in place or what opportunities for collaboration you see for your community?  
- Sanitation Departments  
- Water  
- Wastewater  
- Solid waste  
- Fire  
- Police  
- Joint SWAT  
- Dispatch

What barriers, if any, make it difficult, but not impossible, to collaborate with local governments?  
- Union contracts  
- Politics  
- Elected officials  
- Appointed officials  
- Tax structure  
- ORC  
- City charters

- There is an unlevel playing field amongst the levels of local government, especially in terms of taxes

Dustin/Jones/Levine
Maintaining individual identity
  - Maintaining clear jurisdictional boundaries
- Loss of ownership of services
- Citizens mistrust other jurisdictions
  - Perception issue
- Differing personalities of local leaders
- Jurisdictions and leaders wanting to protect their “turf”

How do you overcome the difficulties?
- The state needs to understand how local governments are collaborating
  - Not just push consolidation
- When two or more communities are voluntarily working together, they will find a way to make collaboration work
- Citizens should be educated on collaboration
  - Citizens should be provided reassurances
- Economic necessity will produce collaboration
- Well defined goals & mission
- Public relations and community involvement
- Identifying advantages and what is potentially being lost from collaboration
- A positive identity of the region will make others more willing to collaborate and look at existing collaboration
- Build on successes
  - May need to be done in baby steps at first

What barriers, if any, stop you from collaborating with local governments?
- State laws, ORC
  - Creates structural issues with local governments
- City charters
- Disparity in the tax base
- The perception of a winner and loser in collaboration
- Experience with collaboration
- Political and appointed leaders unwilling to take chances
- There is a trust factor with citizens
  - Term limits do not promote trust of elected officials
- Personalities of officials
- Fear of collaboration
- Being too busy to attend meetings
- Jurisdictions block students from outside their jurisdiction from attending local school districts, keep it for their citizens
- Maintaining the status quo is easier
- There is difficulty providing current services

What incentives, if any, should the state provide local governments to encourage increased collaboration among local governments?
- Financial incentives
  - This is a broad area that covers many areas of collaboration
- State should not create fear of forced collaboration
  - Perception issue with forced collaborations
  - The state should take non-punitive actions to promote collaboration
- The state should stay out of the way of collaboration
- The state’s position of prevailing wages causes turmoil for local governments
Prevailing wage requirements should be eliminated from local government collaborations

- The state should provide relief for police and fire wages
- The ORC should be changed to establish a base income tax by county

What changes, if any, should the state make in its agencies, such as transportation and health, to encourage increased collaboration among local governments?

- Eliminate ODOT
  - There is a lack of local control for roadway projects
  - ODOT is unresponsive, can’t get answers
  - Too much “red tape”
- ODOD
  - Streamline the process and provide real incentives
  - Phone calls need to be returned in a timely manner
  - * This had an effect on local economic development
- SERB
- Prevailing wage office
  - Rules are inconsistent and unclear
  - Slows down projects
  - Developer don’t want state funding because of the rules
- Department of Taxation
  - Slow to approve TIFs, not done in a timely manner
- Non-essential services
- EPA
  - Law does not back up jurisdictional water sharing
- Attorney General’s Office
  - Indicated a one page survey on a topic, and the survey was actually large and cumbersome
- Disability fraud
- Unemployment structure

What changes in the Ohio revised Code, if any, should be made to encourage increased collaboration among local governments?

