AGENDA

AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

AUGUST 28, 2019

PREVIOUS BUSINESS:

APPROVING PREVIOUS MEETING MINUTES

1. RESOLUTION NO. 280 FOR 2018: AUTHORIZING ALBANY COUNTY'S PARTICIPATION IN THE SALES TAX FREE WEEK FOR 2018 ON ITEMS OF CLOTHING AND SHOES COSTING LESS THAN $110

2. LOCAL LAW NO. "R" FOR 2018: A LOCAL LAW OF THE COUNTY OF ALBANY, NEW YORK PROHIBITING ALBANY COUNTY GOVERNMENT FROM ASSISTING IN THE INVESTIGATION OF CITIZENSHIP OR IMMIGRATION STATUS OF ANY PERSON

3. RESOLUTION NO. 376 FOR 2018: PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW NO. "R" FOR 2018

4. LOCAL LAW NO. "C" FOR 2019: A LOCAL LAW OF THE COUNTY OF ALBANY, NEW YORK, AMENDING AND UPDATING LOCAL LAW NO. 2 FOR 2011 REQUIRING ITEM PRICING BY RETAIL STORES IN THE COUNTY OF ALBANY

5. AUTHORIZING THE CONVEYANCE OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED AT 89 THIRD STREET (TAX MAP NO. 65.74-2-7) IN THE CITY OF ALBANY

CURRENT BUSINESS:
6. **RESOLUTION NO. 356: RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 217 FOR 2019**

7. **AMENDING THE 2019 DISTRICT ATTORNEYS OFFICE BUDGET: ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS**

8. **AMENDING THE 2019 SHERIFF'S OFFICE BUDGET: ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS**

9. **AUTHORIZING AN AGREEMENT WITH CAPITAL MARKET ADVISORS, LLC REGARDING FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES**

10. **AMENDING THE 2019 COMPTROLLER'S OFFICE BUDGET REGARDING A MUNICIPAL SOLID WASTE STUDY**

11. **AMENDING THE 2019 WATER PURIFICATION DISTRICT BUDGET: LIABILITY INSURANCE**

12. **AUTHORIZING AN AGREEMENT WITH NEW YORK STATE DIVISION OF HOMELAND SECURITY AND EMERGENCY SERVICES REGARDING THE STATE HOMELAND SECURITY PROGRAM AND AMENDING THE 2019 ALBANY COUNTY BUDGET**

13. **AMENDING THE 2019 DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS BUDGET: ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS**

14. **AUTHORIZING AN AGREEMENT WITH TYMCO, INC REGARDING THE PURCHASE OF A STREET SWEEPER AND AMENDING THE 2019 DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS BUDGET**

15. **AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 115 FOR 2018 WITH COMPREHENSIVE HEALTHCARE SOLUTIONS REGARDING BILLING AND DEBT COLLECTION SERVICES**

16. **AMENDING RESOLUTION NO. 312 FOR 2018 WITH JERSEN CONSTRUCTION GROUP, LLC REGARDING THE RENOVATION PROJECT AT THE ALBANY COUNTY NURSING HOME**

17. **AMENDING THE 2019 DEPARTMENT OF RESIDENTIAL HEALTH CARE FACILITIES BUDGET: ADMINISTRATIVE ADJUSTMENTS**

18. **RESCINDING THE AUTHORIZATION TO CONVEY REAL PROPERTY PURSUANT TO RESOLUTION NO. 260 FOR 2017 AND AUTHORIZING THE CONVEYANCE OF 47 MAPLERIDGE AVENUE (TAX MAP NO. 75.67-2-44) IN THE CITY OF ALBANY**
19. AUTHORIZING THE CONVEYANCE OF VARIOUS PARCELS OF REAL PROPERTY LOCATED ON RIVER ROAD IN THE TOWN OF COLONIE TO THE TOWN OF COLONIE FOR AN OPEN SPACE INVENTORY

20. AUTHORIZING THE CONVEYANCE OF VARIOUS PARCELS OF REAL PROPERTY TO THE ALBANY COUNTY LAND BANK CORPORATION

21. AUTHORIZING THE CONVEYANCE OF VARIOUS PARCELS OF REAL PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF ALBANY TO THE ALBANY COUNTY LAND BANK CORPORATION

22. AUTHORIZING THE CONVEYANCE OF VARIOUS PARCELS OF REAL PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF COHOES TO THE ALBANY COUNTY LAND BANK CORPORATION

23. AUTHORIZING THE CONVEYANCE OF VARIOUS PARCELS OF REAL PROPERTY IN THE CITY OF WATERVLIET TO THE ALBANY COUNTY LAND BANK CORPORATION

24. AUTHORIZING THE CONVEYANCE OF A PARCEL OF REAL PROPERTY KNOWN AS VAN WIES POINT ROAD (TAX MAP NO. 100.2-1-3.2) LOCATED IN THE TOWN OF BETHLEHEM

25. AUTHORIZING THE RELEASE OF RIGHT OF REVERTER OF TITLE TO 35 TEN BROECK STREET IN THE CITY OF ALBANY

26. AUTHORIZING THE REFUND OF REAL PROPERTY TAXES IN THE TOWN OF BETHLEHEM

27. AUTHORIZING THE REFUND OF REAL PROPERTY TAXES IN THE CITY OF ALBANY

28. AUTHORIZING A CORRECTION OF THE TAX ROLLS FOR THE CITY OF ALBANY

29. AUTHORIZING THE CANCELLATION AND CHARGE BACK OF UNENFORCEABLE DELINQUENT REAL PROPERTY TAX LIENS ON 5565 GRANT HILL ROAD (TAX MAP NO. 61.00-2-701) IN THE TOWN OF GUILDERLAND
Honorable Andrew Joyce and Members of the Albany County Legislature:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

The Audit and Finance Committee of the Albany County Legislature met on July 24, 2019. Chairperson Willingham, Messrs. Clay, Higgins, R. Joyce, O'Brien, Burgdorff, and Mendick were present. Messrs. Dawson and Grimm were excused. The following items were discussed and/or acted upon:

Approving Previous Meeting Minutes: Unanimously approved.

1. Authorizing the Submission of a Grant Application and an Agreement with the New York State Office of Victim Services Regarding the Crime Victims Assistance Grant and Amending the 2019 District Attorney’s Office Budget: The Albany County District Attorney’s Office requested authorization to submit a grant application to and enter into a multi-year agreement with the New York State Office of Victim Services regarding the Crime Victim Assistance Grant in a total amount of $426,356 over a three-year term commencing October 1, 2019 and ending September 30, 2022 with a potential two-year renewal option dependent on future federal funding. The District Attorney’s Office also requested a budget amendment to incorporate a portion of the funding from the first year of the grant into the 2019 District Attorney’s Office Budget. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

2. Authorizing an Agreement with the New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services Regarding the State Homeland Security and Law Enforcement Prevention Grant and Amending the 2019 Sheriff’s Office Budget: The Albany County Sheriff requested authorization to enter into a three year agreement with the New York State Division of Homeland Security and Emergency Services in the amount of $151,400 regarding the State Law Enforcement Terrorism Prevention Program for the period commencing September 1, 2019 and ending August 31, 2022. The Sheriff also requested a budget amendment to appropriate the funding to enhance the Sheriff’s Office’s Homeland Security Program. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

3. Amending the 2019 Sheriff’s Office Budget: Vehicle Salvage Funds: The Albany County Sheriff requested authorization to amend the 2019 Sheriff’s Office Budget to transfer $26,404.50 in revenue from insurance recovery proceeds into the Sheriff’s Office automobiles line and $17,450 from auction proceeds into the specialty equipment line. After brief discussion, the Committee voted
unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

4. Amending the 2019 Department of Health Budget: Administrative Adjustments: The Commissioner of the Albany County Department of Health requested authorization to create two positions relating to disease prevention and public health preparedness and to increase a Supervising Community Health Worker position consistent with their collective bargaining agreement. The Commissioner also requested a budget amendment to appropriate funds for these changes. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

5. Authorizing an Agreement with the New York State Department of Health/Health Research Inc. Regarding the Overdose Data to Action Plan and Amending the 2019 Department of Health Budget: The Commissioner of the Albany County Department of Health requested authorization to enter into a three-year agreement with the New York State Department of Health/Health Research, Inc. regarding the Overdose Data to Action program in the amount of $72,000 per year for a total amount of $216,000 for the term commencing September 1, 2019 and ending August 31, 2022. The Commissioner also requested a budget amendment to incorporate a portion of the funding from the first year of the grant into the 2019 Department of Health Budget. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

6. Authorizing an Agreement with the New York State Department of Health Regarding the Maternal and Infant Community Health Collaborative and Amending the 2019 Department of Health Budget: The Commissioner of the Albany County Department of Health requested authorization to enter into an agreement with the New York State Department of Health regarding the Maternal and Infant Community Health Collaborative in the amount of $134,993 for the term commencing August 1, 2019 and ending September 30, 2020. The Commissioner also requested a budget amendment to incorporate a portion of this funding into the 2019 Department of Health Budget. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

7. Amending the 2019 Department of Mental Health Budget: Overtime: The Director of the Albany County Department of Mental Health requested a budget amendment to cover overtime expenses necessary due to vacancies in the Mobile Crisis Team and the Mental Health Unit at the Albany County Correctional Facility. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously
to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

8. Amending the 2019 Department of Mental Health Budget: Administrative Adjustments: The Director of the Albany County Department of Mental Health requested a budget amendment to allocate funds previously designated for The Next Step, Inc. to Hope House, Inc. The Director indicated this was necessary to maintain funding for ongoing programs due to the merging of the two non-profits into one entity. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

9. Amending the 2019 Department of Mental Health Budget: Staff Adjustments: The Director of the Albany County Department of Mental Health requested a budget amendment in order to increase five Staff Social Worker positions and one Supervising Social Worker position from thirty-five hours to forty hours per week. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

10. Amending Resolution No. 203 for 2019 Regarding the Authorization to Convey Parcels of Real Property to ACLB Holdings, LLC.: The Deputy Commissioner of the Albany County Department of Management and Budget requested authorization to amend Resolution No. 203 for 2019 in order to move forward with the conveyance of various parcels to ACLB Holdings, LLC. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

11. Authorizing the Conveyance of Real Property Located at 89 Third Street (Tax Map No. 65.74-2-7) in the City of Albany: The Deputy Commissioner of the Albany County Department of Management and Budget requested authorization to convey real property located at 89 Third Street in the City of Albany to the Underground Railroad History Project of the Capital Region, Inc. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to table the proposal.

12. Amending Resolution No. 251 for 2019 Regarding the Conveyance of Real Property at 182 Brevator Street (Tax Map No. 53.82-1-9) in the City of Albany: The Deputy Commissioner of the Albany County Department of Management and Budget requested authorization to amend Resolution No. 251 for 2019 to reflect that the property is conveyed to “the Spiritual Center for Human Development of Rev. Clara P. Galus” rather than “Clara Galus.” After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.
13. Authorizing the Albany County Executive to Submit Multiple Applications for Various Projects Through the New York State 2019 Consolidated Funding Application Process: The Albany County Executive's Office requested authorization to submit multiple applications through the New York State 2019 Consolidated Funding Application process to request funding for various County projects including upgrades to Lawson Lake, improvements to the Rail Trail, and improvements at the Times Union Center. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.


18. Resolution No. 204: Authorizing the Conveyance of Real Property Located at 171 Troy Schenectady Road (Tax Map No. 32.1-2-5.2) in the Town of Colonie: The Deputy Commissioner of the Albany County Department of Management and Budget requested authorization to convey real property located at 171 Troy Schenectady Road in the Town of Colonie to ACLB Holdings, LLC. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

19. Adopting the Albany County Capital Plan for 2020-2024: The Commissioner of the Albany County Department of Management and Budget requested that the Albany County Legislature adopt the 2020-2024 Albany County Capital Plan. After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

Respectfully Submitted,
THE AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

WANDA WILLINGHAM, Chairperson
WILLIAM CLAY
CHRISTOPHER HIGGINS
RAYMOND F. JOYCE
JOSEPH O'BRIEN

CHARLES DAWSON, JR.
PAUL BURGDORF
RICHARD MENDICK
MARK E. GRIMM
Honorable Andrew Joyce and Members of the Albany County Legislature:

LADIES AND GENTLEMEN:

The Audit and Finance Committee of the Albany County Legislature met on August 12, 2019. Chairperson Willingham, Messrs. Clay, R. Joyce, O'Brien, Burgdorf, Mendick, and Grimm were present. Messrs. Higgins and Dawson were excused. The following items were discussed and/or acted upon:

1. **Resolution No. 299:** Public Hearing on Proposed Local Law No. “C” for 2019 – A Local Law of the County of Albany Amending and Updating Local Law No. 2 for 2011 Requiring Item Pricing by Retail Stores in the County of Albany: After brief discussion, the Committee voted unanimously to move the proposal forward for legislative action with a favorable recommendation.

Respectfully Submitted,
THE AUDIT AND FINANCE COMMITTEE

WANDA WILLINGHAM, Chairperson
WILLIAM CLAY
CHRISTOPHER HIGGINS
RAYMOND F. JOYCE
JOSEPH O'BRIEN

CHARLES DAWSON, JR.
PAUL BURGDORF
RICHARD MENDICK
MARK E. GRIMM
RESOLUTION NO. 280

AUTHORIZING ALBANY COUNTY'S PARTICIPATION IN THE SALES TAX FREE WEEK FOR 2018 ON ITEMS OF CLOTHING AND SHOES COSTING LESS THAN $110

Introduced: 6/11/18
By Messrs. Frainier, Feeney, A. Joyce, Mauriello, Beston, Bullock, Ms. Cunningham, Messrs. Domalewicz, Higgins, R. Joyce, Ms. Lekakis, Mr. Mayo, Ms. McKnight, Mr. O'Brien, Ms. Plotsky, Mr. Ward, Ms. Willingham, Messrs. Burgdorf, Crouse, Drake, Grimm and Ms. Lockart;

WHEREAS, Pursuant to New York State Tax Law Section 1115(a)(30) individual items of clothing and footwear costing less than $110 are exempted from the state’s 4% sales tax, and

WHEREAS, The [action by the State Legislature cancels the State’s 4½ percent [sales tax on these items for the week-long period and gives] Counties have the opportunity to decide whether to participate, and

WHEREAS, The Albany County Legislature wants to provide Albany County residents with the benefit of this State legislation and desire to enhance the State’s sales tax-free exemption by providing Albany County residents with an exemption from the 4 percent local sales tax on individual items of clothing and footwear costing less than $110 for [this important back-to-school] shopping period commencing September 1, 2018 and ending September 3, 2018 [set forth by the State of New York for 2018], now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That the Albany County Legislature authorizes the County’s participation in the sales tax-free period commencing September 1, 2018 and ending September 2, 2018 [week that the State of New York adopts] for the year 2018, and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Clerk of the County Legislature is directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the appropriate County Officials.

Referred to Audit and Finance Committee – 6/11/18
LOCAL LAW NO. “R” FOR 2018

A LOCAL LAW OF THE COUNTY OF ALBANY, NEW YORK PROHIBITING ALBANY COUNTY GOVERNMENT FROM ASSISTING IN THE INVESTIGATION OF CITIZENSHIP OR IMMIGRATION STATUS OF ANY PERSON

Introduced: 7/9/18
By Messrs. Fein, Simpson and Bullock:

BE IT ENACTED, by the Legislature of the County of Albany as follows:

Section 1. Title

This local law shall be known as the “Welcoming Albany County Act”

Section 2. Legislative Intent

The Legislature finds that Albany County has a diverse population, with residents from many different cultures and backgrounds, including many different races, ethnicities, faiths, and national origins.

The Legislature further finds that the residents of Albany County benefit from the County’s diverse cultural heritage.

The Legislature further finds that it is in the best interest of the residents of Albany County to be a welcoming place for all people of all walks of life with no deference to nationality or citizenship.

Therefore, the purpose of this local law is to ensure that Albany County is a welcoming place for all individuals and that Albany County officials do not investigate individuals’ immigration or citizenship status, do not participate in the enforcement of Federal immigration law, and leave the enforcement of Federal immigration law to Federal officials.

Section 3. Definitions

As used in this local law, the following terms shall have the meanings indicated:

A. “Administrative warrant” means an immigration warrant of arrest, order to detain or release aliens, notice of custody determination, notice to appear, removal order, warrant of removal, or any other document, issued for a civil immigration enforcement purpose and that is not issued or signed by a judge
appointed pursuant to article III of the United States constitution or a federal magistrate judge appointed pursuant to 28 U.S.C. § 631. This definition includes, but is not limited to, administrative warrants entered into the Federal Bureau of Investigation’s National Crime Information Center database. This definition does not include any criminal warrants issued upon a judicial determination of probable cause and in compliance with the requirements of the Fourth Amendment to the U.S. Constitution and New York law.

B. “Agency” means every Albany County department, agency, division, commission, council, commission, board, or other body established by authority of a local law, resolution, or executive order, and shall encompass, for the purposes of this local law, all contractors performing work on behalf of the county.

C. “Agent” means any person employed by or acting on behalf of an agency or county contractor.

D. “CBP” means the United States Customs and Border Protection agency and shall include any successor agency charged with the enforcement of federal civil immigration laws.

E. “Certification” means any law enforcement certification or statement required by federal immigration law including, but not limited to, the information required by Section 1184(p) of Title 8 of the United States Code (including current United States Citizenship and Immigration Service Form I-918, Supplement B, or any successor forms) for purposes of obtaining a U visa, or by Section 1184(o) of Title 8 of the United States Code (including current United States Citizenship and Immigration Service Form I-914, Supplement B, or any successor forms) for purposes of obtaining a T visa.

F. “Certifying agency” means Albany County law enforcement agency or other authority that has responsibility for the investigation, prosecution, or sentencing of qualifying criminal activity. “Certifying agency” includes any agency that has criminal investigative jurisdiction in its respective areas of expertise.

G. “Citizenship or immigration status” means an individual’s recorded citizenship or immigration status, as such status is defined in the federal immigration and nationality act, at the time an agent or agency receives such information.

H. “Contact information” means home address, work address, telephone number, electronic mail address, social media information, or any other information that can be used as a means of locating or contacting an individual.
I. “Eligible for release from custody” means that the person may be released from custody because one of the following conditions has occurred:

a. All criminal charges against the person have been dropped or dismissed.
b. The person has been acquitted of all criminal charges filed against him or her.
c. The person has served all the time required for his or her jail or prison sentence.
d. The person is ordered to be released from custody pending the disposition of his or her pending criminal case.
e. The person has posted a bond.
f. The person is otherwise eligible for release under state or local law, or local policy.

J. “Family member” means a person’s (i) mother, father, spouse, brother or sister (including blood, step or half), son or daughter (including blood, step or half), father-in-law, mother-in-law, daughter-in-law, son-in-law, brother-in-law, sister-in-law, grandparent or grandchild; or (ii) court-appointed legal guardian or a person for whom the person is a court-appointed legal guardian; or (iii) domestic partner or the domestic partner’s mother, father, brother, sister (including blood, step, or half), son or daughter (including blood, step or half).

K. “ICE” means the United States Immigration and Customs Enforcement agency and shall include any successor agency charged with the enforcement of federal civil immigration laws.

L. “Immigration detainer” means a request by ICE or CBP to a federal, state, or local law enforcement agency that requests that the law enforcement agency provide notice of release or maintain custody of an individual, including detainers issued pursuant to Sections 1226 or 1357 of Title 8 of the United States Code or 287.7 or 286.1 of Title 8 of the Code of Federal Regulations. These detainers include DHS Form I-247-A “Immigration Detainer – Notice of Action”; DHS Form I-247D “Immigration Detainer – Request for Voluntary Action”; DHS I-247X “Request for Voluntary Transfer”; DHS Form I-247N “Request for Voluntary Notification of Release,” or any successor forms.

M. “Immigration enforcement operation” means any operation that is primarily for the purpose of identifying or apprehending a person or persons: 1) in order to subject them to civil immigration detention, removal or deportation proceedings, and/or removal or deportation from the United States; or 2) to criminally prosecute a person or persons for offenses related to immigration status, including but not limited to violations of Sections 1253, 1304, 1306(a) and (b), 1325, or 1326 of Title 8 of the United States Code, or violations of Sections 1028A or 1546 of Title 18 of the United States Code.
N. “Judicial warrant” means a warrant based on probable cause and issued by a judge appointed pursuant to article III of the United States constitution or a federal magistrate judge appointed pursuant to 28 USC 631, that authorizes federal immigration authorities to take into custody the person who is the subject of such warrant. This does not include warrants or orders issued by employees of the Department of Homeland Security, the Department of Justice, or the Executive Office for Immigration Review.

O. “Qualifying criminal activity” means any activity involving one or more of the following or any similar activity in violation of federal, state, or local criminal law: rape; torture; trafficking; incest; domestic violence; sexual assault; abusive sexual contact; prostitution; sexual exploitation; female genital mutilation; being held hostage; peonage; involuntary servitude; slave trade; kidnapping; abduction; unlawful criminal restraint; false imprisonment; blackmail; extortion; manslaughter; murder; felonious assault; witness tampering; obstruction of justice; perjury; fraud in foreign labor contracting (as defined in Section 1351 of Title 18 of the United States Code); or attempt, conspiracy, or solicitation to commit any of the above-mentioned crimes. This list of qualifying criminal activity is not a list of specific statutory violations, but instead a list of general categories of criminal activity. Activity not listed in the first sentence of this definition shall be presumed to be qualifying criminal activity when its nature and elements are substantially similar to any qualifying criminal activity listed herein. Qualifying criminal activity that occurs during the commission of non-qualifying criminal activity shall be considered qualifying criminal activity regardless of whether criminal prosecution was sought for the qualifying criminal activity.

P. “Victim of qualifying criminal activity” means any individual who has reported qualifying criminal activity to a law enforcement agency or certifying agency, or has otherwise participated in the detection, investigation, or prosecution of qualifying criminal activity, who has suffered direct or proximate harm as a result of the commission of any qualifying criminal activity and may include, but is not limited to, an indirect victim, regardless of the direct victim’s immigration or citizenship status, including the spouse, children under 21 years of age, and, if the direct victim is under 21 years of age, deceased, incompetent or incapacitated, parents and unmarried siblings under 18 years of age of the direct victim. A bystander victim may also be considered as a “victim of qualifying criminal activity.” More than one victim may be identified and provided with certification depending upon the circumstances. For purposes of this definition, the term “incapacitated” means unable to interact with law enforcement agency or certifying agency personnel as a result of a cognitive impairment or other physical limitation, or because of physical restraint or disappearance.

Section 4. Requesting information prohibited
No agent or agency shall request information about or otherwise investigate or assist in the investigation of the citizenship or immigration status of any person, except as may be required under Section 10 of this local law, unless such inquiry or investigation is required by court order. Notwithstanding this provision, the Albany County attorney may investigate and inquire about citizenship or immigration status when relevant to potential or actual litigation or an administrative proceeding in which the county is or may be a party.

Section 5. Conditioning benefits, services, or opportunities on immigration status prohibited

A. No agent or agency shall condition the provision of Albany County benefits, services, or opportunities on matters related to citizenship or immigration status unless required to do so by state or federal law, or court order.

B. Where presentation of a driver's license or identification card issued by New York State or any U.S. State or U.S. territory is accepted as adequate evidence of identity, presentation of a photo identity document issued by another country, such as a driver's license, passport, or consular identification document or presentation of a photo identity issued by a school, college, or employer located in the United States, shall be accepted and shall not subject the person to a higher level of scrutiny or different treatment than if the person had provided a driver's license or identification card issued by New York State or any U.S. State or U.S. territory except that this subsection (b) shall not apply to the completion of the federally mandated I-9 forms.

C. In order to ensure that eligible persons are not deterred from seeking Albany County benefits, services, or opportunities, all agencies shall review their confidentiality policies and identify any changes necessary to ensure that information collected from individuals is limited to that necessary to perform agency duties and is not used or disclosed for any other purpose, except as may be required under Section 10 of this local law. Any necessary changes to those policies shall be made within 60 days of the adoption of this local law, consistent with agency procedures.

D. All applications, questionnaires, and interview forms used in relation to Albany County benefits, opportunities, or services shall be promptly reviewed by the pertinent agencies and any questions regarding citizenship or immigration status, other than those required by statute, federal law, or court order, shall be deleted within 60 days of the adoption of this local law.

Section 6. Immigration enforcement actions and Federal responsibility
A. No agency or agent shall stop, arrest, detain, or continue to detain a person after that person becomes eligible for release from custody or is free to leave an encounter with an agency or agent, based on any of the following:

   a. an immigration detainer;
   b. an administrative warrant; or
   c. any other basis that is based solely on the belief that the person is not present legally in the United States, or that the person has committed a civil immigration violation.

B. No agency or agent shall accept requests by ICE, CBP, or other agencies to support or assist in any capacity with immigration enforcement operations, including but not limited to requests to (1) provide information (including custody status, release date, home address, or work address) regarding persons who may be the subject of immigration enforcement operations except as may be required under Section 10 of this local law, (2) investigate or interrogate such persons, (3) establish traffic perimeters, or (4) otherwise be present to assist or support an operation. In the event an agent receives a request to support or assist in an immigration enforcement operation, he or she shall report the request to his or her supervisor, who shall decline the request, except as may be required under Section 10 of this local law, and document the declination in an interoffice memorandum to the agency director through the chain of command.

C. No agency or agent shall enter into an agreement under Section 1357(g) of Title 8 of the United States Code or any other federal law that authorizes or permits state or local governmental entities to enforce federal civil immigration laws.

D. Unless presented with a valid and properly issued judicial warrant, no agency or agent shall:

   a. stop, arrest, detain, or continue to detain a person after that person becomes eligible for release from custody or is free to leave an encounter with an agency or agent;
   b. permit ICE or CBP agents access to a person being detained by, or in the custody of, the agency or agent;
   c. transfer any person into ICE or CBP custody;
   d. permit ICE or CBP agents use of agency facilities, information (except as may be required under Section 10 of this local law), or equipment, including any agency electronic databases, for investigative interviews or other investigative purpose or for purposes of executing an immigration enforcement operation; or
   e. expend time to respond to ICE or CBP inquiries or communicate with ICE or CBP regarding a person's custody status, release date, home address, work address, or other information, except as may be required under Section 10 of this local law.
Section 7. Certifications for victims of qualifying criminal activity

A. A certifying agency shall execute any certification requested by any victim of qualifying criminal activity or representative of the victim including, but not limited to, the victim's attorney, accredited representative, or domestic violence service provider, within 45 days of receiving the request. If the victim seeking certification is in federal immigration removal proceedings, the certifying agency shall execute the certification within 14 days of receiving the request. If the victim or the victim's children would lose any benefits under Sections 1184(p) and 1184(o) of Title 8 of the United States Code by virtue of having reached the age of 21 years within 90 days after the certifying agency receives the certification request, the certifying agency shall execute the certification no later than 14 days before the date on which the victim or child would reach the age of 21 years. Requests for expedited certification must be affirmatively raised by the victim.

B. If a certifying agency denies a request for certification, the agency shall notify the applicant in writing of the basis for the denial and the process for appealing the denial to the agency head. Within 90 days of receiving an applicant's letter appealing a denial, the certifying agency head shall notify the applicant in writing that the appeal is rejected and the initial denial is upheld or that the appeal is granted and the certifying agency will issue a certification.

C. The head of each certifying agency shall perform, or designate an agent with a supervisory role within the agency to perform, the following responsibilities:

a. respond to requests for certifications;
b. provide outreach to victims of qualifying criminal activity to inform them of the agency's certification process; and
c. keep written records of all certification requests and responses.

D. All certifying agencies shall implement a language-access protocol for non-English speaking victims of qualifying criminal activity.

E. A certifying agency shall reissue any certification within 45 days of receiving a request from the victim of qualifying criminal activity or representative of the victim including, but not limited to, the victim's attorney, accredited representative, or domestic violence service provider.

F. There is no requirement that there be a current investigation, the filing of charges, a prosecution, or a conviction in order for a certifying agency to provide a certification, and there is no statute of limitations on providing a certification.
G. A certifying agency shall not refuse to provide certifications to applicants with criminal histories or outstanding warrants.

H. Notwithstanding any other provision of this section, a certifying agency’s completion of a certification shall not be considered conclusive evidence that the victim has met eligibility requirements for a U or T visa, and completion of a certification by a certifying agency shall not be construed to guarantee that a victim will receive federal immigration relief. It is the exclusive responsibility of federal immigration officials to determine whether a victim of qualifying criminal activity is eligible for a U or T visa. Completion of a certification by a certifying agency merely verifies factual information relevant to the immigration benefit sought including information relevant for federal immigration officials to determine eligibility for a U or T visa. By completing a certification, the certifying agency attests that the information is true and correct to the best of the certifying official’s knowledge. If after completion of a certification, the victim unreasonably refuses to assist in the investigation or prosecution of the qualifying criminal activity of which he or she is a victim, then the certifying agency may notify the United States Citizenship and Immigration Services in writing.

Section 8. Federal registry programs

No agency or agent shall expend any time, facilities, equipment, information, or other resources of the agency or agent to facilitate the creation, publication, or maintenance of any federal program to register individuals present in the United States based on their race, religion, gender, sexual orientation, gender identity or expression, or national or ethnic origin, or the participation of any residents of the Albany County in such a registry.

Section 9. Commitments

A. The county commits to working with community advocates, policy experts, and legal advocates to defend the human rights of immigrants.

B. The Albany County Sheriff’s Department will continue to respond to requests from immigrant communities to defend them against all crimes, including hate crimes, to assist people with limited language proficiency, and to connect immigrants with social services.

C. The county recognizes the arrest of an individual increases that individual’s risk of deportation even in cases where the individual is found to be not guilty, creating a disproportionate impact from law enforcement operations. Therefore, for all individuals, the Albany County Sheriff’s Department will recognize and consider the extreme potential negative consequences of an arrest in exercising its discretion regarding whether to take such an action, and will arrest
an individual only after determining that less severe alternatives are unavailable or would be inadequate to effect a satisfactory resolution.

Section 10. Information regarding citizenship or immigration status

Nothing in this local law prohibits any Albany County agency from sending to, or receiving from, any local, state, federal agency, information regarding an individual's citizenship or immigration status.

Section 11. Severability

If any clause, sentence, paragraph, section, subdivision, or other part of this local law or its application shall be inconsistent with any federal or state statute, law, regulation or rule then the federal or state statute, law, regulation, or rule shall prevail. If any clause, sentence, paragraph, section, subdivision, or other part of this local law or its application shall be adjudged by a court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid or unconstitutional; such order or judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder of the local law which shall remain in full force and effect except as limited by such order or judgment.

Section 12. Effective Date and Applicability

This local law shall be effective immediately upon filing in the Office of the Secretary of State.

Referred to Law, Public Safety and Audit and Finance Committees – 7/9/18
RESOLUTION NO. 376

PUBLIC HEARING ON PROPOSED LOCAL LAW NO. "R" FOR 2018

Introduced: 8/13/18
By: Messrs. Fein and Simpson

RESOLVED, By the County Legislature of the County of Albany that a public hearing on proposed Local Law No. "R" for 2018, "A Local Law of the County of Albany, New York Prohibiting Albany County Government from Assisting in the Investigation of Citizenship or Immigration Status of Any Person," be held by the County Legislature in the Legislative Chamber, Albany County Courthouse, Albany, New York at 7:15 p.m. on Tuesday, August 28, 2018, and the Clerk of the County Legislature is directed to cause notice of such hearing to be published containing the necessary information in accordance with the applicable provisions of law.

Referred to Law, Audit and Finance and Public Safety Committees – 8/13/18
LOCAL LAW NO. “C” FOR 2019

A LOCAL LAW OF THE COUNTY OF ALBANY, NEW YORK, AMENDING AND UPDATING LOCAL LAW NO. 2 FOR 2011 REQUIRING ITEM PRICING BY RETAIL STORES IN THE COUNTY OF ALBANY

Introduced: 3/11/19
By Messrs. Feeney, Ward and Ethier:

BE IT ENACTED by the County Legislature of the County of Albany as follows:

Local Law No. 2 for 2011 is amended to read as follows:

SECTION 1. Title.

This Law shall be known as the “Albany County Item Pricing Law.”

SECTION 2. Legislative Intent.

This Law recognizes that clear, accurate item pricing is a basic consumer right which is no longer protected under New York State Law. It is the purpose of this Law to ensure that consumer goods offered for sale in the County of Albany are clearly, accurately and adequately marked as to their selling price. The County Legislature does, at the same time, recognize the numerous efficiencies and economies available to the retail food industry through use of computer-assisted checkout systems (together with shelf tag labeling) as the primary method of pricing consumer goods. It is the intention of this Legislature to require that retail food stores place individual item prices on products that they sell and to require accuracy at the checkout registers. It is also the intention of this Legislature to provide for a waiver of the item pricing requirement for certain stores that demonstrate and maintain a very high degree of computer-assisted pricing accuracy and that provide certain consumer protections and services that enhance the ability of consumers to record and verify individual item prices.

SECTION 3. Definitions.

A. “Stock keeping unit” shall mean each group of items offered for sale of the same brand name, quantity of contents, retail price, and variety within the following categories:
1. food, including all material, solid, liquid or mixed, whether simple or compound, used or intended for consumption by human beings or domestic animals normally kept as household pets and all substances or ingredients to be added thereto for any purpose; and

2. napkins, facial tissues, toilet tissues, and any disposable wrapping or container for the storage, handling or serving of food; and

3. detergents, soaps, other cleansing agents, and cleaning implements; and

4. non-prescription drugs, feminine hygiene products and health and beauty aids.

B. “Stock keeping item” shall mean each individual item of a stock keeping unit offered for sale.

C. “Universal product coding” shall mean any system of coding which entails electronic pricing.

D. “Item price” shall mean the tag, stamp or mark affixed to a stock keeping item by an authorized person which sets forth, in clearly readable Arabic numerals, the selling price.

E. “Computer-assisted checkout system” shall mean any electronic device, computer system or machine which determines the selling price of a stock keeping item by interpreting its universal product code, or by use of its price look-up function.

F. “Price look-up function” shall mean the capability of any checkout system to determine the selling price of a stock keeping item by way of the manual entry into the system of a code number assigned to that particular unit by the retail store or by way of the checkout operator’s consultation of a file maintained at the point of sale.

G. “Person” shall mean an individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation

H. “Inspector” shall mean the authorized government official or his agents or employees having jurisdiction to enforce the provisions of this Local Law.

I. “Retail store” shall mean a store selling stock keeping units at retail including, but not limited to, grocery retailers, pharmacies and
department stores. A store which is not open to the general public but is
reserved for use by its members shall come within the provisions of this
definition unless the members must pay a direct fee to the store to qualify for
membership and the store is not required to collect sales tax on transactions
with members. Pursuant to this section, a retail store shall not include any
store which:

1. has as its only full-time employee the owner thereof, or the
   parent, or the spouse or child of the owner, or in addition thereto not
   more than two full-time employees; or

2. had annual gross sales in a previous calendar year of less than
   three million dollars, unless the retail store is part of a network of
   subsidiaries, affiliates or other member stores, under direct or indirect
   common control, which, as a group, had annual gross sales in the
   previous calendar year of three million dollars or more; or

3. engages primarily in the sale of food for consumption on the
   premises or in a specialty trade which the Director of Weights and
   Measures determines, by regulation, would be inappropriate for item
   pricing.

J. "Retail Area" shall mean the area designated in a retail store to
display and sell products, provide customer service, and check out. The retail
area does not include the storage area, back rooms, stock area, maintenance
areas, or other locations which are not intended to be accessible to consumers.

SECTION 4. Item Pricing Required.

A. Subject to the waiver provisions contained in Section 7 of this Local
Law, every retail store, person, individual, firm, partnership, association, or
corporation which sells, offers for sale or exposes for sale in a retail store a
stock keeping unit that bears a Universal Product Code shall disclose to the
consumer the price of each stock keeping item by individually marking each
such item with the item price.

B. Certain items exempted. The following stock keeping items need not
be item priced as provided in Subdivision A of this section provided that a shelf
price and a price look-up function are maintained for such stock keeping items:

1. Snack foods such as cakes, gum, candies, chips and nuts offered
   for sale in single packages and weighing five ounces or less;
2. Stock keeping items which are under three cubic inches in size, and weigh less than three ounces, and are priced under one dollar;

3. Items sold through a vending machine;

4. Fresh milk, cream, half and half and other similarly packaged liquid dairy products and orange juice;

5. Fresh eggs;

6. Unpackaged fresh produce;

7. Food offered for sales in bulk;

8. Items offered for sale which are packaged in poly-plastic frozen food bags;

9. All sale items merchandised in segregated off-shelf displays for a period of up to 21 days provided the name of the product and the advertised or sale price is clearly and conspicuously posted on a sign at the point of display;

10. Individual jars of strained and junior size baby food;

11. Individual boxes of dry gelatin and pudding;

12. Ice cream and frozen yogurt; and

13. Stock keeping items within a multi-package that is properly item priced.

SECTION 5. Pricing Accuracy.

A. No retail store, person, individual, firm, partnership, association, or corporation, shall charge a price for any exempt or non-exempt stock keeping item which exceeds the lower of any item price, shelf price, sale price or advertised price of such stock keeping item. In the event that the programmed computer price exceeds the lowest price a store is permitted to charge for a stock keeping unit, the store will be subject to a penalty as described in Section 6, Paragraph E.

B. In a store with a laser scanning or other computer assisted checkout system, the Inspector shall be permitted to compare the item, shelf, sale or
advertised price of any stock keeping item sold in the store with the programmed computer price.

SECTION 6. Enforcement.

A. Item Pricing Inspection Procedures. For the purpose of determining a store's compliance with the requirements of Section 4, an inspection shall be conducted of a sample of no less than ten stock keeping units. However, in the event the Inspector has received a specific written complaint, no such minimum sample shall be required in the investigation of same.

B. Laser Scanner Accuracy Inspection Procedures. For any inspection under Section 5 or Section 7, the store representative shall afford the Inspector access to the test mode of the checkout system in use at that store or to a comparable function of said system and the retail price information contained in a price look-up function. All inspections conducted pursuant to this section shall consist of a random sample of not less than one hundred nor more than two hundred stock keeping units. In the event the Inspector has received a specific written complaint, the Inspector, may, in his discretion, conduct an inspection of only those items.

C. Stop Removal Order. An Inspector shall have the authority to issue a stop removal order with respect to any device, system, or stock keeping unit being used, handled or offered for sale in violation of Section 4 or 5. Any such order shall be in writing and directed that the device, system or stock keeping unit, as the case may be, shall be removed from use or sale pending correction.

D. Penalties for Item Pricing Violations. Any retail store which fails to mark any stock keeping item in violation of Section 4 shall be subject to the penalties of not less than five dollars and not more than fifty dollars per violation. For additional violations during a subsequent inspection in a twelve month period, the above penalties shall be doubled. In doubling penalties, an Inspector shall not be limited to the doubling of any specific fine previously issued. No penalties shall be imposed for a violation of Section 4 if more than ninety-five percent of all the stock keeping items inspected in each stock keeping unit at an individual point of sale contain clearly readable and correct item prices.

E. Penalties for Scanner Accuracy Violations. Upon a violation of the provisions of Section 5, a penalty in the amount of one hundred dollars per violation shall be imposed for the first two violations of the stock keeping items compared; two hundred dollars per violation for the next two violations; two hundred fifty dollars per violation for the next two violations; and three hundred fifty dollars for each additional violation. For additional violations
during a subsequent inspection in a twelve month period, the above penalties
shall be tripled and suspension of a Section 7 waiver for one year.

SECTION 7. Waiver of Item Pricing Requirements Based Upon Pricing
Accuracy; Consumer Protections.

A. Every retail store, person, individual, firm, partnership, association,
or corporation subject to this Local Law which would otherwise be required to
item price as provided in Section 4 may make an application in writing to the
Department of Weights and Measures for a waiver of the item pricing
requirements as contained herein. The application shall be submitted to the
Director of Weights and Measures for the County of Albany.

[A ]Separate applications shall be required for each retail store,
person, firm, partnership, or corporation subject to this Local Law.

B. Each application for a waiver of the item pricing requirements
contained herein shall be subject to a non-refundable annual waiver fee based
on the retail square footage of the retail area of each store as set forth according
to the following schedule:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Area</th>
<th>Waiver Fee</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>$750.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,000 sq. ft. or more</td>
<td>$3,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[Under 3,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>$500.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10,000- 30,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>$1,500.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[10,000 to 30,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>$1,500.00]</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>[30,000 to 90,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>$3,000.00]</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[B. All written requests for an item pricing waiver shall include an
annual waiver application fee in the amount of three thousand dollars made
payable to the County.]

C. Waiver applications and the required fee submitted under this
section must be received by the Department of Weights and Measures on or
before May 1 of each year. New stores which did not previously hold waivers
may apply after the May 1 deadline and the application and length of the
waiver will be prorated accordingly.

D. [C]. Upon receipt of an application and fee as provided in subsections
A and B of this section, the Director of Weights and Measures shall cause to be
conducted two scanner accuracy inspections of the store for which the application has been submitted. These inspections shall be conducted on two separate days, in a manner prescribed by the Director of the Department of Weights and Measures, and shall consist of comparing the shelf, sale or advertised price of any stock keeping unit with the computer-assisted checkout system price. At stores with a retail area in excess of 30,000 square feet a minimum of fifty (50) items shall be checked at each inspection. At stores with a retail area of less than 30,000 square feet a minimum of twenty-five (25) items shall be checked. In the event that any violations are detected, penalties shall be assessed as provided in Section 6, subsection E. If, considering both inspections together, the number of stock keeping units found to be in violation does not exceed two percent of all stock keeping units inspected, the Director of Weights and Measures shall grant to the applicant a revocable one year waiver from item pricing requirements provided that the applicant has paid all outstanding penalties imposed in connection with this Local Law. Any store with a current waiver shall not be subject to the item pricing provisions set forth in Section 4 herein.

E. A waiver from item pricing requirement contained herein shall be valid for a period of one year from the date of issuance. Stores must reapply annually for the renewal of a waiver at the rates established in Section 7(B) of this law. The waiver fee and two inspections shall be required for each annual renewal application, as required for an original waiver application.

F. In the event that total violations in excess of two percent are discovered in the inspections provided for in subsection D [C] herein, the Director of Weights and Measures shall not grant a waiver to the applicant. Such a store may reapply for a waiver by submitting another application with the required fee.

G. [E]. Stores that have less than 5,000 sq. ft. are not required to install a separate scanner in retail area but must comply with all other pricing requirements, contained in section 214-h of the New York State Agriculture and Markets Law, have an Uniform Pricing Code System and shall maintain registers with a scanner system that clearly displays to the consumer the price of each product that is scanned.

Any retail store that obtains an annual waiver from item pricing shall be required to:

1. Display easy-to-read and properly located shelf tags or signs on every stock keeping unit or group of stock keeping units of the same brand, size and price. Shelf tags shall contain all pricing information
required by section 214-h of the New York State agriculture and markets law, as such law is amended from time to time.

2. Post a notice for the consumer, in a conspicuous location, of the granting of the item pricing waiver which shall indicate consumer rights with respect to the accurate pricing of items and price discrepancies.

