

**Contract For Street
Maintenance
and Repair Between the
Town and Village of Bergen,
Genesee County**

*This report was prepared in partial
fulfillment of contract requirements for:*

*“Cost Effectiveness of
Consolidating Government Highway Services”
A New York State Department of
Transportation Research Contract*

Michael Hattery

Cooperative Highway Services Case Study Report: Number 1

**Contract For Street Maintenance
and Repair Between the
Town and Village of Bergen,
Genesee County**

December, 1996

Michael Hattery
Local Government Program
Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics
College of Agriculture and Life Sciences
Cornell University
207 Warren Hall
Ithaca, NY 14853

*This report was prepared in
partial fulfillment of contract requirements for:*

**“Cost Effectiveness of Consolidating Government Highway Services”
A New York State Department of Transportation Research Contract
No. C008643, PIN R02003881**

Edward Fahrenkopf, Consultant Manager

Table of Contents

Overview.....	1
Importance.....	1
History.....	2
Key Issues: Evidence, Analysis and Conclusions.....	3
Mutual Benefits and Costs	3
Local Government Capacity Issues	5
Leadership	8
Teamwork.....	9
Cooperation.....	9
Legal and Institutional Barriers	10
Implications for Other Governments.....	11
Implications for Legislative and Regulatory Change.....	11
Summary of Key Findings	11
Case Study Documents.....	12
Persons Interviewed.....	13
Town of Bergen Information Profile.....	14
Village of Bergen Information Profile.....	16
Other Project Reports.....	18
Overview of the Case Study Project.....	18
List of Project Reports	18
Appendix.....	20

Contract for Street Maintenance and Repair Between the Town and Village of Bergen, Genesee County¹

Overview

The Village of Bergen (population 1,103) in Genesee County began contracting for highway services with the Town of Bergen (population 2,794) in the fall of 1992. December of 1996 marks the end of the fourth year of this contractual arrangement. A copy of the agreement, ending in December of 1996 is attached to this report. A third two-year agreement is anticipated, continuing the arrangement through the end of 1998. The village contracts for all winter road maintenance (snow and ice removal), service for the maintenance and construction of village streets and sidewalks (including street drainage and signing), and park maintenance with the town. As a part of the initial agreement, the town hired two former village employees, one full-time and one part-time. The process has brought about some useful negotiation and reconsideration of townwide funds used for highway purposes. Rural towns and villages are often accustomed to a different level of service. This agreement was tailored to accommodate differences in the level of service expected in the village.

Importance

The potential for town-village highway cooperation or consolidation is often discussed. The level of highway service and organizational cooperation in the town and village of Bergen is unusual. There are other instances where towns have been providing most village road services for some years. However, because of the length of time since they were initiated, these cases would not provide the evidence that is needed to explore how to bring about change. The Bergen case provides fresh information about budget savings, leadership, legal and organizational change issues that would be useful to other communities considering a change in highway services. There are about 430 towns in the state that contain one or more villages. About one-third of these town-village combinations have a smaller combined population than the Town and Village of Bergen. Given these figures, it is very likely that useful insights from this case can be relevant to many other town-village situations.

¹ This is one of six case study reports prepared under contract with the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT). The report is intended to be useful for: relevant NYSDOT staff, local government officials and those who staff and advise local highway departments. A list of all project reports can be found at the end of this document. A draft of this report was reviewed for general content and accuracy by an involved local government official.

History

In 1992 the Village of Bergen's Public Works Superintendent resigned to take a position in another community. The village mayor decided to use this opportunity to take a broader look at the potential for changing village service delivery. The mayor approached the Town of Bergen's supervisor to initiate discussions about working with the town to provide highway services. Town and village representatives had been meeting together as a part of a joint facility design project. In this joint project a consultant was hired to examine the potential for jointly resolving town and village space needs.² Town and village representatives of this joint committee began to meet during the summer of 1992 to explore a joint arrangement for providing highway services.