- Create more opportunities for a regional mindset
- There should be a threshold created that would eliminate urban townships
  - Current law does not deal with the duplication of services
  - When townships become urban, they should be made to become a city
  - * It is done to villages that become large
  - Townships often do not want to become a city because of the difference in tax structure
- Eliminate prevailing wage, collective bargaining and arbitration
- Jurisdictions are forced to pay higher wages than true market value of the position
- EPA should promote collaboration and mandate services
- JEDD laws need to be changed
  - The current system place jurisdictions in competition with one another
  - Townships can look for the best incentive
- Townships should have an income tax
  - Established on a baseline that is determined by county
* Louisville model

- Right-of-Way guidelines are too rigid
  - Increases the cost of litigation

- The state should look at collaboration that is going on around the state, not consolidation
  - The State does not always support collaboration

- The State Commission only wants easy fixes
  - Afraid to think outside the box

- The collaboration going on in the area is not always perceived to be working

- The State needs to look to streamline, hard to take serious when it is not efficient
  - The State should look to own inefficiencies before looking to local government on streamlining and collaboration
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Introduction
At the request of and in partnership with the Center for Urban and Public Affairs at Wright State University, Ohio University’s Voinovich School of Leadership and Public Affairs conducted a focused discussion about the provision of local government services through municipal collaborations. To conduct the task, the Voinovich School elected to solicit feedback from the Mayors’ Partnership for Progress.

Founded in 1996 as a means of bringing together mayors, city managers, and partner agencies from cities and villages throughout Appalachian Ohio, the Mayors’ Partnership for Progress (MPP) has occupied an important role in the strengthening and revitalization of southeastern Ohio since its inception. A regional collaborative network, the MPP serves as a forum for members to share information, leverage resources, and tackle common issues faced by municipalities throughout the region. The Partnership is composed of 60 villages and cities spread throughout 11 counties in southeast and southern Appalachian Ohio.

At the recommendation of the MPP, the Voinovich School supplemented information collected by mayors at the November 12 focus group with findings from a study the Voinovich School released in November 2009. The purpose of the study, commissioned by the MPP, was to examine the feasibility of implementing a resource sharing network labeled the Rural Resource Alliance (RRA) in the MPP service region. Data was collected for the feasibility study using surveys, in-depth interviews, and focus groups. Information gathered included an inventory of existing municipal collaborations, discussion of past resource sharing experiences, as well as prioritization of desired collaborations for the MPP’s Rural Resource Alliance. Key findings from the study are incorporated into the responses found below.

Background
Since the 1980s, economic and demographic decline in rural areas has proven to be a burden to local governments. Faced with decreasing populations and smaller economic bases, village, city, and county governments in rural areas have had an increasingly difficult time maintaining services and infrastructure for their citizens. To rectify these growing burdens of service delivery and infrastructure maintenance, many local governments have turned to consolidation as a way of providing essential services. While the efficacy of service consolidation and network formation has been debated, collaboration has been stressed by many as one of the most promising solutions to the problems faced by rural governments. Specifically, scholars have called for renewed study of circuit riders and other multijurisdictional programs to “overcome efficiency problems in the delivery of rural services.”

Overall, researchers have concluded that an effective public-sector network should “enhance the capacity of organizations to solve problems and to service clientele.”

---

**Focus Group Summary**

**Collaboration defined:**

Collaboration is a continuing formal or informal agreement among two or more local governments to deliver or improve services, to procure goods and services, or for other reasons such as economic development.

**Question:** What is positive, if anything, about collaboration among local governments?

Through this proposed network, MPP members hope to receive trainings, technical assistance, and applied technology that will assist local governments to address challenges in a more effective and cost efficient manner.

In regards to the potential benefits of resource sharing partnerships, respondents anticipated that cost savings and equipment sharing would be among the most valuable benefits of a resource sharing program. In many responses, these two categories coincided. Municipalities expect to save money by sharing the costs of purchasing and maintaining equipment. Additionally, other municipalities responded with expectations of saving money through sharing personnel such as engineers.

**Question:** What is negative, if anything, about collaboration among local governments?

**Question:** Can you tell us what collaborations you have in place or what opportunities for collaboration you see for your community?

Around half of mayors and city managers responded that their municipality was currently involved in a resource sharing partnership. Of the current partnerships among local municipalities, most involve equipment and facilities sharing. The most common area of resource sharing was identified as road maintenance and mowing equipment.