3. Designate and make available price check scanners to enable consumers to confirm the price of the stock keeping item. These price check scanners shall be in locations that are centrally located in the store and convenient to consumers, with signs of sufficient lettering to identify the scanners to consumers. The minimum number of price check scanners shall be dependent on the stores retail area as follows: [Designate and make available the number of price check scanners set forth in the following table to enable consumers to confirm the price of a stock keeping item]:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Retail Area</th>
<th>Minimum # of Scanners</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>[Square footage of selling space]</td>
<td>Number of Scanners</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 5,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>Register Only</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Less than 30,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>30,000-90,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Over 90,000 sq. ft.</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[Less than 30,000 1]
[30,000 – 90,000 2][3]
[Over 90,000 4][5]

Stores shall have the discretion to install price check scanners which are capable of printing an adhesive label containing the price of the stock keeping item. Stores which choose to have scanners, in an amount which complies with the requirements noted above, but which do not print adhesive labels shall be considered in compliance with the provisions of this local law for purposes of granting a waiver. [One such price check scanner shall be capable of printing an adhesive label containing the price of the stock keeping item. Price check scanners shall be placed in a location convenient to consumers with a sign of sufficient sized lettering identifying this unit to consumers.] Price check scanners may be used by the retail store to meet unanticipated customer checkout needs.
4. Assist county inspectors with store inspections. The retail store may make store personnel or hand-held price scanners available to a county inspector to assist with price accuracy inspections. Inspections of retail stores may be unannounced, provided however, that the inspector shall notify the store upon arrival.

A retail store failing to comply with any of the requirements of section 7 of this local law [this subsection E] shall be subject to a penalty in the amount of no more than three hundred dollars per violation.

H.[F]. An annual waiver from item pricing shall be valid until such time as a store falls below 98% accuracy on two consecutive pricing accuracy inspections. Failure to meet the scanning accuracy requirement or failure to pay the annual application fee shall subject the retail store to the item pricing requirements of this Local Law within ten days of the last inspection.

I.[G]. In the event that the Director of Weights and Measures is unable to conduct inspections pursuant to [subsection C] of this section within thirty days of receipt of a completed written waiver application, the Director of Weights and Measures shall grant a temporary waiver pending completion of the inspections. If, upon completion, the item pricing inspections detect a violation rate of two percent or less, the Director of Weights and Measures shall issue an annual waiver. If the inspections detect a violation rate in excess of two percent, the temporary waiver shall be immediately revoked and the item pricing provisions of this Local Law shall apply.

SECTION 8. Regulations

In addition to the powers and duties elsewhere prescribed in this local law, the Director of the Department of Weights and Measures shall have the power to adopt, amend or rescind, after a public hearing, such regulations that may be necessary to effectuate the purposes of this law with respect to item pricing and accuracy. At least seven days prior notice of such public hearing on proposed regulations shall be published in the official newspapers of the County of Albany. Any regulations adopted pursuant to this local law shall be filed in the Office of the Clerk of the Albany County Legislature.

SECTION 9[8]. Jurisdiction.

The provisions of this Local Law and any Regulations promulgated hereunder shall be enforced by the Director of Weights and Measures for the County of Albany. The Director of Weights and Measures shall refer cases of unpaid penalties to the Albany County Attorney for appropriate legal action.
SECTION 10[9]. Appointment of Review Committee.

Upon the expiration of the first six months of operation, the Chairman of the County Legislature shall appoint a three-member Review Committee to study this Law's strengths and weaknesses and make appropriate recommendations for amendments to the Finance Committee.

SECTION 11[10]. Severability.

If any section of this Local Law, or the application thereof to any person or circumstance shall be adjudged invalid by a Court of competent jurisdiction, such order or judgment shall be confined in its operation to the controversy in which it was rendered and shall not affect or invalidate the remainder of any provision of any section or the application of any part thereof to any other person or circumstance and to this end the provisions of each section of this Law are hereby declared to be severable.


This local law shall take effect immediately.

Referred to Law and Audit and Finance Committees - 3/11/19
July 3, 2019

Honorable Andrew Joyce
Chair, Albany County Legislature
112 State St., Rm. 710
Albany, NY 12207

Dear Chairman Joyce:

Legislative authorization is requested to convey 89 Third Street in the City of Albany a tax foreclosed property to the Underground Railroad History Project of the Capital Region, Inc. This conveyance is in accordance with Resolution No.29 of 2019 which states “Properties which will be conveyed by the County to not-for-profits/non-profit entities for use for a public purpose “.

If you have any questions regarding this request I can make myself available at your earliest convenience. Thank you for your consideration

Sincerely Yours,

Shawn A. Thelen

cc:
Hon. Dennis Feeney, Majority Leader
Hon. Frank Mauelilo, Minority Leader
Majority Counsel
Minority Counsel
REQUEST FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

Description (e.g., Contract Authorization for Information Services):
Authorization to convey 89 Third Street located in the City of Albany to the Underground Railroad History Project of the Capital Region, Inc.

Date: July 3, 2019
Submitted By: Shawn Thelen
Department: Management and Budget
Title: Commissioner
Phone: 518-447-7070
Department Rep.: Anthony DiLella
Attending Meeting: David Reilly/Michael McLaughlin

Purpose of Request:

☐ Adopting of Local Law
☐ Amendment of Prior Legislation
☐ Approval/Adoption of Plan/Procedure
☐ Bond Approval
☐ Budget Amendment
☐ Contract Authorization
☐ Countywide Services
☐ Environmental Impact/SEQR
☐ Home Rule Request
☒ Property Conveyance
☐ Other: (state if not listed) Click or tap here to enter text.

CONCERNING BUDGET AMENDMENTS

Increase/decrease category (choose all that apply):
☐ Contractual
☐ Equipment
☐ Fringe
☐ Personnel
CONCERNING CONTRACT AUTHORIZATIONS

Type of Contract:
☐ Change Order/Contract Amendment
☐ Purchase (Equipment/Supplies)
☐ Lease (Equipment/Supplies)
☐ Requirements
☐ Professional Services
☐ Education/Training
☐ Grant
   Choose an item.
   Submission Date Deadline Click or tap to enter a date.
☐ Settlement of a Claim
☐ Release of Liability
☐ Other: (state if not listed) Click or tap here to enter text.

Contract Terms/Conditions:

Party (Name/address):
   Click or tap here to enter text.

Additional Parties (Names/addresses):
   Click or tap here to enter text.

Amount/Raise Schedule/Fee:
   Click or tap here to enter text.
Scope of Services:
   Click or tap here to enter text.

Bond Res. No.:
   Click or tap here to enter text.
Date of Adoption:
   Click or tap here to enter text.

CONCERNING ALL REQUESTS

Mandated Program/Service: Yes ☐ No ☐
If Mandated Cite Authority:
   Click or tap here to enter text.

Is there a Fiscal Impact: Yes ☐ No ☐
Anticipated in Current Budget: Yes ☐ No ☐
County Budget Accounts:
Revenue Account and Line: Click or tap here to enter text.
Revenue Amount: Click or tap here to enter text.

 Appropriation Account and Line: Click or tap here to enter text.
Appropriation Amount: Click or tap here to enter text.

Source of Funding - (Percentages)
Federal: Click or tap here to enter text.
State: Click or tap here to enter text.
County: Click or tap here to enter text.
Local: Click or tap here to enter text.

Term
Term: (Start and end date) Click or tap here to enter text.
Length of Contract: Click or tap here to enter text.

Impact on Pending Litigation
Yes ☐ No ☐
If yes, explain: Click or tap here to enter text.

Previous requests for Identical or Similar Action:
Resolution/Law Number: Click or tap here to enter text.
Date of Adoption: Click or tap here to enter text.

Justification: (state briefly why legislative action is requested)
Authorization is requested to convey a tax foreclosed property, 89 Third Street in the City of Albany to the Underground Railroad History Project of the Capital Region, Inc., 184 Livingston Avenue, Albany NY, 12210 for $1.00. The URHP who has worked with Albany County in the preservation of several properties located in the City of Albany’s Arbor Hill, is requesting 89 Third Street (Tax Map No. 65.74-2-7) to turn this property into off-street parking for visitors to access their main location of 184 Livingston Avenue. This conveyance is in accordance with Resolution No. 29 of 2019 which states “Properties which will be conveyed by the County to not-for-profit/non-profit entities for use for a public purpose.”
Daniel McCoy  
Albany County Executive  
112 State Street - Room 1200  
Albany, New York 12207

Dear County Executive McCoy,

It has come to the attention of Underground Railroad History Project of the Capital Region that the property located at 89 Third Street will soon come into possession of Albany County. This letter is being written to express the interest of Underground Railroad History Project in taking ownership of 89 Third Street as soon as possible.

Albany County has made available over the past 20 years various properties in Arbor Hill that include the award winning Stephen and Harriet Myers Residence located at 194 Livingston Avenue, as well as vacant lots at 190, 188 Rear, 186, and 184 Livingston Avenue and 99 and 97 Third Street. All of these lots have been reclaimed from the ravages of overgrown weeds and debris, and brought back to life to create a park-like setting for the community. These properties are now called The Stephen and Harriet Myers Residence Campus and are used by community members as well as for programs conducted by Underground Railroad History Project. All of this effort has brought new life and pride of place back to the community.

The desire of Underground Railroad History Project (URHP) to own 89 Third Street is related to the need for URHP to maintain off-street parking for visiting guests and program attendees in an effort to reduce the impact of on-street visitor and attendee parking on our neighbors who also need to park on the street. Off-street parking has been part of the URHP vision since 2005.

Currently URHP owns 184 Livingston Avenue with the purpose of turning this lot into off-street parking. However, for the safety of residents and visitors it would be advantageous for vehicles to enter URHP off-street parking from 184 Livingston Avenue and exit via 89 Third Street. The 184 lot is narrow and, as is well know, Livingston Avenue, as an older street is quite narrow with parking allowed on both sides. Additionally, it is a busy thoroughfare for vehicles and pedestrians.

Underground Railroad History Project commits to maintaining 89 Third Street so that it is an asset to the neighborhood, as it has done with all other properties it owns.

It is hoped that you will look favorably upon this request. Please let me know if there is need of any other information regarding this request.

Sincerely,

Mary Elizabeth and Paul Stewart  
Co-founders
July 1, 2019

David Galin
Deputy Chief of Staff
Office of the Mayor
City of Albany
24 Eagle Street
Albany, NY 12207

Mr. Galin,

Pursuant to the Albany County Property Disposition Plan, I am contacting you to make you aware initiating legislative authorization to dispense of the property located at 89 Third Street within the City of Albany. Provided the request gains passage in the County Legislature, we will convey tax map parcel 65.74-2-7 to the Underground Railroad History Project of the Capital Region.

We view this transaction as beneficial to both County and City residents since it will provide a tax delinquent property to a valuable historical and cultural organization with a positive history of maintaining formerly delinquent property. Please let us know if you know of any potential issues that might arise with such a transfer or if the City of Albany has any objection.

Best,

Mike McLaughlin
Director of Policy and Research
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEAR</th>
<th>TYPE</th>
<th>BILL</th>
<th>INST</th>
<th>CHARGE</th>
<th>BILLED</th>
<th>PRIN DUE</th>
<th>INT DUE</th>
<th>TOTAL DUE</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>RE-E</td>
<td>5409</td>
<td>283.19</td>
<td>283.19</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>308.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>14.16</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>14.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>298.35</td>
<td>298.35</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>323.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>298.35</td>
<td>298.35</td>
<td>25.49</td>
<td>323.84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>RE-1</td>
<td>6228</td>
<td>175.27</td>
<td>175.27</td>
<td>31.55</td>
<td>206.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>32.99</td>
<td>32.99</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>32.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>242.93</td>
<td>242.93</td>
<td>43.73</td>
<td>286.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241.50</td>
<td>241.50</td>
<td>42.47</td>
<td>284.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>692.69</td>
<td>692.69</td>
<td>118.75</td>
<td>811.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>692.69</td>
<td>692.69</td>
<td>118.75</td>
<td>811.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>RE-E</td>
<td>5360</td>
<td>278.07</td>
<td>278.07</td>
<td>58.39</td>
<td>336.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>13.90</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>13.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>292.97</td>
<td>292.97</td>
<td>58.39</td>
<td>351.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>292.97</td>
<td>292.97</td>
<td>58.39</td>
<td>351.36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>RE-1</td>
<td>6349</td>
<td>174.20</td>
<td>174.20</td>
<td>52.26</td>
<td>226.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>20.86</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>20.86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>242.96</td>
<td>242.96</td>
<td>72.89</td>
<td>315.85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>241.50</td>
<td>241.50</td>
<td>72.45</td>
<td>313.95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>679.52</td>
<td>679.52</td>
<td>197.60</td>
<td>877.12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>BILL</td>
<td>INST</td>
<td>CHARGE</td>
<td>BILLED</td>
<td>PRIN DUE</td>
<td>INT DUE</td>
<td>TOTAL DUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>RE-E</td>
<td>3219</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALBANY SCH</td>
<td>268.41</td>
<td>268.41</td>
<td>88.58</td>
<td>356.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% PERCENT</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>13.42</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>13.42</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAILING CH</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>282.83</td>
<td>282.83</td>
<td>88.58</td>
<td>371.41</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>RE-1</td>
<td>70634</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALBANY PRO</td>
<td>216.62</td>
<td>216.62</td>
<td>90.98</td>
<td>307.60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 PERCENT</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>22.98</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>22.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALBANY WAT</td>
<td>242.98</td>
<td>242.98</td>
<td>102.05</td>
<td>345.03</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAILING CH</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>483.58</td>
<td>483.58</td>
<td>193.03</td>
<td>676.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RE-E</td>
<td>4652</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALBANY SCH</td>
<td>333.65</td>
<td>333.65</td>
<td>150.14</td>
<td>483.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5% PERCENT</td>
<td>16.68</td>
<td>16.68</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>16.68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>350.33</td>
<td>350.33</td>
<td>150.14</td>
<td>500.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>RE-1</td>
<td>6918</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALBANY PRO</td>
<td>216.86</td>
<td>216.86</td>
<td>117.10</td>
<td>333.96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 PERCENT</td>
<td>22.99</td>
<td>22.99</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>22.99</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALBANY WAT</td>
<td>242.98</td>
<td>242.98</td>
<td>131.21</td>
<td>374.19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAILING CH</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>483.83</td>
<td>483.83</td>
<td>248.31</td>
<td>732.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>RE-1</td>
<td>7177</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALBANY PRO</td>
<td>208.12</td>
<td>208.12</td>
<td>137.36</td>
<td>345.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 PERCENT</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>14.32</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>14.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>ALBANY WAT</td>
<td>78.20</td>
<td>78.20</td>
<td>51.61</td>
<td>129.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAILING CH</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td>1.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>301.64</td>
<td>301.64</td>
<td>188.97</td>
<td>490.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>YEAR</td>
<td>TYPE</td>
<td>INST</td>
<td>CHARGE</td>
<td>BILL</td>
<td>BILLED</td>
<td>PRIN DUE</td>
<td>INT DUE</td>
<td>TOTAL DUE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>--------</td>
<td>------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-----------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>LIEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALB SCH LN</td>
<td>1165</td>
<td>410.87</td>
<td>410.87</td>
<td>172.57</td>
<td>583.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>410.87</td>
<td>410.87</td>
<td>172.57</td>
<td>583.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>LIEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALB SCH LN</td>
<td>1331</td>
<td>432.50</td>
<td>432.50</td>
<td>151.38</td>
<td>583.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>432.50</td>
<td>432.50</td>
<td>151.38</td>
<td>583.88</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>LIEN</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>ALB LIENS</td>
<td>2221</td>
<td>1,452.39</td>
<td>1,452.39</td>
<td>1,132.86</td>
<td>2,585.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>MAIL CHARG</td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>25.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>TITLE SEAR</td>
<td>290.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>290.00</td>
<td>.00</td>
<td></td>
<td>290.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,767.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,767.39</td>
<td>1,132.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,900.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1,767.39</td>
<td></td>
<td>1,767.39</td>
<td>1,132.86</td>
<td></td>
<td>2,900.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>GRAND TOTALS</td>
<td>6,476.50</td>
<td>6,476.50</td>
<td>2,726.07</td>
<td></td>
<td>9,202.57</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

PARTIAL PAYMENTS ARE NOT ACCEPTED WITHOUT AN INSTALLMENT AGREEMENT. IF ANY PARCEL REMAINS SUBJECT TO ONE OR MORE DELINQUENT TAX LIENS, THE PAYMENT YOU HAVE MADE WILL NOT POSTPONE THE ENFORCEMENT OF THE OUTSTANDING LIEN OR LIENS. CONTINUED FAILURE TO PAY THE ENTIRE AMOUNT OWED WILL RESULT IN THE LOSS OF THE PROPERTY(IES).

PAYMENT MADE TO:
ALBANY COUNTY DIVISION OF FINANCE
112 STATE ST. ROOM 1340
ALBANY, NY 12207
TEL: 447-7082

$35.00 WILL BE CHARGED FOR ANY RETURNED CHECK
INTEREST WILL INCREASE ON THE 1ST OF THE MONTH.
RESOLUTION NO. 356

RESCINDING RESOLUTION NO. 217 FOR 2019

Introduced: 8/12/19
By: Messrs. Mauriello, Burgdorf, Drake, Mendick, Grimm and Ms. McLean Lane

WHEREAS, Resolution 217 for 2019 was passed without its required Fiscal Impact Statement in contradiction to Rule 10 of our Legislative Rules of Order, and

WHEREAS, In addition to the numerous unanswered fiscal and actuarial implications rendered by Resolution 217 for 2019, additional legal and drafting ambiguities exist in the legislation, and

WHEREAS, The County Attorney states in a July 19th memorandum to the legislature that “The Resolution as written improperly indicates that the health insurance retirement benefit set forth in the Rules and Regulations applies to non-union employees only”, and

WHEREAS, The County Attorney also stated in said memorandum that “The Resolution as written reduces the years of service required for health insurance benefits in retirement, but is not specifically limited to active employees”, and

WHEREAS, The County Executive took no action allowing the Resolution to take effect in accordance to our Charter, and

WHEREAS, The citizens and employees of Albany County are ill-served by a policy that neither knows its own cost nor to whom it may be applied to, now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That Resolution No. 217 for 2019 is hereby rescinded, and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Clerk of the County Legislature is directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the appropriate County Officials.

Referred to Personnel and Audit and Finance Committees – 8/12/19
Brandon Russell, Majority Counsel  
Albany County Legislature  
112 State Street, Rm. 700  
Albany, N.Y. 12207

Arnis Zilgme, Minority Counsel  
Albany County Legislature  
112 State Street, Rm. 1360  
Albany, N.Y. 12207

Dear Sirs:

I am requesting legislative action to further the mission of the Office of the Albany County District Attorney. The attached resolution seeks permission to:

- Move funding within the 2019 budget to create a receptionist position.

Attached is the request for legislative action and supporting documents. If you have any questions, please feel free to contact me at 275-4706.

Thank you for your assistance.

Sincerely,

P. David Soares  
Albany County District Attorney
REQUEST FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

DATE: August 14, 2019

DEPARTMENT: Office of the District Attorney
Contact Person: Heather Orth
Telephone: 275-4704
Dept. Representative Attending
Committee Meeting: Heather Orth and/or David Soares, District Attorney

PURPOSE OF REQUEST:
Adoption of Local Law
Amendment of Prior Legislation
Approval/Adoption of Plan/Procedure
Bond Approval
Budget Amendment (See below) X
Contract Authorization (See below)
Environmental Impact
Home Rule Request
Property Conveyance
Other: (State briefly if not listed above) __

CONCERNING CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION (Cont’d)
STATE THE FOLLOWING:

Contract Terms/Conditions:
Party (Name/Address):

Amount/Rate Schedule/Fee:

Term:
Scope of Services:

Contract Funding:
Anticipated in Current Budget: Yes ___ No ___
Funding Source: ___________________________
County Budget Accounts:
Revenue:
Appropriation:

CONCERNING ALL REQUESTS:
Mandated Program/Service: Yes X ___ No ___
If Mandated Cite: ___________________________
Anticipated in Current Adopted Budget: Yes X ___ No ___
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT N</th>
<th>RESOLUTION DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>INCREASE</th>
<th>DECREASE</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT NAME</th>
<th>ANNUAL</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A9 1165</td>
<td>1 6412</td>
<td>Receptionist</td>
<td>13,734.70</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>42,000.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9 1165</td>
<td>8 9060</td>
<td>Health and Medical Insurance</td>
<td>1,373.47</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9 1165</td>
<td>8 9010</td>
<td>State Retirement</td>
<td>1,510.82</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9 1165</td>
<td>8 9030</td>
<td>Social Security</td>
<td>1,057.57</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td><strong>17,676.56</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ACCOUNT N</th>
<th>RESOLUTION DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>DECREASE</th>
<th>INCREASE</th>
<th>UNIT COST</th>
<th>DEPARTMENT NAME</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A9 1165</td>
<td>1 9970</td>
<td>Temp Help</td>
<td>13,500.00</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A9 1165</td>
<td>1 1150</td>
<td>002 Bureau Chief Chief Assistant DA</td>
<td>4,176.56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TOTAL ESTIMATED REVENUES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
August 5, 2019

Honorable Andrew Joyce
Legislative Clerk's Office
112 State Street, Room 710
Albany, New York 12207

Dear Mr. Joyce:

The attached correspondence is forwarded for presentation to the Public Safety Committee of the Albany County Legislature.

I respectfully request a resolution authorizing the elimination of two vacant Correction Officer positions to allow for the creation of three new Special Projects Coordinator Positions within the Albany County Correctional Facility. These positions are required to expand upon programming, provide wrap around services and further reduce recidivism.

Therefore, we are requesting approval to amend our 2019 budget to reflect the following changes;

1. Elimination of three vacant Correction Officer positions with reallocation of $34,875.00 to fund three additional Special Projects Coordinator positions.
2. Creation of a budget line for three additional Special Projects Coordinators (October 1, 2019 through December 31, 2019) with a budget line in the amount of $11,625.00 each totaling $34,875.00.

Should there be any questions, please do not hesitate to call.

Sincerely,

Craig D. Apple, Sr.
Sheriff

Att.

cc: Hon. Daniel P. McCoy, County Executive
Hon. Paul Miller, Public Safety Chairman
Hon. Wanda Willingham, Audit & Finance Committee
Kevin Cannizzaro, Esq., Majority Counsel
Hon. Arnis Zilgume, Esq., Minority Counsel
REQUEST FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

DATE: AUGUST 7, 2019

DEPARTMENT: ALBANY COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPT

CONTACT PERSON: SHERIFF CRAIG D APPLE SR
TELEPHONE: 518-447-5440
DEPT. REPRESENTATIVE ATTENDING SHERIFF CRAIG D APPLE SR
COMMITTEE MEETING:

PURPOSE OF REQUEST:
ADOPTION OF LOCAL LAW
AMENDMENT OF PRIOR LEGISLATION
APPROVAL/ADOPTION OF PLAN/PROCEDURE
BOND APPROVAL
BUDGET AMENDMENT (SEE BELOW) X
CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION (SEE BELOW)
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT
HOME RULE REQUEST
PROPERTY CONVEYANCE
OTHER: (STATE BRIEFLY IF NOT LISTED ABOVE) X

THE SHERIFF'S OFFICE IS LOOKING TO CREATE THREE NEW SPECIAL PROJECTS COORDINATOR POSITIONS AT THE JAIL IN 2019 AND WILL BE ELIMINATING THREE VACANT CORRECTION OFFICER POSITIONS AS AN OFFSET CONCERNING BUDGET AMENDMENTS

STATE, THE FOLLOWING
INCREASE ACCOUNT/LINE NO. SEE ATTACHED
SOURCE OF FUNDS:
TITLE CHANGE:

CONCERNING CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION,

STATE THE FOLLOWING:

TYPE OF CONTRACT
CHANGE ORDER/CONTRACT AMENDMENT
PURCHASE (EQUIPMENT/ SUPPLIES)
LEASE (EQUIPMENT/SUPPLIES)
REQUIREMENTS
PROFESSIONAL SERVICES
EDUCATIONAL/TRAINING
GRANT: NEW
RENEWAL
SUBMISSION DEADLINE DATE

SETTLEMENT OF A CLAIM
RELEASE OF LIABILITY
OTHER: (STATE BRIEFLY)
CONCERNING CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION (CONT'D)

STATE THE FOLLOWING:

CONTRACT TERMS/CONDITIONS: ____________________________

PARTY (NAME/ADDRESS):

______________________________

AMOUNT/RATE SCHEDULE/FEES:

______________________________

TERM:

______________________________

SCOPE OF SERVICES:

______________________________

CONTRACT FUNDING:

ANTICIPATED IN CURRENT BUDGET: YES ☐ NO ☐

FUNDING SOURCE:

______________________________

COUNTY BUDGET ACCOUNTS:

______________________________

REVENUE:

______________________________

APPROPRIATION:

______________________________

BOND (RES. NO. & DATE OF ADOPTION)

______________________________

CONCERNING ALL REQUESTS:

MANDATED PROGRAM/SERVICE:

YES ☐ NO ☐ X ☑

IF MANDATED CITE: AUTHORITY

______________________________

ANTICIPATED IN CURRENT ADOPTED BUDGET:

YES ☐ NO ☐ X ☑

IF YES, INDICATE REVENUE APPROPRIATION ACCOUNTS:

______________________________

FISCAL IMPACT - FUNDING: (DOLLARS OR PERCENTAGES)

FEDERAL:

______________________________

STATE:

______________________________

COUNTY: 100%

______________________________

TERM/LENGTH OF FUNDING:

______________________________

PREVIOUS REQUESTS FOR IDENTICAL OR SIMILAR ACTION:

RESOLUTION/LAW NUMBER: 279 OF 2019

DATE OF ADOPTION: 7/8/2019

JUSTIFICATION: (STATE BRIEFLY WHY LEGISLATIVE ACTION IS REQUESTED)

______________________________

PER SPREAD SHEET

______________________________

THIS WILL BE BUDGET NEUTRAL

______________________________

BACK-UP MATERIAL SUBMITTED (I.E., APPLICATION/APPROVAL NOTICES FROM FUNDING SOURCE,

BID TABULATION SHEET, CIVIL SERVICE APPROVAL NOTICE, PROGRAM ANNOUNCEMENT, CONTRACTS

AND/OR ANY MATERIALS WHICH EXPLAIN OR SUPPORT THE REQUEST FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION.)

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

______________________________

SUBMITTED BY: CRAIG D APPLE SR

TITLE: SHERIFF
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RESOLUTION NO. BTCH</th>
<th>ACCOUNT NO.</th>
<th>RESOLUTION DESCRIPTION</th>
<th>INCREASE</th>
<th>DECREASE</th>
<th>ANNUAL SALARY</th>
<th>POSITION CONTROL NUMBER</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A 3150 1 2267 001</td>
<td>SPECIAL PROJECTS COORD.</td>
<td>11,625.00</td>
<td>46,500.00</td>
<td>46,500.00</td>
<td>390470</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3160 1 2267 002</td>
<td>SPECIAL PROJECTS COORD.</td>
<td>11,625.00</td>
<td>46,500.00</td>
<td>46,500.00</td>
<td>390471</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3150 1 2267 003</td>
<td>SPECIAL PROJECTS COORD.</td>
<td>11,625.00</td>
<td>46,500.00</td>
<td>46,500.00</td>
<td>390472</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TOTAL APPROPRIATIONS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>34,875.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>139,500.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RESOLUTION NO. BTCH</td>
<td>ACCOUNT NO.</td>
<td>RESOLUTION DESCRIPTION</td>
<td>INCREASE</td>
<td>DECREASE</td>
<td>ANNUAL SALARY</td>
<td>POSITION CONTROL NUMBER</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3150 1 4115 034</td>
<td>CORRECTION OFFICER</td>
<td>11,625.00</td>
<td>62,838.00</td>
<td>62,838.00</td>
<td>390099</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3150 1 4115 247</td>
<td>CORRECTION OFFICER</td>
<td>11,625.00</td>
<td>62,838.00</td>
<td>62,838.00</td>
<td>390319</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A 3150 1 4115 187</td>
<td>CORRECTION OFFICER</td>
<td>11,625.00</td>
<td>62,838.00</td>
<td>62,838.00</td>
<td>390259</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>GRAND TOTALS</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>34,875.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>34,875.00</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*NOTE: THE ANNUAL SALARIES HAVE BEEN PRORATED FOR 13 WEEKS IN 2019.*
REQUEST FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

DATE: 8/5/19

DEPARTMENT: Department of Audit and Control
Contact Person: Mike Conners
Telephone: 447-7130
Dept. Representative Attending
   Committee Meeting: Mike Conners

PURPOSE OF REQUEST
Adoption of Local Law
Amendment of Prior Legislation
Approval/Adoption of Plan/Procedure
Bond Approval
Budget Amendment (See below)
Contract Authorization (See below) X
Environmental Impact
Home Rule Request
Property Conveyance
Other: (State briefly if not listed above)

CONCERNING BUDGET AMENDMENTS
STATE THE FOLLOWING:
   Increase Account/Line No
   Source of Funds:
   Title Change:

CONCERNING CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION
STATE THE FOLLOWING:
TYPE OF CONTRACT
Change Order/Contract Amendment
Purchase (Equipment/Supplies)
Lease (Equipment/Supplies)
Requirements Professional Services X
Education/Training
Grant:
   New
   Renewal
Submission Deadline Date
Settlement of a Claim
Release of Liability
Other: (State briefly)
CONCERNING CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION (Cont'd)
STATE THE FOLLOWING:

Contract Terms/Conditions:
Party (Name/Address):
___ Capital Market Advisors
___ 11 Grace Avenue, Suite 308, Great Neck, NY 11022

Amount Rate Schedule/Fee: see attached

Scope of Services: ___ Financial Advisory Services

Contract Funding:
Anticipated in Current Budget: Yes ___ X ____ No ___
Funding Source: 
County Budget Accounts
Revenue: ______________________
Appropriation: ______________________
Bond (Res. No. & Date of Adoption) ______________________

CONCERNING ALL REQUESTS:
Mandated Program Service: Yes ___ X ____ No ___
If Mandated Cite: Authority ______________________
Anticipated in Current Adopted Budget: Yes ___ X ____ No ___
If yes, indicate Revenue/Appropriation Accounts: ______________________

Fiscal Impact - Funding: (Dollars or Percentages)
Federal ______________________
State ______________________
County ______________________
Term/Length of Funding ______________________

Previous requests For Identical or Similar Action
Resolution/Law Number: ________________
Date of Adoption: ________________

Justification: (State briefly why legislative action is requested)
___ This service is required advise and assist the County on all financial issues such as bonds, bans, etc.

Back-up Material Submitted: Proposal for RFP 2019-073 and letter to Purchasing selecting the Vendor to contract with, and the letter from Purchasing in agreement with our decision.

Submitted By: Edward L. Dott ______________________
Title: Executive Deputy Comptroller ______________________
TO: Karen Storm, Purchasing Agent
FROM: Edward L. Dott, Executive Deputy Comptroller
DATE: August 5, 2019
SUBJECT: Financial Advisory Services

The County Comptroller’s Office has reviewed the bid response of one institution that was interested in providing financial advisory services to Albany County. The recommendation for RFP # 2019-073 is that the County select Capital Market Advisors LLC. as its provider of Financial Advisory Services.

The proposal calls for a three-year contract, starting January 1, 2020 with two additional one year terms at the County’s discretion.

Thank you for your consideration in this matter.
MEMORANDUM

TO: Edward L. Dott, Executive Deputy Comptroller
    Comptroller’s Office

FROM: Karen Storm
       Purchasing Agent

DATE: August 5, 2019

RE: RFP#2019-073 Financial Advisory Services

I am in receipt of your recommendation to award the aforementioned Proposals to Capital Market Advisors LLC.

I believe that you have performed a thorough evaluation of the proposal(s) submitted. I have no objection to the selection of Capital Market Advisors LLC. for an award.

Please obtain the necessary contract approval of the County Legislature, so that we may issue a Notice of Award to the successful proposer.
COUNTY OF ALBANY

REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS

ALBANY COUNTY COMPTROLLER’S OFFICE

RFP # 2019-073

FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES

ALBANY COUNTY DEPARTMENT OF GENERAL SERVICES
PURCHASING DIVISION
KAREN A. STORM, PURCHASING AGENT
112 STATE STREET, ROOM 820
ALBANY, NY 12207
NOTICE TO PROPOSERS -- ALBANY COUNTY
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS #2019-073

Sealed Proposals for Financial Advisory Services as requested by Albany County Comptroller’s Office will be received by the Albany County Purchasing Agent, Room 820, 112 State Street, Albany, New York 12207 until 4:30 PM, local time on Friday, June 28, 2019.

Request for Proposal (RFP) documents may be obtained at the office of the Albany County Purchasing Agent, as noted above. RFP documents may be available for download from the Empire State Bid System website at http://www.empirestatebidsystem.com, starting by close of business (4:30 p.m.) on June 6, 2019.

Karen A. Storm
Purchasing Agent

Dated: May 30, 2019
Albany, New York

PUBLISH ONE DAY – June 6, 2019 -- THE EVANGELIST
PUBLISH ONE DAY – June 6, 2019 -- THE TIMES UNION
COUNTY OF ALBANY
REQUEST FOR PROPOSALS
QUALIFICATIONS AND PROPOSED FEES FOR FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES
ALBANY COUNTY COMPTROLLER
RFP#2019-073

RFP DISTRIBUTION- IMPORTANT NOTICE

The County of Albany officially distributes RFP documents through the Purchasing Division Office or through the Empire State Bid System website at http://www.empirestatebidsystem.com. Copies of RFP documents obtained from any other source are not considered official documents. Only those vendors who obtain proposal documents from either the Purchasing Division Office or the Empire State Bid System are guaranteed to receive addendum information, if such information is issued.

If you have obtained this document from a source other than the Albany County Purchasing Division or the Empire State Bid System, it is strongly recommended that you obtain an official copy.

SECTION 1: PURPOSE

1.1 The County of Albany is seeking proposals for QUALIFICATIONS AND PROPOSED FEES FOR FINANCIAL ADVISORY SERVICES as requested by THE ALBANY COUNTY COMPTROLLER.

1.2 Albany County has issued and is considering issuance of bonds for future projects. The County is seeking to employ a financial advisor in connection with the aforementioned projects and further unknown projects which will require long term financing for the period of five years from the date of the award of the contract.

SECTION 2: RECEIPT OF PROPOSALS

2.1 Five (5) copies, and (1) electronic copy on CD or flash drive, of the Proposal and other required documents must be submitted, sealed in an opaque envelope clearly marked with the name and number of the Proposal and the name and address of the Proposer. Proposals must be received no later than 4:30 P.M. on Friday June 28, 2019, at the following address:

Karen A. Storm
Albany County Purchasing Agent
112 State Street, Room 820
Albany, New York 12207

2.2 The Proposal submitted by the individual Proposer(s) is the document upon which Albany County will make its initial judgment regarding the Proposer’s qualifications, understanding of the County’s scope and objectives, methodology, and ability to complete services under the contract.
2.3 Those submitting Proposals do so entirely at their expense. There is no express or implied obligation by Albany County to reimburse any firm or individual for any costs incurred in preparing or submitting Proposals, preparing or submitting additional information requested by the County, or for participating in any selection interviews.

2.4 Submission of any Proposal indicates acceptance of the conditions contained in the RFP, unless clearly and specifically noted otherwise in the Proposal.

2.5 Albany County reserves the right to reject any and all Proposals, in whole or in part, submitted in response to its RFP.

2.6 Albany County reserves the right to waive any and all informalities and to disregard all non-conforming, non-responsive or conditional Proposals.

2.7 Albany County may, at any time by written notification to all Proposers, change any portion of the RFP described and detailed herein.

2.8 Proposals will be examined and evaluated by Albany County Comptroller’s Office

2.9 During the evaluation of Proposals, the County may require clarification of information or may invite Proposers to an oral presentation to amplify and or validate Proposal contents.

SECTION 3: QUALIFICATION OF PROPOSER

Provide a statement of Proposer qualifications including:

3.1 Provide a brief history of your firm and discuss its experience providing financial advisory services to municipalities in New York State. Please also include a copy of your firm’s most recent annual report.

3.2 Provide an organizational chart for your firm. Identify the personnel who would service the County including the role of each individual named. Provide a resume, contact information and the office location for each member of your firm’s team who would service the County. Also, list the name of each individual at your firm that holds a Series 50 license to serve as a Municipal Advisor. Please specify the extent of availability and commitment of every person assigned to the project team.

3.3 Name of firm or person(s) submitting proposal, main office address and local office address if any, primary and secondary contacts and their respective telephone numbers (including area codes).

3.4 Provide a breakdown of the number of bond, note and other financing issues for which your firm served as municipal advisor in New York State for each of the last five years. Also provide a breakdown based on par amount of debt issued for the same time period.

3.5 Discuss and explain your firm’s experience with the credit rating agencies on behalf of
counties in New York State.

3.6 Discuss your firm's in-house, quantitative capabilities.

3.7 Provide at least three (3) references from your firm’s current County clients whom we may contact regarding your firm's services.

3.8 Compliance with the Albany County Affirmative Action Program will be required. With your proposal, please submit a statement indicating the composition of the workforce at your firm.

3.9 Provide any additional information about your firm that you believe would be of interest to the County.

3.10 In addition, the County may make such investigations it deems necessary to determine the ability of the Proposer to perform the work. The Proposer shall furnish to the County, within five (5) days of request, all such information and data for this purpose as may be requested. The County reserves the right to reject any proposal if the evidence submitted by, or investigation of, such Proposer fails to satisfy the County that such Proposer is properly qualified to carry out the obligations of the contract and to complete the work contemplated therein. Conditional Proposals will not be accepted.

SECTION 4: SCOPE OF SERVICES

The County of Albany is seeking a Financial Advisor to perform advisory services as requested by the County. The successful proposer will enter into a contract with the County to perform the following services:

4.1 Orchestrate the debt issuance process to ensure that it is completed in a timely and cost-effective manner.

4.2 Analyze the conditions surrounding the issuance of County obligations including the status of the County’s credit rating and current conditions affecting the marketability of County bonds and notes; including in this area will be the analysis of all issues relating to any refundings of outstanding general obligation bonds. Evaluate the finding needs of the project and the resources available to the county to repay any debt to be issued. Recommend a financing plan that will result in the most favorable cost of capital to the County.

4.3 Perform, or assist the County in performing, the preliminary structuring of general obligation bond issuance and the final structuring of each offering. Advise and assist the county with regard to obtaining bond issuances.

4.4 Assist the County in the selection of the underwriter(s) by defining and drafting the selection criteria for the Request for Proposals (REP), including each firm’s experience and performance with similar financing, and proposed fees and expenses.
4.5 Evaluate the responses to the RFP, including an independent review of the effective interest cost of each response, and make a recommendation as to the selection of the underwriter(s). Appear before the County Legislature to compare the responses received to other issues currently on the market and recommend the award.

4.6 Serve as liaison between the County and the underwriter(s) to ensure that the interests of the County are well-articulated and observed throughout each financing. Organize finance team meetings, set agendas, establish schedules, and monitor each issue’s progress.

4.7 Assist the County in the preparation of a clear and concise presentation of the financing. Provide the rating analysts with financial rating analysts that compare the County’s credit quality to that of other comparable issuers. Prepare comprehensive debt affordability analyses to demonstrate the ability of the County to afford new debt. Serve as a liaison between the County and the credit rating analysts to answer any questions and to resolve any concerns regarding the County, each project, and each financing.

4.8 Assist the County and its bond counsel in the preparation of offering or official statements or other necessary documents and in the review or writing of position papers or speeches, and assist the underwriter(s) in complying with SEC Rule 15(S) 2-12 regarding adequate initial and continuing disclosure. Attend meetings as needed and cooperate fully with the County’s staff, its bond counsel, and its underwriter(s) in the preparation of any documents and the performance of any other work related to the issuance of bonds on behalf of the County.

4.9 Negotiate the terms [interest rates, re-offering yields, call features, and the compensation of the underwriter(s), etc.] with the underwriter(s) on behalf of the County with the sole objective of obtaining the most efficient financing cost. Prepare a pricing book several days in advance of each sale to provide a basis for making pricing decisions. The pricing book shall contain information on comparable issues in the market and update on recent market trends, including the expected demands of investors interested in the particular offering and recommended initial levels for all financing terms so that the County can make informed decisions during the negotiation process.

4.10 Arrange for the transfer of funds and for the investment of the proceeds, subject to arbitrage restrictions, to ensure that they are available when needed for the project(s) being financed.

4.11 Monitor market reception and re-offering yields, track the unsold balance of the balance of the issue held by underwriter(s) on a periodic basis and compare the terms of the sale to the rates that the County received. Prepare a report for the County that analyzes the sale by market absorption, level of bids compared to other issues on the market, market conditions, and underwriting spreads.

SECTION 5: TERM OF CONTRACT:

RFP4
5.1 The term of the contract will be three (3) years from the date of award; the County reserves the option to renew the contract for two (2) additional one-year terms.

5.2 The successful Proposer shall execute a contract with the County of Albany in substantial conformance with this RFP as prepared and approved by the County Attorney.

SECTION 6: COST PROPOSAL:

6.1 Submit a cost proposal inclusive of:
Your firm’s proposed compensation including base fee, per bond, per ban and per note fees and hourly fees for projects unrelated to bond and note financing.

6.2 Provide any other relevant information that will assist the County in evaluating your Proposal.

SECTION 7: PROPOSAL SUBMISSIONS

7.1 In order for the County to conduct a uniform review process of all proposals, proposals must be submitted in the format set forth below. Failure to follow this format may be cause for rejection of a proposal because adherence to this format is critical for the County’s evaluation process: The selection of a Financial Advisor will not be based solely on a monetary evaluation. There will also be an evaluation of the Firm’s understanding of the work required and approach to this project with considerable weight being given to experience in the areas required and the firm’s track record.

SECTION I:
Title Page - The title page should reflect the Request for Proposal subject, name of the proposer, address, telephone number and contact person.

Table of Contents - The Table of Contents must indicate the material included in the proposal by section and page number.

SECTION II:
Qualification / Experience - The Qualification / Experience section must address proposer’s qualifications and experience to carry out the requested service, inclusive of, but not limited to: qualification to do business in NYS, number of years in business and length of experience.

Resumes - Resumes of professional staff members who will be involved in the County engagement must be included in this section.

SECTION III:
References - The References section must include references from similar type projects.

SECTION IV:
Plan Implementation - The Plan Implementation Section must address the Scope of Services in terms of the proposer’s plan to carry out the requested service.
Proposal to provide
Financial Advisory Services
(RFP NO. 2019-073)

County of Albany
New York

Submitted By:

Richard Tortora
President
Capital Markets Advisors, LLC
11 Grace Avenues, Suite 308
Great Neck, New York 11022
(516) 487-9815
rtortora@capmark.org

June 28, 2019
Ms. Karen A. Storm  
Albany County Purchasing Agent  
County of Albany  
122 State Street, Room 820  
Albany, New York 12207  

Dear Ms. Storm:

Capital Markets Advisors, LLC is pleased to respond to RFP 2019-073 for Financial Advisor Services for the County of Albany. CMA has had the privilege to serve as the County's Financial Advisor for the past 20 years. We are consistently ranked among the top ten financial advisors in the nation by Thomson Reuters both in terms of number of financings and total par amount. Headquartered in New York State with offices in the Hudson Valley, Long Island, Western New York and the Southern Tier, CMA personnel have a "local presence" throughout New York State and are less than a 2-hour drive from the County's offices.

CMA currently serves as financial advisor to over 420 public jurisdictions in New York including most of the State's largest counties: Albany, Erie, Monroe, Rockland, Suffolk and Westchester. With a staff of 18 working out of four offices, CMA fully understands the scope of work to be delivered to the County by its financial advisor. CMA is proficient in advising municipalities with the planning and issuance of notes and bonds and has built a strong reputation in the municipal finance community by being both proactive and innovative. We introduced the concept of competitively sold refunding bonds in the State, maximizing refunding opportunities for hundreds of issuers by letting competitive market forces work to the clients' benefit. We also competitively bid out required escrow accounts to maximize the clients' savings. When its clients saw their investment yields plummet, CMA developed its highly regarded Matched Investment Program, which allows one municipal government to invest in another's tax and revenue anticipation notes thereby lowering interest costs for the note issuer while increasing yields for the purchaser. CMA's Strategic Consulting Group provides its clients with a comprehensive approach to financial fundamentals including the management of governmental operations, efficiency studies, and multi-year plans to ensure effective and efficient future operations and structurally balanced budgets.

