

Shared Government Services

in

Onondaga County, NY

Study conducted by Lindiwe Ndlela for
F.O.C.U.S Greater Syracuse

August 2001

F.O.C.U.S. GREATER SYRACUSE
“Forging Our Community’s United Strength”

“A community-wide project to unite, strengthen and advance Central New York – its people and its economy. By facilitating an atmosphere of positive change by and for the people, F.O.C.U.S. seeks to engender a feeling of pride and a future of promise”.

F.O.C.U.S. Greater Syracuse was fortunate to be assigned an executive professional intern from Johannesburg, South Africa for 8 weeks to learn how democratic institutions work in the United States. South Africa is a new democracy and is still grappling with new municipal governments, financial sustainability, and training for persons who had traditionally been excluded from participating in a democracy.

Lindiwe Ndlela came to Syracuse, NY through the auspices of Partners for African Leadership, a United States Department of State program and was personally selected by the U.S. Embassy in Pretoria as their primary candidate. In Syracuse she was hosted by the International Center and they placed Lindiwe with F.O.C.U.S. as the best organization to meet her goals.

As a professional manager with the Non-Governmental Organization (NGO) the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA), Lindiwe arrived with credentials in research and training. Her responsibilities at F.O.C.U.S. included a research project that would expose her to governments, citizens, non-profit organizations, and businesses. It was jointly determined that she would do a study that would advance the F.O.C.U.S. VISION FOR GOVERNMENT. **“A community where all units and levels of government collaborate to use the people’s resources wisely, where everyone feels safe, and where good citizenship is part of everyday behavior”.** She concentrated her study on government-shared services.

F.O.C.U.S. is pleased to share with you the full report prepared by Lindiwe Ndlela. Please note that she submits this study as **“food for thought”** with **“the hopes that this paper will spark a discussion in the different forums and will form a basis on a much more in depth study on more government collaboration and its implications for Greater Syracuse”.**

We hope you will find this study useful in your pursuits to make Greater Syracuse even **greater**.

Sincerely,

Charlotte (Chuckie) Holstein, Executive Director

A. Introduction

As part of the visioning process involving citizens that F.O.C.U.S Greater Syracuse conducted a few years ago, a set of eighty seven (87) goals were developed. The citizens of Greater Syracuse were invited to vote on these goals. Among the top ten preferred goals was goal 78: "consolidate city and county government administration". This would begin with merging selected functions wherever quality can be assured at less cost, leading eventually to consolidating functions among towns, villages and school districts". As a follow through to the process, F.O.C.U.S has commissioned this short study on shared services in Onondaga County and will be circulating it to its members and government officials and politicians as food for thought. F.O.C.U.S hopes that this paper will spark a discussion in the different forums and will form a basis on a much more in depth study on more government collaboration and its implications for Greater Syracuse.

Lindiwe Ndlela, a professional intern to F.O.C.U.S from Johannesburg, South Africa, conducted this study. Her eight-week internship is through the Partners for African Leadership (PAL) programme of the U.S. Department of State and Indiana University. In South Africa, Ms Ndlela is a researcher for the Institute for Democracy in South Africa (IDASA), a non-profit organization whose mission is to promote sustainable democracy through building government institutions and educating citizens and advocating social justice in South Africa.

B. Methodology and Limitations of the study

The researcher had meetings with a variety of people that are practitioners in any one of the three areas studied: shared services for municipalities; citizen participation in municipalities; and the role of municipalities in economic development. Limited primary and secondary research was done to make this study possible. Semi-structured interviews with each of the interviewees were conducted within one hour. Limited literature on the subject was also consulted.

The study is qualitative in nature and therefore subject to the limitations of all qualitative research. It is based on interviews conducted with the people on the list appended and therefore is not representative. The time the researcher had to conduct the study was very limited and has an impact on the depth of the study. However, the study is meant, as mentioned above, to stimulate discussion and further research on the extent to which governments should collaborate.

C. Shared Services

What is meant by shared services?

It is important that one defines what one means by shared services because it means different things to different people and places. There are instances wherein some would say shared services when they are referring to consolidation or merger of functions/departments or government. Thus the term 'shared services' can be misleading and it often is. A study on shared services done for Oneida County in 1998 by Black & Veatch (Oneida County Shared

Services Study) and others concede that the terms shared services, consolidation and coordination all refer to some degree or form of sharing.