**Equipment**

- Emergency Response Equipment and Materials
- Mowing, Ditching, and Wood Chipping Equipment
- Refuse Trucks
- Road Maintenance Equipment
- Water and Sewer Equipment

**Facilities Sharing**

- Community Pool
- Office Facilities
- Wastewater Treatment

**Personnel/Benefits**

- Road Maintenance Personnel

**Services**

- Building Permitting
- Emergency Preparedness
- Grant Writing

**Types of Partnerships**

- City ↔ City
- City ↔ County
- Village ↔ City
- Village ↔ Nonprofit

**Questions:** What barriers, if any, make it difficult, but not impossible, to collaborate with other local governments?

**How do you overcome the difficulties?**

**What barriers, if any, stop you from collaborating with other local governments?**
Among respondent concerns for resource sharing, competition for equipment use and liability and insurance issues were the top potential drawbacks identified. Municipalities noted their concern that projects could be delayed due to unavailable equipment or that certain equipment, such as snowplows, would be in demand by all partners at the same time. Added to these concerns, respondents also indicated that multiple operators and frequent use could cause equipment to wear out much faster than normal.

**Grant Acquisition Problems Identified**
- Lack of knowledge as to what grants are available
- Grant writing is time consuming
- Difficulty seeing if grants apply to one’s community. In order to see if a grant applies one must have a good knowledge of the community and the grant.
- Most small communities do not have a grant writer and cannot afford one.
- Questions on grants are sometime hazy and difficult to answer in the proper manner.
- It can be difficult communicating the needs of your community on a grant application
- The distribution of grants is sometimes unfair in that certain projects are rated more highly than others.
- It can be difficult to keep track of deadlines and adhere to the timeframe
- Matching funds in grants are often prohibitive for small communities. A 20% match is more than some municipalities can afford.

**Grant Acquisition Ideas and Potential Solutions**
- A circuit rider could be a useful idea
- Implementing a feedback system where communities share information on how to obtain a grant and what to avoid when applying for a grant
- Need to standardize data bases and capital improvement plans so that grant writing can be completed more easily
- Sharing a grant writer among communities
- Hold grant writing workshops and training sessions in the evening when communities like Racine can attend them

**Equipment Sharing Problems Identified**
- Distance can limit the amount of resource sharing that can be done over a large area
- Some equipment requires special licenses for operators
- Small villages don’t have much to share
- Union pay scale can be difficult to accommodate for when villages share with cities
- Equipment loses value with use. Must find a way to evaluate the devaluation caused to the equipment by each user.

**Equipment Sharing Ideas and Potential Solutions**
- Equipment sharing would be useful if communities are close
- Many cities and villages have equipment that is seldom used
- Only loan equipment to or share with other communities and government entities
- Those communities that want to borrow should also be willing to share
- Creation of an online listing of equipment that could be borrowed. The listing would include contact information, typical wages paid, equipment available, and operators available.
- Communities would be responsible for making their own agreements. The agreements would be specific and decided on a case-by-case basis between the municipalities involved in the arrangement.
- Sharing equipment is much easier when mayors know each other and communicate effectively with other mayors.
- Cooperative purchasing type of agreement could be implemented where everyone pitches in some money that could be used to repair or buy shared vehicles and equipment.
- Could take a classified ads type of approach. Sale, rental, and purchase information would be made
available. Municipalities would make arrangements with each other if they wanted to share equipment. (Contracts would have to be drafted for the sharing of equipment).

- Use of the FEMA scale on equipment rental rates.
- Use equipment sharing as a tool/bartering chip to get communities involved in the MPP.
- ODOT District 10 has equipment that could be shared or resources that could be utilized. One must call ODOT and work the details out in order to share with them.

**Advanced Technology Problems Identified**

- Mayors are solicited by companies to buy their products, but most mayors do not know much about these products.
- Software programs have licensing agreements that can be problematic.