As the President and Principal of CMA, I am authorized to legally bind the firm. Maintaining our long-standing relationship with the County of Albany is an important goal of CMA. Our extensive database of County's debt coupled with our knowledge of County practices and staff make CMA the best choice to serve as the County's Financial Advisor. We would continue to service the County attentively and professionally and be grateful for the opportunity to do so.

Sincerely yours,

[Signature]

Richard Tortora  
President and Principal
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SECTION I

Qualifications/Experience

Capital Markets Advisors, LLC ("CMA") is an independent financial advisory firm serving the financing needs of public jurisdictions from offices in the Hudson Valley, Long Island, Western New York and the Southern Tier. CMA's 20-person team assists jurisdictions with the planning and issuance of notes, bonds and lease financing to fund capital projects and cash flow needs. As part of our comprehensive service, we plan and structure debt offerings, prepare disclosure documents, assist in securing credit ratings and credit enhancement, sell new money debt and refund existing debt via competitive and negotiated sales, competitively bid out escrow accounts, provide Continuing Disclosure and generally provide thoughtful and sound advice on a wide variety of financial issues affecting our clients. CMA is ready and able to provide the County of Albany with all of the services listed in its RFP. With our extensive database of the County's debt coupled with our knowledge of County practices and staff, CMA is the best choice to serve as the County's Financial Advisor.

CMA was founded in 2002 as a five-person firm with offices in New York City and Western New York. Over the next 18 years we grew slowly and strategically, adding an office in Southern Tier in 2005 and a fourth office in the Hudson Valley in 2009. In 2015, we merged the practice of New York Municipal Advisors ("NYMAC") into CMA bringing 5 additional staff members and 75 clients. Our most recent addition came on February 1, 2019 when Rick McCarthy, founder of Environmental Capital, LLC, merged his practice and 2-dozen clients into CMA. The professional staff at CMA has experience in virtually every area in which governments plan and conduct financings. The CMA team has built a solid reputation by representing our clients with the attentive, professional service that they require to meet all of their financing needs. Collectively, our staff offers over 400 years of experience serving the needs of public jurisdictions. Our team approach to an engagement assures our clients that they will receive the benefit of not just a single advisor but a team of well-trained and seasoned public finance professionals.

CMA is consistently ranked as one of the most active municipal advisors in New York State and the nation. For 2018, CMA ranked 10th in the nation by Thomson Reuters in terms of number of competitive issues sold and for the last 5 years ranked in the top 3 in New York State in terms of par amount and number of issues sold. Over the past three years, members of the CMA team have assisted school districts, towns, cities, villages, counties and authorities in issuing 1,016 bond, note and lease financings with a total par amount in excess of $15.3 billion.

CMA is an innovator that assists its clients in ways outside the traditional financial advisory framework. CMA has brought many firsts to the municipal market place including: competitive refundings, wired funds as good-faith deposit, and matched investments to maximize investment yields. In 2016, CMA launched its Strategic Consulting Group in order to provide clients with a comprehensive approach to financial fundamentals including the management of governmental operations to ensure effective and efficient future operations and structurally balanced budgets. Our roster of clients and the growing complexity of the financings undertaken on their behalf is a good measurement of the success of our efforts. CMA places a premium on senior level service, a commodity prized by our client.
**Capital Markets Advisors, LLC**  
*Independent Financial Advisors*  
**Organizational Chart**  
As of 6.25.19

| Richard Tortora  
President and Principal  
Long Island and the Hudson Valley  
516-487-9815 | Rick Ganci  
Executive Vice President and Principal  
Western New York and the Southern Tier  
716-662-3910 |
| --- | --- |
| Margaret Guarino  
Managing Director  
Great Neck  
516-274-4504 | Janet Morley  
Vice President  
Hopewell Junction  
516-570-0340 |
| Alex Kerr  
Vice President  
Great Neck  
516-274-4501 | Madeline Reid  
Associate  
Orchard Park  
716-662-3910 |
| Roy McMaster  
Vice President  
Elmira  
607-734-4308 | Anthony Nash  
Vice President  
Great Neck  
516-487-9817 |
| Clifton Johnson  
Associate  
Hopewell Junction  
845-227-8678 | Alex LoCascio  
Analyst  
Great Neck  
516-274-4502 |
| Linda Lorentz  
Analyst  
Orchard Park  
716-682-3910 | Tom Vouzakis  
Asst. Vice President  
Great Neck  
516-487-9818 |
| Evan Tortora  
Analyst  
Hopewell Junction  
516-274-4509 | Ellen Duggan  
Administrator  
Great Neck  
516-274-4507 |
| Ellen Death  
Firm Administrator  
Orchard Park  
716-662-3910 | Jennifer Misiano  
Administrator  
Hopewell Junction  
516-354-6363 |

**Resumes**

Following are resumes for the CMA personnel who will be assigned to work with Albany County. Each of them have worked with the County in the past are, committed to the County’s future success and available immediately to continue their work with the County. The County’s CMA team will be supported by additional administrative and analytical CMA staff members.

**Richard Tortora, Esq. - President and Principal – Day-to-day contact**

Richard manages the firm’s Long Island office and is President and founding partner of CMA. He is responsible for providing financial advisory services to most of the firm’s largest and most sophisticated clients. Over the course of his 33-year career in public finance, he has been involved in financings totaling over $50 billion. He has worked with numerous large public jurisdictions, including the counties of Albany, Monroe, Nassau, Rockland, Suffolk and Westchester. As a former bond attorney with the law firm of Hawkins, Delafield & Wood, he has expertise in the New York State Local Finance Law, the General

CMA
Municipal Law and other laws pertaining to municipalities and school districts. Prior to co-founding CMA, he managed the northeast practice of Evensen Dodge, Inc., an independent financial advisory firm, for 9 years and prior to that he managed The Bank of New York’s financial advisory practice for 5 years. He has worked with Albany County for over 20 years and been in public finance for 35 years.

Richard routinely speaks at industry conferences on a variety of public finance topics. He presented to the New York State Association of Certified Public Accountants on “Municipal Credit Ratings and Their Impact on the Cost of Capital”. In the past, he has addressed members of the public finance community on topics including “The Use of Owner Controlled Insurance Programs to Reduce Project Costs,” “Roles and Responsibilities of Players in a Financing,” “Identifying and Executing Refundings,” and “Debt Management.” He taught “Bonds 101” at the State’s Fall Finance School for newly elected government officials and at the Municipal Bond Club of New York for many years.

Richard holds a law degree from St. John’s University School of Law and a B.A. degree from Fordham University in Political Science/Public Administration. He is a former Board member of the NYS Government Finance Officers Association (GFOA). Richard has been licensed by the Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board and the U.S. Securities and Exchange Commission as a Series 50 Municipal Advisor. He manages the firm’s Great Neck office at 11 Grace Avenue, Suite 308, Great Neck, New York 11021 and can be reached at 516-487-9815 and rtortora@capmark.org.

Janet Morley - Vice President – Credit Expertise – Day-to day contact

Janet is CMA’s lead professional in providing credit rating services to our clients. Her duties at CMA include preparing credit rating presentations, analyzing data, conducting comparative analysis of comparable credits within an established peer group and preparing clients for their ratings presentations. In addition, Janet also leads the firm’s efforts with respect to equipment leasing for our clients, preparing RFP’s for lease bids, and shepherding lease financings from provider selection through documentation and closing. Prior to joining CMA, she was one of only a small handful of credit experts consulting to Warren Buffet’s Berkshire Hathaway Assurance Corp. Prior to working with that firm, she was an executive with MBIA, then the nation’s leading municipal bond insurer, where she specialized in distressed credits and workouts. Prior to joining MBIA, Janet was a public finance banker at Fuji Bank.

Janet is an active member of the Northeast Chapter of Women in Public Finance, NFMA, NYS GFOA and MAGNY. CMA clients she has worked with include the cities of Glen Cove and New Rochelle, Suffolk and Albany counties, and the town of Hingham, MA. Janet is also a member of the Town of North Castle’s Budget and Finance Advisory Committee. She has worked with Albany County for over five years and has been in public finance for over 25 years.

Janet received her BS degree in Economics from Lehigh University from which she graduated magna cum laude. She lives in Westchester and works out of CMA’s Great Neck headquarters and can be reached at 516-570-0340 and jmorley@capmark.org. Janet is a Series 50 Municipal Advisor.

Anthony Nash - Vice President – Quantitative Support – Secondary Day-to-day support

Anthony specializes in providing quantitative analysis to the firm’s clients including structuring of new money and refunding bonds and analyzing outstanding debt issues for escrow restructuring opportunities. He serves as the firm’s lead in conducting competitively sold advance refundings of general obligation and revenue bonds; a first in New York State. He is also involved in debt modeling and the production and analysis of amortization schedules and cash flow statements.
Over the past ten years at CMA, Anthony has been the lead advisor on over 200 refunding bond issues. Among the clients he has worked with are the counties of Albany, Monroe, Rockland and Suffolk and cities of Long Beach, Yonkers and White Plains. Anthony has a bachelor’s degree in Financial Economics from SUNY Binghamton. He has worked with Albany County for over 10 years and been in public finance for over 12 years. He is a native of Rome, New York and currently resides in Nassau County. Anthony is a licensed Series 50 Municipal Advisor. He works in the firm’s Great Neck office and can be reached at 516-487-9817 and anash@capmark.org

**Tom Vouzakis – Assistant Vice President – Transaction support**

Tom prepares amortization schedules, financial modeling and cash flow analysis and assists in the preparation of Official Statements. He has worked with clients on a variety of projects including the planning and issuance of new money bond and note issues, advance refunding bonds and cash flow financings. Tom also serves on the firm’s Strategic Consulting team for the US Virgin Islands. He joined CMA in 2014 after interning at the firm for three summers.

Tom completed his undergraduate work at NYU’s Stern School of Business received a B.S. in Finance. He works out of CMA’s Great Neck office and is a licensed Series 50 Municipal Advisor and has been in public finance for over 8 years.

**Alex LoCascio – Analyst – Analytical Support**

Alex provides analytical and documentary support to CMA’s clients. He prepares Official Statements, conducts bond and note sales and closings, performs cash flow analysis and works on the firm’s monthly newsletter. His client assignments have included the city of Glen Cove, towns of Babylon, North Hempstead and Mamaroneck, Village of Garden City and the counties of Franklin and Columbia. He has been licensed by the MSRB as a Series 50 Municipal Advisor Representative.

Alex has a B.A. in Economics from NYU’s College of Arts and Sciences and a minor in Business Studies from NYU’s Stern School Business. He joined the firm as an analyst in September 2017. He resides in Manhattan and works out of the firm’s headquarters in Great Neck. He can be reached at 516-274-4502 and alocascio@capmark.org. Alex is a licensed Series 50 Municipal Advisor.
In the past five years CMA has been one of the two most active financial advisors in New York State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number of Transactions</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>299</td>
<td>393</td>
<td>339</td>
<td>336</td>
<td>308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Par Amount</td>
<td>$3,986,961,000</td>
<td>$5,568,329,578</td>
<td>$4,764,701,565</td>
<td>$5,709,721,282</td>
<td>$5,043,915,449</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Bonds</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Transactions</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>171</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>146</td>
<td>105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Par Amount</td>
<td>$1,227,379,000</td>
<td>$2,535,686,717</td>
<td>$2,302,949,673</td>
<td>$2,570,658,430</td>
<td>$2,140,446,211</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Notes</th>
<th>2014</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>2016</th>
<th>2017</th>
<th>2018</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>No. of Transactions</td>
<td>202</td>
<td>222</td>
<td>198</td>
<td>220</td>
<td>203</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Par Amount</td>
<td>$2,759,572,000</td>
<td>$3,032,642,861</td>
<td>$2,461,751,892</td>
<td>$3,139,062,852</td>
<td>$2,903,469,238</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

CMA represents most of the largest counties in New York State.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>2019 Population</th>
<th>Municipal Advisor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 Suffolk</td>
<td>1,497,595</td>
<td>CMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Nassau</td>
<td>1,363,069</td>
<td>PFM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nassau Interim Finance Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>CMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 Westchester</td>
<td>975,321</td>
<td>CMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Erie</td>
<td>923,995</td>
<td>Hilltop Securities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Erie Fiscal Stability Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td>CMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 Monroe</td>
<td>748,680</td>
<td>CMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 Onondaga</td>
<td>467,669</td>
<td>Fiscal Advisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 Orange</td>
<td>378,174</td>
<td>Munistat</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 Rockland</td>
<td>325,027</td>
<td>CMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 Albany</td>
<td>308,580</td>
<td>CMA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 Dutchess</td>
<td>295,685</td>
<td>CMA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Experience with Credit Rating Agencies

CMA maintains close and frequent ties with each of the three major rating agencies: Moody’s Investors Service, Inc., S & P Global and Fitch Ratings, Inc. Over the past 3 years alone, the CMA team acted as advisor for over 1,000 bond and note issues and secured credit ratings for most of the bond issues and many of the note issues. This large volume of financings gives us the necessary insight to help our clients present the best and most complete information for the agencies’ consideration and gives the CMA team a familiarity
with the rating agencies, their relative perspective, and their personnel. We are able to anticipate rating agency questions and concerns and we can prepare our clients to address those issues, if and when they arise.

The CMA approach with the rating agencies is simple: straightforward and proactive. We encourage clients to initiate a dialogue with the rating agencies, outside of a bond or note sale process. CMA makes certain that the rating agencies are aware of new developments as they arise. We provide financial updates on a regular basis and have hosted rating presentations in our offices as well as at client locations, as necessary. We believe strongly in the use of rating agency presentation booklets to present statistical information—including economic and demographic data—to illustrate trends in financial performance, debt levels, and assessed valuations, among others. We often host rating presentations at our Great Neck headquarters as well as at the clients' office when we believe a site visit may be helpful to secure the highest rating.

CMA has had great success with the credit rating agencies over the past two years. During that time, we have assisted the following jurisdictions get upgraded to the Aaa level, the highest available rating category: towns of Babylon, East Hampton, Islip and North Hempstead, Hewlett-Woodmere Schools and, most recently, Garden City Schools. In fact, CMA represents most of the approximately two dozen, triple-A rated jurisdictions in New York State.

As further evidence of our strong relationship with Moody’s Investors Service, we note that twice in 2016 and again in 2018, CMA President Richard Tortora was invited by Moody’s Investors Service to make presentations to Moody’s staff from around the country on *The Role of a Independent Financial Advisor and Interactions Between Clients and the Rating Agencies*. The rating agencies respect CMA’s honest and proactive approach in our dealings with them on behalf of our clients. Maintaining good relations with CMA is in their best interest as well as our own and our clients’.

**In-House Quantitative Abilities**

In-house quantitative abilities are essential for a financial advisory firm if it is to accurately and thoroughly analyze proposals submitted by investment bankers on behalf of its clients. *CMA routinely reviews banking proposals submitted to our clients in connection with advance refundings and asset securitization*. These proposals also often use derivative products such as interest rate swaps and forward delivery bonds. CMA has the sophistication to verify, in-house, the accuracy and completeness of proposals submitted to our clients.

CMA is recognized for having superior quantitative capabilities. *We were the first in New York State to have successfully run competitively sold advance refundings for local municipalities and school districts*. We are able to do this in part because of our intimate knowledge of the New York State Local Finance Law including Section 90.10. Over the past 5 years, CMA professionals have worked on over 100 advance refundings under Section 90.10. In refunding transactions CMA structures the issuance of advance refunding bonds, markets and receives bids and dual tracked the investment of the bond proceeds in escrow using both open market treasuries and state and local government series securities (“SLGs”). This dual tracking of investments insured that our client would maximize its investment earnings and present value savings while minimizing the amount of refunding bonds sold. Our quantitative work on several advance refundings through the NYS Dormitory Authority received praise from members of the Authority’s staff as well as the investment bankers involved in the transactions. CMA uses proprietary, in-house structuring models, Excel and Munex (an industry software program) to serve our quantitative needs.

CMA often shows our clients different ways to structure their debt such as using a 50% Rule structure, level debt or a weighted average maturity factoring in budget considerations and overall interest expense. Regardless of what structure is selected, CMA always runs individual amortization schedules for each project.
funded and then ties all of the schedules into the amortization schedule for the entire issue. In addition, we often provide schedules showing debt service by fund or purpose.

Composition of CMA Workforce

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Male</th>
<th>Female</th>
<th>Caucasian</th>
<th>Hispanic</th>
<th>African American</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Professional Staff</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administrative Staff</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interns</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Additional Qualifications

CMA’s Strategic Consulting Group. CMA was launched with the conviction that governmental entities would benefit from the services of a municipal advisor that was not only an expert in the issuance of debt but was also cognizant of the unique concerns of each of its public jurisdiction clients. In 2015, this mindset spawned the development of our Strategic Consulting Group (the “SCG”). The SCG works at the intersection of policy, operations, best practices and budgeting to help solve our clients’ toughest problems and to foster effective and efficient governmental operations. Through a comprehensive suite of financial and managerial services, the SCG assists with the development and evaluation of budgets, prepares multiyear financial plans, performs efficiency studies, conducts policy and program analysis and assists with identifying and securing grant funding. The SCG works with numerous public jurisdictions including the Nassau Interim Finance Authority, towns of Islip and Riverhead, cities of Glen Cove, Long Beach and Poughkeepsie, village of Garden City and the US Virgin Islands.

Debt Pricing and Structuring Strategies. Pricing and structuring bonds in connection with negotiated transactions are skills at which CMA excels. We are very familiar with the key players on the desks at each of the major banking firms and have done business with most of them for many years. Our work in helping price bonds sold via negotiation starts long before a preliminary official statement (“POS”) is printed and mailed. Knowing the sales capabilities of underwriting firms is extremely useful in selecting an underwriting team with the proper mix of institutional, retail and regional bankers. The right team of underwriters will insure that the County can sell its bonds to both retail investors, who are traditionally less yield sensitive and institutional investors who are more tolerant of a weak underlying credit rating. Because we do not have an underwriting arm and pose no competitive threat, we have easy access to the desks of every major investment banking firms and use that access to our clients’ benefit.
SECTION II

References

Capital Markets Advisors believes that our clients are the most valuable source of information about our skills, resources, and capabilities to service your account. We encourage you to contact the following three individuals from counties in New York State in your evaluation of our response to your RFP.

County of Monroe, New York
Mr. Robert Franklin, Director of Finance
39 West Main Street
Rochester, New York 14614
585-753-1157
robertfranklin@monroecounty.gov

County of Suffolk, New York
Hon. John Kennedy, Comptroller
100 Veterans Memorial Highway
Hauppauge, New York 11788
631-853-5040
john.kennedy@suffolkcountyny.gov

County of Albany, New York
Hon. Michael Conners
Controller
112 State Street Room 1030
Albany, New York 12207
518-447-7130
michael.conners@albanycountyny.gov

SECTION III

Plan Implementation

CMA has served as the County’s Financial Advisor for over 20 years. We are intimately familiar with the County’s practices, its staff and its debt. We have created a debt database that allows us to quickly identify and capitalize on opportunities to refinance outstanding County debt to reduce future debt service costs and save taxpayers money. We know the issues affecting the County that are of importance to the credit rating analysts that work with the County and we always work hard to get the County the best possible ratings. If our contract with the County is extended, the CMA Team will address financial issues and approach the County’s debt issuance as we have in the past with Richard Tortora at the head of our team, Janet Morley as the lead day-to-day contact and credit specialist, Anthony Nash as a secondary point of contact providing structuring and quantitative expertise supported by the firm’s Associates and Analysts.

In connection with the issuance of bonds and bond anticipation notes for the County, CMA will provide the following services.

1. Review legal, financial, economic and other information necessary for CMA to advise in planning, structuring and otherwise completing each debt issue to be undertaken by the County.
2. Prepare a plan of financing which will include CMA’s analysis and recommendations to the County regarding funding requirements and alternatives, marketing, method of sale (competitive or negotiated), call provisions, credit ratings, credit enhancement, term, federal tax implications and such other matters which the County and CMA agree should be included in the plan of financing.

3. Assist the County in disseminating information to the public. As needed, assist in preparation of informational brochures; attend meetings with County staff and the legislature, and public information meetings to discuss financing strategies with an emphasis on funding and the capital markets.

4. Prepare amortization schedules and alternative financing scenarios including: level debt structure and 50% Rule amortization. For cash-flow financings, assist with preparation of actual and projected cash-flow statements.

5. Prepare tax impact analysis for each bond issue factoring in assessed value of real property subject to taxation and any state aid and/or application of available funds. Assist in determining the tax impact of each bond issue on average household.

6. As directed, CMA will prepare, disseminate and evaluate in the selection of other service providers necessary to conduct each issue including, but not limited to, bond insurance, bond counsel, underwriter, escrow agent, and verification agent.

7. Prepare or assist in the preparation of financing documents, as required, including but not limited to: Official Statement, Notice of Sale and Bid Sheet, DTC Letter of Representations, debt statement and pre-sale or post-sale analysis, when appropriate.

8. Prepare and coordinate the printing and distribution of the Notice of Sale, Bid Sheet and Official Statement. Distribution includes posting of documents on our firm’s website at www.capmark.org and Parity’s electronic bidding service, sending documents electronically and via regular mail and publishing the Notice of Sale, when required.

9. Coordinate the credit rating process. This includes submitting required documents to one or more credit agencies and addressing any questions that the assigned analyst may have. If appropriate, we will schedule and attend a meeting with agency officials and prepare a presentation book.

10. Prepare and maintain a financing schedule, cost of issuance budget, list of participants, and take such other actions requested by the County to efficiently manage each issue in order to meet the County’s objectives.

11. Prepare Debt Statement sent to Office of the State Comptroller as required for issues of $5 million or greater.

12. Participate in all working group meetings and conference calls.

13. Provide market updates to determine best time to price/sell securities and for utilization in evaluating pricing of a negotiated transaction.

14. Set up internet based auction platforms and monitor bid process, as applicable.
15. Participate in the sale of the debt, confirm interest cost calculation and verify underwriter's compensation.

16. Advise county on award of winning bid.

17. Prepare and disseminate to all interested parties, a closing letter to assist with the delivery of proceeds.

18. Coordinate closing of the issue; verify receipt of proceeds and assist with payment of issuance costs.

19. Prepare final debt service schedules including fund and projects schedules as necessary.

20. Competitively bid out the investment of proceeds, if requested.

21. Complete continuing disclosure filing and material event notices with Municipal Securities Rulemaking Board ("MSRB").

In addition to the above the following services will be provided with respect to a refunding transaction.

1. Determine if the County is best served by a competitively sold or negotiated refunding.

2. Assist in the selection of underwriter, verification agent, and escrow agent.

3. Prepare an independent analysis of the refunding to verify underwriter cash flows.

4. If a negotiated transaction is used, supply County with market comparable in advance of the pricing and participate in all pricing calls.

5. Assist in securing NYS Comptroller approval.

6. Assist in all closing matters

SECTION IV

Cost Proposal:

For bond issues: $0.85 per each $1,000 of bonds issued with a minimum fee of $24,500.

For note issues: $0.45 per each $1,000 of notes issued with a minimum fee of $12,500.

For refunding bond issues: $0.95 per each $1,000 of bonds issued with a minimum fee of $30,000.

For Continuing Disclosure: $2,500 annually, inclusive of any required Event Notices.

For services unrelated to a bond or note issuance: an hourly fee of $195 per hour,
CMA does not charge its clients for travel time, mileage, meals, lodging, supplies, telephone or conference calls.

Other transaction related costs would be borne by the District including, but not limited to: Bond Counsel, rating agency, escrow agent, The Bond Buyer (to publish sale notices), and a financial printer

SECTION V

Mandatory Documentation:

END OF PROPOSAL
COUNTY OF ALBANY

PROPOSAL FORM

PROPOSAL IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Financial Advisory Services
RFP Number: 2019-073

THIS PROPOSAL IS SUBMITTED TO:

Karen A. Storm, Purchasing Agent
Albany County Department of General Services
Purchasing Division
112 State Street, Room 820
Albany, NY 12207

1. The undersigned Proposer proposes and agrees, if this Proposal is accepted, to enter into a Contract with the owner in the form included in the Contract Documents to complete all Work as specified or indicated in the Contract Documents for the Contract Price and within the Contract Time indicated in this Proposal and in accordance with the Contract Documents,

2. Proposer accepts all of the terms and conditions of the Instructions to Proposers, including without limitation those dealing with the Disposition of Proposal Security. This Proposal may remain open for ninety (90) days after the day of Proposal opening. Proposer will sign the Contract and submit the Contract Security and other documents required by the Contract Documents within fifteen days after the date of County's Notice of Award.

3. In submitting this Proposal, Proposer represents, as more fully set forth in this Contract, that:

   (a) Proposer has examined copies of all the Contract Documents and of the following addenda: (If none, so state)

   Date   Number
   6/1/19   RFP#2019-073

   (receipt of all of which is hereby acknowledges) and also copies of the Notice to Proposers and the Instructions to Proposers;

   (b) Proposer has examined the site and locality where the Work is to be performed, the legal requirements (federal, state and local laws, ordinances, rules and regulations) and the conditions affecting cost, progress or performance of the Work and has made such independent investigations as Proposer deems necessary;

CP1
(c) This Proposal is genuine and not made in the interest of or on behalf of any undisclosed person, firm or corporation and is not submitted in conformity with any agreement or rules of any group, association, organization or corporation; Proposer has not directly or indirectly induced or solicited any other Proposer to submit a false or sham Proposal; PROPOSER has not solicited or induced any person, firm or a corporation to refrain from Proposing; and Proposer has not sought by collusion to obtain for himself any advantage over any other Proposer or over the owner.

4. Proposer will complete the Work for the following prices(s): (Attach Proposal)

5. Proposer agrees to commence the Work within the number of calendar days or by the specific date indicated in the Contract. Proposer agrees that the Work will be completed within the number of Calendar days or by the specific date indicated in the contract.

6. The following documents are attached to and made a condition of this Proposal:
   (a) Non-Collusive Bidding Certificate (Attachment “A”)
   (b) Acknowledgment by Bidder (Attachment “B”)
   (c) Vendor Responsibility Questionnaire (Attachment “C”)
   (d) Iranian Energy Divestment Certification (Attachment “D”)

7. Communication concerning this Proposal shall be addressed to:
   Richard Tortora, President
   11 Grace Avenue, Suite 308
   Great Neck, N.Y. 11021
   Phone: 516-489-9815

8. Terms used in this Proposal have the meanings assigned to them in the Contract and General Provisions.
COUNTY OF ALBANY
COST PROPOSAL FORM

PROPOSAL IDENTIFICATION:

Title: Financial Advisory Services
RFP Number: 2019-073

Submit a cost proposal as per Section 4: Scope of Services

COMPANY: Capital Markets Advisors, LLC
ADDRESS: 11 Grace Avenue, Suite 308
CITY, STATE, ZIP: Great Neck, NY, 11021
TEL. NO.: 516-487-9815
FAX NO.: 516-487-2575
FEDERAL TAX ID NO.: 02-0532108
REPRESENTATIVE: Richard Tortora
E-MAIL: rtortora@capmark.org
SIGNATURE AND TITLE
DATE 6-27-19
ATTACHMENT "A"
NON-COLLUSIVE BIDDING CERTIFICATE PURSUANT TO
SECTION 103-D OF THE NEW YORK STATE GENERAL MUNICIPAL LAW

A. By submission of this bid, each bidder and each person signing on behalf of any bidder certifies, and in the case of a joint bid, each party thereto certifies as to its own organizations, under penalty of perjury, that to the best of knowledge and belief:

(1) The prices in this bid have been arrived at independently without collusion, consultation, communication, or agreement, for the purpose of restricting competition, as to any matter relating to such prices with any other bidder or with any competitor.

(2) Unless otherwise required by law, the prices which have been quoted in this bid have not knowingly been disclosed by the bidder and will not knowingly be disclosed by the bidder, directly or indirectly, prior to opening, to any bidder or to any competitor.

(2) No attempt has been made or will be made by the bidder to induce any other person, partnership or corporation to submit or not to submit a bid for the purpose of restricting competition.

A bid shall not be considered for award nor shall any award be made where (1), (2), and (3) above have not been complied with; provided, however, that in any case the bidder cannot make the foregoing certification, the bidder shall so state and shall furnish with the bid a signed statement which sets forth in detail the reasons thereof. Where (1), (2), and (3) above have not been complied with, the bid shall not be considered for any award nor shall any award be made unless the head of the Purchasing Unit to the political subdivision, public department, agency or official thereof to which the bid is made, or his designee, determines that such disclosure was not made for the purpose of restricting competition.

The fact that a bidder (a) has published price lists, rates, or tariffs covering items being procured, (b) has informed prospective customer of proposed or pending publication of new or revised price lists for such items, or (c) has sold the same items to other customers at the same prices being bid, does not constitute, without more, a disclosure within the meaning of paragraph "A" above.

B. Any bid hereafter made to any political subdivision of the state or any public department, agency or official thereof by a corporate bidder for work or services performed or to be performed or goods sold or to be sold, where competitive bidding is required by statute, rule, regulation, local law, and where such bid contains the certification referred to in paragraph "A" of this section, shall be deemed to have been authorized by the Board of Directors of the bidder, and such authorization shall be deemed to include the submission of the bid and the inclusion therein of the certificate as to non-collusion as the act and deed of the corporation

________________________
Signature

________________________
President

________________________
Date

________________________
Title

________________________
Company Name

Capital Markets Advisors, LLC
ATTACHMENT "B"
ACKNOWLEDGMENT BY PROPOSER

If Individual or Individuals:

STATE OF NEW YORK )
COUNTY OF NASSAU ) SS.

On this 27th day of June, 2019, before me personally appeared
Richard Tortora

who executed the within instrument, and he (or they severally) acknowledged to me that he (or they) executed the same.

Jillian Waxnin
Notary Public, State of NEW YORK
Qualified in QUEENS COUNTY
My Commission Expires March 19, 2022

If Corporation:

STATE OF )
COUNTY OF ) SS.

On this _____ day of __________, 20__, before me personally appeared

[Name]

who, being by me sworn, did say that he resides at (give address)

[Address]

that he is a ___ (give title)

[Title]

of the (name of corporation)

[Name of Corporation]

the corporation described in and which executed the above instrument; that he knows the seal of the corporation, and that the seal affixed to the instrument is such corporate seal; that it was so affixed by order of the board of directors of the corporation, and that he signed his name thereto by like order.

Notary Public, State of ________________
Qualified in ________________
Commission Expires ________________

If Partnership:

STATE OF )
COUNTY OF ) SS.

On the _____ day of __________, 20__, before me personally came

[Name]

to me known to be the individual who executed the foregoing, and who, being duly sworn,
did depose and say that he / she is a partner of the firm of

[Name of Firm]

and that he / she has the authority to sign the same, and acknowledged that he / she executed the same as the act and deed of said partnership.

Notary Public, State of ________________
Qualified in ________________
Commission Expires ________________
### ATTACHMENT "C"
ALBANY COUNTY
VENDOR RESPONSIBILITY QUESTIONNAIRE

1. VENDOR IS:
   - [ ] PRIME CONTRACTOR

2. VENDOR’S LEGAL BUSINESS NAME
   - Capital Markets Advisers, LLC

3. IDENTIFICATION NUMBERS
   - a) FEIN #: 02-0582108
   - b) DUNS #:

4. D/B/A – Doing Business As (if applicable) & COUNTY FIELD:
   - [ ]

5. WEBSITE ADDRESS (if applicable)
   - www.capmark.org

6. ADDRESS OF PRIMARY PLACE OF BUSINESS/EXECUTIVE OFFICE
   - 11 Grace Avenue, Suite 308
   - Great Neck, N.Y. 11021

7. TELEPHONE NUMBER
   - 516-487-9815

8. FAX NUMBER
   - 516-487-2575

9. ADDRESS OF PRIMARY PLACE OF BUSINESS/EXECUTIVE OFFICE
   - In NEW YORK STATE, if different from above

10. TELEPHONE NUMBER

11. FAX NUMBER

12. AUTHORIZED CONTACT FOR THE QUESTIONNAIRE
   - Name: Richard Tortora
   - Title: President
   - Telephone Number: 516-487-9815
   - Fax Number: 516-487-2575
   - e-mail: rtortora@capmark.org

13. LIST ALL OF THE VENDOR’S PRINCIPAL OWNERS.
   - a) NAME: Richard Tortora
     - TITLE: President
   - b) NAME: Rick Geno
     - TITLE: Executive Vice President

A DETAILED EXPLANATION IS REQUIRED FOR EACH QUESTION ANSWERED WITH A "YES," AND MUST BE PROVIDED AS AN ATTACHMENT TO THE COMPLETED QUESTIONNAIRE. YOU MUST PROVIDE ADEQUATE DETAILS OR DOCUMENTS TO AID THE COUNTY IN MAKING A DETERMINATION OF VENDOR RESPONSIBILITY. PLEASE NUMBER EACH RESPONSE TO MATCH THE QUESTION NUMBER.

14. DOES THE VENDOR USE, OR HAS IT USED IN THE PAST FIVE (5) YEARS, ANY OTHER BUSINESS NAME, FEIN, OR D/B/A OTHER THAN THOSE LISTED IN ITEMS 2-4 ABOVE? List all other business name(s), Federal Employer Identification Number(s) or any D/B/A names and the dates that these names or numbers were in use. Explain the relationship to the vendor.
   - [ ] Yes [ ] No

15. ARE THERE ANY INDIVIDUALS NOW SERVING IN A MANAGERIAL OR CONSULTING CAPACITY TO THE VENDOR, INCLUDING PRINCIPAL OWNERS AND OFFICERS, WHO NOW SERVE OR IN THE PAST ONE (1) YEARS HAVE SERVED AS:
   - a) An elected or appointed public official or officer?
     - List each individual’s name, business title, the name of the organization and position elected or appointed to, and dates of service
     - [ ] Yes [ ] No
   - b) An officer of any political party organization in Albany County, whether paid or unpaid?
     - List each individual’s name, business title or consulting capacity and the official political position held with applicable service dates.
     - [ ] Yes [ ] No
16. **WITHIN THE PAST (3) YEARS, HAS THE VENDOR, ANY INDIVIDUALS SERVING IN MANAGERIAL OR CONSULTING CAPACITY, PRINCIPAL OWNERS, OFFICERS, MAJOR STOCKHOLDER(S) (10% OR MORE OF THE VOTING SHARES FOR PUBLICLY TRADED COMPANIES, 25% OR MORE OF THE SHARES FOR ALL OTHER COMPANIES), AFFILIATE OR ANY PERSON INVOLVED IN THE BIDDING OR CONTRACTING PROCESS:**

| a) | 1. been suspended, debarred or terminated by a local, state or federal authority in connection with a contract or contracting process; | Yes | No |
|    | 2. been disqualified for cause as a bidder on any permit, license, concession franchise or lease; |      |     |
|    | 3. entered into an agreement to a voluntary exclusion from bidding/contracting; |      |     |
|    | 4. had a bid rejected on an Albany County contract for failure to comply with the MacBride Fair Employment Principles; |      |     |
|    | 5. had a low bid rejected on a local, state or federal contract for failure to meet statutory affirmative action or M/WBE requirements on a previously held contract; |      |     |
|    | 6. had status as a Women’s Business Enterprise, Minority Business Enterprise or Disadvantaged Business Enterprise, de-certified, revoked or forfeited; |      |     |
|    | 7. been subject to an administrative proceeding or civil action seeking specific performance or restitution in connection with any local, state or federal government contract; |      |     |
|    | 8. been denied an award of a local, state or federal government contract, had a contract suspended or had a contract terminated for non-responsibility; or |      |     |
|    | 9. had a local, state or federal government contract suspended or terminated for cause prior to the completion of the term of the contract. |      |     |
| b) | been indicted, convicted, received a judgment against them or a grant of immunity for any business-related conduct constituting a crime under local, state or federal law including but not limited to, fraud, extortion, bribery, kickbacking, price-fixing, bid collusion or any crime related to truthfulness and/or business conduct? | Yes | No |
| c) | been issued a citation, notice, violation order, or are pending an administrative hearing or proceeding or determination of violations of; | Yes | No |
|    |  1. federal, state or local health laws, rules or regulations. |      |     |

17. **IN THE PAST THREE (3) YEARS, HAS THE VENDOR OR ITS AFFILIATES HAD ANY CLAIMS, JUDGMENTS, INJUNCTIONS, LIENS, FINES OR PENALTIES SECURED BY ANY GOVERNMENTAL AGENCY?**

| |  | Yes | No |
| | Indicates whether the situation occurred or affirms. State whether the situation(s) was a claim, judgment, injunction, lien or other with an explanation. Provide the name(s) and address(es) of the agency, the amount of the original obligation and outstanding balance. If any of these items are open, unsatisfied, indicate the status of each item as “open” or “unsatisfied.” |      |     |

18. **DURING THE PAST THREE (3) YEARS, HAS THE VENDOR FAILED TO:**

| a) | file returns or pay any applicable federal, state or city taxes? | Yes | No |
|    | Identify the taxing jurisdiction, type of tax, liability year(s), and tax liability amount the vendor failed to file/pay and the current status of the liability. |      |     |
| b) | file returns or pay New York State unemployment insurance? | Yes | No |
|    | Indicate the years the vendor failed to file/pay the insurance and the current status of the liability. |      |     |
| c) | Property Tax | Yes | No |
|    | Indicate the years the vendor failed to file. |      |     |

19. **HAVE ANY BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDINGS BEEN INITIATED BY OR AGAINST THE VENDOR OR ITS AFFILIATES WITHIN THE LAST SEVEN (7) YEARS (WHETHER OR NOT CLOSED) OR IS ANY BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDING PENDING BY OR AGAINST THE VENDOR OR ITS AFFILIATES REGARDLESS OF THE DATE OF FILING?**

| |  | Yes | No |
| | Indicates if this is applicable to the submitting vendor or affiliate. If it is an affiliate, include the affiliate’s name and FEIN. Provide the court name, address and docket number. Indicate if the proceedings have been initiated, remain pending or have been closed. If closed, provide the date closed. |      |     |

20. **IS THE VENDOR CURRENTLY INSOLVENT, OR DOES VENDOR CURRENTLY HAVE REASON TO BELIEVE THAT AN IN Voluntary BANKRUPTCY PROCEEDING MAY BE BROUGHT AGAINST IT? Provide financial information to support the vendor’s current position, for example, Current Ratio, Debt to Equity Ratio, Age of Accounts Payable, Cash Flow and any documents that will provide the agency with an understanding of the vendor’s situation.**

| |  | Yes | No |
21. **IN THE PAST FIVE (5) YEARS, HAS THE VENDOR OR ANY AFFILIATES:**

   ☐ Yes ☒ No

   a) defaulted or been terminated on, or had its surety called upon to complete, any contract (public or private) awarded;

   Indicate if this is applicable to the submitting vendor or affiliate. Detail the situation(s) that gave rise to the negative action, any corrective action taken by the vendor and the name of the contracting agency.

---

1 "Affiliate" meaning: (a) any entity in which the vendor owns more than 50% of the voting stock; (b) any individual, entity or group of principal owners or officers who own more than 50% of the voting stock of the vendor; or (c) any entity whose voting stock is more than 50% owned by the same individual, entity or group described in clause (b). In addition, if a vendor owns less than 50% of the voting stock of another entity, but directs or has the right to direct such entity's daily operations, that entity will be an "affiliate" for purposes of this questionnaire.
ALBANY COUNTY
VENDOR RESPONSIBILITY QUESTIONNAIRE

State of: 
County of: 

CERTIFICATION:

The undersigned recognizes that this questionnaire is submitted for the express purpose of assisting the County of Albany in making a determination regarding an award of contract or approval of a subcontract; acknowledges that the County may in its discretion, by means which it may choose, verify the truth and accuracy of all statements made herein; acknowledges that intentional submission of false or misleading information may constitute a felony under Penal Law Section 210.40 or a misdemeanor under Penal Law Section 210.35 or Section 210.45, and may also be punishable by a fine and/or imprisonment of up to five years under 18 USC Section 1001 and may result in contract termination; and states that the information submitted in this questionnaire and any attached pages is true, accurate and complete.

The undersigned certifies that he/she:

- Has not altered the content of the questions in the questionnaire in any manner;
- Has read and understands all of the items contained in the questionnaire and any pages attached by the submitting vendor;
- Has supplied full and complete responses to each item therein to the best of his/her knowledge, information ad belief;
- Is knowledgeable about the submitting vendor's business and operations;
- Understands that Albany County will rely on the information supplied in the questionnaire when entering into a contract with the vendor;
- Is under duty to notify the Albany County Purchasing Division of any material changes to the vendor's responses.

Name of Business: Capital Markets Advisors, LLC
Address: 11 Grace Avenue
          Suite 308
City, State, Zip: Great Neck, NY 11021

Signature of Owner: [Signature]
Printed Name of Signatory: Richard Tortora
Title: President

Sworn before me the 27th day of June, 2019

Jillian Walton
Notary Public - State of New York
No. 01946572263
Qualified in Queens County
My Commission Expires Mar 15, 2022

Printed Name: [Signature]
Date: 6/27/19
Attachment “D”
Certification Pursuant to Section 103-g
Of the New York State
General Municipal Law

A. By submission of this bid/proposal, each bidder/proposer and each person signing on behalf of any bidder/proposer certifies, and in the case of a joint bid, each party thereto certifies as to its own organization, under penalty of perjury, that to the best of its knowledge and belief that each bidder is not on the list created pursuant to paragraph (b) of subdivision 3 of Section 165-a of the New York State Finance Law.

B. A Bid/Proposal shall not be considered for award, nor shall any award be made where the condition set forth in Paragraph A above has not been complied with; provided, however, that in any case the bidder/proposer cannot make the foregoing certification set forth in Paragraph A above, the bidder/proposer shall so state and shall furnish with the bid a signed statement which sets forth in detail the reasons therefor. Where Paragraph A above cannot be complied with, the Purchasing Unit to the political subdivision, public department, agency or official thereof to which the bid/proposal is made, or his designee, may award a bid/proposal, on a case by case business under the following circumstances:

1. The investment activities in Iran were made before April 12, 2012, the investment activities in Iran have not been expanded or renewed after April 12, 2012, and the Bidder/Proposer has adopted, publicized and is implementing a formal plan to cease the investment activities in Iran and to refrain from engaging in any new investments in Iran; or

2. The political subdivision makes a determination that the goods or services are necessary for the political subdivision to perform its functions and that, absent such an exemption, the political subdivision would be unable to obtain the goods or services for which the contract is offered. Such determination shall be made in writing and shall be a public document.

[Signature]
President
Title
Date
Company Name
August 14, 2019

Andrew Joyce, Chair
Albany County Legislature
Harold L. Joyce Office Building
112 State Street
Albany, N.Y. 12207

Dear Chair,

Attached are three copies of our Request for Legislative Action and the back up for a Study of Municipal Solid Waste, Recycling, Construction and Demolition Debris and related products generated within Albany County or imported to Albany County for your office and the respective caucuses.

