



TO: Jamestown City Council Members

FROM: Mayor Sam Teresi

RE: FY 2011 Executive Operating Budget and Capital Improvement Program

DATE: October 8, 2010

In accordance with Section C-39 (D) (1) of the Jamestown City Charter, I have attached for your review the Executive Operating Budget and Capital Improvement Program for Fiscal Year 2011.

This comprehensive plan, compiled with the assistance of Director of Financial Services/City Clerk Jim Olson and City Comptroller Joe Bellitto, is the culmination of several months worth of effort involving the various department and agency directors of city government, along with input from various members of the City Council.

STRUCTURE / ZERO BASED BUDGETING

As may be seen, the structure of the attached is very similar to that of previous years. Included are detailed line item accounts of the adopted FY 2010 Budget, year to date expenditure totals in each budget category, FY 2011 departmental and agency requests and a line item summary of the final Executive Budget and Capital Improvement Program. Also included is a **realistic** forecast of all non-property tax revenue sources.

As has been the case in every budget during my tenure as Mayor, we have again employed what is commonly referred to as a "**zero based budgeting**" approach, and have done so in the context of a **multi-year** look at the city's future expenditure requirements and revenue prospects. As has been the case during the past ten years, this budget has been built upon a "clean slate" zero starting point.

In other words, **every single expenditure and revenue line item in this budget**, regardless of what has been allocated in past years, **began at the zero point**, and is based upon hard documentation and/or our best forecast of the **actual needs** for the coming fiscal year.

In the case of **expenditure** line items, the bare **minimum funding level** necessary to deliver the service in question was programmed and in the case of non-property tax **revenues**, the most **aggressive**, yet defensible amount was incorporated into this financial plan.

In short, this budget does NOT utilize the respective figures from the previous budget as a starting point upon which an arbitrary series of percentage increases have been applied.

Based upon the most current, available data, it is the professional opinion of the Executive Budget Team that this plan is **balanced** and **honest**, provides adequately for a basic level of **mandated** and **essential** municipal services, addresses the requirements of the City Charter, complies with Generally Accepted Accounting Principles, and is consistent with the objectives and strategies contained within the City's Fiscal Recovery Plan as presented to the City Council on June 19, 2000.

PROCESS

Initial preparations for this plan actually began shortly after the adoption of the FY 2010 Budget. The process moved into full swing with a series of individual meetings involving senior financial staff members several months ago. Over the past several weeks, pre-budget preparation meetings and discussions were held with city council members and department and agency representatives. The Executive Budget Team then proceeded with its series of reviews and revisions prior to the preparation and submission of this fiscal plan.

ISSUES

As with the preparation of any budget document, the Executive Budget Team was confronted and required to deal with a series of issues and dynamics that have profoundly impacted this proposal. Included were the following opportunities, concerns and challenges.

Positives/Opportunities

1. **Disciplined/Realistic Budgeting** – The level of public education, discussion and input over the past several years has clearly helped to produce tighter, more realistic and honest budgets on which to build next year's plan.
2. **Restructuring/Downsizing of Operations** – The determined efforts and difficult decisions of the past several years to change the way in which the City does its business, and the related reduction and streamlining of our operations, have taken significant pressure off of numerous areas in the proposed 2011 Budget.

Previous actions to restructure departments, regionalize services, eliminate positions and institute and abide by a hiring freeze have dramatically impacted this Executive Budget plan. Had these steps not been taken during the past ten years, the increase in costs included in this plan would have been significantly greater and potentially devastating. Included for your review is a summary comparison of FY2000 and current employment totals by department, as well as a listing of 45 restructuring efforts initiated since January 1, 2000. Collectively, these initiatives have resulted in approximately \$4.4 million in **annual recurring savings** to City taxpayers.

3. Positive Fund Balance – Due to the above referenced change in budgeting philosophy and practices over the past several years, and the tight day-to-day management of city operations by Department Heads and staff, the City ended FY 2009 with its 9th consecutive surplus budget and a final, audited, unappropriated General Fund Balance of \$2,150,692. This compares to the accumulated NEGATIVE fund balance of (\$1,371,007) (created by the deficit plagued years of the late 1990's) that the City carried into the 2001 fiscal year.