A number of options were considered. The options discussed revolved around moving all highway maintenance, repair and improvement to the town, under the authority of the town highway superintendent. Village representatives proposed the use of the townwide taxing authority as a means of achieving this goal. Restrictions on townwide versus town outside village highway taxation made this transfer possible for winter road maintenance and for highway equipment funding, but not for road repair and summer maintenance. Since portions of the work would need to be handled through a contract (road repair and summer maintenance) the town and village decided to manage all aspects of the arrangement through a joint agreement. It is interesting to note that a previous joint town -- village committee concluded in 1979 that the Town and Village of Bergen should consider merging their highway operations.³

² The Town and Village of Bergen initiated a joint municipal facility study in 1990. The study examined options for meeting space needs for public works, administrative, public meeting and other community uses. A joint Municipal Facilities Committee with representatives from both village and town worked with an outside consultant in guiding this effort. Early in the study the joint committee began to discuss the potential for combining certain functions that the town and village were responsible for. There was some consideration of turning the study in this direction as a preliminary step to examining physical facility or space needs. While discussions of functional consolidation continued to surface the facility study proceeded and a final report was filed in 1993. Because of the total cost of the proposed facility options, no action was taken to build a new joint facility.

³ In 1978 the Village and Town of Bergen created a joint municipal survey committee. The purpose of this committee was to evaluate the potential gains of dissolving the village and consolidating the two governments. If total consolidation was not feasible the committee was directed to evaluate the potential for consolidating some services. The committee conducted a study which analyzed operating revenues and expenditures (not equipment or capital investment) and was aided in their effort by staff from the New York Department of State. The committee filed a report in March of 1979 entitled "Report of the Joint Municipal Survey Committee for the Town and Village of Bergen." This report indicated that total consolidation of the town and

An initial two-year agreement was signed in October of 1992 to take effect immediately. A second two-year agreement was signed in December of 1994 to remain in force through December 1996. A third agreement is anticipated.

Key Issues: Evidence, Analysis and Conclusions

Information about this case was collected in four areas: (1) mutual benefits and costs, (2) local government capacity needs and resources, (3) leadership, teamwork and cooperation, and (4) legal and institutional barriers. Important information in each of these areas is discussed in a separate section below.

Mutual Benefits and Costs

Local governments and other organizations cooperate in, contract for or consolidate service activities because they derive mutual benefits. These organizations will weigh the perceived costs or disincentives to change against perceived benefits in making a decision to cooperate, contract or consolidate. What were the anticipated benefits for the town and village of Bergen in entering into this contract? Have these benefits been realized? What were the presumed costs or disincentives? Have these been realized?

Efficiency. There was a general sense that by adding personnel, equipment and resources to the town highway department to handle town and village streets there would be an improvement in operating efficiency. Both departments were relatively small. The town agreed to hire one full-time and one part-time employee from the village as a part of the overall transition. Through a series of subsequent personnel actions the village workforce was reduced by two full-time and one part-time positions. Thus there was a reduction of one full-time position, in part, as a result of the contract. The village made a list of equipment available for town use and suggestions for maintaining a larger base of town equipment through the townwide highway equipment fund were discussed.

Both parties felt that overtime hours for winter snow and ice control could be reduced by combining efforts and creating a slightly larger town highway department. By having additional staff the town could create multiple shifts reducing overtime hours and introduce other savings using the combined fleet of equipment. The increased personnel has enabled the town to go to

village would lead to a net loss based largely on changes in state and federal aid and that a significant shifting of tax burden to town outside village property owners would occur.

Some limited cost savings were identified. The report noted that one reason greater savings were not achievable was because the town and village had a history of working together to eliminate the duplication of services in the past. The majority of cost savings identified were in highway services. The committee recommended that the town and village consider consolidating their highway departments. This action would not result in the loss of state or federal aid.

two shifts for snowplowing. Variation in winter snow conditions makes actual changes in operating costs hard to establish.