Thank you for your time to consider this. We look forward to discussing the study with the appropriate committees,

Respectfully,

Michael F. Conners, II
REQUEST FOR LEGISLATIVE ACTION

DATE: 8/14/2019

DEPARTMENT: Audit & Control

Contact Person: Mike Conners, Ralph Signoracci
Telephone: 518-447-7130
Dept. Representative Attending Committee Meeting: Mike Conners & Ralph Signoracci

PURPOSE OF REQUEST:
Adoption of Local Law
Amendment of Prior Legislation
Approval/Adoption of Plan/Procedure
Bond Approval
Budget Amendment (See below) X
Contract Authorization (See below)
Environmental Impact
Home Rule Request
Property Conveyance
Other: (State briefly if not listed above) Authorize budget changes to pay for a shared services study of municipal solid waste, recycling, construction and demolition debris within or imported to Albany County, updating the 2011 feasibility study and complying with Resolution 210 for 2017.

CONCERNING BUDGET AMENDMENTS
STATE THE FOLLOWING:
Increase Account/Line No. _A 91315 44046 Fees for Service - $100,000.00
Decrease Account/Line No. _V 99710 77000 Interest Payments - $100,000.00
Source of Funds: ___Refunding Bond Proceeds

CONCERNING CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION
STATE THE FOLLOWING:

TYPE OF CONTRACT
Change Order/Contract Amendment
Purchase (Equipment/Supplies)
Lease (Equipment/Supplies)
Requirements
Professional Services X
Education/Training
Grant:
New
Renewal
Submission Deadline Date August 14, 2019

Settlement of a Claim
Release of Liability
Other: (State briefly)

_________________________
CONCERNING CONTRACT AUTHORIZATION (Cont’d)

STATE THE FOLLOWING:

Contract Terms/Conditions:
Party (Name/Address):

Amount/Rate Schedule/Fee:

Term:
Scope of Services:

Contract Funding:
Anticipated in Current Budget: Yes ___ No ___
Funding Source:
County Budget Accounts:
Revenue:
Appropriation:
Bond (Res. No. & Date of Adoption) ______

CONCERNING ALL REQUESTS:

Mandated Program/Service: Yes ___ No ___ X___
If Mandated Cite: Authority _______
Anticipated in Current Adopted Budget: Yes ___ No ___ X___
If yes, indicate Revenue/Appropriation Accounts: _______

Fiscal Impact - Funding: (Dollars or Percentages)
Federal _______
State _______
County ______
Term/Length of Funding ___RFQ for Study to be done in 2019

Previous Requests For Identical or Similar Action:
Resolution/Law Number: 210 of 2017 _______
Date of Adoption: passed Unanimously May 8, 2017

Justification: (State briefly why legislative action is requested)
Environmental issue for solid waste and recyclable products are reaching a critical juncture. Potential for monopoly on tipping fees for disposal to dramatically increase in price needs to be studied for alternatives. Legislature requested update in 2017. Studying the possibility of an Albany County District and the potential for flow control being enacted could help resolve the logjam of inaction. Several other Counties have acted on their own and the complications of a regional authority is extremely difficult.

Back-up Material Submitted: (i.e., application/approval notices from funding source, bid tabulation sheet, civil service approval notice, program announcement, contracts and/or any materials which explain or support the request for legislative action.)
Resolution 377 of 2018
Resolution 210 of 2017
Albany County Government Efficiency Plan
2011 Regional Solid Waste Authority Feasibility Study
Submitted By: Michael F. Conners, II
Title: Albany County Comptroller
RESOLUTION NO. 377

REQUESTING THE ALBANY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO CONDUCT A FEASIBILITY STUDY REGARDING COMPOSTING SERVICES THROUGHOUT ALBANY COUNTY

Introduced: 8/13/18
By: Messrs. Signoracci, A. Joyce, Feeney, Clenahan, Fein, Bullock, Reinhardt, Mss. Lekakis, Plotsky, McKnight, Messrs. Miller and Touchette:

WHEREAS, Concerns regarding the management of solid waste in Albany County have increased in recent years as local landfill sites are approach capacity and the end of their useful life cycles, and

WHEREAS, Awareness regarding the management and reuse of organic waste in Albany County has increased due to the various uses of such waste, such as food waste for composting materials or yard waste such as brush, branches, grass clippings, or leaves to be used for composting or as wood chips, and

WHEREAS, The Albany County government has a history of programs and initiatives regarding recycling services and waste management throughout the Capital Region, and has collaborated with various local governments to achieve such goals, including the recent authorization of the construction of a Regional Anaerobic Digester Facility with Saratoga County, and

WHEREAS, Many options may exist regarding consolidation of efforts throughout the county into a central location to maximize efficiency of solid waste management programs, and

WHEREAS, It is in the best interest of the people of Albany County that a feasibility study be completed regarding the efficiency of current composting efforts of the County of Albany and the potential benefits of consolidation of local programs at one site by forming partnerships with local municipalities, now, therefore, be it

RESOLVED, By the Albany County Legislature, that the County Executive is hereby requested to conduct a feasibility study regarding the current composting programs operated by the County of Albany, and the feasibility of forming partnerships with local municipalities regarding the establishment of a central composting facility or location in Albany County, and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the County Executive is requested to pursue such grant funding as is available regarding the completion of said composting feasibility study, subject to the approval of the County Legislature, and, be it further
RESOLVED, That the County Executive is further requested to report back to the Legislature within sixty (60) days of the adoption of this Resolution on the status of the feasibility study or its findings if such study is completed sooner, and, be it further

RESOLVED, That the Clerk of the County Legislature is directed to forward certified copies of this resolution to the appropriate County Officials.

*Referred to Conservation and Improvement Committee* – 8/13/18
*Favorable Recommendation Conservation and Improvement Committee* – 8/28/18
*Adopted by unanimous vote* – 9/12/18
RESOLUTION NO. 210

REQUESTING THE ALBANY COUNTY EXECUTIVE TO UPDATE THE
COMPREHENSIVE RECYCLING ANALYSIS AND LOCAL SOLID WASTE
MANAGEMENT PLAN

Introduced: 5/8/17
By Messrs. Beston, Bullock, Ms. Chapman, Messrs. Clay, Clenahan,
Comissio, Duncan, Feeney, Fein, Higgins, Mss. Lekakis, McKnight, McLean
Lane, Messrs. Miller, O'Brien, Signoracci, Simpson, Smith, Touchette, Ward
and Ms. Willingham:

WHEREAS, Albany County, under the New York State Local Government
Efficiency Grant Program, prepared the “Albany County Regional Solid Waste Authority
Feasibility Study Final Report” of October 2011, and

WHEREAS, The Study recommended that Albany County join a regional solid
waste authority, or, as a second choice, create an Albany County Authority, and

WHEREAS, The Study projected “that a coordinated regional recycling program
could triple the volume of materials recovered in the study area,” and

WHEREAS, The Study found: “During the period of time it takes to develop new
facilities, all the existing local public disposal facilities that are currently operating will
either close or be privatized,” and

WHEREAS, The New York State Department of Environmental Conservation
commented positively upon said study, stating that the “study provides an excellent
overview of the opportunity and benefits of developing a cooperative regional solid
waste management authority,” and

WHEREAS, It is the goal of Albany County to provide reliable and reasonably
priced solid waste management facilities and services to its residents, and

WHEREAS, Since 2011, new industry-wide opportunities for the recycling,
composting, and reduction in the waste stream generated by Albany County have been
developed and implemented elsewhere resulting in unknown positive environmental and
economic impacts, and

WHEREAS, Albany County currently lacks a comprehensive up-to-date solid waste
policy, and

WHEREAS, Albany County has adopted local laws affecting the County’s waste
stream as part of its solid waste management approach, and
WHEREAS, The 2011 Study needs to be updated with an emphasis on regional waste management and the implementation of recently developed waste management strategies and systems, now, therefore be it

RESOLVED, That this Honorable Body requests that an update of the 2011 Study be undertaken, and that all actions taken to date to implement recommendations of the 2011 Study be identified and included in said update, and be it further

RESOLVED, This Honorable Body requests that any local, state or federal grants that exist to update the Study be pursued, and be it further

RESOLVED, This Honorable Body requests that an updated Comprehensive Recycling Analysis and Local Solid Waste Management Plan be developed, and be it further

RESOLVED, Such studies shall include, but not be limited to, New York State solid waste and recycling goals, pricing at other regional waste management facilities, trends in recycling, composting of organic materials, household hazardous wastes, and future solid waste recycling and disposal strategies for Albany County that are evidence-based and do not pose an undue burden on municipalities or our citizenry, and be it further

RESOLVED, To the extent possible, public hearings shall be held for public input, and be it further

RESOLVED, A report to the County Legislature shall be provided on or before January 1, 2018, and be it further

RESOLVED, That the Clerk of the Legislature is hereby directed to forward certified copies of said Resolution to the appropriate County Officials.

Adopted by unanimous vote. 5/8/17
Albany Countywide Government Efficiency Plan
May 28, 2015
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Albany Countywide Government Efficiency Plan

Executive Summary

Local governments and special districts within Albany County have a long history of sharing services and implementing efficiencies in order to control the growth of property taxes. Since 2012 these local governments and special districts have collectively implemented efficiencies, mergers, and shared service agreements that will realize $15.8 million in annual savings in fiscal years 2017, 2018 and 2019. This is over six times the $2.4 million in savings required by New York State’s Property Tax Freeze Credit Law. This total does not include several million dollars in savings realized from shared services and efficiencies implemented prior to 2012, many of which are detailed in this Government Efficiency Plan (GEP). Nor does it include $2.8 million dollars in documented savings, conservatively estimated, that can be realized by implementing future shared services and efficiencies identified in this plan. These include the City of Albany’s implementation of a Joint Enterprise Resource Planning System and the Town of Colonie’s consolidation of Police/EMS communications systems with that of Albany County and the City of Albany.

The premise of the New York State Property Tax Freeze Credit Law was that an added incentive for local elected officials was necessary to get their governments to reduce the growth of property taxes. Accordingly, the law provides that homeowners would receive a real property tax rebate from the state if local governments, school districts and special districts limited the growth of property taxes to the property tax cap or less. If they did not, local leaders would have to take responsibility when the expected rebate checks failed to arrive, and perhaps suffer political consequences.

Leaders of local governments and special districts within Albany County welcome the opportunity to achieve real property tax rebates for homeowners within Albany County. As it is evidenced in this report, local leaders have an established record of focusing their daily work around controlling costs and limiting the growth of property taxes. This commitment may be one reason that a recent Siena poll showed that citizens have a high level of trust in local government.

Moving forward, the shared commitment of local and state government to reduce the burden of property taxes would best be served through a thoughtful dialogue between localities and the state. Through this dialogue, the most promising areas of policy and administration could be identified and then the state could spur additional progress by providing both needed start-up funds and removing administrative and statutory barriers.
**Widespread Collaboration to Respond to the State Requirement**

With the support of the Albany County Legislature, the Albany County Comptroller, Executive, Sheriff and Clerk led a collaborative effort of nineteen Albany County local governments (1 county, 3 cities, 9 towns and 6 villages) and ten Albany County special districts (6 library districts and 4 fire districts) to devise a countywide Government Efficiency Plan (GEP) to comply with the requirements of the Property Tax Freeze Credit Law enacted in 2014. This collaborative action is compelling evidence of a commitment to work together in the public interest and will enable Albany County homeowners to receive an estimated $2.5 million in real property tax rebates in 2016 so long as each participating entity adopts a property tax cap compliant budget in their 2016 fiscal year. All the entities included in this report anticipate adopting budgets within the cap.

**An Established Record of Shared Services**

The collaborative activity and efficiencies already implemented by local governments and special districts within Albany County run the gamut from shared highway equipment and personnel to merging ambulance districts. The Village of Green Island has an exceptionally well established record of effective cooperation with other local governments, particularly evidenced in collaborative development and management of sewer systems. Library districts within Albany County are exceptionally notable for their collaboration in shared cataloguing, materials delivery, e-content collection coordination and staff training. Unfortunately, many of these efficiencies occurred prior to 2012. The Property Tax Freeze Credit Law does not allow these savings to count towards the 2014 state law's required savings target. Nonetheless, Green Island, and most other participating Albany County local governments and special districts, elected to include these efficiencies in this report to document their long-established commitment to collaboration and efficiency, with the understanding that their timing precludes inclusion toward the required savings target.

The following sampling of the shared services, mergers and efficiencies contained in the Albany Countywide GEP have realized the greatest amount of savings for taxpayers.

1. Various management reforms of the Albany County Nursing Home – estimated average annual savings of $3.1 million.

2. Merger of Bethlehem’s Highway and Parks Departments’ maintenance staff and other position eliminations - estimated average annual savings of over $1.6 million.
   *Note: Bethlehem’s overall qualifying savings for this plan exceed one sixth of its property tax levy.*
3. Reduced Town of Colonie landfill personnel costs through a new operating agreement - estimated average annual savings of $1.8 million.

4. Consolidation of Coeymans, Cohoes, Green Island and Watervliet dispatch operations through the Albany County Sheriff – estimated average annual savings of over $900,000.

5. Merger of Bethlehem and Delmar Volunteer Ambulance Districts – estimated average annual savings of $250,000.

6. Reduced workers compensation insurance costs for Altamont, Guilderland and Menands by changing vendors – estimated average annual savings of $195,000.

7. Berne and Voorheesville sharing separate road salt storage sheds with Albany County – estimated average annual savings of over $157,000.

8. Health insurance savings achieved by changing insurers, modifications to benefit design and modifications to cost sharing provisions were implemented by New Scotland, Rensselaerville, Voorheesville Library District and Westerlo – estimated average annual savings of over $196,000.

   Note: Many local governments and special districts within Albany County made similar management decisions related to health insurance prior to 2012. All these changes produce additional savings for property taxpayers within Albany County.

**Future Shared Services and Efficiencies**

The Albany Countywide Government Efficiency Plan also includes plans for future efficiencies that will save property taxpayers within Albany County a minimum of $2.8 million annually from 2017 through 2019. Among these future projects is the City of Albany’s implementation of a Joint Enterprise Resource Planning System.

These future savings are very conservatively estimated. Their total projected dollar value includes only amounts that we can document at this time. Based upon past experience reported here, we anticipate that savings from envisioned shared services and efficiencies will total millions of dollars of additional benefits for local property taxpayers when implemented.

State assistance will be necessary for the two shared services projects that have the potential for the most savings. These include:
1. **Consolidated Dispatch Operations** - a possible future collaboration between the City of Albany, Albany County (inclusive of Coeymans, Cohoes, Green Island and Watervliet operations) and/or the towns of Bethlehem and Guilderland. A major challenge to achieving this shared service is the cost of the necessary equipment, hardware and software. In its recent report to the City of Albany, the New York State Financial Review Board for Local Governments recommended that the City pursue this shared services opportunity with surrounding communities. As noted earlier, Albany County has already successfully consolidated dispatch services of four municipalities, saving over $900,000 annually in these communities.

2. **Joint Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) Systems** - ERP systems integrate all facets of business processes across all departments and functions in each municipality as well as across all participating municipalities. This capability provides significant advantages over current legacy financial and administrative systems, which are comprised of a variety of separate systems and databases that perform the various accounting, payroll, and maintenance operations tasks. Adoption of a shared ERP system would also allow the local governments of Albany County to better identify best practices across municipalities and possible shared personnel opportunities that will be initially established in the Albany County workforce database project discussed below.

One recommendation to the City of Albany from the 2014 New York State Financial Review Board for Local Governments report was that the city obtains an ERP system. A state grant of up to $1.1 million was made to facilitate this step. The Financial Review Board report also recommended that the City explore the possible use of the ERP collaboratively with surrounding communities. Many municipalities in Albany County are interested in such a system. Berne, Rensselaerville and Albany County currently share a joint accounting system that generates significant savings for these municipalities.

Initial capital costs (hardware and software) and annual licensing fees are the primary barrier to extending the availability of an ERP system to all municipalities. These costs are particularly discouraging for smaller municipalities because it would take them at least a decade before they could realize actual savings. The availability of competing systems in the market may also present a challenge to getting an agreement on a single system.
In addition to these priority initiatives, a number of other opportunities for savings through inter-jurisdictional collaboration were identified by local government and special district leaders during the course of this study:

1. Many local governments have expressed an interest in the creation of a common countywide workforce database to facilitate collaborative workforce management and improved succession planning among local governments and across the range of local government functions.
   *Note: This project is under way with financial support from Albany County government.*

2. Many local governments expressed a desire to further leverage joint purchasing of equipment, materials, services and supplies including through the use of existing county, state and other municipal contracts for purchasing. Special attention should be given to joint purchasing of insurance; inclusive of general liability insurance, health insurance, and workers compensation insurance.

3. Nearly all participating local governments encouraged further implementation of the recommendations of the Albany County Highway Study, including shared building projects, facilities, purchasing and use of equipment.

4. Fire Departments in southern Albany County (including Altamont, Berne, Guilderland Center, Knox, Rensselaerville, Westerlo, Westmere and Voorheesville) continue to prioritize the construction of a jointly operated training facility (a new fire tower).

**Impediments to Shared Services in Albany County**

Albany County local governments and special districts share the state’s commitment to reducing demands upon property taxpayers while maintaining excellence in service delivery. In fact, control of property tax levies as a consistent policy priority antedates the recent passage of state real property tax cap and property tax freeze credit legislation. As demonstrated in this report, considerable success has been realized. However, this process again revealed that further success is inhibited by provisions of state law and/or regulation.

One example is that the property tax cap’s adjustment for transfers of function (General Municipal Law Section 3-c (3)(d)), as currently interpreted by the State Comptroller’s Office, has created a disincentive to shared service or functional consolidations. Any budget cut made by a local government counts towards meeting the property tax reduction target, unless that expense reduction is based on a transfer of function – in which case the amount saved by a partnering local government is subtracted from its tax cap levy limit. Thus the local government
gets no credit for having implemented such a change for the purposes of the tax cap. Therefore, layoffs, spending down reserves, or deferring maintenance all count for the purposes of the cap, but transfers of functions which truly reduce recurring expenditures do not.

This interpretation in implementation is a fundamental flaw, because the tax cap and the property tax freeze credit laws were intended to encourage transfers and/or consolidations of functions. In his policy document published in 2010, THE NEW NY AGENDA: A PLAN FOR ACTION, Andrew Cuomo made this intention clear when he wrote: “Exceptions or adjustments [to the property tax cap] would apply to consolidations of services (so that the cap would not discourage a county or town from taking on consolidated services from other localities or special districts). In fact, the cap may well encourage cost saving consolidations, where existing arrangements prove to be too expensive for the new discipline” (p. 44).

To remedy this problem it is necessary to amend General Municipal Law Section 3-c (3)(d) so that any uncompensated expenses taken on by a local government as part of a transfer of function with another local government result in a positive adjustment of their property tax cap levy limit.

Ironically, a second example is embedded in the reporting requirements for the GEP process. Each chief elected official who commits his or her municipality to file collaboratively is required to certify that, in his or her professional opinion, all the actions outlined in the countywide GEP will result in an annual savings of at least one percent of the cumulative 2014 tax levies of the participating jurisdictions for the local fiscal years 2017 through 2019. These officials have no independent knowledge of the finances of other municipalities, making each reluctant to provide such an inclusive certification, and introducing a barrier to collective action.

Third, a study of the first two years of the NY Department of State’s Shared Municipal Service Incentive (SMSI) program found that that major urban centers, small upstate urban centers and suburbs are overrepresented as SMSI lead applicants. Downstate urban centers are roughly proportionally represented. In contrast, rural governments are underrepresented and governments with populations under 1,000 are severely underrepresented. This confirms the idea that the program draws participation disproportionately from governments with the greatest capacity to manage the specifics of the application process. Rural and small municipalities, which could benefit most from shared services, need state assistance to help them implement shared services that will lower their property tax burdens. Our experience in putting together the Albany County GEP confirms that this is a significant barrier to furthering shared services in our county.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>County of Albany</td>
<td>$89,947,275</td>
<td>$6,209,204</td>
<td>$550,361</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Albany</td>
<td>$57,391,328</td>
<td>$1,279,560</td>
<td>$2,043,333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Cohoes</td>
<td>$6,908,365</td>
<td>$661,000</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Watervliet</td>
<td>$3,994,266</td>
<td>$225,904</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Bethlehem</td>
<td>$12,644,857</td>
<td>$2,131,787</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Berne</td>
<td>$789,795</td>
<td>$160,000</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Coeymans</td>
<td>$1,845,593</td>
<td>$404,000</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Colonie</td>
<td>$25,638,546</td>
<td>$3,484,187</td>
<td>$145,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Guilderland</td>
<td>$11,042,142</td>
<td>$365,056</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Knox</td>
<td>$260,925</td>
<td>$4,364</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of New Scotland</td>
<td>$2,546,703</td>
<td>$99,437</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Rensselaerive</td>
<td>$1,269,626</td>
<td>$89,800</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Westerlo</td>
<td>$1,236,559</td>
<td>$76,804</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Altamont</td>
<td>$281,856</td>
<td>$30,188</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Colonie</td>
<td>$1,459,294</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Green Island</td>
<td>$1,942,675</td>
<td>$114,322</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Menands</td>
<td>$2,137,437</td>
<td>$31,787</td>
<td>$26,176</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Ravena</td>
<td>$806,635</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Voorheesville</td>
<td>$287,730</td>
<td>$20,074</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 The Town of Green Island is co-terminus with the Village of Green Island and has no separate tax levy and its efficiencies are included as the Village of Green Island efficiencies.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany Public Library</td>
<td>$8,289,077</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bethlehem Public Library</td>
<td>$3,674,851</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilderland Public Library</td>
<td>$3,437,467</td>
<td>$136,000</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Menands Public Library</td>
<td>$126,483</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ravena-Coeymans-Selkirk (RCS) Community Library</td>
<td>$538,108</td>
<td>$8,200</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Voorheesville Public Library</td>
<td>$1,112,675</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Berne Fire District</td>
<td>$348,159</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elsmere Fire District</td>
<td>$846,105</td>
<td>$27,335</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilderland Center Fire District</td>
<td>$570,872</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westmere Fire District</td>
<td>$1,044,350</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total All Municipalities &amp; Special Districts</strong></td>
<td><strong>$242,419,754</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,807,009</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,802,070</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>1% Savings Target</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$2,424,198</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Albany County Government Efficiency Plan

### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $89,947,275

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Children, Youth and Families share Department of Social Services</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$32,920</td>
<td>$34,566</td>
<td>$36,294</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Investigator to help locate permanent resources for children in foster care</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sheriff’s Office provides overnight/weekend hotline coverage for the Albany County Crime Victims and Sexual Violence Center (^2)</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Clerk’s Office partners with Ulster County for microfilm processing and duplication services (^3)</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Clerk’s Office began submitting electronic RP5217 and deeds</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nurses at the nursing home administer rabies vaccinations on evenings and weekends for the Department of Health, saving overtime</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
<td>$2,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Health has begun to obtain certain medications through the 340B Drug Program</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
<td>$10,500</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^2\) This is based on the county not having to pay for additional staff time to cover the hotline after regular work hours.

\(^3\) This is due to the county not having to purchase special equipment to process microfilm.
### Albany County Government Efficiency Plan (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Area</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Cost 1</th>
<th>Cost 2</th>
<th>Cost 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of legal resources under the County Attorney/Department of Law, allowing for better use of personnel and an end to outsourcing any new litigation⁴</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of the Albany County Land Bank will result in a savings in demolition, stabilization and property maintenance costs. All properties will be transferred to the Land Bank by 2017</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The creation of an Albany County Billing Unit has streamlined billing in the Department of Mental Health, Health and Children Youth and Families to create a more efficient workflow</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$144,000</td>
<td>$146,880</td>
<td>$149,817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Management and Budget created an 18B Coordinator to evaluate and restructure 18B Legal Services</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany County Nursing Home settlements with three bargaining units which resulted in the reduction of 20 positions and reduced salaries</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
<td>$900,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany County Nursing Home Settlements with three bargaining units which resulted in the reduction of holiday pay</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
<td>$115,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴ This is based on prior year outside litigation costs compared to county expended resources.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany County Nursing Home Settlements with three bargaining units which resulted in the reduction of differential pay</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
<td>$270,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany County Nursing Home Settlements with three bargaining units which resulted in the reduction of fringe benefits</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
<td>$620,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany County Nursing Home Settlements with three bargaining units which resulted in the reduction of overtime</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
<td>$575,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Nursing Home establishment of purchased service contracts with Nurse Agencies</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
<td>$625,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Probation has two officers assigned at Jail to complete PSI on individuals incarcerated bound for state prison. Reduces completion time of report by 2 weeks</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1,134,000</td>
<td>$1,134,000</td>
<td>$1,134,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Purchasing Department established a cooperative bid for the purchase of copy paper</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$7,769</td>
<td>$7,769</td>
<td>$7,769</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5 This is based on reduced time of the reports being completed and the cost avoidance due to the shorter duration of days that individuals spent in county jail utilizing average cost per day per inmate.
6 Savings based on a comparison to prior year prices under state contracts to the price for the cooperative bid.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Purchasing Department is the lead agency for a</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
<td>$1,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative bid of crushed stone&lt;sup&gt;7&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Purchasing Department is the lead agency for a</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,095</td>
<td>$1,095</td>
<td>$1,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative bid of asphalt&lt;sup&gt;8&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Purchasing Department is the lead agency for a</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$5,052</td>
<td>$5,052</td>
<td>$5,052</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>cooperative bid of ballot stock for the Board of Elections&lt;sup&gt;9&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Purchasing Department established a cooperative</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bid for the purchase of copy paper&lt;sup&gt;10&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Public Works is able to store salt in</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
<td>$25,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>the NYS DOT salt shed in Colonie&lt;sup&gt;11&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Public Works shares the car wash</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>facility with the Albany County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>7</sup> Savings based on a comparison to prior year prices and/or state contracts.
<sup>8</sup> Savings based on a comparison to prior year prices and/or state contracts.
<sup>9</sup> Savings based on a comparison to prior year prices and/or state contracts.
<sup>10</sup> Savings based on a comparison to prior year prices and/or state contracts.
<sup>11</sup> Savings based on cost of building a new salt shed.
### Albany County Government Efficiency Plan (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>During Storms the Albany County Department of Public Works provides emergency snow clearing services to the Albany County Sheriff's Office</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$104</td>
<td>$104</td>
<td>$104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Public Works frequently shares an air compressor with the Sewer District</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$31,248</td>
<td>$31,248</td>
<td>$31,248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany County Sewer Truck vacuum drains at DPW main garage</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Public Defender's Office began conducting videoconferencing for clients placed in the Albany County Jail. Based on savings of 2 hours of staff time per week[^12]</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
<td>$2,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sewer District Professional Services exchange agreement for the leachate treatment in exchange for sewage sludge ash and debris disposal</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^12]: Videoconferencing saves 2 hours of staff time per week, or 104 hours annually.
### Albany County Government Efficiency Plan (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Sewer District is participating in a regional watershed approach to the development of a mandated plan to mitigate the combined sewer overflow issue to improve water quality</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Sewer District allows member communities as well as the Department of Public Works to use the District’s sewer maintenance vehicle to clean sewer pipes and catch basins</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Sewer District allows the Albany County Storm Water Coalition to utilize lab space and equipment</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Sheriff’s Office Patrol Unit, EMS, EMT, DUI and Emergency Managements Units moved into one building in Clarksville</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
<td>$57,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

13 This shared service enables the county DPW to avoid purchasing otherwise necessary special equipment.

14 This shared service enables the county to avoid contracting out laboratory services.

15 Based on savings in rental space, property maintenance, utility costs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Sheriff’s Office E-911 took over dispatch for Cohoes, Watervliet and Green Island&lt;sup&gt;16&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
<td>$450,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DSS moved a contract for HEAP Outreach and Engagement and Telephone Triage from a private contractor to Cornell Cooperative Extension&lt;sup&gt;17&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$6,108,088</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,257,114</strong></td>
<td><strong>$6,262,409</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>16</sup> Savings have been based on computer and telephone support, shared software and licensing, servers and equipment and storage.

<sup>17</sup> Savings are determined from a comparison of actual prices based on the merger of the two former private sector contracts into one contract with Cornell Cooperative Extension.
# Albany County Government Efficiency Plan: Future Efficiencies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Crime Victims and Sexual Violence Center will partner with the Albany County District Attorney’s Office for primary prevention and community mobilization program</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Crime Victims and Sexual Violence Center will partner with the Department of Children and Families Foster Care Program for primary prevention and community mobilization program activities</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Clerk’s Office plans to implement a new Clerk system that will eliminate the need for expensive labels. In addition, updated pistol permit cards, employee ID cards and veteran cards are able to be printed</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
<td>$9,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Clerk’s Office plans to apply for a records management grant that will enable the digitizing of marriage records for the City of Albany and payroll records for the Albany County Department of Human Resources</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of General Services plans to partner with other municipalities to expand codes expertise throughout the county</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Type of Efficiency</td>
<td>Possible Start Date</td>
<td>Estimated Savings 2017</td>
<td>Estimated Savings 2018</td>
<td>Estimated Savings 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany County Department of General Services will work with the City of</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany to keep vacant lots and foreclosed properties maintained.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of General Services is in the process of</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
<td>$66,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>purchasing 12 new fleet vehicles which will save on maintenance</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and repair costs due to warranties</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Office Building will be upgraded with energy</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$84,500</td>
<td>$84,500</td>
<td>$84,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficient lighting on all floors</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Family Court building will be updated with new</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$69,450</td>
<td>$69,450</td>
<td>$69,450</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Digital Command Control</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Family Court building will replace the current</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,257</td>
<td>$1,257</td>
<td>$1,257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lighting controls</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Family Court building will be upgraded to a new</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$11,603</td>
<td>$11,603</td>
<td>$11,603</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Variable Air Volume System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of General Services will replace the</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$5,596</td>
<td>$5,596</td>
<td>$5,596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>112 State Street boiler to a more efficient model</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The heating and DHW boiler will be upgraded at the Time Union Center</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$23,715</td>
<td>$23,715</td>
<td>$23,715</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Times Union Center will replace the fan coil units and connect to</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$13,401</td>
<td>$13,401</td>
<td>$13,401</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>BMS</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation of Variable Frequency Drive control on the arena exhaust</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$9,146</td>
<td>$9,146</td>
<td>$9,146</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>fans at the Times Union Center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Albany County Government Efficiency Plan: Future Efficiencies (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Installation of lighting control system at the Times Union Center(^{18})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$10,156</td>
<td>$10,156</td>
<td>$10,156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Times Union Center will install heat recovery on supply fans(^{19})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$15,635</td>
<td>$15,635</td>
<td>$15,635</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replace Arena Lighting at the Times Union Center(^{20})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$24,023</td>
<td>$24,023</td>
<td>$24,023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Modify Chiller Piping at the Times Union Center(^{21})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$4,100</td>
<td>$4,100</td>
<td>$4,100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction of the ice rink size at the Times Union Center</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$2,228</td>
<td>$2,228</td>
<td>$2,228</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Installation Variable Frequency Drive on Heat Pump Loop at the Times Union Center(^{22})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$7,012</td>
<td>$7,012</td>
<td>$7,012</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design for Improved Insulation for Times Union Arena Roof(^{23})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$8,756</td>
<td>$8,756</td>
<td>$8,756</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replacement of the Ice Chiller at the Albany County Hockey Facility(^{24})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$9,598</td>
<td>$9,598</td>
<td>$9,598</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design for Reduction in Ice Surface at the Albany County Hockey Facility(^{25})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$4,185</td>
<td>$4,185</td>
<td>$4,185</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{18}\) Energy Savings based on New York Power Authority efficiency project; all Albany County energy savings referenced are from the same source.

\(^{19}\) Energy Savings based on New York Power Authority efficiency project.

\(^{20}\) Energy Savings based on New York Power Authority efficiency project.

\(^{21}\) Energy Savings based on New York Power Authority efficiency project.

\(^{22}\) Energy Savings based on New York Power Authority efficiency project.

\(^{23}\) Energy Savings based on New York Power Authority efficiency project.

\(^{24}\) Energy Savings based on New York Power Authority efficiency project.

\(^{25}\) Energy Savings based on New York Power Authority efficiency project.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Mental Health will merge the mental</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
<td>$40,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>and substance abuse clinic with the help of the NYS Vital Access</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Award</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany County Department of Mental Health will work to improve clinic</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>efficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Probation will conduct video</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>conferencing with probationers living in the community</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Purchasing Department will conduct collective</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bidding for office supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Purchasing Department will conduct collective</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bidding for medical/EMS supplies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Purchasing Department will conduct collective</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bidding for ALS drugs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Purchasing Department will conduct collective</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bidding for automotive parts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Purchasing Department will conduct collective</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>bidding for printing</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Program</td>
<td>Type of Efficiency</td>
<td>Possible Start Date</td>
<td>Estimated Savings 2017</td>
<td>Estimated Savings 2018</td>
<td>Estimated Savings 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Public Works is considering the construction of a shared salt shed with municipalities in the Hilltowns</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Public Works will expand their shared fueling to Towns, the Sheriff's Office, and Fire Departments</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Public Works is considering sharing office space with the surrounding towns in the Hilltowns</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Public Works will initiate conversations with the Town of Colonie and Town of Bethlehem for the winter maintenance of CR151 Albany Shaker Rd., CR152 Old Niskayuna Rd., CR154 Osborne Rd. and in the Town of Bethlehem, CR52 Cherry Ave. and CR53 Jericho Rd./South Albany Rd</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Public Works plans on sharing specialty equipment with other municipalities as well as the paint booth</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Public Works plans to share engineering services such as surveying, construction inspection and minor culvert and storm water design</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Albany County Government Efficiency Plan: Future Efficiencies (continued)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>The Albany County Department of Social Services intends to utilize a Veteran Identifier to identify and match veterans with the appropriate VA benefits</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creation of a comprehensive workforce database for most municipalities in Albany County to identify future shared services and operational efficiencies</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Expected Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$550,361</td>
<td>$550,361</td>
<td>$550,361</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
City of Albany Government Efficiency Plan

2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $57,391,328

City of Albany Water Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany County has a contract to use the city's sewer system and the</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>city pays Albany County $6 million to use their wastewater treatment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>plant</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inter-connections for water supply for the towns of Bethlehem and</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Guilderland[^26]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired City of Albany Department of General Services' employees to</td>
<td>Operational</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>dredge and clean out the lagoons at the wastewater treatment plant</td>
<td>Efficiency</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>instead of contracting the work out to a private firm, saving $95,000.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If this in-sourcing is upheld at a PERB hearing may use in future as</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>an alternative to private contracts</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Executed an inter-municipal agreement (IMA) for combined sewer</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Note 27</td>
<td>Note 27</td>
<td>Note 27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>overflow abatement with Rensselaer, Troy, Cohoes, Watervliet and Green</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Island. The IMA also includes the Albany and Rensselaer County Sewer</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Districts[^27]</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^26]: Interconnection agreement with the Town of Guilderland was originally contracted in 1991. The contract with Bethlehem was signed in 2004. Both contracts are for sale of water to the town and provide revenue to the Albany Water Board. In 2014, revenue from sale of water to Town of Guilderland was $185,487, and revenue from sale of water to Town of Bethlehem was $1,701,000.

[^27]: The value of the cost savings to the City of Albany for 2017, 2018 and 2019 is unknown at this time. The IMA work to date has resulted in water quality improvement in the Hudson River by disinfection projects completed at the wastewater treatment plants. This has an intrinsic value that is not easy to quantify. There have also been inherent savings recognized by collaborating on grant applications and grant awards where the collaboration created a benefit in the grant rating process providing added value toward awarding the grant(s).
### City of Albany Water Department (continued)

#### Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Insourcing of Department of General Services employees to perform functions currently executed through private contracts (pending PERB ruling)</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greater use of Albany North sewer treatment plant excess capacity by other municipalities which will generate additional revenue for the Water Department</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### City of Albany Police Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint training with other police departments in Zone 5</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share crime scene scan machine with other police departments</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchasing of equipment and vehicles using State contracts</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of Police/EMS communications systems with Albany County and Town of Colonie&lt;sup&gt;28&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transferred parking enforcement officers to the Albany Parking Authority&lt;sup&gt;29&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
<td>$485,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$610,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$610,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$610,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Centralized dispatch with other municipalities in Albany and Rensselaer counties</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2018-2020</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared animal control services with other municipalities in Albany County</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016-2020</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded use of joint purchasing by using state and other municipal contracts&lt;sup&gt;30&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>28</sup> The Town of Colonie estimated $125,000 in annual savings; Albany’s savings may be higher but will use the more conservative estimate.

<sup>29</sup> The City of Albany was paying $1.2 million annually for officers but only getting $715,000 in annual revenue.

<sup>30</sup> Savings are included in the Purchasing Department’s savings estimate.
# City of Albany Office of Information Technology

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Replacing desktop computers with virtual desktops[^31]</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of departments physical servers and storage and replace with Virtual Servers/Storage in Co-Location Datacenter[^32]</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardization &amp; replacement of older printers and copy machines with MFP’s</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of Email/Collaboration Services to Cloud based Office365[^33] for procuring new applications when available[^34]</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$120,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
<td>$24,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$490,000</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
<td>$244,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^31]: The implementation of the VDI allows us to remove obsolete desktops while also providing a Windows 7 / Office 2010 upgrade managed from our datacenter. Virtual desktop technology will also provide anytime, anywhere, any device access giving employees the freedom to work securely from anywhere and access their desktop from any device, including tablets and smart phones.

[^32]: The city had servers in multiple locations (usually in unsecure building closets) not a dedicated datacenter. Rather than invest thousands of dollars building a datacenter, we partnered with a local service provider of datacenter services. For less than $1,000 per month, we have a rack in a Tier One datacenter with redundant power, backup generators, UPS, climate control and security. This would have conservatively cost the city $120,000 in capital investment. The way local governments make IT investments and management will need to change dramatically. After pouring hundreds of thousands of dollars into in-house data centers, servers, software and infrastructure local governments may soon find that it’s time to start shutting them down. IT is shifting from being an asset local government owns to a service they purchase.

[^33]: In the hosted Office365 subscription service delivery model, Microsoft deploys and maintains both the hardware and software infrastructure in secure and redundant data centers, providing the city with an immediate disaster recovery plan for email messaging, collaboration, and communications.

[^34]: The IT Paradigm Change “The 21st century vision of computing for Local Governments”. We are at an inflection point – a true paradigm change – in the evolution of computing. The history of computing consists of a series of such shifts, from the era of the mainframe to the advent of the personal computer and now to mobile devices and netbooks and cloud computing and software as a service (SaaS). With the significant advances in information and communications technology over the last half century, there is an increasingly perceived vision that computing will one day be the 5th utility (after water, electricity, gas, and telephony). Computing is being transformed to a model consisting of services that are commoditized and delivered in a manner similar to traditional utilities such as water, electricity, gas, and telephony. In such a model, users access services based on their requirements without regard to where the services are hosted or how they are delivered. This means that local governments will no longer need to invest heavily or encounter difficulties in building and maintaining a complex IT infrastructure. To date the city has implemented this “Cloud First” strategy for the implementation of Office365 for Email/Collaboration Services, Parking Citation Management System, the upcoming Red Light Traffic Enforcement System and the implementation of host Voice over Internet Protocol Services (VoIP). All applications required no capital investment of city funds to purchase servers or storage and require minimal investment of IT staff resources.
**City of Albany Office of Information Technology (continued)**

**Future Efficiencies under Consideration**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Implement an Enterprise Resource Planning System(^{35})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2016-2017</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
<td>$2,000,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Partnered with Albany County on a grant for the procurement of a Document Management System and Conversion Project(^{36})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$95,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,095,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,010,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,010,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{35}\) The City of Albany’s $175 million annual operation is supported by many paper-based, labor intensive systems. ERP will mean using multi-module software applications to improve, standardize and automate a wide range of government operations including purchasing, finance, accounting, human resources, payment collections, inventory oversight, order tracking, resource planning, management control and operational control. Implementing ERP will integrate processes across functional departments and agencies and substantially reduce, if not eliminate, manual, paper-based systems.

\(^{36}\) The Document Management and Shared Document Conversion and Access Project will lead to the creation of electronic files that can be more easily organized and accessed, as well as provide increased preservation. In addition, the county and city will realize considerable savings in personnel time and supply costs if records are available in a digital, easily accessible format. The gained efficiency, security and cost savings will serve as a blueprint for future electronic records projects for other county and city departments and other municipalities.
# City of Albany Fire Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Uses Town of Bethlehem’s training facility 37</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchasing of equipment with 40 fire departments across the state including all paid fire departments in Albany county</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency &amp; Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Dive Team with State Police</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2000</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminated one command position and current Deputy Commanders assumed those responsibilities</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$148,000</td>
<td>$148,000</td>
<td>$148,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamline training of department paramedics so course is completed in 8 months rather than 13 months 38</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$34,610</td>
<td>$34,610</td>
<td>$34,610</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Regional Hazardous-Materials team which serves Albany, Schenectady, Saratoga and Rensselaer</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardization and joint purchasing of Confined Space Entry Equipment with Troy, Albany Police, State Police and OGS to allow equipment sharing</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Standardization and joint purchasing of equipment for water rescue units with Troy which allows for joint response</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchase of fire boat with Port of Albany to provide fire protection to the Port 39</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$39,600</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
<td>$36,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$222,210</strong></td>
<td><strong>$218,610</strong></td>
<td><strong>$218,610</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

37 It would cost an estimated $1 million for the City of Albany to build its own fire training facility rather than the $5,000 in annual rent it currently pays Bethlehem.

38 An average of five firefighters go through this training annually, the average salary plus a .4 benefit factor of a typical trainee is $83,062. The average monthly salary is $6,922 ($83,062/12 = $6,922) and multiplying it by the 5 months reduced training time ($6,922 x 5) equals $34,610 annual savings.

39 The boat cost $450,000 and that the Port paid for 80% of its cost using a Port Security Grant from the federal government; this saved the City $360,000 which if amortized over 10 years saves $39,600 annually ($360,000 plus 10% for amortization spread over 10 years).
### City of Albany Purchasing Office

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater use of: bulk purchasing for basic supplies; piggyback contracts for major purchases including use of NYS contracts and Onondaga and Albany County contracts; cooperative purchasing</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency &amp; Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
<td>$100,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$100,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Considering adoption of a local law authorizing “best value” purchasing⁴⁰</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>Late 2015</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

⁴⁰ Any savings through this law is included in the $100,000 annual savings estimate above.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>All repairs are contracted out and no longer done in-house</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share equipment with Albany County</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased new equipment for pothole repair; will significantly increase life of repair and decrease number of times repair must be made</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$5,000 - $8,000</td>
<td>$5,000 - $8,000</td>
<td>$5,000 - $8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$5,000 - $8,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,000 - $8,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$5,000 - $8,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Greater use of Albany County DPW body and repair shop for vehicle repair(^{41})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased sharing with surrounding municipalities of specialized services/equipment, i.e., sign shop, Durapatcher (hot mix pothole repair equipment), asphalt pavement crew, milling equipment(^{42})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased use of DGS employees, especially the landfill crew, to complete smaller construction projects for other municipalities and departments(^{43})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{41}\) Instead of paying a private contractor $3,000 to paint an Albany DPW vehicle, the city purchased the paint and had the vehicle painted at the Albany County Body Shop. Similar savings can be realized through greater use of the Albany County Body and Repair shop which needs to be negotiated.

\(^{42}\) These shared services will generate revenue for the City of Albany and save surrounding municipalities money; the city may realize savings through joint purchasing of some equipment.