While this hard earned fiscal cushion has yet to accumulate to the optimal level recommended for operations the size of Jamestown, it is nevertheless a significant accomplishment in which we can all take great satisfaction. Additionally, it is always better and somewhat easier to put together a budget plan while operating in the BLACK, as opposed to the deficit, "one foot in the hole" position in which we were at one time forced to start during past years.

4. Health and Dental Care Benefits Management – Increased levels of employee contributions (as provided for through recently settled labor contracts) and the tight management of the self insurance fund by both in-house staff and our third party and pharmacy benefit administrators, have helped to contain, somewhat, the appropriation for employee and retiree health care benefits in the FY 2011 Executive Budget.
5. Miscellaneous Revenues – Despite the overall deflating impact of the weak national/regional economy on various non-property tax revenue lines in this budget, several items have actually remained stable or even posted modest increases.

Overall, it is projected that revenues from miscellaneous, non-property tax sources will increase by \$345,663 (2%) during FY 2011.

6. Debt Service Payments – Total scheduled debt service payments will decrease by \$309,496 (13.2%) during FY 2011.
7. Sales Tax – \$5,300,000 in sales tax revenues have been included in this preliminary budget, which represents an increase of \$150,000 or 2.9%. This may need to be adjusted during the coming weeks, upon receiving the third quarter payment from the County and the outcome of updated forecasts of national economic performance during the 2011 fiscal year.
8. Utility Revenues – Utility revenues are optimistically projected to slightly increase during 2011. Adjustments to these figures may also be necessary during the coming weeks as additional data is received from the Board of Public Utilities and economic forecasts for the coming year begin to sharpen.

Concerns/Challenges

1. The Nation, New York State and the Greater Jamestown Region continue to struggle with the fiscal challenges and fallout of the 2008-2009 Great Recession.

While the economy at both the national and local levels is beginning to show some signs of a much needed recovery, the worst national economic downturn since the Great Depression continues to have an adverse impact on the City Budget, not only from a diminished revenue-generating standpoint, but also from the increased demand on basic municipal (and most notably public safety) services directly associated with a weakened economy.

Recent national economic forecasts point to a continued slow recovery during 2011, which will undoubtedly have a dragging impact on city operations, revenues and expenditures during 2011 and beyond.

2. Salaries and Benefits - In conjunction with the City's previously negotiated and approved labor contracts, (which include an assortment of lucrative wage and health care packages, minimum staffing agreements, no layoff clauses, post retirement benefits, etc., etc.), the categories of salaries and benefits for both active personnel and retirees, remain a major problem/challenge in the 2011 Budget.

Additionally, a number of arbitration decisions (issued over the past several years), courtesy of the New York State Public Employees Relations Board (PERB), have proven to be particularly damaging to our efforts to slow and reign in skyrocketing wage and benefits packages.

The increase in the wage and benefits lines of this budget is also directly attributed to the flawed and biased system in New York State governing public employee contract settlements, in which existing agreements simply CANNOT be scrapped. In effect, the New York State Taylor Law dictates that new contracts must be negotiated and built upon base contracts that have evolved layer by layer over previous years...and quite often, this is done with little or no regard to the ability of local property taxpayers to afford such wage and benefit rich packages.

The increased salary and benefits appropriations in the 2011 Executive Budget have come despite a fairly significant decrease in employment numbers during recent years. I would like to again refer you to the attached chart comparing current city employment levels with those of the past.

3. State Retirement System Obligations – Due in large part to the dramatic loss of stock market revenues (following the 9/11 attacks, and the unraveling of the national financial system following the 9/15/08 crash of Lehman Brothers), and corrective actions taken by the State Comptroller (along with the incremental growth in the City's payroll), the unsustainable amount included in the budget to cover projected, mandatory payment obligations to the State Retirement System

continues to crowd out other needed services and is one of the major factors driving the City's high and punitive property tax levy. To moderate the impact on taxpayers, the 2011 Executive Budget provides an appropriation adequate to cover the required payment through the alternative Retirement Payment Stabilization Program offered by the Office of the State Comptroller.