The contract indicates that the village will reimburse the town for all labor, benefits, administrative overhead costs, and supplies and materials and provide the town with unrestricted use of a list of available equipment. This appears to be a straightforward reimbursement for cost of service (with the exception of charges for equipment use). While this holds for materials, there is no direct connection between labor costs and work performed in the village. The practice is for the village to pay the full regular hourly and overtime labor costs, including fringe benefits, for the two former village employees (one full-time and one part-time) now on the town payroll. This method of reimbursement for labor costs and the absence of tracking equipment usage for village work eliminates the ability to track in a clear way the actual costs of town provision of the full bundle of village services. Without the ability to track these costs it is difficult to determine changes in costs due to the contractual arrangement. Changes in operating costs due to improved efficiency would also be offset in the operating budget by cost increases for expanded construction activity.

Specialization. In initiating this change the village believed that it would lead to improved specialization in local service delivery. Under the previous arrangement the village's Superintendent of Public Works had to oversee and have expertise in: the water system, sewer system, electric utility, park maintenance, and the street and sidewalk system. By contracting with the town for highway services, village officials believed that the remaining village staff could focus their expertise and attention on the remaining service areas. There was concern that the existing situation was leading to a neglect of needed repair and improvement in the village street network. Conversely town and village residents would benefit from a larger town highway department with road building and maintenance expertise.

The Village of Bergen's water system had recently been taken over by the Monroe County Water Authority (a process that started in the late 1980s). This was, in part, a result of action by Monroe County, which borders the Town of Bergen on the north and east, to site a landfill near the village water system's wellhead. The authority took over the water system "as is" in exchange for the landfill siting. This change led to a new source of supply and the Village of Bergen getting totally out of the water business. This experience encouraged village officials to look at the opportunity for specialization in the highway area as well.

Improved Service and Increased Investment. Village officials expected that the new arrangement would lead to improved winter snow removal and improved management of street maintenance and construction. Before the town contract, the village had the experience of investing construction project dollars twice on the same street within a five-year period. They wanted to improve the quality and longevity of investment with this change. As a part of this improvement village officials expected that, at least in the near term, increased investment would be required to "catch up" on needed street construction projects. The village has had no formal pavement management system for rating the condition of village streets. Without such an overall rating, it is difficult to assess whether there has been an improvement in overall street conditions

since the agreement with the town. Both town and village officials believe that service has improved under the agreement.

Progress has been made in solving long term problems on several specific streets. In one case, the town highway superintendent recommended that engineering assistance be obtained to help clarify and resolve a drainage problem on a village street. An engineering solution was developed and the town crews will do corrective construction work next spring and summer. The village has also increased the level of investment in street projects since entering into the agreement with the town.

Reduction in Equipment. Town and village officials expected to be able to reduce the combined equipment inventory needed for road maintenance and improvement. This was seen as a transition to be achieved over several years. Initially, a list of existing village equipment has been made available to the town for use in street maintenance and construction (see list in attached contract document). Overtime it was expected that some of the village equipment would be sold to the town or sold outright and replaced by new equipment owned by the town and paid for through funds from the townwide highway equipment fund.

It was originally expected that several pieces of equipment currently owned by the village would not have to be replaced in the inventory. For example, when the contract was first initiated, old backhoes owned by the town and village were going to be replaced by one owned by the town. This transition is yet to occur. Both still own the old backhoes. During the coming winter the town is experimenting with the use of one ton plow trucks to handle village plowing. If this is successful it may be possible to eliminate a larger plow truck owned by the village that the town has been using on villages streets. This would constitute a minor downsizing in overall equipment needs. Elimination of this larger truck may prove difficult in continuing to efficiently haul snow from village areas during large snow storms.

Operating Costs. The cost reimbursement conditions in the contract limit the ability to evaluate cost savings to the village under the new arrangements.