These degrees and forms of sharing have resulted in different sets of relationships between the levels of local government. The relationship that results from one municipality borrowing a piece of equipment from another is different from the relationship of two municipalities co-owning a piece of equipment, i.e. sharing in its truest form. Similarly, the relationship that results from a contract between municipalities on service delivery is different from a relationship whereby a municipality gives up total control over a service due to inability, usually financial, to keep providing it. These relationships are discussed in some detail further on in the paper. The next section looks at the common reason for sharing services.

Why share services?

Some people believe that sharing services will result in cost savings and that the savings can “increase the quality of a service being delivered”, an interviewee said. The cost saving argument comes up because the different levels of local governments are close to one another in the state of New York. According to the Local Government Handbook (1987, p113) a village is a municipality in its own right. As such, a village has the powers to collect property taxes making up an important source of revenue. User charges, fees, state and federal aid are additional sources of revenue of a village. Villages are located within towns. The towns are another level of local government with similar powers and functions as villages. Parallel to town and villages, there are cities also with the same powers as villages. Overarching these structures of local government are counties with some of the similar powers and functions too.

These levels and structures of local government therefore have similar departments that service the different areas of jurisdiction. The areas of jurisdiction, with the exception of the county, are usually small since the total population of the county is under half a million with about 177,000 households. The population of Onondaga is spread over the city of Syracuse, 19 towns and 15 villages. The argument of cost savings is usually motivated by the fact that there are some departments that exist in all levels of local government. For example, there are villages that have their own police departments. If a town encompassing such a village also has a police department, the result is two police departments plus the county sheriff, all servicing a small area made up of a town and a village.

Residents of such villages then pay as much as four taxes for police: village tax, town tax, county sheriff tax and state tax for police. The proponents of shared services then argue that the village police tax could be saved under these circumstances. Those against the shared service argue that they need to be policed “by people they voted for and know” even if it means that they have to pay an additional tax. The merits and demerits of these arguments are not part of this paper.

Different forms of shared services

As mentioned above, there are different degrees and forms of shared services. All are lumped into one category of shared services. This section attempts to look at these forms more closely and draw a distinction among them. Again, this section makes no assumptions that these are the only forms that exist in the county but covers the ones that the researcher

**Shared government services in Onondaga County
Study by F.O.C.U.S Greater Syracuse, 2001**

came across during the short period of time within which to pull the study together. Also readers need to be reminded that this paper is more of a discussion paper and adds to some of the extensive research that has been conducted by others and those to follow. It is an attempt to commit to paper the different forms of sharing between local governments and ventures into what could follow from sharing of services. The different forms of sharing services follow below.

a. Sharing of equipment

If two towns or villages are close to each other and one already owns a piece of equipment such as a snow-plowing machine, it does not make economic sense for the neighboring town/village to purchase its own when it can borrow it. Municipalities have shared equipment such as street sweepers and snow ploughs. This is fairly easy and can be formal or informal. One interviewee revealed that this form of sharing has been going on for a very long time. It is usually informal and sometimes it is an agreement that exists between the departments of the involved town and villages.

There is a concern that if these “gentlemen’s agreements” were formalized, they would end up getting very complicated because the lawyers will have to be involved. An interviewee went as far as referring to the American society as being “litigious society”. If such agreements are formalized, they will have to state where liability lies should an injury occur. “This can end up discouraging municipalities from lending equipment to others, if they may end up being liable in a legal action since that money will have to come out of our tax payers”. Attempts to formalize agreements involving this form of sharing have failed before. What seems to be clear is that “who breaks the equipment, replaces or fixes it”

Advantages

- *Cost-saving*
The municipality that does not have to buy a piece of equipment clearly saves money by borrowing it from another. This arrangement works better on equipment that is not always in use but is necessary to have when you need it.
- *Enhanced good neighborliness among governments*
Municipal staff get to share other experiences and best practice through this contact.

Disadvantages

- *Restricted to a few people*
This arrangement usually exists between staff only and politicians are not a part of it. It is usually the Departments of Public Works of neighboring municipalities that have this arrangement.
- *There can be backlash*
Even though there is a general understanding that “who breaks it, fixes it”, lack of political involvement and buy in may result in the lending municipality losing out. The borrowing municipality may not approve a replacement of equipment it did not approve being used.