For illustrative and comparative purposes, the City's appropriation for State Retirement System payments in 1999 (for our legally required participation in both the Police/Fire and the Employees Systems) was \$67,980.

The combined allocation for 2011 (which does **not** include City employees working out of the Board of Public Utilities) is \$2,649,000 (a 3,797 % increase!).

4. Health and Dental Insurance – Due to a variety of factors, including the size, age and growth of our self-insured employee and retiree pool, along with skyrocketing expenses within the health care industry, the cost of health and dental benefits remains a problem that also crowds out other needs and priorities within this budget.

The \$4,330,000 allocation in the 2011 Budget is contingent upon realizing savings projected during 2010, which will be “rolled” over into 2011.

During the coming weeks, the performance of the health care fund will need to be closely monitored. **Should it appear that the projected 2010 savings will not materialize, an appropriate adjustment (increase) in the 2011 budget appropriation for health and dental insurance may need to occur.**

5. Fuel, Utilities and Materials – As with private business and family budgets, the City's utility expenses, fuel for its fleet of vehicles and the cost for materials made out of petroleum have experienced **increases**, that must be accounted for and thereby reflected in the 2011 Budget.
6. Capital and Equipment Investments – Due to years of poor planning, legitimate inability, unwillingness and at times, outright neglect, the City's infrastructure, physical plant, equipment and rolling stock assets remain in dire need of a multi-million dollar transfusion. However, due to a variety of other competing needs, previously agreed to obligations and legal mandates, this budget, unfortunately, will once again fall short and provide an inadequate appropriation for equipment and capital projects.

The \$86,500 included for equipment replacement in 2011, while slightly higher than the amount contained in the 2010 spending plan, is actually \$37,615 (30.3%) less than in 2009 and \$62,400 (or 41.9%) less than the \$148,900 contained in the final 2008 Budget.

7. Street Lighting – Due to the recently enacted electric rate increases and the installation of additional streetlights throughout the community, the appropriation

for operating the City's 3,700 streetlights continues to put a strain on the overall budget.

8. Retirements – This budget plan must account for and provide adequate resources for a significant increase in planned retirements. While planned retirements can provide a welcome opportunity and means by which to restructure and downsize our operations, they also result in the loss of valuable, experienced employees and present expensive, contractually provided, “buy-out” packages that place a severe strain on first year out budgets.
9. State AIM Program Payments – Revenues from AIM are optimistically budgeted at the 2010 level. Given the State's current financial crisis, this figure may prove to be unrealistic and may need to be reduced, as the State Legislature continues to address New York's current and growing multi-billion dollar budget deficit.
10. Investment Income – A \$10,000 decrease in revenues from investments has been projected in this Budget. A further reduction in this forecast may be necessary during the coming weeks pending the performance (or lack thereof) of financial markets at the national and international levels.
11. Reduced Taxable Assessment – Due to a variety of influences, for the first time in several years, the City has experienced a reduction in taxable assessed property.

Major contributing factors to this reduction include a retroactive State 485-B RPTL exemption granted to the property at 201 West Third Street (\$2,301,850); a court imposed decision to reduce the assessment on Bush Industries properties (\$906,825); a reduction on the former, vacant Quality Markets property on Fluvanna Avenue (\$950,000); reductions from fire damaged and demolished properties (\$549,000); and, assessment reductions from reduced market sales in a weakened economy (\$704,300).

The net \$4,858,285 reduction in assessment during the past year will translate into a loss of revenue in excess of \$100,000 during the coming year.

12. American Recovery and Reinvestment Act (Stimulus) Funding – This budget plan does not contain any direct Federal Government assistance from what is commonly referred to as “Stimulus Funding”.

As you are well aware, unlike State Governments, County Governments and local school districts, ARRA funding is not provided directly to cities to help offset the costs of day-to-day operations.