\(^{43}\) The water department used DGS employees to do work that was previously done by private contractors at a $150,000 savings and helped clear the Normanskill landslide; greater use of this resource could generate revenue for the city and produce savings for surrounding local governments.
### City of Albany Community Development Agency

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Coordinate with Albany County the funding of homeless programs to insure there is no duplicate funding of the programs</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate joint program with Troy, Schenectady, Saratoga, and Amsterdam provide housing for homeless veterans</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
<td>Undetermined</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Albany County to do lead risk assessments in owner rehabilitation projects rather than using a private contractor(^4^)</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$18,750</td>
<td>$18,750</td>
<td>$18,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$18,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,750</strong></td>
<td><strong>$18,750</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^4^) Private contractors on average charge $750 per assessment – utilization of Albany County to conduct 25 assessments annually will result in an annual savings of $18,750.
## City of Albany Recreation Department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Plumeri Sports Complex fields for City residents during the summer (soccer and lacrosse camps are conducted at these fields)(^{45})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Department of Recreation provides lifeguards two days a week at the Myers Middle school so city residents can use the pool</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany School District allows the use of the Alternate Learning Center in Arbor Hill for the Arbor Hill Community Center and allows city residents to use its indoor pool (for a fee)</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany School District allows use of its facilities for the Albany LAX Club (a non-profit) with city support</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany Medical College provides medical students to teach a biweekly cooking class for youth at the Arbor Hill Community Center</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornell Cooperative Extension provides volunteers for both cooking &amp; gardening programs at community centers</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mater Christi park is on land owned by NYS and is used for city residents (pool, tennis courts and a playground)</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Albany City School District allows use of its facilities for a city run karate program</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Savings:**
NA
NA
NA

\(^{45}\) The complex cost $4.5 million to build and the College and Saint Rose and the city entered into a 30-year lease agreement for the land beginning in 2007. The City of Albany pays Saint Rose approximately $11,000 a year for their share of field maintenance costs.
## Village of Altamont Government Efficiency Plan

### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $281,856

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchasing of fuel with Town of Guilderland for village and town vehicles</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Guilderland and Albany County Sheriff perform police function from 11PM to 6AM</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ambulance and EMT services provided by Town of Guilderland</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares DPW equipment with Town of Guilderland and Village of Voorheesville</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Town of Guilderland Sign Shop for village signs and fuel facility for village vehicles</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Town of Guilderland Vehicle Repair and Body Shop for emergency repairs</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminated Village Assessor and replaced with Town of Guilderland providing assessment service</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Building Inspector with Village of Voorheesville⁴⁶</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$11,665</td>
<td>$11,665</td>
<td>$11,665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Purchase (with Towns of Guilderland, Knox and New Scotland and Village of Voorheesville) of Computer Diagnostic Tool for Village Vehicles⁴⁷</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Changed Workers Compensation insurance vendor⁴⁸</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$15,459</td>
<td>$15,459</td>
<td>$15,459</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁴⁶ The cost for the previous building inspector was $22,000 annually including benefits. The total maximum cost of a shared position is $10,335 annually.

⁴⁷ The cost of the diagnostic tool was $6,318 split by six participants. Altamont’s share was $1,053 paid in 2015. If Altamont purchased this tool on its own it would have spread the cost over five years because of the 2% property tax cap or $1,264 a year. Altamont also estimates it will save an average of $600 annually in repair bills.

⁴⁸ The NYS Insurance Fund charged $40,000 annually and the NYS Municipal Workers Compensation Alliance charges $24,541 annually.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reduce the publication of village newsletter from three to two</th>
<th>Operational Efficiency</th>
<th>2015</th>
<th>$1,200</th>
<th>$1,200</th>
<th>$1,200</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings post 2012 efficiencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$30,188</td>
<td>$30,188</td>
<td>$30,188</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
# Village of Altamont - Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanded joint purchasing for equipment and supplies for public safety and other functions including fire districts</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchasing of liability insurance, health insurance, and workers compensation insurance</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded use of shared equipment for public safety functions including fire districts</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of water supplies among all Albany County municipalities so there is a consolidated water system</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded sharing of other municipalities’ DPW equipment including access to a vacuum truck, tub grinder, aggregate crusher and screen</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of specialized DPW technical services including GIS and engineering services</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared fuel facility with surrounding municipalities</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared salt storage facility when village storage facility needs to be replaced</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement an Enterprise Resource Planning System with surrounding municipalities, possible countywide system</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Construction of a jointly operated training facility (a new fire tower)</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Savings**

| Total Estimated Savings | Work in Progress | Work in Progress | Work in Progress |

While the village intends to pursue all of these efficiencies, they are a work in progress and not at the stage where we can make reliable estimates of future savings. However, we can reliably estimate that we will implement enough of these actions to save between $3,000 and $15,000 annually (between 1% and 5% of the village’s 2014 property tax levy) starting in 2017.
# Town of Berne - Government Efficiency Plan

## 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $789,795

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Paramedic Program&lt;sup&gt;49&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
<td>$200,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Fueling&lt;sup&gt;50&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Snow Plowing Equipment&lt;sup&gt;51&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared accounting system with Albany County and Rensselaerville (Tyler Technologies - MUNIS)&lt;sup&gt;52&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Salt Shed&lt;sup&gt;53&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings post 2012 Efficiencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$160,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$160,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

<sup>49</sup> Savings generated is not added to the total as this shared service was implemented prior to 1/1/12.

<sup>50</sup> Savings generated is not added to the total as this shared service was implemented prior to 1/1/12.

<sup>51</sup> Sharing plowing equipment ensures that plow routes between the Town of Berne and Albany County do not overlap, resulting in efficiencies and savings.

<sup>52</sup> Use of a shared accounting system reduces product and training costs.

<sup>53</sup> Sharing a central salt storage location with Albany County reduces town staffing needs and capital costs.
# Town of Bethlehem Government Efficiency Plan

## 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $12,644,857

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merger of town Highway and Parks maintenance staffs, eliminating 5 FTE positions⁵⁴</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$410,680</td>
<td>$418,830</td>
<td>$427,142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implementation of Key Bank collection and processing of property taxes as well as water and sewer payments; eliminating 1 FTE⁵⁵</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012-13</td>
<td>$80,420</td>
<td>$82,024</td>
<td>$83,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School tax billing handled by schools; eliminating 1 FTE⁵⁶</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$90,773</td>
<td>$93,249</td>
<td>$95,793</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Privatization of Colonial Acres⁵⁷</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merger of Bethlehem Volunteer Ambulance and Delmar Volunteer Ambulance⁵⁸</td>
<td>Merger</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
<td>$250,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

⁵⁴ On May 23, 2012, the Bethlehem Board approved a resolution to promote cost-effective utilization of employee and physical resources and reduce organizational silos, redundant job functions and administration through a formal shared services agreement between the Parks and Recreation and Highway Departments. Accordingly, the Highway and Parks Departments' maintenance staffs were combined, eliminating the need for five (5) FTE's with an annual savings of $374,167 in 2012, growing annually with inflation in salaries and fringe benefits.

⁵⁵ In 2012 the town contracted with Key Bank to perform the collections of mailed water and sewer payments using compensating balances to fund the cost. Beginning June 2012, Key Bank began receiving, processing and transmitting data to the town, reliving the town of manual collection and processing. This allowed for a reduction of one FTE in the Tax Receivers Office. Once confident in the new arrangement, mailed school and property tax collections have been handled through the lockbox since January 2013.

⁵⁶ Bethlehem Central and Ravena-Coeymans-Selkirk school districts began collecting their own taxes in 2014, and the Guilderland Central School District is expected to do so in 2015. The school districts' consolidation of collections through BOCES simplifies their collections and saves the districts money; it has allowed the town to further reduce staffing by another 1.0 FTE in FY 2015 (only one position is dedicated to tax receiving in FY 2015).

⁵⁷ Beginning in 2013, the town divested itself of responsibility for operating the Colonial Acres golf course (located on public land). The town worked with the PGA to locate a professional to operate and maintain the course so that residents would not lose access to a valuable recreation and open space asset. This course, which was acquired in August 2007, was running with costs exceeding revenues by approximately $40,000 annually. In addition, the license agreement with the operator requires payments to the town of 2% of revenues which are estimated to be approximately $1,000 annually.

⁵⁸ In 2012, the town's two volunteer ambulance services — Bethlehem Volunteer Ambulance and Delmar Volunteer Ambulance — were combined, with full functional consolidation achieved by the end of 2012 and legal consolidation in 2013. During 2013, the town also cancelled service from a for-profit provider in a smaller portion of the town, and merged the three previously separate ambulance districts. Savings are already occurring from these efficiencies and are growing over time. The consolidated ambulance/EMS service has worked internally and with Albany County ALS/Paramedic services to enhance billing procedures and results. Savings resulting from these efficiencies are growing substantially as the new unified provider implements and obtains consolidation efficiencies and town tax levy support is reduced.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Elimination of 11 FTE positions through attrition(^{59})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1,207,238</td>
<td>$1,231,383</td>
<td>$1,256,011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduce Planning Board from 7 to 5 members(^{60})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$14,756</td>
<td>$15,051</td>
<td>$15,352</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$2,094,868</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,131,536</strong></td>
<td><strong>$2,168,957</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{59}\) Major attrition savings were achieved in 2012 by not filling 11 positions vacated between September and December 2012. These ongoing savings are in addition to and not inclusive of the initiatives described above, and are generally based on de-enriched staffing, but in some cases service cutbacks (e.g., reduced days the transfer station is open). These positions have not been refilled.

\(^{60}\) Reduction in number of members serving on Planning Board from 7 to 5 members under local law passed in June of 2013; savings of $6,800 in first year, roughly doubling thereafter, with savings growing in subsequent years due to inflation in salaries and fringe benefit costs.
## Town of Bethlehem - Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch consolidation with surrounding communities (discussed with ACSO and Guilderland); need state financial assistance for CAD/RMS software (barrier to consolidation)</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consideration of Joint purchasing of liability insurance, health insurance, and workers compensation insurance</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Implement an Enterprise Resource Planning System with surrounding municipalities, possible countywide system</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the town intends to pursue all of these efficiencies, they are a work in progress and are not at the stage where we can make a reliable estimate of future savings. If we receive the necessary State assistance especially relating to joint dispatch and a shared Enterprise Resource Planning System significant savings will be achieved.
## Town of Coeymans Government Efficiency Plan

### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $1,845,593

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint operation of sewer plant with Village of Ravena</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share DPW equipment and employees with Village of Ravena</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase water from Village of Ravena to avoid constructing our own water system</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased jet-vacuum to clean sewers and street sweeper which are shared with Town of Coeymans</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Replaced a 1 ½ FTE bookkeeping positions with a part-time position and a contract</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
<td>$49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hired new police chief who is a retired state trooper; reduce overtime in police department</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
<td>$80,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Merge their dispatch service with the Albany County Sheriff starting in June 2015</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$180,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
<td>$300,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated 1½ FTE clerk positions in the building department and assessor’s office into 1 full-time position</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings post 2012 efficiencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$324,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$444,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$444,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

61 In 2012 the salary for the full-time position was $97,000; in 2015 the total cost for the part-time position and contract is $48,000 for a $49,000 annual recurring savings.

62 The new chief’s salary is $48,000 less than the former Chief’s salary and benefits. Since the new chief gets his health care from his retirement and there is no pension cost; in addition the new chief will reduce overtime costs by $32,000 in 2015. The lower 2015 base cost of overtime will reoccur in 2017 through 2019. This is a conservative savings estimate as the town’s 2015 police department budget is $90,000 less than 2014’s expenditures for the police department.

63 Their expenditures for dispatch were $300,000 in 2014. For the next three years (2015-2017) they will pay Albany County $120,000 for the salaries of their two full-time dispatchers who merged with the county and after that they will have no dispatch costs.

64 The total cost of the eliminated part-time clerk position was $15,000 annually.
### Town of Coeymans - Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchasing of insurances including general liability, health and workers compensation</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchasing of commodities with Albany County</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the town intends to pursue all of these efficiencies, they are a work in progress and are not at the stage where we can make a reliable estimate of future savings.
City of Cohoes Government Efficiency Plan

2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $6,908,365

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Revenue generated from sale of water (with Green Island and/or any other municipal entities)</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>$42,000 (revenue)</td>
<td>$45,000 (revenue)</td>
<td>$48,000 (revenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reimbursements from school district for Solid Waste Collection</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2008</td>
<td>$36,400</td>
<td>$37,500</td>
<td>$38,650</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Animal Control Services with Green Island and Troy</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,000 (revenue)</td>
<td>$1,000 (revenue)</td>
<td>$1,000 (revenue)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goods and Services procured through (Fire) joint purchasing consortium</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared basin maintenance services with Watervliet</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Dispatching through Albany County</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$325,000</td>
<td>$350,000</td>
<td>$400,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced FTEs (Police)</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012 - current</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
<td>$84,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced FTEs (Fire)</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012 - current</td>
<td>$152,000</td>
<td>$152,000</td>
<td>$152,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced FTEs (DPW)</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012 - current</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
<td>$75,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$636,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$661,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$686,000</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post 2012 efficiencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

65 Revenue generated is not added to total as this shared service was implemented in 1999.
66 Savings generated is not added to total as this shared service was implemented in 2008.
67 Revenue generated is not added to total as this shared service was implemented in 2010.
68 Savings generated is not added to total as this operational efficiency/shared service was implemented in 2010.
69 Savings generated is not added to total as this shared service was implemented in 2010.
70 Savings are a function of 7 FTEs that were eliminated, a reduction in OT, less payment to Albany County.
71 2 FTEs reduced.
72 4 FTEs reduced.
73 3 FTEs reduced.
# Town of Colonie Government Efficiency Plan

## 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $25,638,546

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminated vendor supplied yard leaf and brush waste collection and</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
<td>$500,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>assigned responsibility to existing highway staff</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire Services/Building Department consolidation resulting in position</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$303,006</td>
<td>$303,006</td>
<td>$303,006</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eliminations and other efficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfill Operation Agreement, personal service savings</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$1,889,713</td>
<td>$1,889,713</td>
<td>$1,889,713</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Youth Bureau/Parks Department Consolidation resulting in position</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$587,703</td>
<td>$587,703</td>
<td>$587,703</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eliminations and other efficiencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated Facilities Department into Department of Public Works</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$69,600</td>
<td>$69,600</td>
<td>$69,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Consolidated the Office of Emergency Management into the EMS</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$134,165</td>
<td>$134,165</td>
<td>$134,165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>eliminating one FTE position</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Savings**: $3,484,187

---

74 Third party vendor contract was $575,000 annually, offset by $75,000 of additional equipment costs by providing the service with existing Town of Colonie personnel.
75 Eliminated 4 FTE salaries and related employee benefit costs.
76 Eliminated 20 FTE, OT and related employee benefit costs.
77 Eliminated 12 FTE and related employee benefit costs. Also experienced a reduction in certain operating costs for the department.
78 Eliminated 1 FTE and related employee benefit costs.
79 Eliminated 1 FTE and related employee benefit costs in addition to other operating costs of the department.
### Town of Colonie - Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Consolidation of Police/EMS communications systems with Albany County and City of Albany&lt;sup&gt;80&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Cooperative Purchasing Agreement&lt;sup&gt;81&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$145,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$145,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$145,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>80</sup> Maintenance costs will be shared with Albany County.

<sup>81</sup> Reduction in operating costs associated with current Town of Colonie procurement processes.
### Village of Colonie Government Efficiency Plan

#### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $1,459,294

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Dental Insurance through a new insurer&lt;sup&gt;82&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>04/01/2014</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Workers Compensation Insurance through a new insurer&lt;sup&gt;83&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>06/01/2014</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of retiree health insurance through a new insurer&lt;sup&gt;84&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>01/01/2015</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$25,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$25,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>82</sup> Previously purchased through BCBS; now purchased through Guardian.

<sup>83</sup> Previously purchased through Workers Compensation Alliance; now purchased through PERMA.

<sup>84</sup> Previously purchased though MVP; now purchased through CDPHP.
Village of Green Island - Government Efficiency Plan

2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $1,942,675

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Police Dispatch Agreement with Albany County Sheriff’s Office&lt;sup&gt;85&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$28,819</td>
<td>$25,377</td>
<td>$103,371</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Workforce Reduction&lt;sup&gt;86&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$61,800</td>
<td>$61,800</td>
<td>$61,800</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$90,619</strong></td>
<td><strong>$87,177</strong></td>
<td><strong>$165,171</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>85</sup> General operations, workforce and capital reductions are anticipated from this agreement.

<sup>86</sup> Savings generated from cost reductions related to the following positions: Administrative Clerk, Utility Billing Clerk, Deputy Treasurer, DPW Commissioner, Building Inspector, FT Attorney schedule reduction to PT Attorney status.
Village of Green Island

The Village of Green Island implemented extensive shared or cooperative services and operational efficiencies before 2012 (which because of their earlier adoption do not qualify for inclusion in the GEP)

1. **Public Safety**- Outsourced dispatcher services to Albany County at an average annual savings of over $33,000 for the first 6 years. After the sixth year, the net savings will be over $100,000 annually.

2. **Code Enforcement**- Shared Code Enforcement and Building Inspection with Albany County which allows us more cost effective staff and experience to deal with code enforcement issues. Eliminated one ¾ position in Code Enforcement Office and we now share one job with the Assessor and Director of Recreation.

3. **Storm Sewer**- Created the Stormwater Coalition of Albany County with 12 other Albany County municipal government entities and the University at Albany to manage our mandated MS4 Stormwater SPDES permits together resulting in savings to every participating member.

4. **Albany County Sewer District**- Green Island is one of 8 member communities that formed one of the first real shared cooperative efforts and a great example of local governments working together for a common solution to a big problem. Planning for this project started in 1966, creation of the District happened in 1968 and implementation and operation began in 1974. The staff of 75 employees treats an average of 45.5 million gallons of wastewater daily from the 8 communities.

5. **Sewer**- Six (6) “Albany Pool” communities joined together to create a $6 million Long Term Control Plan (LTCP) for Combined Sewer Overflow’s (CSO) in the Hudson River to meet the Federal Clean Water Act mandates. The six communities recently signed a $136 Million Order on Consent with the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation (DEC).

6. **Sewer**- The same six communities together are in the process of creating a Local Development Corporation (LDC) to administer projects together under the DEC Order on Consent to meet mandates of the Clean Water Act. The project will be administered by the Capital District Regional Planning Commission (CDRPC) with oversight by the Local Development Corporation formed and made up of Board members from each participating community.

7. **Public Safety**- Shared purchase of a ladder truck with the City of Watervliet for firefighting. This ladder truck, housed in the City of Watervliet, responds to all fire calls in the Village of Green Island. This will allow us to retire our own ladder truck at the end of its useful life (2015) and replace it with a less expensive and more useful pumper vehicle.

8. **Public Safety**- Municipal Service Agreement (MSA) and Certificate of Need (CON) with the City of Watervliet for providing municipal ambulance service to the Village of Green Island at no cost to the Village.
9. **Public Safety**—Automatic first response to and from Watervliet and Cohoes for any structure fire call to any of the municipalities. All three communities automatically respond with firefighters and equipment to any report of a structure fire in any of the three communities.

10. **DPW**—Cooperation with the Albany County Sewer District (ACSD) for catch basin cleaning in the Village and MSA for lab work for mandated outfall sampling and testing as per SPDES permits. The ACSD also maintains and cleans our CSO regulating systems on a regular basis as per contract.

11. **Emergency Management**—Worked cooperatively with the Albany County Sheriff Office and Albany County Department of Health to develop and train all employees for emergencies for mandated (by Presidential Directive) compliance with National Incident Management Service (NIMS) through the Department of Homeland Security and for mass immunization Point of Dispensing (POD) potential.

12. **DPW**—MSA as member of Solid Waste Management Plan and Capital Region Solid Waste Management Partnership with the DEC and City of Albany for solid waste & recycling. Also, shared arrangement with City of Watervliet for recycling pickup.

13. **DPW**—Participant community in County of Albany Shared Highway Services Study which was completed in 2014.

14. **DPW**—Street Sweeping arrangement with City of Cohoes for periodic services where they send staff and equipment to sweep our streets on a scheduled basis and have also been available for emergency calls as well.

**Reduction of Work Force**

1. Village Office administration went from 11.5 to 8.5 FTE employees over four years.

2. PD dispatchers went from 4.2 to .5 FTE and Officers remained the same FTE but are now all PT without Health Insurance benefits.

3. DPW went from 6 to 4.8 FTE of regular employees (now share two employees with Water Department).

4. The PT school crossing guard was eliminated by attrition and on duty police officers now assist near the school at drop off and pick up times. This has saved just over $10,000 in salary and benefits annually.

5. The above reductions save a net $395,657 annually for all Green Island municipal entities and $61,800 for the general fund alone and was accomplished in part by the automation or upgrade of administration service functions to include payroll, real property tax collection, utility billing, fixed asset inventory and the finance/accounting system.
## Town of Guilderland Government Efficiency Plan

### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $11,042,142

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchasing of fuel with Village of Altamont for village and town vehicles</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Altamont uses town fueling facility</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Perform police function for Village of Altamont from 11 PM to 6AM</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provide Ambulance and EMT services to Village of Altamont</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared salt shed with Village of Altamont</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares DPW equipment with Village of Altamont and other towns</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sign Shop produces signs for New Scotland, Altamont and Voorheesville[^87]</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Altamont uses Guilderland Vehicle Repair and Body Shop for emergency repairs</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town provides assessment service for Village of Altamont</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Provides Knox with 24 hours per day and 7 days per week advanced life support system to respond to medical emergencies</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Water interconnections with Bethlehem, Voorheesville, and City of Albany</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stop paying the Medicare Part B premiums for all new town retirees and cap payment for current town retirees at the 2007 expense</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

[^87]: The Village of Voorheesville started using this service in 2014. This produces revenue for the town and savings for the municipalities that use this service rather than using a private contractor.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Terminated private contract and use town employees and equipment to haul sewer sludge to ANSWERS plan 88</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Purchase (with Town of Knox and Villages of Altamont and Voorheesville) of Computer Diagnostic Tool for Village Vehicles 89</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$2,464</td>
<td>$2,464</td>
<td>$2,464</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Switched workers compensation insurance carrier from State Insurance Fund to Public Employer Risk Management Association 90</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
<td>$150,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminated the Director of Parks Administration position and replaced with an Administrative Assistant position and shifting some work to a another current employee 91</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$45,840</td>
<td>$45,840</td>
<td>$45,840</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminated Town Planner position and replaced with a consultant 92</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$52,023</td>
<td>$52,023</td>
<td>$52,023</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

88 This is the difference between the cost of the private contract and the cost of using town employees and equipment to do the same work.
89 Cost of diagnostic tool was $6,318 split by six participants, Guilderland's share was $2,106 paid in 2015. If Guilderland purchased this tool on its own it would have spread the cost over five years because of the 2% property tax cap or $1,264 a year. Guilderland also estimates it will save an average of $1,200 annually in repair bills.
90 The State Insurance Fund estimated total premium for the town for 2015 was $720,000, the cost of the PERMA premium was $570,000; this base premium savings will reoccur in 2017 through 2019.
91 The salary of the Director position was $89,895, the salary of the Administrative Assistant is $37,055, and the increased salary of the Public Relations officer salary to assume part of the Director's work was $7,000. The benefits cost factor for each position is 40% of salary which we do not include in these savings figures as the reduced benefit costs will more than offset future salary increases for the new position.
92 The salary for the Town Planner position was $82,023, the cost of the consultant is $30,000. The benefits cost factor the Town Planner position is 40% of salary which we do not include in these savings figures as the reduced benefit costs will more than offset future increases for the consultant contract.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminated the Building and Zoning Inspector position and replaced with a Building Inspector position and increased responsibilities for the Chief Building Inspector position</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$21,977</td>
<td>$21,977</td>
<td>$21,977</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminated the Building Maintenance Supervisor position</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$42,752</td>
<td>$42,752</td>
<td>$42,752</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$365,056</strong></td>
<td><strong>$365,056</strong></td>
<td><strong>$365,056</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

93 The salary for the Building and Zoning Inspector was $67,054, the salary for the new Building Inspector position is $50,077 and the increased salary for the Chief Building Inspector is $5,000. The benefits cost factor for each position is 40% of salary which we do not include in these savings figures as the reduced benefit costs will more than offset future salary increases for the new position.

94 The salary for the Building Maintenance Supervisor position was $37,502 plus a 40% benefit factor.
## Town of Guilderland - Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Expanded joint purchasing of DPW equipment and supplies; possibly purchase an asphalt paver with Town of Bethlehem</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of water supplies among Albany County municipalities; discussing this with Town of New Scotland and Town of Rotterdam</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint construction of a new water tower with the Town of New Scotland</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchasing of liability insurance, health insurance, and workers compensation insurance</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchase of new equipment for sign shop to allow other municipalities to use this resource</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded sharing of town vehicle and repair shop as resources allow</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dispatch consolidation with surrounding communities (in discussions with Bethlehem); need state financial assistance to accomplish</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016-17</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
<td><strong>Work in Progress</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the town intends to pursue all of these efficiencies, they are a work in progress and are not at the stage where we can make a reliable estimate of future savings. However, we can estimate that we will implement enough of these efficiencies to save at least $110,000 annually in 2017 through 2019 (about one percent of our 2014 real property tax levy).
## Town of Knox Government Efficiency Plan

### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $260,925

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Contracts with Town of Guilderland to provide 24 hours/7 days advanced life support system to respond to medical emergencies</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operate joint youth programing with Berne and Westerlo</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share various highway services and equipment with Albany County, Berne, Westerlo and the Town of Wright (Scholarie County)</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared salt shed with Albany County</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Purchase (with Guilderland, Altamont and Voorheesville) of Computer Diagnostic Tool for Vehicles&lt;sup&gt;95&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converted data collection position (Assessment) from salaried to a waged position&lt;sup&gt;96&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
<td>$2,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$4,364</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,364</strong></td>
<td><strong>$4,364</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>95</sup> Cost of diagnostic tool was $6,318 split by six participants, Knox's share was $1,053 paid in 2015. If Knox purchased this tool on its own it would have spread the cost over five years because of the 2% property tax cap or $1,264 a year. Knox also estimates that it will save an average of $600 annually in repair bills.

<sup>96</sup> The town paid $4,000 a year for the part-time position based on current and projected use they will spend at most $1,500 annually for the hourly employee.
## Town of Knox Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of specialized DPW technical services</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of a paver, excavator, and guiderail equipment with neighboring municipalities including Guilderland, Berne, Rensselaerville and Westerlo</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colocation of material stockpiles at Albany County facility in Knox</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchasing of insurances including general liability, health and workers compensation</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the town intends to pursue all of these efficiencies, they are not at the stage where we can make a reliable estimate of future savings. In addition, it is possible that these efficiencies will be implemented before 2019.
# Village of Menands Government Efficiency Plan

## 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $2,137,437

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Increase all village employees except DPW employees share of health</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2006</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>insurance from 0% to 15%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share fuel with Albany County and use county refueling facility at</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>$1,700</td>
<td>$1,800</td>
<td>$1,900</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>county water treatment plant for village vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plow School District parking lots in return for village use of their</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>auditorium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plow Library District parking lot in return for village use of parking</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>lot during snow emergencies</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Fire inspector with Town of Colonie</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use New York State contact to purchase all road resurfacing work(^{97})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
<td>$15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increase DPW employees share of health insurance from 12.5% to 15%(^{98})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$2,134</td>
<td>$2,348</td>
<td>$2,583</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Workers Compensation insurance costs by changing vendor from</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$29,432</td>
<td>$29,432</td>
<td>$29,432</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>State Insurance Fund to PERMA(^{99})</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Savings post 2012 Efficiencies**

|                        | $31,566 | $31,780 | $32,015 |

\(^{97}\) The village spends an average of $150,000 annually on road repair and use of the State contract saves 10% from the cost Menands could receive on its own. This savings is excluded from the village’s savings total because the efficiency was instituted prior to 2012.

\(^{98}\) The total village payment for DPW health insurance, not including employee contributions, was $64,156 in the 2015 village fiscal year (ending May 31, 2015). The village’s cost for DPW employee health insurance would have been 2.5% more without the increase in employee contributions instituted in the 2012 village fiscal year or $65,760. This saved the village $1,764 in the 2015 fiscal year. We estimate the village DPW health insurance costs will increase an average of 10% a year from 2016 to 2019 and that the 2015 savings will escalate at the same rate from 2016 to 2019.

\(^{99}\) The State Insurance Fund estimated premium for FY 2014 was $160,803 and the premium paid to the Public Employer Risk Management Association in FY 2014 was $131,371, or a base year savings of $29,432 which will reoccur through FY 2019.
### Village of Menands - Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchasing of liability insurance, health insurance, and workers compensation insurance</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded sharing of other municipalities’ DPW equipment including access to pipe bucket trucks, TV equipment, mini-excavator and asphalt rollers</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cooperative agreement with a nearby locality to share DPW manpower to complete mid-sized special projects that cannot be completed due to year round staff size and currently must be contracted out to a private company</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared salt and sand storage facility when village storage facility needs to be replaced</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased all employees health insurance contribution to 17% in 2017, 19% in 2018, and 20% in 2020(^{100})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$12,615</td>
<td>$27,753</td>
<td>$38,161</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$12,615</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,753</strong></td>
<td><strong>$38,161</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the village intends to pursue all of these efficiencies, they are a work in progress and are not at the stage where we can make a reliable estimate of future savings for each of them except for the increased employee contribution for health insurance which is subject to negotiation with bargaining units.

\(^{100}\) The village's total fiscal year 2015 expenditure for health insurance was $521,288 not including employee contributions. We estimate village health insurance expenditures will increase at a 10% annual rate or a total expenditure of $573,417 in FY 2016, $630,758 in FY 2017, $693,834 in FY 2018, and $763,217 in FY 2019. The savings estimate was derived by multiplying the estimated health insurance expenditure for FY 2017 by 2%, the estimated health insurance expenditure for FY 2018 by 4% and the estimated health insurance expenditure for FY 2019 by 5%.
# Town of New Scotland Government Efficiency Plan

## 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $2,546,703

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Merged the Town of New Scotland and Village of Voorheesville courts</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
<td>$3,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Streamlined coverage for town retiree Medicare Advantage Plan leading to</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$77,000</td>
<td>$86,200</td>
<td>$90,810</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>a reduced premium</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Stormwater Manager from FT to PT</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$4,000</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>$4,410</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converted from a fee for service contract for engineering services to a</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$4,950</td>
<td>$4,950</td>
<td>$4,950</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>master service agreement reducing fee from $200 an hour to $155 an hour</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Purchase (with Guilderland, Knox, Altamont and Voorheesville)</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diagnostic Tool for Village Vehicles</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$91,564</strong></td>
<td><strong>$100,964</strong></td>
<td><strong>$105,784</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

101 The town avoided a $150,000 cost to build an addition to Town Hall for a new court that was required under an OCA audit regarding the need for security upgrades. Instead they pay Albany County $12,000 annually for space for the newly merged court. The cost of the renovation would have been spread over 10 years or $15,750 (estimated 5% interest) a year for a $3,750 annual savings in 2017 through 2019.

102 Switching Medicare eligible retirees, who had been on regular full-price plans, to a new Medicare Advantage plan in 2013 resulted in a 1st year savings of $80,440. In 2013 the town paid $272,625, instead of $353,064, a savings of $80,440. This savings recurs in 2017, 2018, and 2019. The savings will increase over the years as retirees reach Medicare eligibility. Medicare eligible spouses of active employees have also elected to join the Medicare Advantage plan thereby reducing the cost of this “family” coverage.

103 The former annual cost Stormwater Management was $4,500 and engineering services were $15,000, on average. The new part-time salary is $2,500 and engineering is $12,000, on average. With in-depth training the new part-time position has taken on the inspection of Stormwater systems, thereby reducing the engineering costs for conducting same and is more efficient.

104 The town estimates it will be billed for an average of 110 hours of engineering services in 2017 through 2019. This would have cost $22,000 in a fee for service plan and will now cost $17,050 under the master plan agreement.

105 Cost of diagnostic tool was $6,318 split by six participants, New Scotland's share was $1,053 paid in 2015. If New Scotland purchased this tool on its own it would have spread the cost over five years because of the 2% property tax cap or $1,264 a year. New Scotland also estimates will save an average of $600 annually in repair bills.
## Village of Ravenna Government Efficiency Plan

### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $806,635

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint operation of Sewer plant with Town of Coeymans</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Albany County contract to purchase road salt</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared salt shed, equipment and employees with Ravenna-Coeymans-Selkirk (RCS)Central School District</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share DPW equipment and employees with Town of Coeymans</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sell water to the Towns of Coeymans and New Baltimore generating $166,000 in revenue annually</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Purchased jet-vacuum to clean sewers and street sweeper which are shared with Town of Coeymans</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Allow RCS school district, the Head Start program, and the non-profit Ravenna-Coeymans Historical Society to rent space in the village hall at below market rents</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Used village employees instead of private contractor to repair village water plant(^6)</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
<td>$50,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings post 2012 efficiencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$50,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$50,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^6\) The village received an estimate of $1 million for a private contractor to do the repairs needed at the water plant; the cost to do the same repairs with village employees was $500,000 and we spread the savings over a 10 year period as the cost of the private contractor would have been spread over ten years.
# Town of Rensselaerville Government Efficiency Plan

## 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $1,269,626

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Shared MUNIS accounting system with Albany County and Town of Berne</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share senior bus with Town of Westerlo(^{107})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seniors and their families help reduce “Senior Bus” operating costs through private donations</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share various highway services and equipment with Towns of Westerlo, Knox, and New Scotland and Town of Broome in Schoharie County(^{108})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
<td>$8,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Albany County provides tree trimming services</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>No Significant Savings</td>
<td>No Significant Savings</td>
<td>No Significant Savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Animal Control Officer with Town of Berne</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>No Significant Savings</td>
<td>No Significant Savings</td>
<td>No Significant Savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Water Treatment Officer with Town of Westerlo (^{109})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>No Significant Savings</td>
<td>No Significant Savings</td>
<td>No Significant Savings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Code Enforcement Officer with Town of Greenville (Greene County)(^{109})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
<td>$3,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

\(^{107}\) Westerlo pays $5,000 a year to the town to help cover the expenses of bus operation and maintenance but these savings are not included in the chart as the efficiency was instituted prior to 2012.

\(^{108}\) The town saved $3,600 in 2012, $7,100 in 2013, and $13,100 in 2014 from shared highway services and equipment or an average savings of $7,933 a year which we conservatively project to be $8,000 a year in 2017, 2018, and 2019.

\(^{109}\) The town saves an average of $3,200 a year by sharing training and mileage costs.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Converted traditional health insurance plan for employees to a high deductible plan</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$78,600</td>
<td>$78,600</td>
<td>$78,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Decreased future retired employee health insurance coverage from unlimited to 10 years and increased years of service to qualify from 10 years to 15 years of service</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>Significant Future savings after 2019</td>
<td>Significant Future savings after 2019</td>
<td>Significant Future savings after 2019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Savings post 2012 actions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$89,800</td>
<td>$89,800</td>
<td>$89,800</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

110 The town's health insurance premium for its original plan was to be $160,258 in 2013 and its total cost under the new plan in 2013 was $81,632; these base savings will recur in 2017 through 2019.
### Village of Voorheesville Government Efficiency Plan

#### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $287,730

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint construction of Water Supply Interconnection with Town of New Scotland for use in emergencies only</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2005</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminate Village Court by Merging with Town of New Scotland Court(^{111})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,250</td>
<td>$7,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shares DPW equipment with Town of New Scotland, Town of Guilderland and Village of Altamont(^{112})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Building Inspector with Village of Altamont(^{113})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,300</td>
<td>$3,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint Purchase (with Towns of Guilderland and Knox and Village of Altamont) of Computer Diagnostic Tool for Village Vehicles(^{114})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
<td>$1,864</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use of Town New Scotland and Guilderland repair shop for vehicle maintenance and repair instead of private contractor(^{115})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,100</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{111}\) Reflects reduced personnel and operational costs adjusted for normal salary increases.

\(^{112}\) Reflects estimated the average annual savings from the cost of renting the equipment from a private vendor.

\(^{113}\) Reflects reduced benefit costs as Altamont pays part of those costs; estimated 10% increase each year as that has been the average benefit cost increase over the last several years.

\(^{114}\) Cost of diagnostic tool was $6318 split by six participants, Voorheesville's share was $1,053 paid in 2015. If Voorheesville purchased this tool on its own it would have spread the cost over five years because of the 2% property tax cap or $1,264 a year. Voorheesville also estimates it will save an average of $600 annually in repair bills.

\(^{115}\) Reflects the estimated average annual savings from obtaining this service from a private vendor plus a 10% average annual increase.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Use of Town of New Scotland transfer station for village hazardous waste recycling(^\text{116})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$4,200</td>
<td>$4,400</td>
<td>$4,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Use Town of Guilderland sign shop for street signs(^\text{117})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$160</td>
<td>$160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$19,224</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,074</strong></td>
<td><strong>$20,924</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^\text{116}\) Reflects the estimated cost of holding hazardous waste recycling day at village facilities (based on actual 2013 costs) which was $5,000 plus the average increase in the annual cost ($200) minus the $800 in village personnel costs for assisting the town in staffing the service.

\(^\text{117}\) Reflects the difference between the cost of sign from a private vendor ($160) and the town ($80); estimating replacement of two signs annually.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchasing of liability insurance, health insurance, and workers compensation insurance</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded joint purchasing for equipment and supplies for public safety and other functions including fire districts</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded use of shared equipment for public safety functions including fire districts</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of water supplies among all Albany County municipalities so there is a consolidated water system</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sharing of specialized DPW technical services including GIS and engineering services</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share salt storage facility with New York State, so village does not have to repair its storage facility which would have to be done in 2017(^{118})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded sharing of other municipalities’ DPW equipment including access to a mini excavator and skid steer attachments</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2016</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colocation of material stockpile storage and fuel storage and dispensing</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2020</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
<td>$7,200</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the village intends to pursue all of these efficiencies, they are a work in progress and not at the stage where we can make a reliable estimate of future savings for each of them other than the avoided cost of repairing the village salt shed. However, we can estimate that we will implement enough of these efficiencies to save at least $2,800 annually in 2017 through 2019 which is about one percent of our 2014 real property tax levy. In addition to the avoided cost of building a new salt shed this would increase our overall savings to $10,000 annually for future efficiencies.

\(^{118}\) Reflects the estimated cost of repairing the village salt shed in 2017 ($19,800 plus a 10% amortization factor) which would have to be amortized over three years to comply with the tax cap.
## City of Watervliet Government Efficiency Plan

### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $3,994,266

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Purchase of Ladder Truck with Green Island(^{119})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2009</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
<td>$6,700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared Ambulance Services with Green Island(^{120})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shared basin maintenance services with Cohoes(^{121})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2010</td>
<td>$1,545</td>
<td>$1,591</td>
<td>$1,637</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint dispatching through Albany County(^{122})</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$219,261</td>
<td>$225,838</td>
<td>$232,613</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings Post 2012 Efficiencies</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$219,261</td>
<td>$225,838</td>
<td>$232,613</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{119}\) Green Island and Watervliet share a $67,000 ladder truck that Green Island paid for. The useful life of the ladder truck is 10 years. The principal avoided by Watervliet is $6,700 annually. Savings not added to total as this shared service was implemented in 2009.

\(^{120}\) This arrangement between Watervliet and the Village of Green Island generates revenue for Watervliet. Savings not added to total as this shared service was implemented in 2010.

\(^{121}\) Savings not added to total as this shared service was implemented in 2010.

\(^{122}\) Savings from the elimination of three fulltime dispatchers and OT paid to patrolmen to perform dispatch services on Saturdays and Sundays.
## Town of Westerlo Government Efficiency Plan

### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $1,236,559

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Share various highway/garbage services and equipment with Towns of Berne, Knox, Coeymans, New Scotland, and Rensselaerville as well as Durham in Greene County</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occasional use of Albany County Engineering staff</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share senior bus with Town of Rensselaerville</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2011</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Share Water Treatment Officer with Town of Rensselaerville who replaced private contractor</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elections administered by County instead of Town</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduction in liability insurance premium by changing vendors</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminated one Dog Control Officer position</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$2,856</td>
<td>$2,856</td>
<td>$2,856</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced one Building inspector position</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$8,330</td>
<td>$8,330</td>
<td>$8,330</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminated all part-time Park positions</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
<td>$12,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---

123 All savings estimates for Westerlo (footnotes 123 to 132) were derived by actual reductions from the town’s 2012 adopted budget to 2015 adopted budget. Contract for LVDV was $33,102 in 2012 and the total cost of Water Control Officer in 2015 is $26,000.

124 Elections administered by county instead of town: $2,000 reduction in contractual appropriation (from $8,000 to $6,000).

125 Reduction in liability insurance: $10,000 reduction from FY 2012 appropriation of $50,000 to $40,000.

126 Dog Control Officer: reduction of $2,856; the FY 2012 appropriation was $11,200 now $8,344.

127 Reduced one Building inspector position: $8,330 reduction in personal services; the FY 2012 appropriation was $22,000 now $13,770.

128 Eliminated all part-time Park positions; eliminated FY 2012 $12,000 appropriation for temporary help for parks.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Eliminated Summer Youth Program</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eliminated Planning Board Secretary</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
<td>$4,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Converted traditional health insurance plan for employees to a high deductible plan</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$23,694</td>
<td>$23,694</td>
<td>$23,694</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Increased employee share of health insurance premiums from 0% to 10% for all new hires on or after July 1, 2013</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$3,772</td>
<td>$4,750</td>
<td>$4,750</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$76,152</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,130</strong></td>
<td><strong>$77,130</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

129 Eliminated Summer Youth Program; $2,000 overall reduction ($1,000 reduction from both the FY 2012 personal services and contractual services appropriations).
130 Eliminated Planning Board Secretary; $4,500 overall reduction from FY 2012 appropriation.
131 $23,694 reduction from FY 2012 appropriation for Hospital/Medical insurance premiums.
132 Employee cost of family plan is $2,794 annually and employee cost of an individual plan is $978 annually, two current employees paid for health insurance one family, one single; expect one retirement by 2018 (family plan) to be replaced by a new single employee.
## Town of Westerlo - Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Colocation of highway facility with Albany County</td>
<td>Shared Service &amp; Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colocation of fuel dispensing and storage with surrounding towns and/or Albany County</td>
<td>Shared Service &amp; Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2019</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchase of Gradall machine</td>
<td>Shared service</td>
<td>2018</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Joint purchasing of insurances including general liability, health and workers compensation</td>
<td>Shared Service &amp; Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2017</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
<td>Work in Progress</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

While the town intends to pursue all of these efficiencies, they are a work in progress and are not at the stage where we can make reliable estimates of future savings; however, we can reliably estimate that we will implement enough of these actions to save a minimum of $8,700 annually beginning in 2017 (1% of the town’s own 2014 property tax levy not including special districts).
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
<th>Total Estimated Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiencies (Utility Savings)</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement of Software through BOCES</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$7,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Change of Staffing Model to Reduce Benefit Costs</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General Liability Insurance</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$6,000</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$41,000</td>
<td>$98,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Bethlehem Public Library - Government Efficiency Plan

### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $3,674,851

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Health Insurance premiums by moving from NYSHIP to CDPHP(^{137})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiencies (Roof, Windows)(^{138})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>Pre 2012</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>NA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Efficiencies(^{139})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012–2014</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
<td>$125,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$125,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$125,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$125,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{137}\) Savings generated is not added to total as this shared service was implemented prior to 1/1/12.

\(^{138}\) Savings generated is not added to total as this shared service was implemented prior to 1/1/12.