Local Government Capacity Issues

Local governments need to *have* or be able to *access* the capacity to identify, evaluate and take action on potential, desirable highway service changes. Adequate management and governance capacity is required to evaluate possible changes in service delivery, select an alternative and then *revise* or *adjust* policy and service delivery arrangements. A deficit of management capacity can limit and frustrate the ability of decisionmakers to evaluate

benefits, costs and other technical issues. Inadequate governance capacity⁴ may lead to indecision, deferral or neglect of important opportunities for service cooperation, contracting or consolidation. Once a new service arrangement is in place local capacity is required to manage and maintain the activity.

What advice, information and analysis was utilized in making decisions to move forward with this opportunity for service cooperation, contracting or consolidation? How did the process of decisionmaking and policy action unfold in relation to advice information and analysis? What kinds of decisionmaking help was desired but not available?

Cost Information for Decisionmaking. Cost information that would strongly or clearly indicate savings from the proposed service change was not available for town and village decisionmakers before the contract was entered into. This is not unusual. Accounting records are generally not structured to easily analyze the cost of particular service activities. As a result, town and village officials had to make a decision and try new service arrangements based on their best sense about the situation, without clear evidence of savings. Town and village officials structured their agreement to compensate based on service costs and included a fixed amount (\$4,000) or consideration for administrative or overhead costs (\$4,000 which was added to the highway superintendents salary). These administrative charges were set on a lump sum basis without detailed assessment of actual administrative contributions or sharing percentages. Because of the handling of equipment and manpower expenses the actual cost allocations and recordkeeping do not permit an ongoing analysis of the full cost of town provision of village street services.

Village Administrator Position. The village of Bergen has a full-time village administrator. This position was created in 1990 at the initiative of a new mayor (elected in 1989). Previously Bergen had a full-time clerk treasurer with several office staff. A village administrator is somewhat unique for a village the size of Bergen in upstate New York. It can be argued that the breadth of services provided by Bergen including both water, sewer, and electric utilities is also relatively unique (less than 50 municipalities in New York state have municipally owned electric utilities). This raises the question if the presence of additional management capacity provided by the village administrator was a key to making this service delivery change.

The existence of this administrative position may have been beneficial in preparing needed information and facilitating the development of agreements, etc., but the initiative for the new

⁴ The useful distinction has been made between governance and management capacity. Governance capacity is the ability or extent to which a local government can effectively determine what it should do (what the local community wants it to do) and set organizational processes in motion to accomplish, adjust, and evaluate organizational goals and activities. This would be demonstrated in the ability to make and implement policy, effectively managing the local legislative agenda, and maintaining a planning process for future capital investment. Management and governance capacity are distinct and yet have clear linkages. The smaller the government the more management and governance are intertwined.

town-village service arrangement came from the village mayor not as a management initiative from the village administrator. The existence of a village administrator may have been an important factor in the willingness to consider this change. Village leaders with less management capacity (e.g., without a full-time administrator) may have been more hesitant to initiate this kind of change given the contract monitoring, communication and other activities required by the new agreement.

Service Delivery Requirements Village of Bergen decisionmakers were careful to define and protect village service provision needs and preferences in developing contract arrangements with the Town of Bergen. The built character of most villages creates service delivery needs which are distinct from those required by the open land character of most town-outside-village areas. To some degree these differences are a reflection of residential choice. Many residents choose to live in villages because of the closeness of neighbors and amenities and the expectation of a higher level of public services. The converse is true for those choosing less dense, rural, town-outside-village locations. This results in at least two different bundles of public service needs and expectations.

In this case, village decisionmakers provided for continued regular curbside brush pickups, sidewalk repair and maintenance, snow removal and hauling in the village's downtown area, and continued village street sweeping. Each of these services were part of the village service package and not a part of normal town highway services outside the village. Street sweeping continued to be provided by village personnel and brush pickups became a joint town-village activity. Sidewalk repair and maintenance and snow removal in central village areas became town responsibilities under the contract.