**Shared government services in Onondaga County
Study by F.O.C.U.S Greater Syracuse, 2001**

Recommendations

- This form of sharing can save money for municipalities if there is a non-complicated agreement that is approved by participating municipalities to account for unforeseen circumstances and it should be encouraged.
- Municipalities wanting to share equipment need to follow the example set by the Town of Clay among others. The north area towns including Clay, Cicero, Liverpool, 5 school districts and 2 villages have come to an agreement regarding sharing of equipment. Each has provided a list of equipment they own.

b. Cooperation and collaboration

Their size, number and similar powers and functions of municipalities in Onondaga County provides an opportunity to cooperate and collaborate on a number of activities that may save some money. The importance of saving money is that the savings can be redirected elsewhere where they are most needed to improve the quality of a service. This collaboration is best for “back office” functions of municipalities. These are usually activities such as purchasing, tax collection, billing and assessment. They are called back office function because they do not have a direct impact on the tax payer. “Residents do not care where government buys its pens, as long as it provides a good service”, an interviewee asserted.

Some municipalities are already collaborating on some of these “back office activities”. The inter-municipal consortium provides a good vehicle to do this and for municipalities to know about the best deals available for them. Here are a few examples:

- Municipalities have been able to purchase in bulk salt to melt snow and have saved a lot of money this way.
- The state and the county have good bargains available to them when purchasing big equipment such as cars and computers. The city, towns and villages can also purchase on the prices available to the county and the state if they need to. Municipalities are able to use the county contracts to purchase smaller things as well.
- Some town and villages share the assessment services and have one person assessing properties both in the town and the village.

There are many more examples of this. There are some advantages and disadvantages to collaboration and below are a few.

Advantages

The advantages are similar to the ones for sharing equipment and they are:

- *Cost saving*
There is no doubt that money is saved when the customer is bigger.

- *Good neighborliness*
Municipalities begin to know what is happening in other areas next to them.
- *Increased interaction between governments*
Municipalities interact more and start discussing and that can lead to collaboration on more functions.
- *Enhanced regional approach*
Municipalities start thinking beyond their jurisdictions and much more regionally. Their actions begin to reflect a regional approach.

Disadvantages

- *Loyalty to companies*
Every municipality has certain companies that they are already contracting with and would want to continue supporting for various reasons.
- *Fear of staff redundancy*
There is a fear that cooperating on purchasing may lead to redundancy of staff that is doing the job. Therefore most municipalities with purchasing departments continue to purchase separately and collaborate on very few things.
- *Power of a customer*
Being a direct customer comes with certain benefits and power to bargain that may be lost when a municipality gives this up to the county or another municipality. Customers have the power to negotiate other deals and can ask for sponsorship much more easily than non-customers do.
- *Fear of interests being ignored*
There is a fear that when purchasing is pooled, municipalities will not get their orders prioritized.

Recommendations

- A joint purchasing agreement can be drafted in such a way that some fears are addressed.
- Municipalities that are faced with the challenge of saving costs should really consider this form of sharing and negotiate that the buying municipality or the county takes on some of their staff to ensure that their interests are given priority.
- Municipalities can also second staff (terminology used in S. Africa) to the servicing municipality. This simply means having staff based in the offices of the municipality that is managing or administering the service but keeping the staff on the original payroll. Seconded staff reports to the management of the office in which they are based but is paid by the seconding office.
- If it is not already in place, an inter-municipal structure for senior officials doing similar work could enhance more collaboration.

c. Service contracts

In saving costs, municipalities may enter into an agreement with another for a particular service to be delivered to its residents. In such an arrangement, a service is outsourced to another municipality leading to a public-public partnership. The municipality that provides the services charges a fee. The relationship here is much more formalized and is similar to that of a client and a service provider. There are a few service contracts that already exist in Onondaga County and the following list is not exhaustive:

- The county provides a public library system for municipal libraries.
- The county manages the library branches for the city.
- The county provides solid waste disposal for the city, towns and villages.
- The county is responsible for the administration of processing arrested people on behalf of the city.
- Some towns plow the county roads for the county.
- City provides water to the town of De Witt.
- City gets its water from Skaneateles Lake.
- The county is providing zoning services to the city.

Advantages

- *Cost saving*
The cost saving benefit is the common reason behind service contracts. This way the client municipality does not have to be faced with huge start up infrastructure costs to deliver a service. The saving is also on the overhead costs of delivering a service.
- *Strengthened relationship between municipalities*
Municipalities have a much more strengthened relationship when they have contracts with one another. A mutually beneficial relationship usually begins and can lead to other things.
- *Formal agreement*
The agreement is a formal one that can always be referred to should a dispute arises.
- *Increased tax base*
Service agreements generate more income for the municipality providing the service.