\(^{139}\) Elimination of Assistant Director, Librarian III reclassified as Libraries II, new FT Librarians (as of 7/1/15) hired will be on a lower salary schedule than librarians hired on or before (6/30/15).
Guilderland Public Library - Government Efficiency Plan

2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $3,437,467

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Processing</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>08/01/2013</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Reductions through Attrition</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>07/01/2014</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
<td>$70,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance Savings (insurance and broker changes)</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>12/01/2014</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
<td>$13,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>02/01/2015</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
<td>$500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Savings Related to Postage and Printing</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>03/01/2015</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
<td>$19,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiencies (utility savings)</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>03/31/2015</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
<td>$30,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$136,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$136,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$136,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

140 Changed providers to obtain a better rate.
141 Several positions are vacant and others have been filled at entry level wages.
142 Renewed coverage one month early to lock in previous rates.
143 Changed recycling contractors to obtain more favorable rates.
144 Reduced number of mailings per year from 12 to 4.
145 Changed providers to secure better rates, secured a free energy audit from National Grid and converted lights to L.E.D. Additional conversions are planned.
# Menands Public Library - Government Efficiency Plan

## 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $126,483

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Processing 146</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
<td>$400</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Procurement Efficiencies 147</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounting Services 148</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
<td>$600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

146 Decreased cost resulting from change of vendors from ADP to Paychex.
147 Decreased expenditures for books and supplies.
148 Decreased cost of accounting services resulting from insourcing of the service.
## Ravena-Coeymans-Selkirk (RCS) Community Library - Government Efficiency Plan

### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $538,108

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
<th>Estimated Savings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Printing Center Efficiencies(^{149})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staffing Efficiencies(^{150})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
<td>$3,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reduced Cost of Liability Insurance(^{151})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Insourcing of Payroll Processing(^{152})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
<td>$2,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Automation Consultant(^{153})</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
<td>$1,200</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$8,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,200</strong></td>
<td><strong>$8,200</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{149}\) Reduced equipment generated savings related to supplies (less toner purchased) and reduced maintenance costs.

\(^{150}\) PT Library Clerk position is anticipated to remain as a vacancy.

\(^{151}\) Change of vendor from Hartford to Utica resulted in savings.

\(^{152}\) Payroll processing was previously provided through ADP and now the task is completed by existing staff.

\(^{153}\) Consultants previously provided IT support services which are now provided by existing staff.
### Voorheesville Public Library - Government Efficiency Plan

**2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $1,112,675**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Copying Center Efficiencies&lt;sup&gt;154&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2013</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Energy Efficiencies&lt;sup&gt;155&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Health Insurance Modifications to Premium Share and Copayments&lt;sup&gt;156&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
<td>$5,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Telephone Savings&lt;sup&gt;157&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
<td>$1,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payroll Processing (changed providers)&lt;sup&gt;158&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
<td>$1,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Total Estimated Savings**                                               |                    |                  | $10,000                 | $10,000                 | $10,000                 |

---

<sup>154</sup> Change of vendor has resulted in decreased costs (Centurion to Toshiba).

<sup>155</sup> New roof has decreased utility costs.

<sup>156</sup> Premium growth has decreased and implementation of $5 increase in copayments for healthcare maintenance services and prescriptions has decreased costs.

<sup>157</sup> Change of vendor has resulted in decreased costs (Verizon to TWC).

<sup>158</sup> Change of vendor has resulted in decreased costs (ADP to Paychex).
Berne Fire District - Government Efficiency Plan

2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $348,159

Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of a jointly operated training facility (a new fire tower)</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Elsmere Fire District - Government Efficiency Plan

### 2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $846,105

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Modified LOSAP funding by changing from &quot;defined benefit&quot; to &quot;defined contribution&quot;</td>
<td>Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2014</td>
<td>$27,335</td>
<td>$27,335</td>
<td>$27,335</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$27,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,335</strong></td>
<td><strong>$27,335</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

159 $27,335 represents the initial budget decrease from this modification; LOSAP is the Length of Service Awards program.
Guilderland Center Fire District - Government Efficiency Plan

2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $570,872

Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of a jointly operated training facility (a new fire tower)</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Estimated Savings</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Westmere Fire District - Government Efficiency Plan

2014 Real Property Tax Levy: $1,044,350

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Date Established</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Group purchasing of fire apparatus, equipment testing, repair and certifications</td>
<td>Shared Service / Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2012</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
<td>$6,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Group purchasing of natural gas and electricity (through BOCES)</td>
<td>Shared Service / Operational Efficiency</td>
<td>2015</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
<td>$3,500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Future Efficiencies under Consideration

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Program</th>
<th>Type of Efficiency</th>
<th>Possible Start Date</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2017</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2018</th>
<th>Estimated Savings 2019</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Construction of a jointly operated training facility (a new fire tower)</td>
<td>Shared Service</td>
<td>2017-2019</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
<td>$10,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total Estimated Savings</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$10,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

160 This represents the average annual savings the fire district receives from group purchasing.
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1. Executive Summary

CURRENT CONDITIONS

Communities in the nine county study area are facing significant changes to the way solid waste is managed. These changes pose significant challenges to the communities, but they also are an opportunity to bring significant improvements in recycling, organics recovery, efficiency and cost savings. **We project that a coordinated regional recycling program could triple the volume of materials currently recovered in the study area.**

During the period of time it takes to develop new facilities, all the existing local public disposal facilities that are currently operating will either close or be privatized. A failure to act soon will mean that communities in the study area will drift into a "default" situation where recycling initiatives are limited and disjointed, and the types and locations of any new facilities will be left predominantly to the private market decisions based on the cheapest means of waste disposal. In their review of the preliminary draft of this report [see Appendix D], the State Department of Environmental Conservation [DEC] noted:

"Privatization of existing facilities will likely compromise existing recyclables collection programs by driving solid waste management to the least expensive alternative, leaving less profitable aspects of solid waste management to whither."

The City of Albany landfill is under a State order to close. Although the 2010 Capital Region Solid Waste Management Plan estimated that the facility would reach its final capacity in 2016, updated estimates by the City's engineer currently project that with the eastern expansion its useful life will go through 2020. In any case, the DEC has been very clear that it will not permit continued operation beyond the eastern expansion. Currently, the Albany landfill accepts significant volumes of waste from communities outside the City. The impending closure of that landfill will have implications throughout the nine county study area and beyond.

The Town of Colonie landfill, also a regional facility, will be undergoing significant changes in the near future. On July 28, 2011 the Town Board approved an agreement to privatize operation and management of the Town-owned landfill. Although initial information from the Town for this report indicated that the landfill would reach capacity in 14-16 years, the 25 year agreement with the private company Waste Connections anticipates that applications will be made to DEC to develop new disposal capacity at the site and possibly increase the daily volume of incoming waste. When the details of these future expansion plans are determined, a revised estimate of the useful life of the facility can be made. That will also make it possible to evaluate the impact of the Colonie landfill as a merchant facility on the City of Albany landfill.

Later this year, the waste-to-energy facility in Hudson Falls will go from public ownership and control to private ownership and control. This facility ownership transition will also result in changes to solid waste management in the study area.
Although all the details of their future operations are not currently available, both the Colonie landfill and the Hudson Falls waste-to-energy facility will operate at some level as merchant facilities. That means that, except for the disposal price control mechanisms included in Colonie's contract with Waste Connections relative to waste generated in the town, market conditions for waste disposal will largely influence the prices charged and therefore the locations from which waste is delivered to those facilities. It is possible that one or both of these facilities could take part or all of the volume of waste currently going to the Albany landfill. However, it is also possible that any available capacity at those two facilities [beyond the capacity used for contractually committed waste such as that generated in the Town of Colonie] will be used by communities outside the study area if the facilities could obtain a higher tip fee for that waste. In that case, communities in the study area would be faced with the cost and risk of transporting waste outside the region. In any case, there are likely to be significant implications for communities in the region.

Saratoga County has recently been notified by the DEC that they must prepare a new local solid waste management plan [LSWMP] and comprehensive recycling analysis [CRA] aimed at improving recycling, advancing sustainability, and becoming consistent with the State plan "Beyond Waste". In the notice DEC pointed out that the LSWMP and CRA are prerequisites for solid waste management facility permits and that, without a LSWMP in place certain grant funding may be adversely affected. DEC also notified the county that disposal facilities that receive waste from Saratoga County may be required to stop accepting waste from Saratoga County until an acceptable CRA is approved.

The DEC's requirements to maintain updated LSWMP's and/or CRA's can have far reaching consequences for any community that receives such a notice, which would effectively force a locality to come into compliance or risk a complete shut-down of their solid waste management system. The short and long term impacts throughout the region may be significant. This was underscored by the DEC in their review of the preliminary draft of this report:

"The Department is moving to a higher level of enforcement of Local Solid Waste Management Plans (LSWMP). Therefore, adherence to the terms and conditions within those plans will force smaller communities to expend greater resources to upgrade plans as well as develop their solid waste programs to maintain strict compliance with the local plans. The statewide plan has laid the groundwork for this path. The possible loss of grant funding and inability to permit solid waste management facilities may result if these communities are unable to update their plans or develop their programs in compliance with the statewide plan."

**FINDINGS**

Unless steps are taken to create a regional solid waste authority, the basic forces of supply and demand will continue to greatly influence what communities in the nine county study area pay for solid waste disposal in the future. Today, some communities are benefiting from the very low prices currently available at private landfills in New York as well as outside the State. However, one cannot depend on that condition remaining
the same for the future. The depletion and/or privatization of existing disposal facilities in the nine county study area, plus the rising price of fuel, will make long distance transport of waste significantly more expensive in the future.

The privatization of both the Hudson Falls and Colonie facilities brings into sharper focus the potential for monopolistic pricing by dominant haulers. The formation of a regional authority could be an important step to insure stable prices and progress on recycling, reduction and organics recovery.

A number of solid waste management authorities in other areas have established a track record of financially independent, cost effective and successful operations. Structural problems at other authorities have resulted in situations that can and should be avoided or overcome by statutory and contractual provisions that can be established at the outset by a consensus of local communities. Notably, well run solid waste authorities:

- Are achieving the highest recycling rates in the State;
- Six have developed materials recovery facilities;
- Six have developed long-term local disposal facilities;
- Eight of the twelve active solid waste authorities operate as financially independent entities receiving no subsidy payments from the sponsoring municipalities; and
- Provide predictable and stable solid waste management costs.

In the nine county study area there is a population of over one million people generating over 2 million tons of waste each year which is managed by a combination of private interests, 10 public planning units, and three solid waste management authorities. Currently, based on tonnage data reported to the DEC, 74% of the waste generated in the study area is taken to local public facilities. There is an adequate volume of waste generated in the study area to support the development of facilities as part of a comprehensive, coordinated system.
KEY FINDINGS

The creation of a new regional authority is feasible from a cost and operational perspective.

There can be significant benefits to creating a new regional solid waste management authority to serve the communities in the study area including:

- Cost savings from combining services, eliminating overlap and duplication, and developing facilities that can capture an economy of scale:
  - Potential savings from economies of scale could be in the range of $10.8 to $15.84 million per year.
- Significantly increasing recycling through a consistent region wide information and management program.
- Consolidation of services, pooling of resources, streamlining governance.
- Consolidation of up to 10 LSWMP's saving time, staff and money.
- Protection against market risks for disposal and transportation.
- Protection against environmental liability.
- Establishment of predictable and reliable long term disposal.

Despite these benefits, there have been concerns raised that can present hurdles to advancing a regional waste authority including:

- The perception of a "bail out" for the City of Albany.
- The fear that an authority will build a waste-to-energy facility.
- The general fear that a regional waste management facility will be proposed in their community.
- The general distrust of public authorities.

RECOMMENDATIONS

In light of the significant benefits, it is recommended that the communities comprising the study area join now to create a new regional solid waste management authority, and that actions to satisfy their concerns be taken at the outset.

One mechanism to accomplish this could be to develop an inter-municipal agreement to allow communities to opt in as part of an authority formation team and to continue building a consensus on key issues.

In their review of the preliminary draft of this report, the DEC stated:

"Provided adequate assurances are included to assuage concerns regarding general mistrust of the motives behind an authority, the establishment and implementation of an authority is feasible. We support the recommendation that an inter-municipal agreement be established amongst Capital District municipalities to help build consensus prior to the establishment of the Authority."
IMPLEMENTATION CONSIDERATIONS

The local communities can go a long way to address concerns and to insure the success of the authority by:

- building a strong region-wide consensus;
- promoting transparency;
- prioritizing projects;
- involving local governments; and
- carefully structuring the authority to meet local needs.

The local communities maintain great flexibility in how an authority can be set up, including:

- representation and structure of the governing board;
- methods of oversight and reporting; and
- the nature and extent of the authority's powers, duties and responsibilities.

NEXT STEPS

In the short term, four steps can be taken to further foster the development of a new regional authority.

- The actions delineated below can be undertaken within the framework of an inter-municipal agreement developed by and for communities interested in working together to cost effectively improve their solid waste management and recycling programs.

- The study area communities could seek a grant to complete an in depth analysis of the specific cost savings on an individual planning unit basis achieved by the creation of an authority. Such a study could also include a model of future disposal capacity needs based on information from Waste Connections regarding their expansion plans, if possible, or based on a range of possibilities for future expansion at the Colonie landfill. It could also be helpful to include a legal analysis of how a franchise system for collection services might be authorized under state and local laws.

- Programs such as a coordinated regional household hazardous waste program, and possibly a facility, will establish and enhance communication and cooperation and should demonstrate costs savings for those who participate.

- A similar but much more extensive sharing of services could be achieved by evaluating the consolidation of waste and recyclables collection services. More efficient collection routes could be explored and the environmental benefits and savings could be documented for bringing oversight and administration under a single entity. Private hauling companies could continue to provide curbside collection services, but they would compete for publicly awarded contracts that would be granted to whichever companies
provide the most cost effective collection services in designated collection zones. In their review of the preliminary draft of this report, the DEC noted:

"Under "Next Steps" the proposal to contractually control private company collection routes/practices is particularly attractive. Cost savings could be realized but more importantly environmental benefits such as reduction of carbon emissions could be significant. We strongly support this idea."

Finally, if an agreement among all or some of the counties in the study area to create a new regional solid waste management authority cannot be reached, it would still be feasible and advantageous for Albany County to pursue a new one county authority. Most of the benefits described herein would remain, albeit on a somewhat reduced scale.
2. Introduction

2.1 Study Area Definition

For the purpose of this study, the Albany region [the study area] is defined as Albany County plus up to eight surrounding counties as listed below and as shown on the map in Figure 1.

- Albany County
- Columbia County
- Greene County
- Montgomery County
- Rensselaer County
- Saratoga County
- Schenectady County
- Schoharie County
- Washington County

2.2 Background

The study area is a region of 5,442 square miles with a population of over 1 million and characterized by a mix of urban centers, suburban communities and rural residential/agricultural areas. Over 2 million tons of all categories of waste are generated each year. Based on tonnage data submitted to the DEC, three local public facilities currently function as the primary disposal facilities:

- The City of Albany Landfill
- The Town of Colonie Landfill
- Warren & Washington Counties Resource Recovery Facility

Albany County and a number of its neighboring communities regularly explore the potential for sharing services as a means to eliminate duplication and save money. A number of regional initiatives have resulted from these efforts including the Capital District Regional Planning Commission, the Capital District Transportation Authority, the Capital District Transportation Committee, the U.S. Department of Homeland Security Urban Area Working Group, the Albany Airport Authority, and the Capital District Youth Center, Inc.

The idea for this study came from Albany County Executive Michael Breslin's advocacy for shared services and exploration of how regional initiatives can improve public services. Conversations with neighboring communities led to letters of support for the Department of State Shared Services grant proposal from:

- Capital District Regional Planning Commission
- County of Rensselaer
- County of Schoharie
Eastern Rensselaer County Solid Waste Management Authority
- City of Albany
- City of Cohoes
- City of Watervliet
- Town of Berne
- Town of Bethlehem
- Town of Clifton Park
- Town of Schodack
- Town of Grafton
- Town of New Scotland
- Town of Poestenkill
- Town of Rensselaerville
- Town of Rotterdam
- Town of Schaghticoke
- Village of Allamont
- Village of Green Island
- Village of Menands
- Village of Ravena
- Village of Voorheesville

Barton & Loguidice and Gerhardt were retained to identify waste volumes being generated in the region, evaluate current solid waste management practices, identify technologies that may be available to process the region’s waste, describe the process to develop facilities using one or more of those technologies, identify the benefits there may be to creating an authority to develop a solid waste management system, and describe the steps necessary to create such an authority.

2.3 Impending “Milestones”

As the Albany County Executive and leaders in neighboring communities considered the solid waste management issues it became apparent that several very important milestones will be reached in the next few years in the Albany region and that decisions will have to be made which will impact solid waste management for the next several decades.

Although the 2010 Capital Region Solid Waste Management Plan estimated that the Albany City Landfill Facility would reach its final capacity in 2016, an updated estimate by the City’s consulting engineer currently projects that with the eastern expansion the useful life of the landfill will go through 2020. In any case, the DEC has been very clear that it will not permit continued operation beyond the eastern expansion. This facility currently provides essential disposal service for approximately 94,000 people in the City of Albany plus numerous communities in the region. It is estimated that 73% of the waste accepted at the City landfill is generated outside the City, including significant volumes from outside Albany County. The impending closure of this facility will
necessitate the City and all the other communities currently relying on the City landfill to seek other disposal options, likely outside the area. This underscores both the significance and the regional nature of the impacts that will be created by the closure of the City landfill.

The Town of Colonie approved an agreement with Waste Connections to operate and manage the Town-owned landfill. Although initial estimates provided by the Town for this report estimated that the landfill would reach the end of its useful life in 14 - 16 years, the privatization agreement anticipates that applications will be made to the DEC for the development of an expansion that will provide additional disposal capacity. It is also anticipated that Waste Connections will seek approval to increase the daily volumes taken at the landfill. When the details of these future expansion plans are determined, a revised estimate of the useful life of the facility can be made. That will also make it possible to evaluate the impact of the Colonie landfill as a merchant facility on the City of Albany landfill.

Later this year, the waste-to-energy facility in Hudson Falls will go from public ownership and control to private ownership and control. This facility ownership transition will also result in changes to solid waste management in the study area.

Although all the details of their future operations are not currently available, both the Colonie landfill and the Hudson Falls waste-to-energy facility will operate at some level as merchant facilities. That means that, except for the disposal price control mechanisms included in Colonie's contract with Waste Connections relative to waste generated in the town, market conditions for waste disposal will largely influence the prices charged and therefore the locations from which waste is delivered to those facilities. It is possible that one or both of these facilities could take part or all of the volume of waste currently going to the Albany landfill. However, it is also possible that any available capacity at those two facilities [beyond the capacity used for contractually committed waste such as that generated in the Town of Colonie] will be used by communities outside the study area if the facilities could obtain a higher tip fee for that waste. In that case, communities in the study area would be faced with the cost and risk of transporting waste outside the region. In any case, there are likely to be significant implications for communities in the region.

Public accounts of the 25-year privatization agreement indicate that the Town of Colonie will receive $23 million in an up-front payment, $2.3 million per year for the first 5 years, $1.1 million per year for the next 20 years, $19.8 million for closure [and $21 million in an insurance policy], and $2-$10.8 million for backing a landfill expansion.

The waste-to-energy facility in Hudson Falls, initially sponsored by Warren and Washington Counties, will be conveyed to the private operator later in 2011 and the counties will have to determine if they will continue to utilize that facility or send their waste to another facility, likely outside the region.
The agreement among the Montgomery-Otsego-Schoharie Solid Waste Authority [MOSA] and the sponsoring counties expires in 2014. The member Counties are actively evaluating their options and Otsego County has petitioned the State legislature to amend the enabling statute to allow Otsego County to withdraw from the authority. Whether or not the authority remains in place, there are no local disposal or recycling facilities and the authority and/or counties must regularly secure capacity through competitive bids.

In 1998 Saratoga County was granted the permits to develop a landfill to serve the County. The landfill was constructed but has not yet been utilized. The County is holding the facility as an "insurance policy" and will decide when and if to use it in the future. Currently, they have no plans to open the facility. However, in correspondence dated March 3, 2011 the DEC has notified the County that they must prepare a new LSWMP and improve their solid waste management and recycling strategies to help ensure that landfill facilities that receive their waste can continue to do so in the future.

Similar to Saratoga County, all the planning units in the study area are facing a requirement to submit updated or new LSWMP's in the next 1-2 years. This presents an opportunity to consolidate solid waste planning efforts.

The impending closure of the Albany landfill, the private take-over of the Hudson Falls waste-to-energy facility and the private operation and management of the Town of Colonie landfill will have to be considered by the study area communities in evaluating their long-term arrangements for disposal. The success of waste reduction and recycling efforts, the ultimate capacity of the Colonie landfill, and Saratoga County's decision regarding possible future use of its landfill will all influence the timing and need for additional local disposal capacity.

If the volume of waste currently taken to the City of Albany landfill is taken outside the area to private facilities, that will increase the demand on those disposal facilities, consume landfill capacity, reduce the available supply of disposal capacity and ultimately increase the cost of disposal. Even allowing for the development of new disposal capacity, which appears to be on the horizon with the privatization of the Colonie landfill, without local public facilities all the communities in the region will be subject to the volatility that goes with the private market. There may be times, like the current condition, when communities can benefit from an economic recession and low disposal prices. However, there will also be times when prices increase and in that case communities will have no option but to pay whatever the market demands. Based on experience in other areas, the absence of any local public facilities can lead to one or two large waste companies dominating collection and disposal to such an extent that small haulers are driven out and prices to homeowners and businesses increase.
If no action is taken to develop a local public system, local communities will be particularly vulnerable to price increases driven by increases in fuel costs and other market conditions largely outside local public control. Transporting waste hundreds of miles in trucks that get 4-5 miles per gallon can become very expensive when fuel costs increase rapidly as has been the case in 2011.

In light of these future developments and consistent with the desire to look at opportunities for consolidation and improved operations, Albany County applied for a shared services grant through the Department of State to explore the feasibility of creating a regional solid waste authority. The County invited neighboring counties and planning units to participate in the study without obligation or a financial contribution at this time.

2.4 Other Local Plans

Over the past several decades there have been several initiatives calling for the creation of a regional entity to address solid waste management issues. In 1989 a study prepared by the State Environmental Facilities Corporation, "Capital District Integrated Solid Waste Management System" made a finding:

"In order to effectively plan and implement the counties' long and short term response to their solid waste problems, state legislation establishing a solid waste management authority is recommended."

A 1992 Local Solid Waste management Plan for the greater Albany area anticipated that in the future the planning unit would operate as an authority. Twice State legislation was introduced to create such an authority but it was never enacted.

In 2010, the Capital Region Solid Waste Partnership Planning Unit [comprised of 3 cities, 8 towns, and 3 villages within this study area] completed a Plan which concluded that implementation of a regional solid waste management authority would:

"...meet all of the objectives associated with the goal of continued provision of reliable and reasonably priced solid waste management facilities and services.... would be able to provide for new infrastructure and programs such as expanded mandatory recycling and SSOW [source separated organic waste] composting facility... would also provide a more effective administrative structure than currently exists to facilitate the implementation of new facilities and programs...would also meet all of the objectives associated with the goal of minimizing the amount of solid waste requiring land disposal in the future..."

As is described in Sections 5 and Appendix A, there is a substantial track record for solid waste authorities in the State which provides a road map for success, as well as a guideline for pitfalls to be avoided. In looking at the
experience over the past 25-30 years, it is apparent that properly structured, well-run solid waste management authorities have reduced the costs, streamlined operations and administration, spearheaded controversial but necessary facilities, increased transparency, and increased recycling. This occurs for several reasons. An authority that represents multiple communities can capture "economies of scale" - the more solid waste that is treated, the lower the cost per ton. Treatment facilities can be fully and more efficiently utilized, and contractors will sometimes offer better prices for larger amounts of waste.

This also occurs because a solid waste management authority usually replaces several local municipalities or organizations which are managing solid waste, and fewer staff is needed. There are currently 10 planning units within the study area:

Capital Region Solid Waste Management Partnership
Town of Colonie
Columbia County
Eastern Rensselaer County Solid Waste Management Authority
Greene County
Montgomery-Otsego-Schoharie Solid Waste Authority
Saratoga County
Schenectady County
City of Troy
Washington County

If the participating counties and planning units decide to move forward with this initiative, the disposition of each planning unit and each pre-existing authority would have to be resolved. However, if there was an agreement by the individual counties, authorities, and planning units, then this initiative could create one new authority which could replace three existing authorities. It could also serve as the planning unit for the nine counties in the region, or it could coordinate facilities and programs for any existing planning units that may be left in place.

2.5 The New York State Solid Waste Management Plan

In December 2010 the State Department of Environmental Conservation adopted the State Solid Waste Management Plan "Beyond Waste". The State Plan is self described as a vision for transforming waste management into materials management and a series of goals which local planning units will be required to use as a guide in developing their local plans. Although the State Plan is neither a law nor a regulation, the State's Part 360 Regulations require an approved local solid waste management plan [LSWMP] as a condition for facility permits and some State grants.
The State Plan attempts to shift the focus away from "end of pipe" solutions to "upstream" approaches that will actually reduce the volume of waste that is created. It relies heavily on the concept of extended producer responsibility or product stewardship which would shift part of the burden and cost for disposal from local governments to manufacturers. The State Plan also advocates heavily for the separation and recovery of organics, principally food waste, for recovery through composting or digestion. The State also calls on local governments to achieve significant improvements in recycling. In their review of the preliminary draft of this report DEC made a direct reference to the importance of the State Plan and the ability of local communities to meet their goals [for full text, see Appendix D]:

"The Department is moving to a higher level of enforcement of Local Solid Waste Management Plans [LSWMP]. Therefore, adherence to the terms and conditions within those plans will force smaller communities to expend greater resources to upgrade plans as well as develop their solid waste programs to maintain strict compliance with the local plans...... Without an Authority, it will not be economically feasible for communities to begin to implement the ideas put forth in the Statewide Plan, Beyond Waste...."

The creation of a new regional authority could provide a real advantage to achieving the State's goals by being able to aggregate large quantities of organic waste and therefore garner the benefit from a facility that could capture an economy of scale. Coordinated public information programs for organics and traditional recyclables could also significantly improve recovery rates.

A regional approach would be consistent with the State's goals as set forth in the State Plan and the Solid Waste Management Act of 1988. The Act of 1988 established a procedure for the creation of planning units and specifically encouraged regional cooperation as the best means to implement the solid waste management hierarchy of reduction, recycling, energy recovery, and landfill disposal. "Beyond Waste" reinforces the Act of 1988 noting:

"The implementation of solid waste management programs in New York State has historically been the responsibility of local government...municipalities may acquire land for waste management and disposal facilities; construct solid waste management facilities; provide...collection services; conduct facility siting studies;... operate or contract for the operation of facilities; ensure compliance and reporting; enact flow control ordinances; and educate the public...The Act also encouraged local governments to join together to form solid waste management planning units and create LSWMP's to guide their programs and ensure alignment with the state's solid waste management hierarchy".
2.6 Steering Committee and Meetings

The preparation of this study has been guided by a steering committee comprised of representatives of the local governments and planning units in the study area. The committee reviewed the grant proposal and the RFP for professional services as well as the submissions by prospective consulting firms. They reviewed all the data compiled by the consultant, identified current practices and conditions that impact the study, and suggested options for consideration. They reviewed a preliminary draft of this report prior to its public release. The committee members and meeting dates are noted below.

Steering Committee

Michael Breslin – Albany County
Michael Franchini – Albany County
Willard Bruce – City of Albany
Frank Zeoli – City of Albany
Paula Mahan – Town of Colonie
Matthew McGarry – Town of Colonie
David Robinson – Columbia County
Jolene Race – Columbia County
Matthew Curley – ERCSWMA
Dan Frank – Greene County
Gary Harvey – Greene County
R.J. VanValkenburg – Greene County
Doug Greene – Montgomery County
Shayne Walters – Montgomery County
Dennis Heaton – MOSA
John Thayer – MOSA and Montgomery County
Linda von der Heide – Rensselaer County
Jeff Edwards – Schenectady County
Carl Olsen – City of Schenectady
Jeri Murray – Schoharie County
Robert Banks – Washington County

Steering Committee Meetings
August 18, 2010
September 30, 2010
March 23, 2011

The study process was also designed to offer meetings with solid waste management officials from each county or planning unit, identified as stakeholders. Three local communities requested such meetings which were held with a representative of Albany County and the consultants as indicated below.

Stakeholder Meetings
December 7, 2010 City of Albany and Town of Colonie
March 30, 2011 Schenectady County
3. Current Conditions and Practices

3.1 Waste Quantities and Characteristics

The nine county study area spans approximately 5,442 square miles and has a population of over one million and is characterized by a diverse mix of urban centers, the State capital and all the associated government offices, suburban residential and commercial development, and extensive rural-agricultural lands.

In order to estimate the volume and character of waste generated in the study area data from the United States Environmental Protection Agency (EPA), DEC State Solid Waste Management Plan, and planning units in the State were examined. In consideration of all this data, we believe that the per capita estimate used for the March 2010 Capital Region Solid Waste Management Plan is a sound means for this study at this stage, and it was therefore used to develop the estimates in Table 1 below. A closer examination of waste quantities and characteristics may be needed if the regional initiative moves forward with the actual development of facilities.

In order to address the State's priority on the organic components of municipal solid waste, an estimate of the volume of organics in the waste stream and the potential for recovery was made and is shown in Table 2.

In looking at the critical measure of how waste and recyclables are currently handled in the study area, based on tonnage data reported to the DEC it has been determined that 74% of the MSW generated in the region is disposed of in the region at three facilities; The City of Albany landfill, the Town of Colonie landfill, and the Hudson Falls waste-to-energy facility. The remaining 26% is exported outside the region. For construction and demolition debris, the tonnage data reported to the DEC indicates that 44% is disposed at in-region facilities, and 56% is exported. As noted in the introduction, this dynamic will change significantly in the future. Appendix B provides an inventory of major solid waste and recycling facilities in the study area.

Waste destined for disposal both in and out of the region is handled through a combination of public and private transfer stations. For MSW and C&D, the tonnage data reported to the DEC reveals that 42% is handled at publicly owned stations with 58% handled at private facilities.

For both MSW and recyclables, solid waste planning unit profiles compiled by the DEC show that 32% of the study area population is served by a public collection program, with 68% using private subscription service.

The diversion (recycling and composting) and disposal data reported to the DEC by each planning unit involved in the study was compiled. Table 3 below summarizes the diversion and disposal quantities from each planning unit and the resulting diversion rate calculation. The average diversion rate across
the area was calculated at approximately 17%. As many planning units do not have access to data from the private sector, particularly the quantity of recyclables marketed directly to markets by the generator, these numbers typically underestimate the quantity of diverted materials. Nonetheless, this data provides a snapshot of the current diversion of materials from the waste stream. Also included in the table for comparative purposes, is the quantity of material requiring diversion in order to meet the maximum overall diversion rate of 65% percent utilized in Table 1.
### Table 1 - Estimated Annual Waste Generation\(^1\) by County (Tons/Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Pop.(^2)</th>
<th>Residential MSW @ 3.60 lb/per./da</th>
<th>Non Residential MSW @ 1.80 lbs/per./da</th>
<th>C&amp;D Waste @ 4.00 lbs/per./da</th>
<th>Non Hazardous Industrial Waste @ 1.15 lbs/per./da</th>
<th>Total Tons/Year</th>
<th>Estimated Recycled/Reduced Material(^3) @ 65%</th>
<th>Waste Stream for Disposal Tons/Year</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany County</td>
<td>304,204</td>
<td>199,862</td>
<td>99,931</td>
<td>222,069</td>
<td>63,845</td>
<td>585,707</td>
<td>380,709</td>
<td>204,997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia County</td>
<td>63,096</td>
<td>41,454</td>
<td>20,727</td>
<td>46,060</td>
<td>13,242</td>
<td>121,483</td>
<td>78,964</td>
<td>42,519</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene County</td>
<td>49,221</td>
<td>32,338</td>
<td>16,169</td>
<td>35,931</td>
<td>10,330</td>
<td>94,769</td>
<td>61,600</td>
<td>33,169</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery Coun</td>
<td>50,219</td>
<td>32,994</td>
<td>16,497</td>
<td>36,660</td>
<td>10,540</td>
<td>96,690</td>
<td>62,849</td>
<td>33,842</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer County</td>
<td>159,429</td>
<td>104,745</td>
<td>52,372</td>
<td>116,383</td>
<td>33,460</td>
<td>306,961</td>
<td>199,524</td>
<td>107,436</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga County</td>
<td>219,607</td>
<td>144,282</td>
<td>72,141</td>
<td>160,313</td>
<td>46,090</td>
<td>422,826</td>
<td>274,837</td>
<td>147,989</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoharie County</td>
<td>32,749</td>
<td>21,516</td>
<td>10,758</td>
<td>23,907</td>
<td>6,873</td>
<td>63,054</td>
<td>40,985</td>
<td>22,069</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington Coun</td>
<td>63,216</td>
<td>41,533</td>
<td>20,766</td>
<td>46,148</td>
<td>13,267</td>
<td>121,715</td>
<td>79,114</td>
<td>42,600</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,096,468</strong></td>
<td><strong>720,379</strong></td>
<td><strong>360,190</strong></td>
<td><strong>800,422</strong></td>
<td><strong>230,121</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,111,112</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,372,223</strong></td>
<td><strong>738,889</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

2. Population based on U.S. Census Bureau 2010 census population data for New York State counties.
3. Recycled/Reduced Material includes source separated organic waste and recyclables at a 75-80% recovery rate for each waste stream. The estimated recovery rate for each type of waste (food waste, yard waste, paper, plastic, metal, etc.) was multiplied by the estimated percentage of each material in the waste stream to develop the 65% weighted average recovery rate. For the entire 9-county region, the breakdown of diverted waste is approx. 200,000 tons per year of organic waste (see separate table) and approx. 1,171,000 tons per year of dry recyclable materials (roughly a 15/85 split).
Table 2 - Estimated Annual Organics Waste Generation by County (Tons/Year)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population¹</th>
<th>Total MSW @ 5.40 lbs/person</th>
<th>Organics @ 25% ²</th>
<th>Recovered Organics @ 75% of Total Organics³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany County</td>
<td>304,204</td>
<td>299,793</td>
<td>74,948</td>
<td>56,211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia County</td>
<td>63,096</td>
<td>62,181</td>
<td>15,545</td>
<td>11,659</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene County</td>
<td>49,221</td>
<td>48,507</td>
<td>12,127</td>
<td>9,095</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>50,219</td>
<td>49,491</td>
<td>12,373</td>
<td>9,280</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer County</td>
<td>159,429</td>
<td>152,190</td>
<td>38,047</td>
<td>28,536</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga County</td>
<td>219,607</td>
<td>216,423</td>
<td>54,106</td>
<td>40,579</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady County</td>
<td>154,727</td>
<td>152,483</td>
<td>38,121</td>
<td>28,591</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoharie County</td>
<td>32,749</td>
<td>32,274</td>
<td>8,069</td>
<td>6,051</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>63,216</td>
<td>62,299</td>
<td>15,575</td>
<td>11,681</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,096,468</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,075,642</strong></td>
<td><strong>268,910</strong></td>
<td><strong>201,683</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Population based on U.S. Census Bureau 2010 census population data for New York State counties.
2. Percent organics as reported in NYSDEC draft report *Beyond Waste*.
3. Assumes highest achievable recovery rate of organic materials from the waste stream is 75%.
Table 3 - Regional Recycling Percentage by Planning Unit

Note: Many planning units do not have access to data from the private sector, particularly the tons of recyclable materials marketed directly to end-use markets by the generating source, hence the tons of recyclables shown in this table for each planning unit may underestimate the tons of materials actually recycled.

Data taken from 2009 Planning Unit Annual Reports

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Planning Unit</th>
<th>Recycled Materials (^{1,2}) (tons)</th>
<th>Disposed Materials (tons)</th>
<th>Percentage Recycled</th>
<th>Tons Recycled at Maximum</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Troy</td>
<td>4,049.80</td>
<td>22,725.15</td>
<td>15.13%</td>
<td>17,403.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene County</td>
<td>2,273.70</td>
<td>18,574.46</td>
<td>10.91%</td>
<td>13,551.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOS SWMA (^{3})</td>
<td>6,955.00</td>
<td>95,938.00</td>
<td>6.76%</td>
<td>66,880.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia County SWD</td>
<td>4,928.00</td>
<td>10,145.00</td>
<td>32.69%</td>
<td>9,797.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga County</td>
<td>5,666.00</td>
<td>242,075.00</td>
<td>2.29%</td>
<td>161,031.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Colonie DPW (^{4})</td>
<td>5,639.61</td>
<td>42,738.00</td>
<td>11.66%</td>
<td>31,445.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Capital Region SWM</td>
<td>93,925.50</td>
<td>169,372.27</td>
<td>35.67%</td>
<td>171,143.55</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Eastern Rensselaer</td>
<td>1,470.59</td>
<td>7,439.15</td>
<td>16.51%</td>
<td>5,791.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren &amp; Washington</td>
<td>3,374.95</td>
<td>59,049.55</td>
<td>5.41%</td>
<td>40,575.93</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady County (^{5})</td>
<td>80,351.00</td>
<td>147,322.00</td>
<td>35.29%</td>
<td>147,987.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>208,634.15</td>
<td>815,378.58</td>
<td>17.23%</td>
<td>665,608.27</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Recycled values include organics whenever they were recovered and diverted from the waste stream.
2. Assumed Values: Computer monitors weigh on average 45 pounds each, televisions weigh on average 100 pounds each and tires weigh on average 25 pounds each.
3. MOS SWMA stands for Montgomery Otsego Schoharie Solid Waste Management Authority
4. Tons of disposed materials shown for Colonie represent only materials generated within the Town that required disposal.
5. Schenectady County-wide Inter-municipal Planning Unit
4. Waste Processing Technologies

4.1 Summary of Technology Options

The following is a summary of the major technology options which could be considered by a regional authority for use in processing the volume of waste which remains after maximizing recycling [material recovery] and reduction.

Proven Inside the U.S. for MSW Treatment/Disposal

Municipal Solid Waste Landfill

MSW landfills are considered the conventional disposal method for MSW in New York State. Waste is disposed of in state-of-the-art landfill facilities with double composite liner systems, which prevent liquids and contaminants from the waste from entering the surrounding soils and groundwater. Leachate (liquid that has come into contact with waste) is collected and typically disposed of at wastewater treatment plant. Landfill gas, which is generally rich in methane (~50%) is also collected and combusted to prevent dissipation into the atmosphere. Collected gases can also be beneficially used for energy production. Landfilling is on the lowest rung of the state’s solid waste management hierarchy. There are currently 27 MSW landfills operating in New York State. One MSW landfill has been built but never operated (Saratoga County).

Waste-to-Energy Facility (Combustion)

A Waste-to-Energy (WTE) facility is a solid waste management facility that combusts wastes to generate steam or electricity and reduces the volume of municipal solid waste (MSW) that would otherwise need to be disposed of by approximately 80-90 percent. These facilities are also sometimes referred to as resource recovery facilities, Municipal Waste Combustors (MWC) or solid waste incinerators with energy recovery. Newer technology allows higher efficiency heat recovery from the combustors, increasing energy production potential. There are currently 10 active WTE facilities in New York State.

Mixed Municipal Solid Waste Composting

Mixed MSW composting is typically an aerobic composting process that breaks down all organic portions of the waste into compost material. Waste is typically collected at the facility as a mixed stream. The process requires intense pre- and post-processing, treatment and sorting to remove inert materials such as plastic or glass, which diminish the quality of compost products. Some MSW composting facilities also accept biosolids. Wastes are typically loaded into a rotating bioreactor drum for two to four days. Screening processes are used to separate unacceptable wastes, which is landfilled as process residue, from the
raw compost which is stored in a maturation area for approximately one month to allow biological decomposition to occur. There are currently 13 mixed MSW composting facilities in operation in the United States, including one in Delaware County, New York.

Proven Outside the U.S. (Europe & Japan) for MSW Treatment/Disposal

Plasma Arc Gasification

Plasma arc gasification is a waste treatment technology that uses electrical energy and the high temperatures created by an electrical arc gasifier. This arc breaks down waste primarily into elemental gas and solid waste (slag), in a device called a plasma converter. The process has been touted as a net generator of electricity, although this will depend upon the composition of input wastes. It will also reduce the volume of waste requiring land disposal.

There are currently 10 plasma arc gasification facilities in operation in Japan and Taiwan, but only one that operates on a large scale (all others are < 50 TPD) and uses mixed MSW as its only feedstock. A small MSW facility (85 TPD) is in operation in Canada. In the United States, St. Lucie County in Florida has obtained a permit to construct a large scale MSW plasma arc gasification facility, but as of this date, has not commenced construction due to vendor and funding issues.

Pyrolysis/Gasification

Pyrolysis systems use a vessel which is heated to temperatures of 750°F to 1,650°F, in the absence or near absence of free oxygen. The temperature, pressure, reaction rates, and internal heat transfer rates are used to control pyrolytic reactions in order to produce specific synthetic gas (syngas) products. These syngas products are composed primarily of hydrogen (H₂), carbon monoxide (CO), carbon dioxide (CO₂), and methane (CH₄). The syngas can be utilized in boilers, gas turbines, or internal combustion engines to generate electricity, or alternatively can be used in the production of chemicals. Some of the volatile components of MSW form tar and oil, and can be removed for reuse as a fuel. The balance of the organic materials that are not volatile, or liquid that is left as a char material, can be further processed or used for its adsorption properties (activated carbon): Inorganic materials form a bottom ash that requires disposal, although it is reported that some pyrolysis ash can be used for manufacturing brick materials.

Gasification is a similar process performed at slightly higher temperatures (1,400°F to 2,500°F) to produce primarily hydrogen and carbon dioxide as syngases.
There are currently two pyrolysis/gasification plants in operation in Japan which have operated with mixed MSW as a sole fuel source with mixed success.

**Mechanical-Biological Treatment**

Mechanical-biological treatment (MBT) systems are similar to mixed MSW composting systems in that intense sorting is required as the first step in the waste treatment process. This is considered the mechanical phase of the treatment, where recyclable and non-organic materials are removed from the waste stream, prior to the biological treatment. The biological treatment phase involves bio-drying of the remaining organic materials for production of refuse derived fuel, or RDF. RDF can be used in place of fossil fuel products, such as a replacement for coal in electricity production. There are currently over 70 active MBT systems in operation across Europe, with a majority of these facilities operating as pilot scale projects (exact numbers are not available).

**Anaerobic Digestion**

Anaerobic digestion is a biological process by which microorganisms digest organic material in the absence of oxygen, producing a solid byproduct (digestate) and a gas (biogas). In the past, anaerobic digestion has been used extensively to stabilize sewage sludge, but is more recently under consideration as a method to process the organic fraction of MSW. In anaerobic digestion, biodegradable material is converted by a series of bacterial groups into methane and CO₂. In a primary step called hydrolysis, a first bacterial group breaks down large organic molecules into small units like sugars. In the acidification process, another group of bacteria converts the resulting smaller molecules into volatile fatty acids, mainly acetate, but also hydrogen (H₂) and CO₂. A third group of bacteria, the methane producers or methanogens, produce a medium-Btu biogas consisting of 50-70% methane, as well as CO₂. This biogas can be collected and used for a variety of purposes including electricity production or converted to high BTU natural gas. There are currently over 200 MSW anaerobic digestion facilities operating across Europe. Many of these facilities are smaller scale projects, designed to provide treatment of wastes for small towns and villages. There are two such facilities in operation in Canada, each in the Toronto, Ontario area.