While the City of Jamestown has pursued and was successful in receiving considerable funding commitments to assist with specific capital projects (ie: the Washington Street Bridge replacement, 5th, 6th, and Steele Street improvements, wastewater treatment plant upgrade, etc.), funding is clearly not available as a revenue source in this budget to offset costs associated with public safety activities, public works services, parks operations, general administrative services,

state retirement payments, health care benefits, etc. and thereby reduce the local property tax burden.

FY 2011 EXECUTIVE BUDGET – POINTS OF INTEREST

The following is a summary of some of the points of interest within the Executive Budget, as outlined in greater detail in the attached.

1. An increase of \$994,680 over the amount budgeted for 2010 has been included in this plan for **employee salaries**. This amount is in accordance with and necessitated by the terms of previously approved labor contracts and Police and Fire impact pay arbitration awards imposed on the City by the State of New York. Major cost drivers in the salaries category include the recent three-year retroactive Fire Department contract settlement, the retroactive two-year Police Department contract settlement and the unusually high number of retirements (including expensive buyout packages) scheduled during 2011. This increase comes in spite of a significant decrease in total city government employment during the past ten years.
2. A decreased appropriation of \$321,310 (3.6%) for **contracted employee benefits**.

As previously indicated, health care fund expenditures during the coming weeks will need to be closely monitored. Should it become evident that projected savings during the remainder of 2010 will not be attainable, an appropriate increase in the 2011 health care fund budget allocation will need to occur.
3. A decrease in the mandatory appropriation for **State Retirement System** obligations (\$30,310) (1.1%). As indicated previously, this is directly attributed to the decision to participate in the alternative Retirement Stabilization Payment Program offered by the Office of the State Comptroller.
4. Appropriation for **street lighting/heating of parking decks - Flat**.
5. Increased allocation for **utilities, fuel, and other material/contractual services** (\$273,635) (6.5 %).
6. Decreased **debt service** payments (\$309,496) (13.2%).
7. Increased appropriation for **acquisition and replacement of equipment** (\$15,650). The 2011 amount, however, represents a 30.3% reduction from the 2009 appropriation and a 41.9% reduction from the 2008 Budget.
8. Decreased **Capital Projects** appropriation (\$80,000) (9.4%).

It should be noted that \$726,732 of the total \$775,000 appropriated for capital projects will be provided from State CHIPS funding to the City. The remaining

\$48,268, which is allocated for a variety of initiatives (ie: continued roof repairs at Diethrick Park, critical storm drainage improvements, trees, small capital needs, etc.) is the actual appropriation from City generated funds.

9. The **Contingency Account** allocation of \$220,000, is a modest increase over the amount finally included in the FY 2010 spending plan. This marginal increase is necessary to hedge against the potential/likely further reduction in State AIM assistance during 2011, the impact of City bargaining unit contracts that will be settled during 2011, and to cover unforeseen/unbudgeted expenses (ie: storm damage, equipment failure, capital project overruns, etc.) that can occur during the course of any year.
10. Increased Social Security obligations (\$13,000) (1.1%).
11. **Workers Compensation Premium** – \$360,000, a \$40,000 (12.5%) increase from the previous budget.
12. An optimistic \$150,000 (2.9%) increase in **Sales Tax Revenues**. See previous comments and conditions.
13. Funding for **agency contracts** – Flat.
14. **BPU Tax Equivalency Payments** – A slight increase of \$61,000 from the 2010 budgeted amount. See previous comments and conditions.
15. Decreased **investment revenues** (\$10,000) (13.3%).
16. A very reluctant \$400,000 appropriation from the \$2,150,692 unappropriated **General Fund Balance**. This amount reflects a \$50,000 increase from the amount appropriated during 2010.
17. **State AIM Assistance** – Flat at \$4,665,000 (see previous comments)
18. **General Liability Insurance Expenses** – Flat.
19. Increased total expenditures of \$573,859 or 1.8% over the 2010 Budget. Contracted salary increases, retirement buyout expenses, benefits, and fuel/utility costs account for all of this increase, and then some.
20. Increased non-property tax (miscellaneous) revenues of \$345,663 (or 2.0%) compared to the 2010 Budget level.
21. A tentative increase in property tax generated revenues of \$178,196 or 1.28% over the 2010 Budget level.