Disadvantages

- *Court cases*
If there is no built-in mechanism to resolve disputes, municipalities may end up taking each other to court. Without assuming that a contract between the city and the county on jail services did not have this mechanism, it did end up in court a few years ago. The city did not agree with a bill for services rendered by the county. It felt that the county's charge out rate was higher than the rate agreed to.

- *More in-house service provision*

This may lead to more and more municipalities doing it themselves to avoid the feeling of being 'ripped off'. Thus defeating the purpose to save costs.

Recommendation

- Contracts need to have dispute resolution mechanisms built into them to avoid unnecessary legal costs.
- The county may consider having a program with staff that will look at services that are shared and those that may be shared. Oneida County has developed a menu following a study on shared services that was conducted. The programme staff makes presentations in town and village meetings on the services that the county is able to provide them on contract.

C. Consolidation

Consolidation is different from shared services in that it is a much more formalized than all of the forms of shared services discussed in the last section. It can be described as the next step beyond shared services. Consolidation, like shared services has different degrees ranging from consolidating a "back office" function such as the purchasing department of two or more municipalities to consolidating a department such as the police departments of all municipalities into one.

Consolidation can itself be a very misleading term. Most of the studies refer to consolidation as meaning metropolitan government. This paper briefly looks at metropolitan government in the next section. There is a huge difference between consolidating 'back office' functions of two or more municipalities and the total consolidation of both administrative and political sections of municipalities into one entity. It is important to make the distinction because the term 'consolidation' has gained such a bad reputation that even when one refers to consolidating the administrative functions that can make it easy and save money for municipalities, people immediately think they are giving up power.

Why consolidate?

"New York State is a LEGO entity", said one interviewee. Each local government has its own departments and for the same reason as shared services discussed above, there are people who think that consolidation of services is better and leads to cost saving.

Again, readers need to be reminded that this paper does not aim to reinvent the wheel by repeating efforts of the research that has been conducted before. The aim here is to draw a distinction between different sets of relationships and collaborative efforts of the levels of local government whose objectives are to save money. The subject of consolidation has been on and off the table of policy-makers, lobbyists and advocates alike for many years. Studies have been conducted; best practice models and lessons to learn on consolidation have been published in abundance. The Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs did a more recent report on consolidation in 1996. This section looks at the different degrees of administrative consolidation.

**Shared government services in Onondaga County
Study by F.O.C.U.S Greater Syracuse, 2001**

1. Consolidation of 'back office' functions

As defined above, 'back office' functions are those functions that do not have a direct impact on the taxpayer. Purchasing is the most obvious one. If municipalities in Onondaga County were to consolidate purchasing, there would be one department. The objective would still be to save money and direct it where it is needed most. Other functions would include billing and property assessments. Also both the city and the county have departments on economic development. One interviewee felt that one department on economic development would be effective and would "combine people who really know the city well and those who know the county well".

Advantages

The advantages of consolidating such functions are the same as those discussed under shared services.

Disadvantages

The disadvantages are similar to the ones discussed under shared services, except that there is a real fear that that if the city was to consolidate its purchasing department with that of the county, there would be about 6-7 jobs that would be lost.

2. Consolidation of other departments

There are other departments that if they were consolidated would result in cost savings. The Maxwell study developed "service consolidation scenarios" to reflect the potential of saving costs by consolidating three departments: Parks and Recreation, Tax Assessment and Highway. It concludes that there are expenditure savings that can be made from consolidation. It also does, however, acknowledge that a "more in depth study is an essential element in weighing a consolidation proposal". The departments that need to be studied for consolidation include:

- Police Departments
- Highway Departments
- Purchasing Departments
- Parks & Recreation Departments
- Water Departments
- Sewerage
- Refuse Collection
- Tax Assessment

There are services that have been consolidated into the county so far. The city has given up the administration of these services because it either has struggled financially to keep them or it has felt that they serve a regional purpose and therefore should be administered by the county. However, it still has some form of influence over some of them since it either continues to contribute towards them or maintains the power to appoint half of the Board members or both on some of them. The following list is not exhaustive:

- The Zoo
- Health Department
- Human Rights Commission
- Programme for Aging and Youth
- Forensic Crime Laboratory

Advantages

- *Bigger pool of resources*
Resources are pooled in consolidation and this means that there are more of the human and financial resources as well as assets to deliver a service.
- *Better quality of service*
If there are more resources, the quality of a service can only improve.
- *Bridged inequities*
With more resources, some services can be easily extended to those that are not currently accessing it without it costing a lot more since the infrastructure already exists.
- *Employment*
Becoming a bigger department does not always mean shedding of jobs. Sometimes it means more people are needed, thus creating employment. The DeWitt/East Syracuse police department merger is a case in point. The Post Standard reported that the "DeWitt Police Department would need to add 10 employees to place a dedicated patrol in the village of East Syracuse" (July 26, 2001)
- *Standardization of service*
Consolidating a service results in the provision of a service that is equal in standard and quality for the same amount of money for everyone.