**Advanced Technology Ideas and Potential Solutions**

- Create a Consumer Report type of listing where mayors and public officials can critique services and software that they have used in the past.
- Joint Purchasing of Technology will be dependent on the size of the communities in question.
- Assemble an inventory of software.
- Communications systems and live streaming video conferencing could be used to connect mayors and other city officials.
- Ohio has a listing of the top 10 municipal ordinances online. This could serve as a useful template for software listings.
- Possible sharing of IT people.
- Creation of a database with employment listings and availability of local IT people.
- Using technology to coordinate water systems and supply.

**Human Resources/Personnel/Benefits Problems Identified**

- There is a learning curve involved with becoming a Mayor or elected official.
- Small communities often put a lot of stress/time pressure on clerks.
- Small communities can often be in very precarious positions, a loss of one key employee can be devastating.

**Human Resources/Personnel/Benefits Ideas and Potential Solutions**

- Look into the trainings that the state already does for newly elected officials. MPP should approach new mayors and offer them support.
- A Joint Insurance Plan could be useful. It would require a lot of communities coming together though. There could be different levels of coverage that communities could choose from in order to accommodate the different coverage requirements of communities.
- A countywide enforcement officer would take the pressure off of mayors who are bothered about violations. (Citizens come to the mayor to complain about problems in small communities)
- It could be helpful if all the mayors of the MPP got together to talk about the similar problems and projects.
- Personnel sharing could be useful, especially with high need personnel such as clerks and wastewater employees.
- MPP could list and/or coordinate the linking of skilled personnel with communities.

**Miscellaneous Problems Identified**

- State representatives are often at meetings but communities do not know how to approach them.
- Stimulus funds did not help some communities. Mayors were not aware of funds until after they came out or the deadlines had passed. Money was distributed based on political reasons.

**Miscellaneous Ideas and Potential Solutions**

- Cities need to utilize state representatives more. They need to learn how to be advocates for their communities and the region.
- End each MPP meeting with a “Mayors’ Wish.
List,” where mayors discuss what their communities need.

- Need to build the MPP and improve involvement in the organization before worrying about lobbying and advocacy.
- An MPP member should go to each community and speak to them about the problems that they have. Will draw more communities into the organization.
- It would be useful to standardize the equipment and supplies used by the communities in the region.
- To get mayors to the meetings, the MPP should rotate meeting locations and have mayors set their own agendas.
- With more mayors involved in the MPP, mayors can talk with each other about their similar problems and projects.
- MPP should rank the number of years of experience that each mayor has on a database so that others know where they should turn if they are in need of something.

Question: What incentives, if any, should the state provide local governments to encourage increased collaboration among local governments?

Please reference content of the “barriers” section.

Question: What changes, if any, should the state make in its agencies, such as transportation and health, to encourage increased collaboration among local governments?

Regarding community interest in resource sharing, almost every respondent mentioned that they would like to see some type of grant writing assistance. Municipal planning and energy audits ranked among the secondary interests of survey participants.

Concerning interest in workshops and training sessions, municipalities provided scattered responses.

“No basic education requirements are necessary to be a Mayor or Council member. We are swinging wildly to get a hit. It’s a basic flaw in the system.”

Training sessions addressing human resources issues received the most responses. Particularly, participants noted that their communities would be interested in training sessions for public employees and elected officials.

“Training sessions with very specific examples of solutions to common municipal problems would be useful. Such as, how cities develop storm water management plans or models of city/county/township interactions (with respect to the law and powers of each).”

In addition please review content of the “barriers” section.

Question: What changes in the Ohio Revised Code, if any, should be made to encourage increased collaboration among local governments?

No specific comments recorded.
VOINOVICE SCHOOL OF LEADERSHIP

AND PUBLIC AFFAIRS

Ohio University

Ohio University
Athens, Ohio 45701
740-593-1000
www.ohio.edu