**Unproven/Emerging**

**Ethanol Production**

Ethanol production from a mixed MSW waste stream requires an intensive sorting process as the first processing step. All recyclable and inert materials must be removed to produce an organic waste stream for ethanol production. This material is then chopped, fluffed, and fed into a hydrolysis reactor. The effluent of this reactor is mostly a sugar solution, which is prepared for
fermentation. This solution is detoxified and introduced to a fermenter, in which microorganisms convert the sugar to ethanol and CO₂. Next, the solution is introduced into an energy-intensive process that combines distillation and dehydration to bring the ethanol concentration up to fuel grade (99%) ethanol. A solid residue of unfermented solids and microbial biomass is recovered through the anaerobic digestion process, and its marketability as a compost material depends on the purity of feedstock as well as its visual quality. Solid residues can be burned or gasified if alternative methods of reuse are not feasible. Various pilot scale facilities are operating in the United States and Europe, but many have reverted to more homogeneous feedstocks such as wastewater treatment sludge and food processing wastes, because obtaining the homogeneous input stream from mixed MSW has proven difficult.

4.2 Costs Summary

If a solid waste management authority is established for the Albany area, the development of long-term solid waste management facilities would be an integral part of its mission. Preliminary estimates of capital costs and costs per ton are presented below, in 2011 dollars, to illustrate the magnitude of costs that could be involved for the development of a single stream Materials Recovery (Recycling) Facility (MRF), a source separated organic waste management facility (such as an anaerobic digester), a waste processing facility (such as a waste to energy facility), and a new landfill. While different types and sizes of solid waste management/recycling facilities may ultimately be considered by a regional solid waste authority for the Albany area, the preliminary cost information presented below provides a representative range of comparative facility costs.

1. New single stream MRF assumed to process 160 Tons Per Day (TPD) of recyclable materials:
   a. $12,500,000 capital cost.
   b. Potential tip fee of $25 per ton of recyclable material.

2. For estimating purposes, an anaerobic digester system was assumed to process approximately 160 TPD of food and paper waste, and 160 TPD of biosolids or manure, as a stabilizing feedstock, for a combined total of approximately 320 TPD of organic waste at 30 percent solids:
   a. $35,000,000 capital cost.
   b. Potential tip fee of $108 per ton of food and paper waste.

3. A 600 TPD waste to energy facility could potentially process virtually all of the non-recyclable waste generated by Albany County:
   a. $160,000,000 capital cost.
   b. Potential tip fee of $93 per ton of processible waste.
4. A 2100 TPD waste to energy facility could potentially process virtually all of the non-recyclable waste generated from the entire 9-county Albany Study Area:
   a. $545,000,000 capital cost.
   b. Potential tip fee of $71 per ton of processible waste.

5. A 600 TPD landfill could potentially dispose of all of the non-recyclable waste generated by Albany County:
   a. $40,000,000 capital cost.
   b. Potential tip fee of $41 per ton of waste.

6. A 2100 TPD landfill could potentially dispose of all of the non-recyclable waste generated from the entire 9-county Albany Study Area:
   a. $45,000,000 capital cost.
   b. Potential tip fee of $22 per ton of waste.

There are a number of requirements that would have to be met to successfully develop one or more of these solid waste management and recycling facilities. These facility development requirements are contained in Appendix C.

4.3 Comparison of Current and Future Disposal Costs

Currently within the study area the non-contract gate fees for disposal of waste ranges from $60 to $75 per ton, as is shown in Table 4. This range reflects three primary means of disposal—local public landfills, a local waste-to-energy facility, and long distance transfer to private landfills. The average non-contract gate fee charged for disposal is $67.25. These fees do not reflect the cost of recycling or other solid waste management services beyond the disposal of municipal solid waste.

The ability to compare current costs to potential future costs is straightforward for the disposal component. As shown in Table 4, the projected future cost of the two primary, proven disposal technologies, landfill and waste-to-energy, compares favorably to current costs if the communities in the nine county study area were to join together in a regional authority. Future costs would be within the range of the current disposal costs.

However, one of the primary reasons for considering the creation of a new regional solid waste authority for the study area would be to significantly increase recycling and advance organics recovery. So, the costs of developing recycling and organics recovery facilities have been shown in Section 4.2, above, and in Table 4 these costs have been added to the cost of disposal to illustrate the cost impact for a theoretical new, integrated system. However, care should be taken
in such a comparison because the two scenarios represent systems with significantly different facilities configurations. It will be up to the authority board to carefully evaluate all relevant conditions and decide what facilities it will develop and what the schedule for development should be. Only then will the true system cost be known.

Table 4 - Disposal Fee Comparison

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Existing Facilities</th>
<th>Average Disposal Fee/Ton Waste</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Albany Landfill</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Colonie Landfill</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warren/Washington WTE</td>
<td>$65.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSA Transfer Stations</td>
<td>$69.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Average Disposal Cost</td>
<td>$67.25</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Potential "Break Even" Disposal Fee/Ton Waste

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Potential Treatment Facilities/Systems</th>
<th>9-County Region</th>
<th>Albany County</th>
<th>Potential Savings/Year for 9-Counties (vs. Albany County Only)³</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Landfilling</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$41.00</td>
<td>$13,680,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste to Energy</td>
<td>$71.00</td>
<td>$93.00</td>
<td>$15,840,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfilling &amp; Recycling</td>
<td>$45.00</td>
<td>$60.00</td>
<td>$10,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste to Energy &amp; Recycling</td>
<td>$94.00</td>
<td>$122.00</td>
<td>$12,960,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfilling, Recycling, Digestion</td>
<td>$75.00</td>
<td>$90.00</td>
<td>$10,800,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste to Energy, Recycling, Digestion</td>
<td>$124.00</td>
<td>$142.00</td>
<td>$12,960,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Range of Treatment Facilities/Systems</td>
<td>$22.00</td>
<td>$142.00</td>
<td>$10.8M to $15.84M</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1 - Disposal fee range based on average published "gate rate" tipping fees for MSW/C&D waste at the facilities for 2010/2011. Lower $/ton tip fees may be charged per contractual arrangements with large haulers and other major facility users.
2 - Average estimated cost per ton range based on facilities sized to handle all specified waste generated within either Albany County, or the 9-County study area, respectively.
3 - Annual savings based on the disposal of 720,000 tons per year in the 9-county study area.

The potential annual savings per county that could result from development of a new 9-county solid waste management facility is illustrated below in Table 5.
Table 5 -- Potential Annual Savings

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population¹</th>
<th>% of Study Area</th>
<th>Potential Savings Per Year²</th>
<th>Potential Annual Savings Per Capita</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany County</td>
<td>304,204</td>
<td>27.7%</td>
<td>$4,394,648</td>
<td>$14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia County</td>
<td>63,096</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>$911,509</td>
<td>$14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene County</td>
<td>49,221</td>
<td>4.5%</td>
<td>$711,066</td>
<td>$14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery County</td>
<td>50,219</td>
<td>4.6%</td>
<td>$725,483</td>
<td>$14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer County</td>
<td>159,429</td>
<td>14.5%</td>
<td>$2,303,173</td>
<td>$14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga County</td>
<td>219,607</td>
<td>20.0%</td>
<td>$3,172,527</td>
<td>$14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady County</td>
<td>154,727</td>
<td>14.1%</td>
<td>$2,235,246</td>
<td>$14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoharie County</td>
<td>32,749</td>
<td>3.0%</td>
<td>$473,105</td>
<td>$14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington County</td>
<td>63,216</td>
<td>5.8%</td>
<td>$913,243</td>
<td>$14.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>1,096,468</td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
<td><strong>$15,840,000</strong></td>
<td><strong>$14.45</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Notes:
1. Population is per the US Census data for 2010.
2. Based on potential annual savings equal to $15,840,000 for a 9-counties project, as shown in Table 4, when compared to a project sized only for Albany County.

If these savings were passed on directly to the waste generator by local haulers, regardless of whether the hauling services are publicly or privately procured, then in today's dollars the generator would save $14.45 per capita per year. For a 4-person household in Albany County, for example, in today's dollars the potential savings for a regional authority project would be about $58 per year.

Additional savings, both pecuniary and environmental (e.g., there would be less fuel consumption and reduced greenhouse gas emissions), could be realized -- for residences that convert from individually subscribed curbside collection services to publicly controlled curbside collection services -- as a result of an Authority's contracting/franchising of curbside collection services.

4.4 Comparison of Greenhouse Gas Impacts

Each of the waste handling facilities described above would have greenhouse gas (GHG) emissions and sinks (carbon sequestration) associated with the waste treatment process. With the exception of the anaerobic digester, these values were calculated using the Environmental Protection Agency's Waste Reduction Model (WARM). A brief description of these emissions and sinks for each facility is provided below. The analysis showed that each treatment process results in a GHG sink due predominately to the offset of fossil fuel energy use associated with each. Table 6 below provides a summary of the actual GHG sinks associated with each facility.
1. Single Stream MRF – The GHG impacts associated with recycling were calculated based on the diverted quantities given above in Table 1. GHG sinks (reductions) associated with recycling include energy savings in the production process due to the replacement of virgin materials with recycled input feedstocks and carbon sequestration associated with trees that are allowed to remain standing when they are replaced with recycled paper in the production of new paper materials.

2. Anaerobic Digester – The GHG impacts associated with anaerobic digestion (AD) were calculated based on the diverted organic waste quantities given above in Table 2. GHG sinks associated with AD include emissions avoided due to displaced electric utility generation plus carbon sequestration in the finishing compost. GHG emissions include those associated with collection of the material and energy use in the AD process itself.

3. Waste-to-Energy Facility – The GHG impacts associated with waste to energy were calculated for the two facility sizes described above. GHG emissions associated with the facilities include transportation of waste to the facility and stack emissions from the facility. Sinks include emissions avoided due to displaced electric utility generation and decreased energy requirements for production processes using recycled inputs associated with the recovery of steel from the combustion ash. GHG emissions were based on a state of the art, high efficiency waste to energy facility.

4. Landfill – The GHG impacts associated with landfiling were calculated for the two facility sizes described above. GHG emissions associated with landfiling include the generation and fugitive emission of CO2 and methane gases due to the anaerobic decomposition of waste in the landfill and emissions from transportation of the waste to the landfill facility. GHG sinks are associated with the storage of some carbon in organic material within the landfill, due to incomplete decomposition, that would otherwise have been emitted to the atmosphere. It was assumed that the landfill accepting the waste would be equipped with a state of the art gas collection system and landfill gas to energy facility. For this reason, the GHG sink associated with the avoided emissions from fossil fuel energy generation was also taken into consideration.

Overall, recycling represents the waste processing technology with the maximum GHG reductions. The waste generation numbers utilized in this report reflect the maximum achievable recycling diversion rates for all materials, with the remaining portion of the waste generated still requiring an alternate means of treatment and/or disposal. In comparing waste to energy, anaerobic digestion and landfiling as the method of disposal for the remaining material, the results of the analysis indicate that waste to energy would result in the greatest GHG
emission reductions over the lifetime of the materials. It should be noted that the greenhouse gas impacts associated with temporary construction activities for the facilities listed above were not included in the comparison.

Table 6- Greenhouse Gas Reduction Associated with Waste Processing Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Processing Technology</th>
<th>Estimated GHG Reduction Per Year (^1) (in metric tons carbon dioxide equivalent)</th>
<th>Average GHG Reduction Per Ton Processed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycling (Regional)</td>
<td>2,567,429</td>
<td>2.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling (Albany County)</td>
<td>716,413</td>
<td>2.52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste to Energy (Regional)</td>
<td>175,129</td>
<td>0.38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfilling (Regional)</td>
<td>145,406</td>
<td>0.25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste to Energy (Albany County)</td>
<td>49,033</td>
<td>0.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfilling (Albany County)</td>
<td>40,806</td>
<td>0.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic Digestion (Regional)</td>
<td>25,558</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic Digestion (Albany County)</td>
<td>7,081</td>
<td>0.10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Emissions estimates based on the processing of recyclables, organic materials, and solid waste at the waste generation rates and diversion rates given in Tables 1 and 2 of this report.

4.5 Comparison of Energy Impacts

The energy impacts of each facility described above were calculated based on factors reported by the EPA in *Solid Waste Management and Greenhouse Gases – A Life Cycle Assessment of Emissions and Sinks, 3rd Edition, September 2006*. All of the waste treatment technologies analyzed represent an energy savings with the exception of landfilling. A brief description of the estimated energy savings (usage) for each facility is provided below in Table 7.

1. Single Stream MRF – The energy impacts associated with recycling were calculated based on the diverted quantities given above in Table 1. Energy consumption/savings associated with recycling include energy associated with the replacement of acquired virgin materials (mining of metal ore, cutting of trees, drilling of oil, etc.) and transportation energy for recycled feedstocks versus virgin feedstocks.

2. Anaerobic Digester – The energy impacts associated with AD include the generation of electricity from the methane byproduct of the process.

3. Waste to Energy Facility – The energy impacts associated with waste to energy facilities were calculated for the two sizes described above. Energy consumption/savings associated with the facilities include avoided utility fuel due to electricity generation, energy savings due to steel recovery (similar to
the energy savings reported for recycling above), and energy used in transporting waste to the facility and transporting ash from the facility to a disposal site.

4. Landfill – The energy impacts associated with landfilling were calculated for the two facility sizes described above. Energy consumption/savings associated with landfilling include transportation energy related to hauling the waste to the landfill facility and avoided utility energy through the landfill gas to energy facility at the site.

Table 7- Energy Savings Associated with Waste Processing Technologies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Waste Processing Technology</th>
<th>Estimated Energy Savings Per Year (in Millions of BTUs)</th>
<th>Average Energy Savings Per Ton Processed</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Recycling (Regional)</td>
<td>24,754,534</td>
<td>24.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recycling (Albany County)</td>
<td>6,895,574</td>
<td>24.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste to Energy (Regional)</td>
<td>2,848,145</td>
<td>6.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic Digestion (Regional)</td>
<td>1,835,790</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste to Energy (Albany County)</td>
<td>807,215</td>
<td>5.48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Anaerobic Digestion (Albany County)</td>
<td>509,321</td>
<td>7.47</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfilling (Albany County)</td>
<td>-122,388</td>
<td>-0.80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Landfilling (Regional)</td>
<td>-488,934</td>
<td>-0.89</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Energy use estimates based on the processing of recyclables, organic materials, and solid waste at the waste generation rates and diversion rates given in Tables 1 and 2 of this report.

As can be expected, recycling and anaerobic digestion represent the treatment options that provide the most energy savings per ton processed, although the energy savings associated with recycling are largely on the manufacturing side and would not be realized locally nor by the operator of a materials recovery facility. Anaerobic digestion is the most efficient means to extract energy from organic materials, but many nonorganic materials will still remain in the waste stream after diversion. Waste to energy offers energy savings associated with managing these materials when compared to landfilling.
5. Track Record of NYS Solid Waste Management Authorities

Authorities have been formed in New York State, initially at the State level and later at the local level, over the course of several decades. The Office of the State Comptroller [OSC] succinctly stated the purpose for creating these authorities in its 2004 report "Public Authority Reform—Reining in New York’s Secret Government":

“The objective of public authorities is to finance, construct and operate revenue producing facilities for the public benefit, to assist the public sector with projects intended to spur economic development, to provide financial support for non-profit sector projects that serve public needs and/or to coordinate the development or management of resources that transcend traditional public boundaries.”

As indicated by the title of the OSC report, public authorities came under fire over the past several years for abuses, mainly at State level entities but also at some local authorities. This led to a series of laws and regulations known as the public authorities accountability act [and amendments] which require standards and training for board members, ongoing monitoring of governance, financial oversight, filing of financial information, documentation of the public availability of files, and numerous other requirements designed to insure transparency and accountability. Ironically, public authorities are now more tightly controlled by these new regulations than the traditional units of local government.

In looking at the track record of solid waste management authorities the level of success can be characterized by whether they are financially self sufficient, whether they have developed the facilities needed to fulfill the reason they were created, and whether they serve the public as originally envisioned.

Appendix A provides key information on each of the solid waste management authorities created in New York, which can be summarized as follows:

1. Six developed and own materials recovery facilities [MRF’s] to process recyclable materials for marketing (Dutchess, Islip, Oneida-Herkimer, Rockland, Ulster, and Western Finger Lakes);
2. Onondaga and Oneida Herkimer have achieved two of the best recycling rates in the State;
3. Three developed new waste-to-energy facilities (Dutchess, Islip, current Onondaga);
4. Three developed new landfill facilities (DANC, Franklin, Oneida-Herkimer);
5. Seven export waste to disposal facilities located outside of their service area (Dutchess (partial), Eastern Rensselaer, MOSA, North Hempstead, Rockland, Ulster, and Western Finger Lakes);

6. Four have not achieved long-term financial independence (Dutchess, MOSA, Ulster, Western Finger Lakes); and

7. Four multi-county solid waste authorities have been formed (DANC, MOSA, Oneida-Herkimer, and Western Finger Lakes).
6. Benefits and Drawbacks To Creating An Authority

Ultimately the decision whether or not to create an authority is a local decision which will be based on whether the benefits are seen to outweigh the potential drawbacks. In examining the track record of the other New York solid waste management authorities and considering what provisions can be built in to the enabling statute, there are numerous benefits, and a few drawbacks, which are listed in Table 8 and discussed below.

We believe one of the most significant benefits to a new regional authority would be in recycling—a projected four-fold increase over current levels. This would be achieved in a number of ways starting with a plan to unify both the list of eligible recyclables and the instructions on how to separate the material. The fact that the Capital region is a discreet media market as well as an identified socio-economic center lends itself perfectly to a unified recycling message, thereby eliminating the significant confusion that currently results from a myriad of different recycling programs.

We also believe that a new regional authority has the best chance of actually implementing a successful organics recovery program. By coordinating among the wide array of significant food waste generators across the study area, an authority can develop a program with ample volume to be sustainable and more cost effective than many uncoordinated small programs.

A new authority would be able to efficiently pull together all the information necessary to do a regional solid waste management plan, either eliminating or reducing the burden on the existing planning units. This is one example of what may be the most obvious benefits created by consolidation. One comprehensive and coordinated system would make the maximum use of staff resources, allowing technical, operating, and professional staff to perform the necessary duties at multiple facilities and for multiple jurisdictions. There will be new expenses to comply with the State’s recently adopted mandates in the Authority Accountability Laws; however, the most efficient way to meet those requirements would be with a single, regional authority.

In their review of the preliminary draft of this report, the DEC noted:

"While there is some collaboration amongst communities within the Capital Region Solid Waste Management Planning Unit, the establishment of a formal Solid waste management Authority would strengthen their ability to enhance recovery and collection programs and realize economies of scale with much greater ability to take advantage of marketing opportunities."

Ultimately, the development of a publicly sponsored solid waste management system is integrally involved with the private sector and private markets. For example, any public materials recovery facility sends 100% of the recyclables it processes to private mills for remanufacture into new products. The price those mills pay for the
recyclable materials are controlled by global markets. As those markets are strong, the mills will pay higher prices to the public materials recovery facility. Another component of a solid waste management system, collection, is often done by private companies whether by private arrangement or public bidding.

A community must also be cognizant of the private market for disposal as it considers how to manage its non-recyclable waste. This brings to light how a new regional authority could create a significant benefit for the region. If a new regional processing and disposal facility were developed it would largely insulate the area from the potential for significant future increases in the cost of disposal in the private market. Like any other commodity, the cost of waste disposal in the private market place is determined by supply and demand. Over the past 25 years there has been significant volatility in the disposal market (the availability and price of disposal service). For nearly a decade starting in the mid 1980s disposal prices rose sharply. This spurred the development of new disposal capacity in neighboring states and that increase in supply leveled prices for the ensuing decade. In the last several years the economic recession and associated reduction in waste volumes has caused owners who built disposal capacity to reduce their prices to the lowest level in nearly 30 years. At this time very good rates can be obtained at disposal facilities.

However, no one can depend on that condition for the long term. Conditions throughout the Northeast and beyond will impact the availability and price of disposal capacity.

In looking just at the study area, if the volume of waste currently taken to the City of Albany landfill is taken outside the area to private disposal facilities, that will increase the demand for disposal capacity, consume landfill capacity, reduce the available supply and ultimately increase the cost of disposal.

Even allowing for the development of new disposal capacity as is anticipated for the Town of Colonie landfill, as local publicly controlled disposal capacity diminishes all the communities in the region will be subject to the volatility that goes with the private market. There may be times, like the current condition, when communities can benefit from an economic recession and low disposal prices. However, there will also be times when prices increase and in that case the local communities will have no option but to pay whatever the market demands.

Development of a new local public disposal facility may be more expensive than the current market and for the near-term future, but having that facility will guard against the inevitable price increases in the long term. The existing but unused Saratoga County Landfill might be able to serve this purpose, but Saratoga County’s decision making would determine the extent to which this could help anyone outside of its borders.
In addition to the cost of disposal, the cost of transportation can be significant. If a community relies on long haul for disposal they will be vulnerable to the sharp increase in fuel evident again in 2011. High volume tractor trailers that haul waste only get 4-5 miles per gallon so the travel distance to the disposal facility is a significant factor. Developing a local disposal facility will minimize and stabilize transportation costs. It should also be noted that the development of a coordinated regional solid waste management system will create a framework for more efficient and less costly collection of waste and recyclables. At the same time, new initiatives such as the separate collection of source separated organics may be implemented on a more cost effective basis due to economies of scale associated with a regional authority.

The issue of environmental liability is also important in evaluating the development of a public system. If there is no public role, the private sector will typically seek the lowest cost disposal facility and provide additional services like recycling only when markets are positive or they are being paid a premium. In the past, that has sometimes meant that waste went to marginal disposal facilities, almost always without the knowledge or consent of the waste generator. When environmental problems later arise, under state and federal laws the liability and cost to clean up the problems is directed to any and all of the waste generators regardless of the quantity or character of the waste sent to the disposal facility. Literally, the owner of a bakery, for example, that produces low volume low impact waste can be forced to pay for a clean-up caused by a large volume industrial waste generator. The development of a local public disposal facility allows the community to incorporate the best environmental protection systems and to control the origin and character of waste that is accepted thereby minimizing the long term risk for all local waste generators.

Past experience for communities where the disposal facilities are privately controlled illustrate another benefit to a public system. The natural course of private competition usually means that the company that controls pricing at the disposal facility can use that to gain a controlling market share of the collection business. This private control allows for unchecked increases in prices and often the elimination of smaller hauling companies. Public control of pricing at the disposal facility creates an even playing field for all waste haulers and generators that stimulates competition and helps keep prices in check.

In their review of the preliminary draft of this report DEC noted:

"While there is some collaboration amongst communities within the Capital Region Solid Waste Management Planning Unit, the establishment of a formal Solid waste management Authority would strengthen their ability to enhance recovery and collection programs and realize economies of scale with much greater ability to take advantage of marketing opportunities..... Provided adequate assurances are included to assuage concerns regarding general mistrust of the motives behind an authority, the establishment and implementation of an authority is feasible. Consensus is a key element."
### Table 8 – Benefits and Drawbacks of a Solid Waste Management Authority

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Drawbacks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Eliminate Overlap and Duplication</td>
<td>1. Perception of financial waste, abuse of power, unethical activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Consolidate Services</td>
<td>2. One step removed from political [ballot box] accountability</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Pool Resources</td>
<td>3. Involves changes to current local public administration of solid waste management and recycling facilities/ programs (i.e., it's not the status quo)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Streamline Governance</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Replace up to 3 authorities and 10 planning units with 1 new regional authority.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. Save Money</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7. Development of an in-region public system:</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Guard communities against disposal market risks</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Reduce vulnerability to fuel cost spikes</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Effectively eliminate environmental liability</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Avoid negative consequences of control by one large private company.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Create advantage and efficiency of dealing with large volumes, economies of scale.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. Provide the best chance of aggregating the volumes of organics necessary to develop an organics processing facility.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. Allow for the creation of a service fee system that encourages reduction and recycling and is based on the level of service actually used or made available [as compared to a fee set by property value].</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. Remove facility siting from the &quot;white hot&quot; political climate.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13. Facilitate planning and implementation of facilities and programs for the long-term benefit of the community.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14. Regional public information initiatives to promote additional waste reduction and recycling.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
7. Key Ingredients For Success, Steps For Creating An Authority

The procedure for the actual creation of a new solid waste management authority will first involve the preparation of a draft State enabling statute, based on local decisions on elements of the statute and based on previous similar statutes. Each participating county will then pass a home rule request to the State legislature. The enabling statute will then be approved by the State legislature and signed by the governor. The authority will then be activated when the counties [and/or other local appointing entities] file the appointments to the board of directors with the State.

Drawing on the extensive base of over 25 years of experience with other New York solid waste management authorities combined with the unique conditions in the study area, there are several keys to creating a successful entity that can serve this region.

Build Consensus

First, it is essential to build a strong consensus among the communities as a basis for agreeing to move forward with a regional initiative. This will involve a recognition that there are problems on the horizon and even though they are several years away, action must be taken now to have any chance of having a system in place by the time those problems are at hand. The consensus should reflect each community's clear and complete understanding not only of the potential problems ahead but also what will be expected of them, how they will interact with a new authority, and what changes will result for the homeowners and businesses they represent. The participating communities must "buy in" to the overarching benefits of creating an authority -- consolidation of services, elimination of duplication, improved efficiency in the delivery of services, and costs savings -- they must also accept that the authority is being created to take concrete actions to resolve or avoid large complex problems. Each community should recognize that they may not always agree with the decisions of the authority.

Establish Public – Private Relationship

We also believe that there should be a conscious recognition at the outset of this process that the creation of a regional authority is a major public policy commitment. It entails a commitment to a measure of public control over the kind of solid waste management system that will be built to serve the region. That is not to say that the authority or the components of its system will be hostile to the private sector. In fact, quite the contrary is true. Most notably, the collection of solid waste, recyclables, and in the future source separated organics is likely to continue to be the province of private haulers through subscription or by municipal bids and contracts. Also, the procurement of a waste processing facility or facilities by the authority is very likely to seek substantial private involvement. However, the nature and extent of private involvement will be decided at a future date when the authority decides the configuration of a system.
that best meets the needs of the region. In the final analysis, the authority would be created to build a public system that provides the facilities and services needed and wanted by the residents, businesses and industries of the region — so there has to be at least some measure of public control in any public-private partnership arrangement.

Promote Transparency

From the outset, it is critical to maintain transparency. Albany County has made this a top priority even as discussions of the concept of an authority are just getting started. The highly publicized problems at some authorities now means that all authorities must insure that all their business is conducted openly, that their records are easily accessed by the public, that information is provided to the counties on an ongoing basis, that all budget matters are fully disclosed and documented, that the basis for decisions is well documented and explained, and that misperceptions are quickly and completely corrected. The enabling statute for a new regional authority can include provisions that reinforce the State Public Authority Accountability Act by requiring that the authority submit its annual operating budget to the participating communities prior to adoption and its annual independent audit immediately upon receipt by the authority.

Involve Local Governments

The municipalities within the participating Counties should be kept well informed and current. Some are involved in the delivery of solid waste management services and may need to adjust to new methods for waste handling, collection, and delivery. Whether or not they are directly involved, local governments are on the front line—they are the ones who get the first calls about a change or a new proposal. It will serve the authority well to keep the local governments involved and informed. For all the same reasons, private waste haulers and service providers should be involved in the authority’s public involvement program. The public information and education process should be started early, long before possible construction of a new facility starts or a new program is offered.

Prioritize Initiatives

At the very outset of the process to create an authority its initiatives should be prioritized. Based on what we know about the region and based on the priorities of the State [who will ultimately have to approve many of the facilities and programs that are developed], we recommend that the first priority be initiatives that are aimed at waste reduction, improved recycling, recovery of organics; and cost savings.

Carefully Structure Authority To Meet Local Needs

In considering how to best structure the authority it cannot be emphasized enough that this can be controlled by the participating communities. One of the most important things that must be decided at the local level is the representation from the participating
Counties and the corresponding configuration of the board of directors. There are many different ways a governing board could be structured, and for illustrative purposes three options for the board of directors are shown below in Table 9.

**Table 9 – Examples of Options for Authority Board Member Appointments**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>County</th>
<th>Population</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Option A</th>
<th>Option B</th>
<th>Option C</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>304,204</td>
<td>27.7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbia</td>
<td>63,096</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene</td>
<td>49,221</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montgomery</td>
<td>50,219</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rensselaer</td>
<td>159,429</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saratoga</td>
<td>219,607</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady</td>
<td>154,727</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schoharie</td>
<td>32,749</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Washington</td>
<td>63,216</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,096,468</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>9</strong></td>
<td><strong>13</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

It should also be noted that the appointments to the authority board of directors can be structured to reflect unique local conditions. For example, if the size of a particular local municipality warrants an appointment to the authority board, specifically by or from that municipality, that can be designated in the enabling statute. If the counties, for example, want appointments to be initiated by the county executive [if that form of government is in place] and confirmed by the county legislature, that can be established in the enabling statute.

The enabling statute [and the service agreement discussed below] should be structured for the authority to be financially independent. This means that the enabling statute must authorize the authority to establish and collect fees for its facilities as well as a “service availability fee” that can be assessed on all waste generators in the authority service area. The authority may be well advised to name the service availability fee something like the “green fee” and earmark the revenue from it to pay for reduction, reuse, recycling, composting, HHW, education, and other environmental benefit programs and facilities. That would theoretically reduce the sting of a new fee and allow the tip fee charged for disposal to be “at market”, thereby minimizing the impact on local governments and haulers and actually reducing the reliance on flow control.

Even if the participating communities don’t expect to use it, they should make sure that the enabling statute provides the sponsoring counties the ability to enact a local flow control law. Similarly, the enabling statute should designate to the authority the power to exercise eminent domain to acquire property essential for needed facilities. Authorization to establish franchises for collection of solid waste and recyclable materials should also be sought for inclusion in the enabling statute.
Another important factor which can be controlled locally through the statute and/or the service agreement is the disposition of the pre-existing solid waste management authorities and planning units within the study area, including the possible purchase by the Authority of some of their assets.

**Carefully Craft Service Agreement**

In addition to the state enabling statute, a service agreement will be needed to establish the relationship among the participating communities, to establish the business relationship between the counties and the authority, and to provide a foundation for the authority to issue bonds for the solid waste management system. If properly structured, the agreement can insure that the authority will be financially independent [that is, there will be no subsidy payments by the counties] while also providing the assurance that the annual debt service obligations will be met.

The agreement will need to establish that if the authority is unable to meet its operating and debt service obligations, the counties will make those payments. However, if the following provisions are incorporated, the chance of that happening can be virtually eliminated by 1) the counties pledging to deliver or cause to be delivered all waste generated in their county [flow control], 2) the counties requiring the authority to enforce flow control, and 3) the authority committing to always setting its fees to cover 100% of its operating and debt service expenses.

**Devise Start-Up Plan**

A means for providing initial funding for a new authority would need to be established. For the first several years, the Authority would need to i) hire key staff (e.g., executive director, engineer/planner, accountant), ii) develop and implement a regional waste reduction and recycling public information program, iii) coordinate the network of transfer stations with an RFP/contract for disposal of waste that can’t be managed within the region, iv) complete the evaluations necessary to decide the nature, configuration, and priority of the programs for recycling, HHW, composting and organics recovery, and v) establish a means of funding such facilities and programs, such as:

1. State grant.
2. Authority service availability fee (i.e., green fee) collected from waste generators in its service area.
3. Seed money from member Counties/municipalities.
4. Authority bond issue to purchase facilities from member Counties/municipalities.
5. Combination of above.
8. Findings and Conclusions

1. Recycling levels, as reported by the existing planning units in the region and considering the under-reporting that exists, are very low for many of the planning units. The 2009 data indicates a range of 2.29% - 35.67% with an average of all the planning units in the region of 17.23%. Through a regional initiative coordinated by a new authority it is projected that annual waste reduction and recycling levels in these planning units could achieve a goal of 65% and increase annual volumes from 208,634 tons to 665,608 tons.

2. Creation of a new regional solid waste management authority provides the best opportunity to develop a cost effective and sustainable organics recovery program.

3. The impending closure of the Albany landfill, the private take-over of the Hudson Falls waste-to-energy facility and the private operation and management of the Town of Colonie landfill will have to be considered by the study area communities in evaluating their long-term arrangements for disposal. The success of waste reduction and recycling efforts, the ultimate capacity of the Colonie landfill, and Saratoga County's decision regarding possible future use of its landfill will all influence the timing and need for additional local disposal capacity. The DEC has recently notified Saratoga County that they must update their LSWMP and the DEC noted that an approved LSWMP is a requirement for facility permits and certain State grants.

4. The creation of a new regional authority is feasible from a cost and operational perspective.

5. There would be significant benefits to the creation of a regional authority including cost savings, consolidation of government services, elimination of duplication, realization of an economy of scale in the development of facilities and operation of programs, protection against sharp price increases due to fuel price hikes and other factors, protection against monopolization by one private company. The recent sale of the private hauling company with the largest market share of collection service in the area highlights the need to carefully consider the potential long term implications for the region.

6. There is a substantial base of experience with solid waste management authorities in the State and the track record of the successful authorities has resulted in financially independent operations, the development of well run and cost effective facilities, and programs for recycling that are the best in the State. Problems at some authorities are well documented and can be avoided through the structure of the authority and proper oversight by the participating counties.
7. On an annual basis, there is 1,080,569 tons of MSW, 800,422 tons of C&D, 230,121 tons of non-hazardous industrial waste for a total of 2,111,112 tons of waste generated in the study area. Through an integrated system developed by a regional authority recycling could be increased over current levels an organics recovery facility could be developed, and a facility for the safe handling of non-recoverable materials could be developed within the region.

8. Proven technology is available to process, recover, and dispose of the volume and character of waste generated in the study area. If all the communities in the study area elected to join a new regional authority the number of options available and the costs savings would be the greatest. However, if only Albany County moved forward with the creation of an authority it would still be feasible from a cost and technology perspective.

The cost for development of a range of technologies has been provided; the actual cost will depend on the facilities selected by the authority.

9. There is great flexibility in the set up and structure of a solid waste management authority to serve the region. The local participating communities will be able to a) specify the size and representation of the governing board, b) require oversight and reporting to reach the highest level of transparency, and c) control the powers and duties to be established by the State enabling legislation for the authority.

10. Funding will be needed for the establishment and initial start-up of an authority.
9. Potential Hurdles

1. If the City of Albany landfill closes as is currently projected, there will at that point still be approximately $44 million in unpaid bonds associated with the facility. Other communities in the study area are concerned that if they join a new authority they should not be saddled with satisfying these bonds. From discussions with the steering committee, there seems to be a consensus that the creation of the authority would have to include a binding provision, likely in the service agreement, that the Albany landfill debt would not become an authority obligation.

2. There is a vocal local contingent which is strongly opposed to the development of a waste-to-energy facility and some perceive this feasibility study as a precursor to such a facility. This perception is not consistent with the discussions among the steering committee. In fact there is a strong consensus that if the regional initiative moves forward the top priority should be on facilities and programs to increase recycling, recover organics, and detoxify the waste stream through programs like household hazardous waste collections. Ultimately, the types of waste processing facilities would be decided by the authority. However, the participating communities can require that the authority only employ proven technology that, at a minimum, meets all DEC and EPA standards.

3. There is concern from some of the smaller population counties that if they join a regional authority their interests will be overwhelmed by those of the larger counties. While this is a difficult issue to overcome, if care is taken in how the authority is structured, particularly the board of directors, and steps are taken to expand the current working relationships among the study area communities, then it would be possible to create a successful multi-county authority.

4. There may be opposition to the creation of a regional authority from large private haulers serving the region. While the creation of an authority will initiate changes, one of the most important benefits is that it will create an even playing field for all waste generators and haulers. This will enhance competition among haulers big and small, which can lower pricing and improve overall collection services. This becomes even more important in light of the sale of the area’s largest local private hauler to a national company.

5. There is concern by several communities that they may be the location for a future facility. The study area communities can help insure that any siting process will be open and fair and that a commensurate compensation package will be provided to host communities.
6. Some are focusing on the short term and the fact that there are no pressing problems, rather than focusing on future conditions and the need to begin now to address those conditions to avoid significant problems in the long run.

7. The implementation of an authority and any resulting waste treatment infrastructure could take many years to implement; possibly beyond the useful life of the existing disposal facility options.

8. The current uncertainty about the scope of future expansions at the Colonie landfill, and therefore the extent to which it is likely to be able to accept additional waste from within the study area in future years, limits the ability to develop projections about the timing and sizing of new facilities which may be needed.
10. Recommendations

1. Start planning before it's too late:
   a. Be ready before local disposal capacity expires.
   b. Be ready when the economy improves.
   c. Be ready when state and federal grants are available.

2. Take steps now to create a new, regional solid waste management authority.
   a. Seek a Department of State Shared Services Grant to:
      * Develop a model of future disposal capacity needs based on a definitive plan from Waste Connections regarding their expansion plans, if possible, or based on a range of possibilities for future expansion at the Colonie landfill.
      * Complete a detailed analysis of savings from creating an authority by quantifying savings on a per county or per planning unit basis. This will provide information to the authority formation team necessary to answer specific questions from communities.
      * Develop an inter-municipal agreement to allow communities to opt in as part of an authority formation team and to continue building a consensus on key elements such as board representation, priority initiatives, method for initial funding, and budget oversight. Once an inter-municipal agreement is in place for all those communities electing to participate, the potential for forming a new consolidated planning unit can be evaluated.
      * Develop a draft state enabling statute for the regional solid waste management authority [public benefit corporation].
      * Develop a draft service agreement which specifies the relationship and responsibilities of the member counties as well as the regional authority.
      * Develop an authority start-up plan and model as a means to foster a consensus among the counties and illustrate how the authority would operate.
   b. Evaluate the feasibility of a state funded consolidation incentive for communities electing to join the authority, such as purchase of existing facilities that would have future utility for authority operations.
   c. Take incremental steps to enhance the working relationship among the study area communities, such as:
* Develop and implement a regional waste reduction and recycling public information program.
* Evaluate regional HHW service.
* Evaluate consolidation of collection services.

3. Meet with NYS officials [DOS, DEC, ABO] to review this study, explore future grant potential, and advocate for:

   a. Funding for solid waste management facilities patterned on the Clean Water Act funding for waste water treatment facilities.
   b. Support for approaches that advance consolidation.
   c. Reward initiatives that reduce GHG.

On June 27, 2011 the draft report was posted on the Albany County website, announced through a press release by Albany County, and made available for public comment through July 11, 2011. The comments received are attached as Appendix E. All comments were reviewed and evaluated and any changes deemed appropriate were made. It was then circulated to the Steering Committee before release as a final report.
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Appendix A

Profiles of Solid Waste Management Authorities in New York
Note: The enabling legislation for these solid waste authorities can be obtained on-line at: http://public.leginfo.state.ny.us/menugetf.cgi?COMMONQUERY=LAWS or refer to the Titles of the NYS Public Authorities Law (Article 8, Miscellaneous Authorities) listed below.

1. Dissolved or Inactive Solid Waste Authorities

**Title**

13-D* Broome County Resource Recovery Agency
(§§ 2047-a*-2047-x*).

13-K. County of Essex Solid Waste Management Authority
(§§ 2051-a--2051-x).

13-L. Greater Troy Area Solid Waste Management Authority
(§§ 2052-a--2052-y).

13-A. Multi-Town Solid Waste Management Authority
(§§ 2040-a--2040-u).

13. Onondaga County Solid Waste Disposal Authority
(§§ 2015-2037). **Expiration Date: 04/01/1982 DISSOLVED**

13-J. Town of Brookhaven Resource Recovery Agency
(§§ 2051-a*--2051-y*).

2. Active Solid Waste Authorities

**Title**

13-I. County of Franklin Solid Waste Management Authority
(§§ 2051-a**--2051-x**).

29. Development Authority of the North Country Act
(§§ 2700-2724).

13-D. Dutchess County Resource Recovery Agency
(§§ 2047-a--2047-x).

13-H. Eastern Rensselaer County Solid Waste Management Authority
(§§ 2050-aa--2050-yy).
13-AA. Montgomery, Otsego, Schoharie Solid Waste Management Authority (§§ 2041-2041-x).

13-FF. Oneida-Herkimer Solid Waste Management Authority (§§ 2049-aa-2049-yy).

13-B. Onondaga County Resource Recovery Agency (§§ 2045-a-2045-x).

13-M. Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority (§§ 2053-a-2053-z).


13-F. Town of North Hempstead Solid Waste Management Authority (§§ 2049-a-2049-x).


30. Western Finger Lakes Solid Waste Management Authority (§§ 2725-2749).
Authority Profile

1. County of Franklin Solid Waste Management Authority (CFSWMA).
3. Serves Franklin County population of 50,274.
4. 7 member board of directors appointed to 3 year terms by the county legislature.
5. Annual operating budget of $6,000,000.
6. County makes debt payments with reimbursement from Authority; this resulted in annual county subsidy every year until 2010 when additional revenue from a 2006 landfill permit tonnage increase eventually balanced the books.
7. No "service availability" fee.
9. Eminent domain authorized.
10. CFSWMA owns a regional landfill and 4 transfer stations, with recycling and yard waste composting provided at its transfer stations.
Authority Profile

1. Development Authority of the North Country (DANC).

2. Created in 1985 as a multi-purpose public authority to develop infrastructure (e.g., water, sewer, solid waste, fiber optics, housing) and to provide services to support growth of the Fort Drum military installation.


4. 13 member board of directors appointed to 4 year terms. Each county legislature appoints 2 board members, 2 are appointed by the Watertown City Council, and 5 non-voting members are appointed by the governor.

5. Annual solid waste operating budget of approx. $10,200,000.

6. No subsidy payments from counties.

7. No “service availability” fee.

8. Flow control authorized by DANC’s enabling statute and enacted in Lewis and St. Lawrence Counties in 2009/2010. No flow control has been enacted in Jefferson County.

9. Eminent domain authorized, subject to approval by county legislature where the property is located.

10. DANC owns and operates a regional landfill. Each county is responsible for its own transfer station and recycling facilities. In 2010, DANC has started to help its member counties with solid waste planning and recycling education.
Authority Profile

1. Dutchess County Resource Recovery Agency (DCRRA).
3. Serves Dutchess County population of 292,878.
4. 7 member board of directors appointed to 3 year terms by the county executive [3], the county legislature [3], and jointly by the executive and legislature [1].
5. Annual operating budget of $22,000,000.
6. County subsidy of $3-$6 million per year.
7. No "service availability" fee.
8. Flow control enabling authorization, but not enacted by county.
9. Eminent domain authorized.
10. DCRRA owns a waste-to-energy facility and a materials recovery facility and contracts the operation of both to private vendors; they hold special events for HHW. [Note—the WTE facility was sized to handle approximately 60% of the waste generated in the county.]
Authority Profile

1. Eastern Rensselaer County Solid Waste Management Authority (ERCSWMA).
3. Serves 3 towns and 4 villages with a combined population of 22,663.
4. 7 (1 per municipality) appointed by each town/village board to 5 year terms.
5. Annual operating budget of approximately $750,000 for disposal and hauling contracts plus general administrative expenses.
6. The ERCSWMA budget is paid for by its member municipalities, who pay per capita shares of the ERCSWMA budget per an agreement.
7. No "service availability" fee but unpaid solid waste fees become a lien on property that can be collected as if they were unpaid property taxes.
8. Flow control authorized but not enacted.
9. Eminent domain authorized.
10. ERCSWMA established ERC Community Warehouse in 1995 as an outlet for reusable goods; spun-off in 1997 as a separate non-profit corporation. Has a 20-year disposal contract that is available to its member town and villages, and an 8-year hauling contract that services a member town's transfer station; both contracts expire in 2012. ERCSWMA also prepares bid documents for its members' procurement of curbside collection services.
Authority Profile

1. Montgomery-Otsego-Schoharie Solid Waste Authority (MOSA).


4. 8 member board of directors appointed to 4 year terms by the Montgomery County Board of Supervisors [3], the Otsego County Board of Representatives [3], and the Schoharie County Board of Supervisors [2].