FUTURE ISSUES/CHALLENGES

As I have stated over the years, a good, honest and realistic budget proposal cannot be developed within a vacuum, but rather, must be created with an eye toward future issues and concerns.

In past Executive Budget presentations, I have repeatedly made the attempt to identify and plan ahead for factors that would be impacting future budgets. A review of the budget proposals and veto messages from previous years will confirm that these forecasts and warnings have largely materialized. Continuing with that practice, I have outlined below numerous factors, which will likely impact the FY 2012 and 2013 budget plans.

- A weakened national and local economy that does not have the capacity to create and sustain jobs, income and an adequate government revenue stream at the local level...while placing increasing demands and undue burdens on government service levels.
- Reduced State aid payments that are exacerbated by growing, unfunded State mandates.
- Increasing salary and health care benefit expenses associated with negotiated contracts and State imposed agreements with the City's labor force.
- Skyrocketing retirement system expenses.
- Increased workers compensation expenses.
- The adverse impact of continued deferred capital and equipment replacement investments
- Further changes by the county in the collection and distribution of sales tax revenues.
- Increased fuel and utility expenses
- Costs associated with expensive post retirement obligations (health care benefits for life) that have been granted to retirees and their dependents through previous labor contracts.
- Costs associated (expensive buyout packages) with employee retirements that are expected to occur in 2011, 2012 and 2013.
- Improper utilization of "one shot" revenues and the ill advised draining of our modest fund balance.

NEXT STEPS

During the coming weeks, a variety of actions will be required in order to put this budget plan, or one utilizing it as a base, into action. As I am sure that you are all aware, I stand ready and look forward to working with you in any manner deemed helpful to bring this process to a successful conclusion on or before December 1st.

In accordance with past practice, I would be happy to arrange for a series of meetings with representatives of the various departments to review in greater detail, not only what

I have outlined in this plan, but to examine from the departments' perspective their identified needs and the impact of this proposal.

During the coming weeks, we will be receiving additional and/or updated information that may necessitate further attention and revisions to selected revenue and expenditure lines. Specifically, we will all need to pay close attention to the following before final action is taken on the 2011 plan:

- All 2010 revenue and expenditure lines as of 10/31/10
- 3rd quarter sales tax revenues (due in early November)
- FY 2010 health and dental benefits expenditures as of 10/31/10

Please keep in mind that this is an **extremely tight budget** that is consistent with the principals and recommendations contained within the City's Financial Recovery Plan developed and presented publicly to the City Council on June 19, 2000. As such, any and all modifications to either the appropriations or revenue lines, with **the desire to impact the final tax levy and rate, must be based upon sound fiscal reasoning, solid documentation and Generally Accepted Accounting Principals.**

In so far as the revenue lines in this budget are extremely aggressive, I would strongly recommend that **any changes to this plan come from the expenditure side of the equation**...so long as the proposed cuts are legal and achievable.

Given Jamestown's history with and past reliance on inflated and unsubstantiated revenue allocations, **it is important that we avoid falling back into the trap that once took this City to the brink of bankruptcy and a state control board.**

During the coming weeks, I look forward to **working with all of you every step of the way to further improve this budget.** I would again encourage each member of the City Council to conduct his or her own review and feel free to contact me, or any member of the Executive Budget Team whenever questions should arise.

Again, as I have said before, we are all in this together and as we have done in the past, we must attempt to work as one to insure the development of a plan that all can be relatively comfortable with, is honest in its approach, provides for the needs of the community and continues the change that we all recognize as necessary.



