

Tompkins County Council of Governments
Special Meeting Minutes
Wednesday, October 13, 2010 3:00 PM
Scott Heyman Conference Room

Approved 10-28-10

SUBJECT: MUNICIPAL YOUTH SERVICES SYSTEMS 2011 FUNDING

ATTENDANCE

H. Engman, Town of Ithaca; C. Peterson, City of Ithaca; D. Barber, Town of Caroline; R. Barrier, Town of Enfield; P. Boynton, Town of Caroline; W. Burbank, TC Legislature; M. Christopher, Town of Lansing; K. Coleman, TC Youth Service Dept.; B. Conger, Village of Groton; J. Dennis, TC Legislature; R. DePaulo, Ithaca; R. Dietrich, Danby; K. Friedebarn, City of Ithaca; A. Hendrix, TC Youth Services Dept.; J. Johnson, TC Youth Services Dept.; J. Mareane, TC Administration; R. Marino, Ulysses; D. McKenna, TC Legislature; K. Miller, Lansing; L. Moran, Joint Youth Commission; G. Morey, Town of Groton; D. Nottke, Village of Trumansburg; F. Proto, TC Legislature; P. Pryor, TC Legislature; Dillon Race, Town of Danby; A. Rider, ECC-Enfield; M. Robertson, TC Legislature; B. Robison, TC Legislature; P. Stein, TC Legislature; M. A. Sumner, Dryden; L. Vance, City of Ithaca; N. Zahler, TC Youth Services

CALL TO ORDER

Don Barber called the meeting to order at 3:05 PM and thank everyone for coming.

INTRODUCTIONS and FRAMING TODAY'S DISCUSSION

Mr. Barber asked everyone to introduce herself/himself.

The reason for the meeting is that the State has been increasing the financial burden on local governments while cutting the revenue. And the reaction of the County has been to shift wherever possible program funding that is shared with municipalities to the municipalities because they are feeling the pressure from the State. This shift has been occurring for several years in the Youth Services Division, and for 2011, the tentative budget has the support going to zero.

AGENDA REVIEW

Mr. Barber reviewed the agenda (Attachment A).

Youth commission representatives were asked to speak briefly about their perceptions/concerns with the change in the programming that could take place with the County proposal to show how we are coming at this from different perspectives.

Municipal representatives were asked to hear, to state the board's plans and discussions had during their deliberations so far on youth programming with their budgets. They were also asked to state their feeling about developing a formal collaborative agreement for youth programming that doesn't exist at this time, but does exist for direct partnership, just as an example.

Legislators were asked to state their comments/responses during the agenda item on Brainstorming Ideas.

YOUTH COMMISSION REPS

Representatives reported that some of the effects on programs as a result of the County proposal are:

- Loss of full-time and part-time program positions;
- Complete loss of an elementary school program effecting 100-200 students;
- Loss of programs in middle and high schools affecting about 500 students;
- Loss of 23 teen jobs;

Minutes
Tompkins County Council of Governments
Wednesday, October 13, 2010

- Loss of the ability to hire students for summer camp and continue outreach programs and partnerships;
- Jeopardize continued services from Cornell Cooperative Extension and service to at-risk children.

MUNICIPAL REPRESENTATIVES

Town of Caroline

- Committed extra money from what was done last year, but not full amount at this point in time;
- Board is waiting to know outcome of this meeting to decide how it wants to deal further;
- Programming depends on blending monies from several sources;
- From small town perspective we feel that if we pull string on this and start to unravel and we feel that other things might happen to our programming if it's not all just financial.
- On collaboration: if decide to move ahead with effort should be moving toward some kind of formal agreement and talking about what is each one's responsibility.

Town and Village of Groton

- Willing to come up with more;
- Every \$5000 more put in is 1% more on the tax rate.

Town of Dryden

- Doubt if able to cover funding cut this year as was able to do last year;
- Share now is \$45,000;
- If funding cuts stand, Board will continue discussion of how the services may not continue.

Danby

- Can't afford to put in place as stand alone;
- Willing to step up and pay fair share, but can't make up difference
- Doesn't see how can happen without county.

Lansing

- Regarding budget, waiting to see what happens;
- Will be impacted by making major cuts;

Town of Enfield

- Share of Approx. \$40,000 (about 3%) difficult to come up with
- Each \$8,000 we're looking at

Ulysses

- Looking at how much more can put in;
- Seeing how can keep it going at the level that it patches all the leaks.

Town of Ithaca

- Board waiting for County to make [decision];
- Haven't changed budget at all;
- \$92,000 into program for county portion if had to cover, but not clear would get the best value for taxpayers dollar by being in the system so think the County's participation absolutely is essentially;
- Beyond 10-15% cut becomes virtually impossible for municipalities to make it up;
- Town supervisors met and added up everybody's contribution and came up with \$50,000; cut is \$260,000. No way that towns and other municipalities can make up that kind of money, so would be very supportive of the County increasing its target amount;
- Town of Ithaca is increasing its share; not a lot of wiggle room would have to take out of discretionary fund.

Common Council

- Youth bureau has in their budget that we have no contribution in the programming;

- Have not yet discussed what direction to take without contribution; will have to come back.