Disadvantages

- *'Small is better'*
Some people feel that big organizations are naturally inefficient and big government will be inefficient after some time.
- *Loss of senior management jobs*
Consolidation of services leads to loss of jobs for senior management. It leads to one police chief, for example.

Recommendations

- *Process not event*
Consolidation should be a process and not an event. It takes a long time to finally reach fruition. Its benefits are not immediate but more long term and therefore it should be given all the attention it requires. However, the length of time should not be used as an argument against it.

- Citizens need to be brought in from the beginning and the details need to be explained to them fully. Meetings such as the ones that were convened by the town of DeWitt and the village of East Syracuse are recommended.

D. Metropolitan government

As mentioned above, metropolitan government is constantly referred to as consolidated government. This is only true if it is not only administrative departments that are consolidated but also the political system. When a government is consolidated this way, the result is one government for the entire area and departments are streamlined. Metropolitan governments can be shaped to suit local needs and there are numerous cities and counties that have consolidated to form metropolitan government. In the state of New York, the city of New York is a metropolitan government. There are others throughout the United States.

Why metropolitan government?

Again governments have consolidated this way for many reasons. Among those that have are the following:

Salt Lake City County, Utah - 1975
 Nashville City and Davidson County, Tennessee - 1963
 Charlotte City and Mecklenburg County, North Carolina - 1996
 Jacksonville/Duval County, Florida - 1967
 Indianapolis City and Marion County, Indiana -1968
 Town and the village of Ossining, New York - 1993
 City of Athens and Clark County, Georgia - 1990

On the more recent efforts to consolidate government, the city of Louisville will merge with Jefferson County, Kentucky in 2003. Voters chose to merge the two governments last November. Another merger that is under discussion is that of the city of Des Moines and Polk County.

The main reason behind cities merging with counties has to do with the crisis that many cities are faced with. Most cities are experiencing a shrinking tax base as more and more people are leaving for the suburbs. Thus most cities are in dire straits financially and then need to merge with the counties.

Advantages

- *Efficiency and growth*
 Metropolitan government reduces overlapping jurisdictions thus coordinating services better. In Onondaga County, governments already have similar departments serving in the same jurisdictions. An example is police services. "A resident living in a village that has its own police department has a choice of calling the village police, sheriff or the state trooper if needing help", an interviewee pointed out.

It has also been pointed out that there are instances when a car accident happens and three law enforcement officials from the different local government administrations have come to the scene of the accident because they all have jurisdiction in that area. This

**Shared government services in Onondaga County
 Study by F.O.C.U.S Greater Syracuse, 2001**

has been noted as an inefficient way to use government resources and it is believed that a metropolitan government is an answer and resources would be used much more efficiently.

- *Bigger pool of resources*

Merged governments have bigger populations and thus receive increased state and federal funding. This funding can be used to finance projects to uplift the cities that are experiencing financial distress at the moment to revitalise them. In case of Syracuse, such increased funding can surely help the efforts that are in place now.

- *Single tax base*

Metropolitan governments result in a single tax base. This will mean that governments will not have to compete for resources and opportunities. With cities experiencing loss of residents and businesses to the suburbs, and Syracuse is not an exception, a metropolitan government with a single tax base ensures that such a resident or business is still contributing to the same tax base. A single tax base is also a good vehicle to address inequities and problems that lead to people leaving cities in the first place.

Another reason a single tax base is a good idea is that the status quo is such that people live in the suburbs but work in the city. An interviewee pointed out that the city is subsidizing parking lots thus benefiting suburban residents without any return and the "city is losing money on these parking lots". This interviewee also pointed out another more subtle point about the city subsidizing suburban residents, "I am sure that the city does not charge for its amenities downtown, even if it is county amenities, the city does not get anything back from having those county amenities such as the Convention Center downtown". Having a single tax base would ensure that these problems are taken care of.