Samuel Teresi
Mayor

pc: Department Heads

FULL TIME EMPLOYMENT COMPARISON
01/01/2000 – 10/01/2010

	<u>01/01/2000</u>	<u>10/01/2010</u>	<u>Change</u>	<u>% Change</u>
Administrative* (JCAA, CSEA, Non-Bargaining, Court Security)	61	50	- 11	-18%
Fire Department (Local 1772)	67	55	-12	-18%
Police Department (Kendall Club PBA)	72	60	-12	-16%
DPW (AFSCME 66/418)	51	43	-8	-16%
Parks (AFSCME 66/418)	19	15	-4	-21%
JURA – DOD (JCAA)	17	11	-6	-35%
TOTAL	287	234	-53	-18.5%
*Appointed City Officers	13	6.5	-6.5	-50%
Positions Eliminated/Merged:				
City Clerk				
City Treasurer				
Ombudsman/HR Director				
Associate Corporation Counsel				
Assessor (.5)				
Parks Director				
Fire Chief				

CITY OF JAMESTOWN EMPLOYMENT HISTORY

1/1/1980 1/1/1990 1/1/2000 10/1/2010

BOARD OF PUBLIC UTILITIES (all employees)

FULL-TIME	173	130	143	141
PART-TIME	0	0	8	14

JAMESTOWN GENERAL HOSPITAL

FULL-TIME	285	0	0	0
PART-TIME	109	0	0	0

FIRE DEPARTMENT (Local 1772 members)

FULL-TIME	99	90	67	55
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0

POLICE DEPARTMENT (Kendall Club members)

FULL-TIME	76	91	72	60
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0

PARKS DEPARTMENT (AFSCME members)

FULL-TIME	42	35	19	15
PART-TIME (ICE RINK EMPLOYEES)	0	0	8	0

DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS (AFSCME members)

FULL-TIME (includes WWTP, misc. employees 1980,1990)	112	106	51	43
PART-TIME	0	0	0	0

MISCELLANEOUS (Non-bargaining, Court Security, CSEA, JCAA)

FULL-TIME	32	38	61	50
PART-TIME (does not include City Council)	2	14	31	32

JAMESTOWN URBAN RENEWAL AGENCY

FULL-TIME			17	11
PART-TIME			0	1

TOTAL FULL-TIME

	819	490	430	375
--	-----	-----	-----	-----

TOTAL PART-TIME

	111	14	47	47
--	-----	----	----	----

TOTAL FULL-TIME (LESS BPU & JGH)

	361	360	287	234
--	-----	-----	-----	-----

TOTAL PART-TIME (LESS BPU & JGH)

	2	14	39	33
--	---	----	----	----

CHANGE 2000-2010

TOTAL FULL-TIME (LESS BPU & JGH)				-53
----------------------------------	--	--	--	-----

TOTAL PART-TIME (LESS BPU & JGH)				-6
----------------------------------	--	--	--	----

TOTAL				-59
-------	--	--	--	-----

CITY OF JAMESTOWN
EMPLOYEE RESIDENCE 10/2010

DEPARTMENT	TOTAL EMPLOYEES	JAMESTOWN RESIDENTS	%	NON-RESIDENTS (E.G., W.E., BUSTI, ETC.)	%
DEVELOPMENT	12	7	58.33%	5	41.67%
FIRE	55	26	47.27%	29	52.73%
POLICE	60	20	33.33%	40	66.67%
MISC.	82	51	62.20%	31	37.80%
DPW	43	28	65.12%	15	34.88%
PARKS	15	8	53.33%	7	46.67%
BPU	155	73	47.10%	82	52.90%
TOTAL	422	213	50.47%	209	49.53%
CITY NON-BPU	267	140	52.43%	127	47.57%
BPU	155	73	47.10%	82	52.90%
TOTAL	422	213	50.47%	209	49.53%



CITY OF JAMESTOWN RESTRUCTURING EFFORTS

(1/1/00 –Present)

1. Restructured and downsized the Legal Services Department (annual savings - \$75,000) (1/00)
2. Transferred Housing and Building Code legal prosecution efforts to the County (1/00)
3. Merged the administration of the Public Works and Parks Departments (annual savings - \$65,000+) (1/00)
4. Changed Health Care Program Third Party Administrator (annual savings - \$1,000) (6/00)
5. Consolidated contract negotiations and administrative activities with the Board of Public Utilities (6/00)
6. Restructured the Financial Services Operation (annual savings - \$10,000+) (8/00)
7. Changed Employee Assistance Program Administrator (annual savings - \$2,100) (11/00)
8. Restructured the Human Resources Department (annual savings – \$10,000+) (1/2001 & 10/01)
9. Shared administrative personnel between the Police and Fire Departments (annual savings - \$20,000) (1/01)
10. Instituted a new Fire Department callback and overtime policy (annual savings - \$300,000+) (1/01)
11. Transferred all City-owned bridges and nine more roadways to the County (projected annual savings - \$100,000) (7/01)
12. Round I: Police and Fire Department Early Retirement Incentive Program (initial annual savings - \$100,000) (11/01)