5. Annual operating budget of $11,045,014.

6. Counties must meet minimum guaranteed annual tonnages [GAT] set by the authority and pay penalties for failure to meet the GAT; Counties also subsidize hauler tip fees.

7. No "service availability" fee.

8. Flow control enabling authorization.

9. Eminent domain authorized.

10. MOSA owns and operates 3 transfer stations and leases and operates 2 transfer stations for the receipt and transport of non-recyclable waste to out-of-county contract landfills; under contract with the counties, MOSA does the post closure monitoring and maintenance for 3 closed county landfills.
Authority Profile

1. Oneida-Herkimer Solid Waste Authority (OHSWA).


3. Serves the Oneida and Herkimer counties population of 277,984.

4. 10 member board of directors appointed to 5 year terms by the Oneida County executive [3], the Oneida County legislature [4], and the Herkimer County legislature [proportion based on population].

5. Annual operating budget $26,140,000.

6. No county subsidy payments.

7. No “service availability” fee.

8. Flow control laws at county level, backed by hauler/generator contracts.

9. Eminent domain authorized and used.

10. OHSWA owns and operates a new full-service landfill, materials recovery facility, green waste compost facility, permanent HHW facility, 3 transfer stations. [WTE facility 1985-1995].
Authority Profile

1. Onondaga County Resource Recovery Agency (OCRRA).

2. Created in 1990.

3. Serves population of 438,856 [less Village of Skaneateles].

4. 15 member board of directors appointed to 3 year terms by mayor of Syracuse [6], the county executive [4], the county legislature [3], and the Town of Camillus [1], Town of Van Buren [1].

5. Annual operating budget $33,193,000.

6. No county subsidy payments.

7. No “service availability” fee.

8. Flow control through municipal laws, county law, municipal contracts, hauler contracts.

9. No power of eminent domain.

10. OCRRA has a public – private partnership for a waste-to-energy facility, [a local ash/bypass waste landfill site was secured but never developed - ash is trucked to a landfill in Western NY]; they own and operate 2 transfer stations; they own and operate a compost facility; they contract for recycling services [material recovery facilities]; they hold special events for HHW; they have an expansive public relations and education program.
Authority Profile

1. Rockland County Solid Waste Management Authority (RCSWMA).


3. Serves Rockland County population of 300,173.

4. 17 member board of directors appointed to 2 year terms. 10 appointed by county legislature [8 must be county legislators, 2 must be village mayors], 2 appointed by the county executive, and the supervisor of each of the 5 towns in the county is also on the Authority Board.

5. Annual operating budget of approx. $29,000,000.

6. No subsidy payment.

7. A "service availability" fee is authorized and in place. Facility debt service is paid for by an Area Benefit Charge collected on an ad valorem basis. RCSWMA also collects fees to cover its facility/program operating costs from a Green Waste Unit Charge per parcel and from unit charges per dwelling unit for HHW, Transfer Station, MRF and Sludge Composting [the latter also includes a water usage unit charge for non-residential properties].


9. Eminent domain authorized but can be vetoed by county legislature within 45 days.

10. RCSWMA owns a MRF, 3 transfer stations, a sludge composting facility, a household hazardous waste collection facility, a yard waste composting facility, and a concrete crushing facility.
Authority Profile

1. Town of Islip Resource Recovery Agency (IRRA).
3. Serves the Town of Islip population of 322,612.
4. 5 member board of directors is the Town Board.
5. Annual operating budget of approximately $40,000,000.
6. No subsidy payment.
7. District fee charged to every residential property; $0 tip fee.
8. Flow control enabling authorization, but "economic" flow control is the actual practice.
9. Eminent domain authorized but unused.
10. IRRA has a public-private partnership for a waste-to-energy facility; ash is sent to Brookhaven landfill; they own and operate a materials recovery facility, green waste compost facility, HHW storage facility, C&D processing and disposal facility, and transfer stations; IRRA also provides collection service to approximately 8,500 homes [10% of total].
Authority Profile

1. Town of North Hempstead Solid Waste Management Authority.
4. All 7 town board members also serve as the Authority Board.
5. Annual operating budget of $22,000,000.
6. No subsidy.
7. No “service availability” fee.
8. Flow control authorized and enacted.
9. Eminent domain authorized with consent of Town Board and Town Supervisor.
10. The Authority exports its waste off Long Island through its own transfer station, which is operated by a contractor. It holds 4 HHW collection days per year and provides weekly e-waste collection at a drop-off site. It contracts for recyclables processing and there are multiple contracts for curbside collection services in the town.
Authority Profile

1. Ulster County Resource Recovery Agency.


3. Serves the Ulster County population of 182,742.

4. 5 member board appointed to 3 year terms by the county legislature.

5. Annual operating budget of $13,553,302.

6. County subsidy of $1,400,000 for 2010.

7. No "service availability" fee.

8. Flow control enabling authorization.

9. Eminent domain authorized.

10. UCRRA owns and operates a materials recovery facility and a transfer station for receipt and transport of non-recyclable waste to out-of-county contract landfill; they hold special events for HHW.
Authority Profile

1. Western Finger Lakes Solid Waste Management Authority.


4. Wayne County appoints 6 board members and Yates appoints 2.

5. Annual operating budget of $1,656,000 in 2009.

6. Wayne County paid subsidy of $1,632,000 and Yates paid $37,000 in 2009.

7. No “service availability” fee.

8. Flow control authorized but not enacted.

9. Eminent domain authorized with consent of county where property is located.

10. The Authority provides no disposal or transfer services. It owns and operates a MRF in Wayne County.
Appendix B

Larger Solid Waste Management and Recycling Facilities in the Study Area
All facility capacity data based on quantities listed in the NYSDEC-provided facility permit or registration. All received quantities based on those reported in the facility annual reports to the NYSDEC for 2008.

### Active MSW Disposal Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TPY Rec’d</th>
<th>TPY Capacity</th>
<th>Est. Life (Years) Remaining</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Rapp Rd Landfill</td>
<td>City of Albany</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>232,330</td>
<td>275,000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Colonie Landfill</td>
<td>Town of Colonie</td>
<td>Colonie</td>
<td>164,083</td>
<td>170,500</td>
<td>14-16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheelabrator RRF</td>
<td>Warren &amp; Washington Counties (until 2011)</td>
<td>Hudson Falls</td>
<td>170,317</td>
<td>219,000</td>
<td>20+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TPY Totals =&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>566,730</strong></td>
<td><strong>664,500</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Larger (Permitted) PRIVATELY Owned Transfer Stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TPY Rec’d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EACO B-3</td>
<td>Canaan – Columbia County</td>
<td>23,424</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hiram Hollow</td>
<td>Wilton – Saratoga County</td>
<td>69,259</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WMNY – Port of Albany</td>
<td>Albany (C) – Albany County</td>
<td>54,692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Edward</td>
<td>Fort Edward – Washington County</td>
<td>9,845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County Waste – Clifton Park</td>
<td>Half Moon – Saratoga County</td>
<td>112,924</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TPY Totals =&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>270,144</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Larger (Permitted) PUBLICLY Owned Transfer Stations

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TPY Rec’d</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady*</td>
<td>Schenectady – Schenectady County</td>
<td>71,454</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSA - Amsterdam</td>
<td>Amsterdam – Montgomery County</td>
<td>21,975</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSA – Western</td>
<td>Root – Montgomery County</td>
<td>15,548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MOSA – Schoharie</td>
<td>Schoharie- Schoharie County</td>
<td>13,850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greene County</td>
<td>Catskill – Greene County</td>
<td>18,574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Greenport</td>
<td>Greenport – Columbia County</td>
<td>10,426</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TPY Totals =&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>151,829</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Privately operated.
### Larger (Permitted) PRIVATELY Owned Composting Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CY/Y Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hiram Hollow</td>
<td>Wilton – Saratoga Co.</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CTI Agri-Cycle</td>
<td>Cambridge – Wash. Co.</td>
<td>64,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CY/Y Totals =&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>79,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Larger (Permitted) PUBLICLY Owned Composting Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>CY/Y Capacity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Albany</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>38,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Bethlehem</td>
<td>Bethlehem</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Guilderland</td>
<td>Guilderland</td>
<td>26,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Clifton Park</td>
<td>Clifton Park</td>
<td>60,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Colonie</td>
<td>Colonie</td>
<td>28,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Saratoga Springs</td>
<td>Saratoga Springs</td>
<td>49,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady County</td>
<td>Glenville</td>
<td>86,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Town of Rotterdam</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>15,000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CY/Y Totals =&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>388,000</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Larger PRIVATELY Owned Materials Recovery (Recycling) Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TPY Rec'd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>FCR MRF</td>
<td>Casella Waste</td>
<td>Claverack</td>
<td>14,086</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waste Connections Inc [Sierra Fibers]</td>
<td>Marketable Materials LLC</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>51,090</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WM Biers/BBC Aggregate Recycling</td>
<td>WM. Biers, Inc.</td>
<td>Albany</td>
<td>Unk.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kara Fibers RHRF</td>
<td>Kara Fibers Inc.</td>
<td>Fort Edward</td>
<td>1,797</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fort Edward MRF</td>
<td>Waste Management of New York</td>
<td>Fort Edward</td>
<td>3,590</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>TPY Totals =&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>91,843</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Larger PUBLICLY Owned Materials Recovery (Recycling) Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Name</th>
<th>Owner</th>
<th>Location</th>
<th>TPY Rec'd</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Town of Colonie</td>
<td>Town of Colonie</td>
<td>Colonie</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schenectady MRF*</td>
<td>Schenectady County</td>
<td>Rotterdam</td>
<td>Unknown</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>TPY Totals =&gt;</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Unknown</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Privately operated, and currently functions as a transfer station for recyclable materials.
Appendix C

Solid Waste Management Facility Development Process
If the development of a regional waste authority is deemed feasible and if part or all of the Counties in the study area elect to empower a new authority to develop an integrated system, among the first tasks of the authority will be to determine a) which, if any, existing public facilities will continue to be utilized, b) what role will the private sector play [e.g., a publicly owned facility can be privately operated], and c) what are the target waste components and tonnages to be managed? Based on what we know at this time, the facility development would fall into 3 categories:

RECYCLING – DRY RECYCLABLES; ORGANICS [2-3 years to new facility opening]

1. Issue 120(w) RFP to procure a long term contract with an existing facility, and/or

2. Establish siting criteria [e.g., based on acceptable travel times from local collection routes; compatibility with nearby land uses] and designate a site for new facility development:
   a. Complete SEQRA and permitting requirements.
   b. Issue 120(w) RFP for development of a new facility through a public – private partnership, or
   c. Proceed with design-build-operation of new public facility.

TRANSFER & DISPOSAL [interim] [2 years to start – operate for 10-12 years until long-term facility opens]

1. Determine optimum transfer station configuration to serve the region based on acceptable travel times from local collection routes through consideration of potential use of existing public transfer stations, construction of a new transfer station or stations, or some combination. [Keeping the number of transfer stations to a minimum is critical, from a cost effectiveness perspective].

2. Complete SEQRA and permitting requirements.

3. Proceed with design-build-operation of new public facility or facilities:
   a. Facility construction, operation and/or hauling can be done by a private contractor.
PROCESSING & DISPOSAL FACILITY [long term] [12-14 years to facility opening]

1. Establish target capacity.

2. Define waste components to be handled.

3. Review potentially feasible technologies.
   a. Track record
   b. Environmental impacts
   c. Cost


5. Develop facility siting criteria/policies/preferences, such as;
   a. Remoteness.
   b. Proximity to waste centroid.
   c. Proximity to other existing land uses.
   d. Preferred primary highway classification.

6. Prepare draft siting methodology.

7. Initiate first phase of SEQRA process for technology and siting methodology:
   a. Establish lead agency.
   b. Make positive declaration of environmental significance.
   c. Issue draft GEIS.
   d. Coordinate public comment period.
   e. Hold public hearing.
   f. Develop response to comments.
   g. Issue final GEIS.
   h. Prepare findings statement.

8. Prepare and submit a request for Conceptual Review by DEC based on the GEIS with a preferred technology and siting methodology determined to be the best fit for the community and the waste stream.

9. Following DEC conceptual approval of technology and siting methodology, select the technology and the site – May consider the issuance at this stage of a 120(w) RFP to shift the responsibility for most development costs to a private entity who would then prepare documents and provide technical assistance to complete 10-14 below.
   a. The 120(w) RFP process involves issuance of a Draft RFP, followed by a Final RFP, then an evaluation of proposals and negotiation of a contract with the selected company.
10. Initiate second phase of SEQRA process for designated technology on selected site
   a. Establish or reaffirm SEQRA lead agency.
   b. Hold EIS public scoping meetings.
   c. Complete all necessary evaluations of potential and projected impacts, such as:
      i. Hydrogeology
      ii. Unique and sensitive environmental areas
      iii. Regulated wetlands
      iv. Rare, endangered, threatened species
      v. Traffic
      vi. Air emissions
      vii. Odors and other nuisance factors
      viii. Environmental justice issues
   d. Issue draft site specific EIS.
   e. Establish public comment period.
   f. Hold public hearing.
   g. Develop responses to comments.
   h. Issue final site specific EIS.
   i. Issue findings statement.

11. Submit all required permit applications (this can be initiated once the draft site specific EIS is complete).

12. Commence DEC adjudicatory hearing process:
   a. Issues conference.
   b. Determination of issues by DEC ALJ.
   c. Adjudicate issues [adjudicatory hearing is conducted like a trial with expert witnesses, cross examination, etc].

13. Receive adjudicatory hearing process results; receive permits; update processing/disposal market analysis; respond to litigation.

14. If not previously completed, proceed with issuance of a 120(w) RFP for development of a new facility through a public-private partnership, or proceed with the design – build – operation of a new public facility.

15. Execute facility construction/operation contracts.

16. Facility construction.

Start facility operations.
Appendix D

NYSDEC Region 4 Comments on Preliminary Draft of Report
June 9, 2011

Mr. Michael V. Franchini
Director of Operations
Albany County Office of the Executive
112 State Street – Room 200
Albany, NY 12207-2021

Re: Albany County Regional Solid Waste Authority Feasibility Study Draft of 5-31-11

Dear Mr. Franchini,

The Department of Environmental Conservation Region 4 Office is pleased to offer the following comments in review of the subject draft study.

The referenced study provides an excellent overview of the opportunity and benefits of developing a cooperative regional solid waste management authority for the Capital District. Currently the Capital District is composed of multiple municipalities, each managing solid waste with minimal coordination and cooperation between communities. While there is some collaboration amongst communities within the Capital Region Solid Waste Management Planning Unit, the establishment of a formal Solid waste management Authority would strengthen their ability to enhance recovery and collection programs and realize economies of scale with much greater ability to take advantage of marketing opportunities. In addition, the establishment of waste flow control strategies would provide a sound foundation for the long term maintenance of these programs.

1. The report correctly points out that Capital District disposal facilities will be closing or significantly changing operations within the time needed to implement changes. Privatization of existing facilities will likely compromise existing recyclables collection programs by driving solid waste management to the least expensive alternative, leaving less profitable aspects of solid waste management to whither.

2. Under key findings, the report correctly points out that significant cost savings would result from the establishment of an authority by eliminating duplicative services and the realization of economies of scale. In addition, Capital District communities would realize greater capture of recyclables through consolidation and increased revenues. Provided adequate assurances are included to assuage concerns regarding general mistrust of the motives behind an authority, the establishment and implementation of an authority is feasible. Consensus is a key element. We support the recommendation that an inter-municipal agreement be established amongst Capital District municipalities to help build consensus prior to the establishment of the Authority.
3. The Department is moving to a higher level of enforcement of Local Solid Wasté management Plans (LSWMP). Therefore; adherence to the terms and conditions within those plans will force smaller communities to expend greater resources to upgrade plans as well as develop their solid waste programs to maintain strict compliance with the local plans. The statewide plan has laid the groundwork for this path. The possible loss of grant funding and inability to permit solid waste management facilities may result if these communities are unable to update their plans or develop their programs in compliance with the statewide plan.

4. Under “Next Steps,” the proposal to contractually control private company collection routes/practices is particularly attractive. Cost savings could be realized, but more importantly, environmental benefits such as reduction of carbon emissions could be significant. We strongly support this idea.

5. The report points out the impacts to the projected lifetime and subsequent privatization of the Colonie landfill, but emphasis should be given to the possibility of greatly increased fill rates, and subsequent shortening of the life for this landfill subsequent to its acquisition by a private company. In the short term, this may result in lower tipping and disposal rates, but the longer term impact will be diminished disposal capacity, and coupled with the impending closure of the Rapp Rd. facility, will result in significantly higher disposal costs, and potentially a solid waste disposal crisis for Capital District communities. It is imperative that steps be taken now to begin to advance the establishment of an Authority to avoid these effects.

6. Without an Authority, it will not be economically feasible for communities to begin to implement the ideas put forth in the Statewide Plan, Beyond Waste, which proposes to hold producers of waste responsible for its proper management, as well as removal and alternative management of organics from the waste stream.

7. Table 4 provides the disposal fees for various facilities. The average disposal fee for Albany landfill is given as $75.00/ton. This fee appears somewhat high; the city is currently in contract with two of the area’s largest waste haulers for $47/ton for up to 600 tons per day. Non-contracted waste haulers pay higher tip fees, but the average would likely be less than the $75/ton figure provided.

8. Key Ingredients For Success, Steps For Creating An Authority. This section provides a clear and concise roadmap for the development and creation of a successful solid waste management Authority. It’s absolutely critical at each step of the process to carefully bring consensus with clarity and absolute transparency. All stakeholders in the region must be included in the process and have confidence the end result (Authority) will ultimately provide long-ranging benefits for all involved. The Feasibility Study outlines all the necessary tools and steps that will assure a positive outcome.

Sincerely,

Gene Kelly
Regional Director
Appendix E

Comments on Public Review Draft
From: Willard Bruce [mailto:wbruce5190@gmail.com]
Sent: Tuesday, June 28, 2011 9:35 AM
To: Mike Franchini; Franchini, Michael; Hans G. Arnold
Subject: Fwd: Trash report

Guys,
Comments on the draft below.............Bill

-------- Forwarded message --------
From: Frank Zeoli <zeolif@ci.albany.ny.us>
Date: Mon, Jun 27, 2011 at 3:38 PM
Subject: RE: Trash report
To: twefward@apl.com, MARSO1@ci.albany.ny.us, parkerc@ci.albany.ny.us
Cc: wbruce5190@gmail.com, danton@ci.albany.ny.us

Hello All

Table 3 of the County Study released today should be corrected to accurately reflect the material recycling tonnage and percentage from the Capital Region Solid Waste Management Partnership (CRSWMP).

Specifically, That table did not appear to account for 84,082 tons miscellaneous recyclables and recycled C&D debris listed on the 2009 Planning Unit Recycling Report, including:

- 4 tons of commingled containers
- 24,864 tons of asphalt/pavement
- 6,769 tons of concrete
- 40,667 tons of petroleum contaminated soil
- 5,630 tons of construction project soil
- 2 tons of wood
- 6,146 tons of alternative daily cover.

Total reported recycling tonnage in 2009 was 146,372 tons and the total percentage recycled should be 46.36%.

Bill: Can you forward this one to the rest of the committee who received this report
Cashawna: Can you see that the council receives this as well.

Thank You

Frank Zeoli, Director of Recycling
518-434-2489 (w) | 518-462-6846 (f)

zeolif@ci.albany.ny.us | www.albanyrecycles.com
July 8, 2011

Mr. Michael Franchini
Albany County Director of Operations
112 State Street, Room 200
Albany, NY 12207

Dear Mr. Franchini:

At about 10:30 a.m. today I spoke with Elizabeth -- at your office number (518) 447 7040 -- in the Albany County Executive’s Office, regarding the pending July 11th deadline to submit comments on Albany County’s pending “Draft Regional Solid Waste Management Authority Feasibility Report.” I made this inquiry to find out just how hard the announced comment deadline of July 11th date was; and after checking, she indicated that our submission, if received by COB on Wednesday, July 13th, would be accepted and reviewed in normal order.

I understand that you were out of the office on Friday (7/8) and that the extension of this deadline was made with proper authority. We wish to acknowledge and thank Elizabeth for her fine professional effort here to help us with this minor extension. That said, while we will work to get comments in by this extended 7/13 deadline, we are also inclined to request that Albany County consider further extending the deadline for comments even longer. From what we know, the draft feasibility report hasn’t been available for general public review for even 30 days. In many instances, from our experience, comment periods for such comprehensive reports and studies often are kept open for 60 or 90 days.

Thanks for your further consideration of extending the deadline. In the meantime we will use the found time to get our comments on paper and to you by the COB 7/13 extended deadline.

Regards,

Steve Changaris
Manager
NY State Chapter

Steve Changaris • Manager, Northeast Region • Environmental Industry Associations: NSWMA & WASTEC • 290 Turnpike Road, PMB# 407, Westborough, MA 01581 • office: 508.839.4751 / 800.679.6263 • mobile: 508.839.4529 / fax: 508.839.4761 • email: schangaris@nswma.org
---Original Message---
From: Andy Arthur [mailto:andy@andyarthur.org]
Sent: Sunday, July 10, 2011 9:57 PM
To: SWMAComments
Subject: My Concerns With Regional Solid Waste Management Authority Study

Mike Franchini
Albany County Director of Operations
112 State St., Room 200
Albany, NY 1220

SWMAComments@albanycounty.com
(via electronic mail)

Dear Decision Maker:

I am writing you to express my concerns with the "Regional Solid Waste Management Authority Study", recently completed by Albany County. I became concerned with solid waste issues back in 2003 when I was a college student studying part-time at SUNY Albany, and stumbled upon the Albany Pine Bush, and discovered how wasteful our urban societies really are.

I grew up on my parents land out in Westerlo in Hilltowns of Albany County. We never had trash pick up, in part because we never had a lot of trash. My parents where working class, they struggled to find good paying work after the early-1990s recession. We grew or raised a lot of our food, burned and composted what "waste" we could on our little farm. It was a sin to toss a recyclable can or bottle in with the burnable trash, and food scraps and other organics wasn't just something to be wasted in burn barrel. Some see a carved up animal carcass, I see valuable organic materials. On my parents farm, trips to transfer station where rare. We often took more home from the Westerlo transfer station, then we sent to the Albany landfill.

This was totally different then what I saw going on in the city, where food waste was "just garbage", recycling was at best window dressing or a political statement, and people didn't really care much about the impact of their garbage output. I saw this urban garbage was being dumped in beautiful Albany Pine Bush — are rare ecological oasis in an urban waste land. This landfill will close soon due to this wastefulness. I couldn't believe city folk would even dream of tossing a valuable aluminum can in the trash.

Today, I also am very aggressive in avoiding waste myself, bringing organic waste out to my parents farm, and hauling the carefully separated recyclables and a minimal amount of trash to the Rupert Road Transfer Station a couple of times of year. I don't have weekly trash pickup here. Just following what I learned growing up, I know it's wrong to be wasteful and generate a lot of trash.
**I believe we must change how we deal with waste in our cities.**

Since becoming a resident of Town of Bethlehem in 2007, I have voted in all elections including primaries and school board, and are involved in numerous local political campaigns, particularly when there are true progressive leaders fighting to change our community for the better. I am an active member of Save the Pine Bush, and are constantly advocating for more conservation of the Albany Pine Bush, and for better recycling and especially organic waste recovery policies in our cities.

Below are my comments on the "Regional Solid Waste Management Authority Study"; please review them carefully. Thank you for your consideration! If you have questions, please don't hesitate to call my cell at 518-281-9873 or email andy@andyarthur.org

Sincerely,

Andy Arthur
15A Elm Avenue
Delmar, NY 12054

---

"The policy of the state shall be to conserve and protect its natural resources and scenic beauty and encourage the development and improvement of its agricultural lands for the production of food and other agricultural products." - Article XIV Section 4, NY State Constitution

---

**Point 1: Study Should Analyze Best Way to Get to Zero Waste**

- Study spends too much time considering how to build and construct a disposal facility, There are more then adequate trash landfills and incinerators to dispose of waste within our state for the foreseeable future.

- Study should define best practices for maximizing recycling and organics recovery, not disposal.

- Many studies have shown that large disposal facilities -- incinerators or landfills -- are expensive to run and canalize recycling efforts.

- If a solid waste agency builds a 1,000 ton per day incinerator or landfill, it will require that much trash. If it can't find that amount of trash, it will reduce recycling efforts to have enough trash to fill the incinerator or landfill. This undermines efforts to get to zero waste or near zero waste by increasing recycling and composting of organic materials.
- Study should include a 20-year plan similar to that of the recently submitted Albany Solid Waste Management Plan that proposes steady reductions in disposal of waste in favor of recycling.

- The study should be Zero Waste goal, where nearly all waste is recycled and organics are recovered. Many communities across the country have adopted a Zero Waste goal and are vastly more aggressive in recycling and organics recovery than what this study is proposing.

** Point 2: Public Authorities Are Anti-democratic **

- The study fails to acknowledge the benefits of competition, and how having competing transfer stations or disposal facilities could lower disposal costs.

- Authorities are anti-democratic. Citizens have the right to influence their leaders on what solid waste facilities are built and what solid waste laws are implemented. ** The study should not call for the authority to decide on disposal facilities -- it's up to elected officials to decide. **

- The lack of competition with an Authority will lead to large bureaucratic overhead, waste, fraud, and abuse.

- Citizens and elected officials have a right to know ahead of time what kind of disposal facilities if any would be constructed prior to creation of an authority.

- Local communities should have a voice in process and all decisions should be made by consensus of all communities. A large governmental body makes consensus impossible.

- Communities named in an authority's legislation are stuck in the authority until the legislature amends the law or allows it sunset, regardless of democratic choice. Any solid waste agency should be democratic in nature, and allow communities to freely join or leave it with sufficient notice (e.g. 90 days).

** Point 3: Study Fails to Acknowledge Alternatives **

- The study does not analyze the effectiveness of a Solid Waste District similar to those in Vermont. A Solid Waste District would have no employees or bureaucracy, but is a consistent set of regulations and permitting guidelines administered by multiple towns.

- The study fails to show what is wrong with the current ANSWERS structure. While the current ANSWERS disposal facility will close shortly, ANSWERS for many years has relied on communities contracting with private recycling brokers. Why can't communities also contract with private disposal brokers, while maintaining a coordination of solid waste planning through the current ANSWERS board?
- Citizens should be free to choose what hauler and disposal or recycling facility they use. Some may choose a landfill for disposal of their waste, while others seeking a more different option, may prefer extra to have waste hauled to an incinerator. The choice of disposal facility should be a key part of any plan, to allow citizens weight costs and benefits of different facilities.

- Consider creating a "Green Rating" system for trash haulers. Let consumers choose if what lower-value materials they wish to be recycled, and what kind of disposal facility they wish to pay for.

** Point 4: Town of Colonie, 8 Other Counties Have Not Expressed Interest in this Proposed Authority **

- The study claims to be on behalf of a 9-county region. However, only ANSWERS Communities have given formal resolutions in support of this study, and most notably the Town of Colonie has not given a resolution of support of the study. No other town or county, has formally stated their support or opposition to creation of a regional authority. Why not?

- Would Saratoga or Rensselaer Counties want to join the Authority, if they knew a massive 1,000 tons per day incinerator or landfill was going to built in their county, and all of the trash from Albany County through Otsego County was going to be hauled there?

- If other counties and non-ANSWERS towns are interested in creating an authority, they should be at the table now, and their citizens and elected officials should be kept fully informed. All counties, all towns, and all regions MUST have regular meetings on this topic, and a full debate in each community must occur prior joining any solid waste agency.

** Point 5: 9 County Regional Authority Would Ignore Need for Rural Area Flexibility, Differences in Urban vs Rural Waste Stream **

- Waste compositions vary by town and by county. Different regions have different disposal needs. For example, farmers and rural residents may burn or bury some of their wastes on site rather then needing a centralized facility. Wastes generated on a farm are significantly different then those generated by a commercial center or urban resident.

- In rural communities, it may make sense to have town owned and operated source-separated organics composting facilities or even disposal facilities for non-toxic farm and household trash. Decentralized composting and disposal facilities (e.g. less then 20 tons per day) will have a lower impact on surrounding communities then large facilities.

- Recycling programs should be tailored towards large generators of waste in a community. An centralized authority could not adequately focus on need to recycle agricultural plastics and agricultural chemicals, while also focusing on recycling of urban organic wastes or electronic waste.
**Point 6: Polluter Pays, No Taxpayer Subsidies**

- Any disposal program should operate without taxpayer subsidies. Polluter pays. There should be no volume discounts - a person who disposes 10 lbs of trash should pay the same proportional rate as a corporation who disposes of 200 tons of trash.

- Those who do not use the services of ANSWERS should not pay for it. For example a farmer or rural resident who burns or buries non-toxic waste on their property, should not be charged for disposal of that waste. Those who compost on their property should not pay for commercial composting operations.

- No taxpayer subsidies for waste disposal, all services administered by ANSWERS should come from those who seek to recycle or dispose of a material.

**Point 7: Small is Beautiful**

- Study over states the benefits of scaling up facilities and bureaucracy.

- Numerous political science studies show that larger bureaucracies are less efficient, more subject to waste, fraud, and abuse. If a bureaucracy employs hundreds of persons it is difficult to maximize productivity and keep employees from watching Youtube at work.

- Avoiding the bureaucracy of an authority, by simply using existing structures reduces cost and waste.

- Large landfills, trash incinerators, recycling plants are more polluting. While large facilities may have better pollution controls than small facilities, large facilities inherently release more pollution in aggregate, have more truck traffic, and more potential for serious harm.

- A 1,000 tons per day incinerator puts out 1,000 tons per day of carbon dioxide. That's 365,000 tons per year of carbon dioxide, that could be avoided -- or possibly a multiple of the number, by increasing recycling or organics composting.

- Ask yourself, would you prefer to live next door to a 20-tons per day unlined town landfill, only consisting of local household trash and farm waste, or a massive 1,000 tons per day incinerator burning unsorted and largely unregulated mixed waste next door? How about being downwind of a neighboring farm's burn barrel vs living next to a 1,000 tons per day incinerator burning mixed waste from far away? Distant towns that don't care what goes up the smoke stack or leaches into your ground water. Again, while some pollutants may be better controlled by a mega-facility, the reality is other pollutants will increase and be particularly burdensome to the host community.

- No disposal or recycling facility should be larger than 100 tons per day, and all facilities should be decentralized and close to sources of waste generation. Where scale is necessary to
overcome costs of pollution control, it must be as small as possible and use the least toxic processes possible.

- A large incinerator or landfill would incur significant costs and would require a large amount of trash to be disposed on it. This would undermine attempts at expanding recycling efforts.

- Least desirable facilities (incinerators, landfills, recycling plants, composting plants) should be spread over as many communities as possible to be fair and democratic. It should not just target poor rural or urban communities, but include facilities in wealthy suburban communities too.

- No one community should have the burden of disposal of waste for a nine-county region. It is especially obscene to site a large disposal facility in a rural or farming region, where many farmers may have traditionally disposed of their own waste on-farm, and are not responsible for the entire region's long-term solid waste problem.
From: Carol Tansey [mailto:carol_tansey@hotmail.com]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 12:44 PM
To: SWMAComments
Subject: Request for public comment extension

To Whom It May Concern:

I am a senior citizen - and am hard-pressed to make a careful reading of the Solid Waste Management Authority Feasibility Study. I want to be an active, participating citizen.

Please extend the 2 week public comment period. I have not yet completed reading the Study.

Thank you.

Carol Tansey
115 New Krumkill Rd. #716
Albany NY 12208
Tele: 489-0616
From: Barbara Warren [mailto:warrenba@msn.com]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 3:33 PM
To: SWMAComments
Subject: Comments re: Solid Waste Authority

Attached please find out comments.

Barbara Warren
Executive Director
Citizens' Environmental Coalition
33 Central Ave.
Albany, NY 12210
518-462-5527 Phone
518-465-8349 Fax.
August 11, 2011

Mike Franchini
Albany County Director of Operations
112 State St., Room 200
Albany, NY 12207 by July 11, 2011.
SWMAComments@albanycounty.com

Dear Mr. Franchini

We are formally requesting an extension of the public comment period on this proposal. For a proposal of this magnitude it is usual to have a minimum of a 60 day public comment period. Instead there has been only 2 weeks.

There are several important points to note about authorities:

1) They are not really "public" authorities in that they operate completely outside of public oversight for management, major policy decisions and day to day operations. officials.

2) They represent the antithesis of a normal functioning democracy. Can you imagine the difference if you suggested the creation of a dictatorship to manage solid waste?

3) Authorities are responsible for more than 90% of all outstanding state debt. In August of 2010 New York State Comptroller DiNapoli issued a report on public authorities in New York State. Outstanding public authority debt totals over $214 billion. Even more astounding is the fact that 94% of all state-funded debt was issued by public authorities without voter approval, reflecting an average increase of 9% per year since 1985.
We object to an authority because the process leaves the public out of major solid waste decisions. More importantly the creation of this authority and leaving the public out of these future decisions is really about advancing unsustainable, costly and environmentally unsound options like waste to energy incineration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Barbara J. Warren
Executive Director
From: James Travers [mailto:jatrv@yahoo.com]
Sent: Monday, July 11, 2011 3:53 PM
To: SWMAComments
Cc: CountyExec; Peter Clouse
Subject: Comments on Solid Waste Management Authority Study

I most respectfully request that the public comment period on the Solid Waste Management Authority Study, which ends today, be extended to 60 or at least 30 days.

Albany County has taken 1.5 years to prepare this 73 page report, but has allowed members of the public most unfairly only a two week comment period which included the 4th of July holiday weekend.

As many are away vacationing during this time of the year, it is only fair that the comment period be extended.

The only publication that I and others are aware of announcing the 14 day comment period, was indicated in an Albany Times Union newspaper article published on June 27, 2011.

I remain unaware of any other official public notice announcing the public comment period.

Sincerely,

James Travers
Town of Coeysmans
From: elyse [mailto:ekunz@mhcable.com]
Sent: Tuesday, July 12, 2011 5:33 PM
To: SWMAComments@albanycounty.com
Subject: Solid Waste Study

Please extend the public comment period for the Regional Solid Waste Management Authority Study.

Two weeks over the Fourth of July holiday is exceptionally unfair to the public when Albany has taken over a year to prepare the study. The impact of this waste authority will be profound and the public should be given ample opportunity to review and comment on this study. Anything short of 60 days is grossly unfair to the many people who will be affected.

In addition, I am opposed to the siting of any kind of landfill, waste incinerator, or waste to energy facility in the Town of Coeymans as part of the operation of this regional authority.

Thank you,
Elyse Kunz
Coeymans, NY
From: Steve Changaris [mailto:schangaris@nswma.org]
Sent: Wednesday, July 13, 2011 3:54 PM
To: SWMAComments
Cc: CountyExec
Subject: Albany Solid Waste Authority Feasibility Report

Via Email

Wednesday, July 13, 2011

ATTN: Mr. Michael Franchini
Albany County, Dir. Of Operations

Thank you for giving us a couple of extra days to file these comments.

A hard copy will be sent overnight by COB today.

Regards,

Steve Changaris
Manager
NY State Chapter
Comments of the
National Solid Wastes
Management Association
New York State Chapter

On the
Albany County
Draft Regional Solid Waste Management
Authority Feasibility Report

Submitted to the
Office of the
Albany County Executive
Honorable Michael G. Breslin
July 2011

By: Steven Changaris
Regional Manager
NSWMA Northeast Office

Comments of the National Solid Waste Management Association, NY State Chapter
On the Draft Regional Solid Waste Authority Feasibility Study

INTRODUCTION

NSWMA represents an industry that is dedicated to the environmentally protective and
economically efficient management of recyclables and wastes. And further, as private
companies, we place great value on the exercise of choice, and market competition, in the
delivery of these environmental services as being good for both the environment, and for the
bottom line of those using these services,

We have a vision of a sustainable society that reduces waste, recycles more and recovers value
from discards to the maximum extent practicable and properly disposes the wastes that remain.
As our motto states, we approach our job by thinking of ourselves as being “Environmentalists
Everyday”. In effect we are reality-checkers who must negotiate, adapt to, and address the day-to-day and evolving conditions associated with collecting recyclables and handling wastes. We are in a unique position to offer well informed perspectives on the realities of how recyclables and solid wastes are managed today, and how they will be best managed tomorrow. We are grateful for this opportunity to provide comments on Albany County’s current draft feasibility report about how wastes and recyclables might be managed in the county and region in the future.

ABOUT US

The National Solid Wastes Management Association (NSWMA) is a 45 year old Washington, DC based trade association of private solid waste companies that collect, handle, recycle, compost and dispose the discards and waste materials generated by the citizens, communities, institutions and businesses of America. Our members operate in all fifty states, and many have an active and significant presence in the solid waste system currently operating under the state and local laws, regulations and rules of New York in Albany County and the counties within this study’s purview.

The NSWMA membership is comprised of small “mom and pop” haulers; and, small to medium to large privately held companies that collect and/or process recyclables and wastes; and publicly traded national companies that provide integrated waste services from collection to recycling to transfer to disposal and more.

In New York, private waste facilities and companies are already among the state’s most environmentally proactive and regulated industries. We are regulated by laws, rules and regulations established at all levels of government, including the federal, state, county, special waste planning unit level and at the most local level, the municipal level. Private companies, under strict NY State Department of Environmental Conservation permitting requirements, operate the state’s largest landfills, waste-to-energy trash combustion facilities, waste transfer and processing facilities, recycling facilities, compost sites, recycling and waste collection operations and related plants.

We employ thousands; we pay taxes and special fees to all levels of government; we invest, with private capital, in the physical infrastructure necessary to manage NY wastes and recyclables, as well as in the fleets of collection vehicles and related infrastructure necessary to collect and manage these discards and waste materials; and last, we also partner directly, and indirectly, with all kinds of governmental entities in NY to see that modern, environmentally sound waste management infrastructure, that is protective of the public health and safety, exists for them and all New Yorkers.

5 KEY INDUSTRY CONCERNS

A New Waste Authority is Not Needed: Creating a new super regional waste authority is not necessary to improve recycling rates; minimize waste production; or, to create the new infrastructure to take the management of solid wastes to the next level. In fact the creation of
such an authority will likely inhibit environmental progress by establishing a “command and control” governmental monopoly approach to the management of these materials. Such a new authority runs the risk of: 1) creating a vast lost opportunity for environmental innovation; and, 2) creating higher prices for all those who use waste related services. Such governmental monopolies drive innovation, choice and competition out of the equation for system users. Every citizen; community; institution and business in Albany County and the region has the tools today immediately available to be as environmentally friendly as necessary in the management and handling of the discards and waste materials they generate.

Public v. Private Facilities: The record does not support the notion that public waste and recycling facilities are necessarily a superior choice -- or a less costly option -- or have less environmental impacts -- than privately held facilities and is simply, as a premise in this study, fundamentally flawed and inaccurate. It is a view that should be not be used at all; but, in the event it is, it must be used with the utmost caution in any public policy debate or study about how best to manage a community’s or region’s recyclables and wastes. All waste and recycling facilities in NY are strictly regulated by NY State Department of Environmental Conservation; and, local authorities too. As such, we believe private and public facilities to be equal; and, should be treated as such in all public policy debates, reports and reviews. Further, the cost to government for any waste related service, when provided by privately held facilities, is always the result of competition -- since before it can be provided, the winning provider had to undergo an open competitive procurement process. Publicly owned and operated waste and recycling services are never subject to this competitive driver; a driver which serves as a fantastic check to make sure safe, quality environmental services, with the greatest efficiency and least costs, are being provide.

Waste Authority History: The record clearly shows that waste authorities, both in NY and throughout the region, have not performed with the consistency that would justify the direct cost of creating and operating a new super-regional one as called for in this report. Further, to be clear, once established, any future bonded indebtedness of this authority will become new fiscal liabilities for all county and municipal governments, and other system users including the institutions and businesses operating in the region. There is a saying about the best government is one that is as close to the people as possible. In this context, this means the responsibility for recycling and waste services should be kept local, within communities and as close to the people who pay for them as possible. Edicts regarding the management of recyclables and wastes emanating from a one, centralized and insulated super-regional waste authority -- without elected directors responsible to the voters -- spread out over nine counties and dozens and dozens of municipal governments, will cause great conflicts and will trip-up the region’s well established governing procedures for providing and growing such vital local services.

Affordable NY at the Crossroads: Former NY Governor Mario Cuomo once said, “It is not government’s obligation to provide services, but to see that they are provided.” His son, now the current Governor, from the onset of his administration earlier this year, has boldly taken the reins of what he has generally characterized as New York’s broken, multi-layered, oft at cross-purposes system of governance with its myriad specialized units and concurrent over-the-top taxing and special fee and assessment authorities. In this context one has to take a hard look at the premise of this feasibility report since it contemplates the creation of such a new unit of
government. As a broad matter of policy, given the systemic and structural fiscal problems facing all levels of government in NY, a better policy path for Albany County and the region would be to explore which simple steps and actions could be undertaken -- by existing officials and units of government responsible for recycling and waste programs -- that would yield the highest policy rewards like improving recycling rates; increasing diversion and other forms of reuse; and, minimizing the amount disposal as much as possible. The NY State Chapter of NSWMA, as the industry's trade group, stands at the ready to assist all public officials to achieve these kinds of goals.

**Public v. Private Capital:** NY state law requires local waste planning units to plan so that environmentally protective waste services are available for their constituencies who use these services. There is nothing in the law that says these services have to be provided by the government. In those limited cases where they are, that is where the planning unit becomes the provider of these services, private capital and new private environmental infrastructure is largely shut out. At this time, again given NY's severe fiscal problems, it is most appropriate to suggest that waste planning efforts for Albany County, and the other counties in the report's purview, shouldn't focus on continuing with the creating a new waste planning unit and its related costs and bureaucracy. Rather, the efforts of local officials responsible for recycling and waste services should be re-focused and be directed to change "the command and control government as waste provider culture" that exists within NY. This existing planning culture should be reformed and realigned so that the government sets the direction and provides the leadership, so that private industry can do its part to build the infrastructure and set-up the programs to attain the goals and attendant benefits of having a well run environmentally secure and cost effective system based on the principles of the integrated waste management hierarchy. With this change and new signal, the private sector will be in a much better position to further improve existing infrastructure and to site, build and operate new environmental infrastructure and programs with private capital, and to see that it will be provided competitively to all within the region.

**Other Resources:** The link below is to our recent monograph on recycling and waste service privatization.


The letter below appeared in the Times Union during the time it was running a feature series on waste related issues in the Capital Region earlier this year.

**timesunion.com**

**Use private funds to pay for waste**
**Published: 12:25 a.m., Friday, February 11, 2011**

The Jan. 30 story, "Buried in trash," highlighted many waste and recycling issues and focused on the fact that the Albany city-owned landfill has only a couple of years of capacity left. It raised the specter of a monopolistic flow control regime that will raise costs without providing additional environmental
benefits. With budget deficits and burdensome tax levels, New York needs to scale back such layers of government, not create new ones.

The facts show that the best environmental and economic options for waste and recycling services involve choice, competition and economic efficiency.

The Capital Region's waste and recycling infrastructure is a mix of public and private sector facilities. The region has an adequate waste and recycling infrastructure. It meets the highest standards of modern integrated waste management: sustainability, lowering our carbon footprint, reducing and recovering the maximum amount from our discards and disposing of the remaining waste in state-of-the-art facilities.

The solutions offered in the article won't address the challenges that exist, and will create real problems. The easiest, most effective way for the region to get the best deal for these services is to pay for the waste and recycling infrastructure with private capital, not government bonds; to give all citizens, communities and businesses choice in their service provider who will comply with the region's waste and recycling goals; and to ensure that all providers have equal opportunity to compete for customers.

STEVE CHANGARIS
NY State Chapter Manager
National Solid Wastes Management Association