- *Enhancing regional economic development opportunities*

The mayor of Des Moines believes that a metropolitan government leads to "increased economic opportunities" which will lead to "more jobs and better pay in the workplace" (Des Moines Register, 13 February, 2001). Government consolidation results in large governments and their size can be used to market themselves economically. If it becomes a metropolitan government, Des Moines will "immediately grow from the 92nd largest city in the nation to the 75th largest. If all the suburban communities in Polk County joined ...would become the 47th largest city in America".

The same could happen to Syracuse if the city, the county and the towns and villages consolidated. The economic benefit would be realised in attracting business to the area of Greater Syracuse and putting it on the map globally. The existing resources to develop the city economically could be combined with those of the county and business without worry that business would not necessarily locate in the city. Anywhere in the Greater Syracuse a business decides to locate would be beneficial for the metropolitan government.

Disadvantages

There are some disadvantages to metropolitan government but these are not meant to discourage governments from consolidating. They are challenges that any metropolitan government will need to address in the process. Here are some of them:

**Shared government services in Onondaga County
Study by F.O.C.U.S Greater Syracuse, 2001**

- *Impact in representation*
Metropolitan governments are usually large and incorporate bigger populations. As a replacement to the small villages, towns and cities, people fear that "the closeness many citizens feel towards elected officials can be lost", according to the Maxwell study. Furthermore, the representation of minorities may be lost in the bigger government. The consolidated government may want to follow examples of those that consolidated before. An example of Athens-Clarke County in Georgia "allowed for the representation of small local interests as well as larger county-wide issues", reported the Maxwell study.
- *Loss of jobs*
There is a fear that if service departments were merged, people would lose jobs. This may not be necessarily true of all merged services, as some departments may need to be bigger as the area of jurisdiction grows larger. Also, a metropolitan government may adopt a long-range view and ensure that the departments that merge do not shed staff but also do not replace staff that leave. A plan for organisation change can be developed with all the affected employees. There may even be opportunities for retraining staff for new jobs.
- *Higher taxes*
There is a fear that residents in towns that are not currently paying taxes because their property taxes are covered by the sales tax.

Recommendations

Again, forming a metropolitan government is not an event but a process and a goal that should always be aimed towards. The following may be a step in the right direction:

- *Consultation with citizens*
There are instances when citizens have not voted for consolidation not because they do not want it but because they do not know enough about it and do not feel included in the discussion. Article IX of the New York State Constitution requires "multiple majorities" in referendums that would involve the consolidation of governments. "Multiple majorities are defined as distinct majorities in rural and urban areas" (Maxwell School, 2001, p7).

The Maxwell study clarifies this requirement further by noting that separate majorities of villages, towns and county are required. Residents of a village would then vote twice in such a referendum. This may be hard to attain but it is important to keep trying. It has taken as much as 30 years or more for some of the metropolitan governments to consolidate.
- *Create a platform for debate and discussion*
Continuous debate and discussion will lead to sufficient buy-in from all the stakeholders. Most of the more recent government consolidations received wide press coverage. Those people that are for it and those against it had it out in public. Have campaigns, it is an important issue after all.
- *Political will*

One interviewee said, "You need a cheerleader to drive a process such as forming a metropolitan government". This means that political will is necessary. Leaders must be willing to take charge and lead the discussion. A metropolitan government means that Greater Syracuse will have one elected chief executive. That understanding has to be created and a decision should be taken based on what is good for Greater Syracuse. The consolidation of Louisville and Jefferson County has the support of its top politicians including the Mayor, County Judge-Executive and the Senator.

E. Conclusion

In conclusion, all that this paper has attempted to do is trace a development in relationships that exist between the different levels of local government. It broke down the different terms used to describe these relationships and then charted a course that these relationships usually follow as a 'natural' process of development of governments and the growth of relationships. The paper also tried to look at both the advantages and disadvantages of these different relationships hoping to contribute to the discussion that started a long time ago but is resurfacing in the Syracuse community.