13. Physical consolidation of City Clerk and Treasurer's Offices (Initial annual savings - \$30,000) (1/02)
14. Relocation/Restructuring of the Assessor's Office (annual savings - \$12,000) (1/02)
15. Round I: Restructuring of the Fire Department (annual savings of \$161,000)(2/02)
16. Round I: Restructuring of the Police Department (annual savings of \$359,000)(2/02)
17. Relocation and Restructuring of the Youth Services Department to Parks, Recreation and Conservation Offices (annual savings - \$13,000) (2/02)
18. Restructuring of Department of Development/JURA Operations (annual Savings - \$125,000)(2/02)
19. Restructuring of the Public Works Department (annual savings - \$100,000)(4/02)
20. Consolidation of EMS Dispatching with the County (annual Savings - \$150,000) (1/2000 – 6/03)
21. Transfer of Community College Chargeback Payments to the County (annual savings - \$1,000,000+) (4/02)
22. Administrative restructuring and consolidation: Police & Fire Departments (annual savings – \$82,000) (6/2002 and 2/03)
23. Round II: Police and Fire Department Early Retirement Incentive Program (annual savings - \$100,000) (12/02)
24. Changed the city's Internet Service Provider (ISP) to the Board of Public Utilities (annual savings - \$3,000) (2/03)
25. Revised sidewalk replacement procedure (annual savings - \$40,000) (2/03)
26. Regionalization of Assessment operations (annual savings \$40,000) (6/04)
27. Consolidation of City Clerk position with Finance Director/Treasurer (annual savings - \$70,000) (1/06)
28. Replacement of Health Care Benefits Plan Third Party Administrator (annual Savings - \$400,000) (10/06)
29. Provision of telephone services and equipment in house-utilizing City BPU personnel (annual savings - \$10,000) (11/06)

30. Creation of a State Consolidated Assessment Program (CAP) with the Town of Busti (annual savings - \$75,000) (2/07)
31. Completed Energy Conservation Capital Improvement Program (annual savings - \$195,000) (2/07)
32. Replacement of Health Insurance Stop Loss Coverage Administrator (annual savings - \$6,000) (7/07)
33. Replacement of Property and Liability Insurance Administrator (annual savings - \$160,000) (10/07)
34. Replacement of Pharmacy Benefit Manager (PBM) Administrator (annual savings - \$114,000) (2/08)
35. Consolidation of DPW Operations and Assistant Engineer Positions into a Senior Engineer Position (annual savings - \$30,000) (5/08)
36. Consolidation of Civil Service Commission with County (annual savings - \$55,000) (7/08)
37. Elimination of Assistant Parks Director Position – Restructured Recreation Coordinator (annual savings - \$25,000) (1/09)
38. Expanded Consolidated Assessment Operation to include the Town of Ellicott (annual savings - \$20,000) (4/09)
39. Merged Police Department Payroll Clerk with Part-Time Finance Department Position (annual savings - \$20,000) (3/09)
40. Revised Asphalt Procurement Procedure (annual savings - \$100,000) (4/09)
41. Restructured Parking Enforcement positions (annual savings - \$10,461) (8/09)
42. Replaced contractor for Boarding of Stray Dogs (annual savings - \$18,000) (7/09)
43. Restructured Medicare supplement insurance for pre-1987 retirees (annual savings – \$140,000) (11/09)
44. Revised Fire Department Shift Maintenance Overtime Policy (annual savings - \$75,000) (1/10)
45. Established new Parking Fines Enforcement and Collection Contract (annual savings - \$10,000) (2/10)

Total Annual Savings : \$4,426,561