To maintain village service needs care also had to be taken to ensure adequate town equipment for snow removal. The town highway department traditionally used large 10 wheel plow trucks for winter maintenance on town roads. These trucks were too large to negotiate snow removal on village streets. The village loaned a smaller (6 wheel) plow/dump truck for plow routes in the village. This truck will be replaced with equivalent or smaller equipment on the town's inventory in the future.

Handling service related calls from village residents took some experience to work out the "kinks." After signing the contract village office staff began referring all street service related calls to the town offices. Overtime it became clear that the village needed to field these calls and then communicate any needed follow-up with the town highway staff. It was important for the village to be the primary contact for two reasons. First, the village was still the provider of street services in the village even though they were accomplishing this provision contractually. As the provider, fielding calls helped keep in touch with citizen satisfaction and need for changes in the arrangement. Second, the village had a full-time office staff and was more accessible for citizens calls.

Mechanisms for Coordination and Planning. The initial town-village contract (item 11) calls for the town highway superintendent to "cooperate with village officials, to develop a street/sidewalk improvement and maintenance plan and budget estimate." A similar annual plan and budget clause is contained in the second contract (section 2). and adds that this annual plan

should be developed in time for town budget planning in the fall and can be amended during later village budget deliberations. This annual improvements plan dealing with “summer” maintenance and construction activities was the major coordinative mechanism put in place to help manage the agreement between the two municipalities. Winter snow and ice removal and park mowing were considered straightforward tasks and did not require annual negotiation or approval of work.

The annual improvement and maintenance plan and budget has not proven to be an adequate tool for coordinating work under the agreement. Annual plans and budgets have been developed but the process does not seem to work smoothly. For example, as a part of the second town-village agreement a bimonthly meeting was established to “discuss and settle any problems or unanticipated conditions arising out of this agreement” (section 12).. This regular meeting has helped but both parties admit that coordination and communication needs improvement.

The current agreement and related arrangements fail to deal with the real resource constraints faced by the Town Highway Superintendent in managing and completing two sets of work priorities. In attempting to “catch-up” on village road rebuilding and new facility development there are real resource constraints using existing town crew labor and equipment. The costing process and the negotiation process do not carefully deal with this issue. Since the village is not billed for the direct labor and town equipment use required for village work there is the common tendency to inflate the expectations of what is possible for both town and village leadership. The issue of what is “possible” in a given construction season has been subject to debate. Expectations about work accomplishment has led to some conflict between the two boards over what work should get done. The priority of construction work on town and village parks by the town highway department has been the focus of part of this conflict. The difference in town and village budget timing may add to the difficulty in planning. Several parties indicated that in effect there are two boards trying to direct the work of a highway department that is led by an independently elected highway superintendent.

Leadership

Leadership is required to initiate concern over existing conditions, generate interest in beneficial change, engage others in service cooperation, contracting or consolidation, and pursue the opportunity through to a service delivery solution.

The mayor of the Village of Bergen took the initiative to look for alternative ways to provide highway services for residents. He used the opportunity created by the departure of the village public works superintendent. In part his motivation was a desire to reduce costs and to improve service. He built on recent experience with the transfer of the village water system to the Monroe County Water Authority. Once the initiative was taken by the village, the town supervisor was a willing and cooperative partner in trying to find a joint solution. The existing joint town village facility committee provided a base for beginning discussions of changing highway operations.

Teamwork

The nature of the relationship between governing board members and relevant operating personnel within each involved unit of government is important when considering changes in service delivery. The earlier and more active the involvement of operating personnel in service delivery considerations the higher the potential for the identification of successful service delivery changes involving other governments. Clearly targeted implementable goals, an early focus on program implementation, and a clear locus of responsibility for action within the organization this (usually means the designation of a key person or agency with authority and support) have been identified as keys to successful service delivery change.

Village of Bergen. There appears to have been good cooperation between the mayor, village board members, and with the village administrator during the period when alternative street service arrangements were being considered. During the development of the contract the public works staff was in a period of upheaval. The position of public works superintendent was eliminated (after the incumbent left for another job) and a number of other staff changes were made. As a part of the agreement two village employees were transferred to the town highway department. These transitions were difficult for some involved employees.