Sources consulted

- Black & Veatch (1998), Oneida County Shared Services Study.
- Daniels, Preston *"Logical step for Polk County and Des Moines: Consolidate"*, Des Moines Register GC, 13 February 2001.
- Doak, Richard *"Louisville government merger is a model for Polk, D.M."*, Des Moines Register GC (undated).
- Greenblatt, Alan *"Regional Agitator"*, Governing Magazine, April 2001.
- Hogan, Cyndy Liedtke *"Louisville, Jefferson County Vote to Merge Governments"*, Nation's City Weekly, 20 November 2000.
- Laird, Rox *"One vision, one voice"*, Des Moines Sunday Register GC, 11 March 2001.
- Maxwell School of Citizenship and Public Affairs, (1996) Report to the Onondaga County Executive on Government Consolidation.
- Peirce, Neal *"Promote city-county mergers on their economic benefits to residents"*, Des Moines Register DC, 12 April 2000.
- Read, Jim *"DeWitt Police to Make Pitch"*, The Post Standard, 25 July 2001
- Read, Jim *"DeWitt needs 10 more to police village"*, The Post Standard, 26 July 2001.
- Register's Editorials, *"Ten little reasons"*, 09 February 2001.
- Register's Editorials, *"Make it a people's plan"*, 14 May 2001.
- State of New York Department of State (1987), Local Government Handbook (4th ed). Albany.

F.O.C.U.S. GREATER SYRACUSE
Meetings and Events Attended by:
Lindiwe Ndlela
Executive Professional Intern
IDASA, Pretoria, S. Africa
July 2 – August 24, 2001

MEETINGS:

Syracuse Neighborhood Initiative
 Leadership Greater Syracuse Board meeting
 Syracuse 20/20 to meet Mayor Matt Driscoll
 Comprehensive City Plan Issues Group
 County Executive's Workshop/Clean-up
 Hyett Palma/MDA Downtown Committee Report
 TNT Sector meeting
 F.O.C.U.S. Arts Culture Events Downtown WG
 F.O.C.U.S. Core Group/July 27 & Aug. 24
 Signage & Beautification

LOCATION/HOST:

Home Headquarters/Linda Henley
 Chamber of Commerce/Paul Predmore
 KSR/Frank Lazarski, A. Michel, D. Barclay
 F.O.C.U.S./Councilor Van Robinson
 Chamber/County Executive Nick Pirro
 Chamber of Commerce/David Mankiewicz
 Levy Middle School/Beth Broadway
 F.O.C.U.S. City Hall Commons/C. Holstein
 Report to F.O.C.U.S. (preliminary & final)
 Syracuse Convention & Visitors Bureau

EVENTS:

July 4th Celebration
 Mayor Bernardi Farewell Reception
 Mayor Matt Driscoll Swearing-In Ceremony
 MOST (Museum of Science & Technology)
 Leadership Direct Connection
 All-America City Delegates Dinner
 Komen Cancer Foundation fund-raiser
 Presentation on Israel/Middle East conflict
 Leadership Economic Development Day
 Tour of Higbee Manufacturing Company

Cazenovia, NY/Grosack family
 Downtown Syracuse/Mayor Bernardi
 City Hall/Mayor Driscoll
 MOST fund-raiser/Lemon Grass restaurant
 Unity Allen Bldg./Judy Mower presenter
 Holstein's home
 With Barbara Holstein
 Presbyterian Church/Alex Holstein speaker
 OCC Technology Ctr.
 Higbee/Larry Higbee

Shared government services in Onondaga County
Study by F.O.C.U.S Greater Syracuse, 2001

Tour of Niagara Mohawk Power Corp.	NIMO/Larry Bonner
International Center of Syracuse picnic	Lucille Browning's home
Pride Family Unity Day	Thornden Park/Ed Moss, editor publisher
F.O.C.U.S. reception for Lindiwe	City Hall Commons
Utica Children's Museum Fund-raiser	Utica, NY/JoAnn Cucci
Press Conference re City Comprehensive Plan	City Hall/Councilor Van Robinson

SPEAKING ENGAGEMENTS:

Lions Club	Corinthian Club
Eastwood Rotary Club	Eastwood restaurant

INTERVIEWS – NEWSPAPER ARTICLES:

Syracuse Newspapers/Post Standard	Sean Kirst, columnist
Syracuse Pride/African American & Latino	Ben Johnson, special reporter for "Pride"

F.O.C.U.S. GREATER SYRACUSE
Lindiwe Ndlela
Executive Professional Intern
Interviews
July 2 –August 24, 2001

Completed interviews and Visits:

Mayor Roy Bernardi	Former Mayor of Syracuse to July 9, 2001 HUD, Washington D.C.
Frank Lazarski	Syracuse 20/20 500 S. Salina St. Syracuse, NY 13202
Peg Stroman	TNT (Tomorrow's Neighborhood Today) City Hall Commons 201 E. Washington St Syracuse, NY 13202
Carol Dwyer	Syracuse University Maxwell School, Benchmarking Syracuse, NY 13244
William Coplin	Syracuse University Maxwell School, Professor Syracuse, NY 13244
Nick Pirro	County Executive Civic Center 421 Montgomery St. Syracuse, NY 13202
Deb Warner	Greater Syracuse Chamber of Commerce 572 S. Salina St. Syracuse, NY 13202
Kathy Hanna	Division of Management & Budget, Training & Facilitation Civic Center 421 Montgomery St Syracuse, NY 13202
Marilyn Pinsky,	Onondaga County Dept of Aging and Youth, Commissioner Civic Center 421 Montgomery St Syracuse, NY 13202

David Mankiewicz	MDA/Downtown Committee State Tower Bldg Syracuse, NY 13202
Ken Mokrzycki	City Hall City Administrator Syracuse, NY 13202
Fernando Ortiz	Community Development Commissioner & Budget Director City Hall Syracuse, NY 13202
Vito Sciscioli	Director of City Operations & Economic/Community Development City Hall Syracuse, NY 13202
Joe Mareane	Onondaga County Chief Fiscal Officer Civic Center 421 Montgomery St Syracuse, NY 13202
Marilyn Higgins	Niagara Mohawk Power Corp. Economic Development, Director 300 Erie Blvd W Syracuse, NY 13202
Bill Pavlus	Supervisor, Town of Skaneateles Town Hall 24 Jordan St Skaneateles, NY 13152
Judy Mower	F.O.C.U.S., Leadership / Youth Leadership, Consultant 429 N Franklin St Syracuse, NY 13204
William Sanford	Onondaga County Legislature, Chair Room 407 Court House Syracuse, New York 13202
Sandra Barrett	Syracuse University / Onondaga Citizens League SU Continuing Education Syracuse, NY 13244
Van Robinson	City Councilor Syracuse City Hall Syracuse, NY 13202
Larry Schroeder	Syracuse University Maxwell School-Professor Syracuse, NY 13244

**Shared government services in Onondaga County
Study by F.O.C.U.S Greater Syracuse, 2001**

Douglas Barclay, Esq.	Hiscock & Barclay 221 S. Warren St. Syracuse, NY 13202
Fred Eisenberg	Mayor, Village of Marcellus 6 Slocombe Ave. Marcellus, NY 13108
Mary Thompson	Oncenter Complex Manager 800 S State St. Syracuse, NY 13210
Eric Mower	Eric Mower and Associates 500 Plum St. Syracuse, NY 13204
Linda Henley	Syracuse Neighborhood Initiative (SNI) 500 Plum Street Syracuse, New York 13204
Russ Andrews	Sinclair & Andrews 306 Hawley Ave. Syracuse, NY 13203
Mike Grosack Nattha Chutintranond Abdulla Alnouri	Youth Leadership group
Sherry Mossotti	LGS/YLGS 507 Plum St. Syracuse, NY 13202
Ed Kochian	Deputy Onondaga County Executive John Mulroy Civic Center 421 Montgomery St Syracuse, NY 13202
Patrick DiDomenico	Supervisor, Town of Clay Town Hall 4483 Route 31 Clay, NY 13041
Beth Broadway	Consultant 531 Salt Springs Road Syracuse, NY 13224

Mayor Tim Julian	Mayor of Utica 1 Kennedy Plaza Utica, NY 13502
Joseph Hobika, Jr.	City of Utica Urban and Economic Dev. Empire Zone Coordinator 1 Kennedy Plaza Utica, NY 13502
Linda S. Fatata	City of Utica Dept of Law 1 Kennedy Plaza Utica, NY 13502
Harry Scaramella	Attorney/City Courts Utica, NY 13501
David Pendergast	Oneida County Executive County Office Building 800 Park Ave. Utica, NY 13501
Martha Mulroy	County Legislator, Chair, Ways & Means Committee 407 Court House Syracuse, NY 13202
David Aitken	Lakefront Dev., Director 238 W. Division St. Syracuse, NY 13204
Peggy Ogden	CNY Community Foundation 500 S. Salina St., Ste 428 Syracuse, NY 13202
Lynn Shepard Scott	Human Services Administrator John Mulroy Civic Center 421 Montgomery Street Syracuse, NY 13202
Karen Kitney	Director, Syracuse Onondaga County Planning agency John Mulroy Civic Center 421 Montgomery Street Syracuse, NY 13202