Town of Bergen. As in the village, there appeared to be good working relationships between involved members of the town board and with the town highway superintendent. Town officials believed that the change in highway responsibilities and the personnel would be a net improvement and that the experience with the arrangement has demonstrated improvement.

In this kind of arrangement the town highway superintendent is in a vulnerable position. There is the potential for town and village board members to negotiate an unworkable agreement. The superintendent needs to be involved in the negotiations to assure that the arrangement is realistic and able to be accomplished within existing time and resource constraints. The town and village assured this “reality check” by making the highway superintendent a third cosigner of the bi-annual services agreements. This has proven to be an important point of input and agreement for the superintendent’s active involvement.

Cooperation

Good working relationships between individuals from involved local governments will enhance the opportunity for cooperation. The existence of long term, good working relationships between governing board members and/or operating personnel in the different involved organizations will improve the potential for successful changes in service delivery that involve cooperation, contracting or consolidation.

History of Cooperation. This town-village agreement built on a history of experiences in working together. As mentioned earlier, this contract arrangement developed during the completion of a joint facilities study by the two municipalities. The town and village had a history of cooperative highway activities between the two municipalities including: paving, material hauling, and other roadwork activities. There is a broad experience with cooperative and joint activity between the two municipalities in other areas.

Continued Refinement. The continued attempt to improve and work at the joint highway arrangement is evidence of a generally cooperative environment between the town and village. The creation of bimonthly meetings and other changes in the second contract demonstrate this desire to continue to work at existing problems and improve service delivery arrangements.

Legal and Institutional Barriers

Some observers believe that a variety of legal requirements and regulatory and institutional barriers exist which can hinder local government organizations from making changes needed to cooperate, contract or consolidate when mutual benefits exist which outweigh costs and other disincentives.

Current law regarding town highway funds and taxing of property inside the village (or townwide) created difficulty in arriving at a satisfactory agreement between the Town and Village of Bergen. Section 141 of the Highway Law provides that a town's highway budget shall consist of four items: #1) repair and improvements of town highways, #2) repair and construction of bridges having a span of five feet or more, #3) purchase, repair, and custody of road machinery, and #4) removal of obstructions caused by snow and for other miscellaneous purposes. By state law, Item #1 can be charged only to residents of the town-outside village area. Item #2 is a charge payable by residents of the entire town. Section 277 of the Highway Law authorizes a town board to exempt all property within the surrounded village from the levy and collection of taxes for Items #3 and #4 of the Town Highway Budget.

Prior to the agreement between the Town and Village of Bergen, the Town charged village residents for Item #3 (purchase and repair of equipment), and exempted village property from item #4 (snow removal). Village officials had for sometime criticized the town for the Item #3 charge on village residents. It was felt that the village was providing all major street maintenance, repairs and construction with village owned equipment. Some minor equipment sharing practices were acknowledged. The townwide charge for equipment became a real hindrance during negotiations for a contract with the town for village street work.

While an agreement was finally reached, issues regarding equipment costs, replacement, and transfer continue to be a point of disagreement and miscommunication between the two governments. This is true in a circumstance where there is significant good will and cooperative initiative. The ambiguity caused by these town equipment charges between town and village governments with less good will would constitute a significant barrier. The ambiguity or perception of unfairness to village taxpayers permitted by current state law can constitute a significant barrier to the development of cooperative highway arrangements between towns and villages. Various municipal associations have highlighted this issue in the past as an equity issue for town and village taxpayers. Here it is noted as a *potential barrier to cooperation* in highway services between towns and villages.

Implications for Other Governments

There are about 430 towns in the state that contain one or more villages. About one-third of these town-village combinations have a smaller total population than the Town and Village of Bergen. The Village of Bergen has about five miles of road to maintain (see Village of Bergen Profile at the end of this report). On a per capita basis this is about average for villages with less than 1,700 people (the smaller 50% of New York's villages). The Town of Bergen has just over 20 miles of road to maintain. This is well below the average town road mileage for towns of similar size (see Town of Bergen Profile at the end of this report). However, the Town of Bergen has a relatively high percentage of paved town mileage for its size.

Most villages in or below Bergen's size range, with 1,990 populations below 1,700, will find themselves in towns with highway departments that manage a much larger road network than the Town of Bergen. We would expect that these towns would have a larger staffed and more well equipped highway department, and they will probably have less experience managing paved road surfaces. This means that many villages with populations below 1,700 and that currently maintain their own street system may find it beneficial to explore the potential to contract with their town highway department for highway maintenance services. The benefit of such contracts will also depend on other factors such as the breadth of other village service responsibilities, and the size and skills of village staff. Smaller villages, like Bergen, with a broad range of service responsibilities may find it beneficial to contract for highway services to enable village staff to focus on other service areas (e.g., water and sewer services). It is important for these villages to identify the ability and willingness of town highway departments to maintain paved surfaces and other service characteristics typical of village conditions (e.g., sidewalk construction and maintenance, appropriately sized snow removal equipment, brush pickup, etc.).

Implications for Legislative and Regulatory Change

This case study identified needed change in the state laws regulating the authority of town taxation in villages for highway purposes. In this case use of townwide taxing authority for Item #3 for equipment purchase and maintenance was a hindrance for village consideration of contracting with the town for maintenance and construction of village streets.

Summary of Key Findings

1. **Costing Services:** There is a general need for improved cost analysis practices and tools for use by local governments. Assistance in this area would prove beneficial for local governments in assessing opportunities for cooperation and in developing costing approaches to guide contractual relationships. It is also important to help municipalities in effectively separating operating and capital investment expenditures.
2. **Differences in Service Delivery Characteristics across Jurisdictions:** Contractual relationships need to allow for important differences in service delivery needs and expectations across different municipalities and community types. A key distinction is the

service delivery characteristics that village officials need to provide in comparison with the service expectations that are typical in more open-land town outside village areas. (Town and Village of Bergen).

3. **Mechanisms for Monitoring and Maintaining Agreements.** Even well structured agreements require fine tuning and adjustment over time. Agreements should include mechanisms (a process for mutual agreement on annual statements of planned work, regular meetings, etc.) for board members and or operating personnel to communicate and accommodate need for adjustment and change.
4. **Incorporating the Perspectives of Operating Personnel.** Governing broad members benefit from the insights of operating personnel (village public works and town highway staff) in negotiating service agreements and adjusting them overtime.

Case Study Documents

Below is a list of all legal, budget and organizational documents collected for the case study. Documents marked with an asterisk in the list below are appended to this report.

Bergen Municipal Facilities Committee Study, 1979

Cost Sharing Assumptions and Estimates, May 1996.

Intermunicipal Meeting Minutes Between the Village/Town, March 1996.

* Intermunicipal Agreement Between the Town and Village of Bergen, December 1994.

Draft Intermunicipal Agreement Between the Town and Village of Bergen, June 1994.

Intermunicipal Agreement Between the Town and Village of Bergen, October 1992.

Inventory of Highways Machinery, Tools and Equipment.

Purchasing Procedures, Village of Bergen.

Report of the Joint Municipal Survey Committee for the Town & Village of Bergen, March 1979.

Bergen School General Fund, Statement of Appropriations, Expenditures, and Encumbrances, February 1993.

Tentative Village/Town Contract Schedule, July 1, 1994 - December 31, 1994.

Town and Village Meeting Minutes, June 1996.

Town and Village meeting communications (various undated meeting notes).

Town of Bergen Budget for 1996.

Town of Bergen Budget for 1994.

Town of Bergen, General Fund Appropriations, Summary 1989.

Town of Bergen, Winter Notification Procedures.

Persons Interviewed

Bob Lichtenthal, Administrator, Village of Bergen

James R. MacConnell, Mayor, Village of Bergen

Michael Stoll, Supervisor, Town of Bergen

David C. Roggow, Highway Superintendent, Town of Bergen

Town of Bergen Information Profile

Village of Bergen Information Profile

Other Project Reports

Overview of the Case Study Project

This report is part of a larger research project funded by the New York State Department of Transportation (NYSDOT). The Department sought proposals on the “Cost-Effectiveness of Consolidating Government Highway Services.” The issue of jurisdictional realignment, combining units of government, was not to be the focus of the study. NYSDOT was interested in identifying both service functions that are appropriate for consolidation and methods of achieving this consolidation. The Department wanted to identify the institutional and political barriers that adversely affect decisions based on economic factors and to suggest methods for dealing with such barriers (including recommendations for change in state laws and regulations). To achieve these goals a case study design was proposed by the investigator and selected by NYSDOT. A Project Advisory Group (PAG) was recruited to give advice on the selection of case studies. PAG members included a town highway superintendent, a county highway superintendent, a NYSDOT regional maintenance engineer, a staff member from a metropolitan planning organization, staff from the Cornell Local Roads Program, and a staff member from the New York State Legislative Commission on Rural Resources.

A mail survey with telephone follow-up was conducted in the fall of 1995 to identify cases of intergovernmental cooperation in the provision and production of highway services. A list of ten examples were selected for possible case study analysis and refined through consultation with the Project Advisory Group and the NYSDOT Consultant Manager. Six case studies were conducted and the final reports are included in the list of reports below.

A review of current reports and findings on existing statutory and regulatory barriers to service delivery cooperation was also conducted as a part of this project. The results of this review were combined with relevant findings from the case studies in a report on barriers and recommendations for change. See the summary report or executive summary listed below for a review of the projects overall findings and recommendations.

List of Project Reports

Case Study Report: Suggested Cases of Highway Cooperation and Consolidation for Further Study. Michael Hattery and David Kay. Local Government Program, Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. November 9, 1995.

Appendix to Case Study Report: Data Base of Cases Identified through the Interview Process. Michael Hattery and David Kay. Local Government Program, Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. November 9, 1995.

Case Design Report: Research Design for Cases of Highway Cooperation and Consolidation. Michael Hattery. Local Government Program, Department of

Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. May 15, 1996.

Contract for Street Maintenance and Repair between the Town and Village of Bergen, Genesee County. Cooperative Highway Services Case Study Report Number 1. Michael Hattery. Local Government Program, Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. December, 1996.

Chautauqua County Bridge Program. Cooperative Highway Services Case Study Report Number 2. Michael Hattery. Local Government Program, Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. December, 1996.

Cayuga County Vehicle Maintenance Pool Service to the City of Auburn. Cooperative Highway Services Case Study Report Number 3. Michael Hattery. Local Government Program, Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. December, 1996.

Town of Esperance Contract with Schoharie County. Cooperative Highway Services Case Study Report Number 4. Michael Hattery. Local Government Program, Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. December, 1996.

Jefferson County Contracts With Towns for Major Improvements. Cooperative Highway Services Case Study Report Number 5. Michael Hattery. Local Government Program, Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. December, 1996.

Fostering Exchange with Local Governments: New York State Department of Transportation Region 7 Office of the Regional Maintenance Engineer. Cooperative Highway Services Case Study Report Number 6. Michael Hattery. Local Government Program, Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. December, 1996.

Recommendations for Legislative and Regulatory Change to Promote Highway Service Cooperation and Consolidation. Duane Wilcox, Michael Hattery, and Kevin Crawford. Local Government Program, Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. December, 1996.

Summary Report of Case Study Findings and Recommendations for Legislative and Regulatory Change. Michael Hattery. Local Government Program, Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. December, 1996.

Project Executive Summary. Michael Hattery. Local Government Program, Department of Agricultural, Resource, and Managerial Economics, College of Agriculture and Life Sciences, Cornell University. December, 1996.

Appendix