CORE FUNCTION CONCEPT DISCUSSION

Don Barber

Thanked Nancy Zahler and Ken Schlater for the energy they have put in to help the group to come to some understanding of the groundwork that we're working under.

There has been an unwritten kind of structure since the municipal youth services system started. At that time, there was a 50-50 split of town /county funds and, overtime, some attrition at county level. Other funding sources have kicked in (United Way et al) or just in-kind services presented so that the County share decreased from that, not good or bad, but a shifting thing that [municipalities] have been adapting to and have probably had the same discussion, that all the programs are going to be affected, that municipalities will do all they can to keep it going. Now, we're talking about a quantum shift.

Nancy and Ken were asked to formulate a description of the core function that they see would be required for all these programs to be operational, then this group can talk about that as a potential basis and then see where to move from there. Since today's discussion is more about process than about outcome, it was felt that members of Tompkins County Legislature should be present. Although they all said that they were going to step up and go for an OTR, I don't think that's going to happen so that should not be an expectation; if it does, great. Think about process and stay focused on that because there is a certain amount of work to do between now and first part of November.

Nancy Zahler

Nancy stated that she was heartened by the turn out and found it to be impressive.

She distributed an historical background of the Municipal Youth Services System (Attachment B) describing how the County created the System as a program in '88, how municipalities' participation was set up, what was the program focus, and how it would be funded. Nancy noted that there has been an agreement, but not one that was designed not to be time limited or that had signatures.

Core services

Although it works a little different in different places, County funds have been allocated to each community as if it were a block grant that once matched with the community's money became a total that the community could allocate to the services and projects that met local needs as they were identified. The way in which money was allocated money to different municipalities at the county youth board level was based on several assumptions (Attachment B). What has happened over time is that many communities have actually exceeded, in local appropriation, the dollar figure needed to match the money.

Partnership

The essence of the program is a partnership that allows each community to really define its own needs and develop its own programs in its own ways. Have tried to boil down the many different ways around the county (Attachment B).

Key elements in the partnership were shared from the perspective of the County and Cornell Cooperative Extension (CCE) (Attachment B).

1. Continuation of local community commissions and being able to provide the support that provides some continuity from year to year in an all-volunteer system is at the heart of the partnership. The county has responded with an ongoing commitment to the municipalities' apprehensions, such as "Is this a bait and switch? Are you asking me like the State and Federal so often do to put up some incentive money and then 2 years from now pull the rug out from under us?" Although it is a commitment that some at the county think it cannot afford to continue, municipalities say what they do is going to depend on the county; municipalities are looking to the county for leadership. As town boards change and the need to respond to different things changes at the local level, the constant presence of County

2. funding, even if it isn't perhaps at this same level, makes that continuity in stability important.
3. Continuing commitment of municipalities, a structural element, to at least match or increase, depending on what the local needs are. In terms of the money, the program as it operated in 2009, which included a component that sent money to communities for jobs was really where the system should be; that's already gone.

Associated Costs

2010 County allocation of \$265,000 is the base funding.

Key elements of the associated costs are:

1. Staffing
2. Program costs
3. Program support
 - a) Contracts for specialty programs.
 - b) CCE - enables a community to legally and efficiently recruit, hire, train, supervise staff; coach and assist staff in providing customized programs to meet the respective needs in each community, not cookie cutter (that's probably efficient, but not what this community has asked for.); and provide an administrative function that tracks the spending in local communities where CCE is the primary contractor.

It was not feasible for municipalities to provide the program support themselves. It would have resulted in isolation. The notion of having a coordinated support for hiring staff, training and supervising, and networking them so that they can do joint programs would create a synergy that no single program working in isolation would do.

What can we afford and who can pay?

A 2011 Municipal Youth System Fiscal Impacts sheet (Attachment C) was distributed that gives a frame of reference. Although the system is spoken of in the aggregate, it is a system where local people are spending local dollars. The sheet is an effort to show what is the impact under a different set of assumptions, the cost of staffing through just CCE, what is the total cost for program.

BRAINSTORMING

Before opening the floor to receive ideas, Don Barber summarized what the municipality representatives have said so far, noting that not everyone is here and nor has everyone said the same thing. The bulk of the municipalities are willing to do more than they have in the past to keep these things going. Most of them, but not all, have said that there is going to be some real significant impact to real people if we go down the road that's been proposed. So, want to look at ways to bridge this for some amount of time and then come up with a firm expectation for the future.

Tompkins County Legislators

Each Legislator thanked the municipality representatives for coming and said they were glad to hear that some municipalities might be able to step up to cover their portion of the budget to keep programs going.

The Legislators said that:

- Of today's budget, 88% is for state mandated programs leaving only 12% available for non-mandated use;
- Different ways to fund MYS might be 1) for the County to fund the CCE part and municipalities fund the rest, 2) for the County to fund half, or 3) for the County to fund percentages of it all;
- [They] are looking at a lot of different areas that concern children and youth

Minutes
Tompkins County Council of Governments
Wednesday, October 13, 2010

- [They] agree with municipalities that programs are very important but neither County nor municipalities have funds;
- There are 124 OTRs being considered or \$1.9MM worth of OTRs;
- A maintenance of effort budget from 2010 to 2011 to which are added only required additional mandate costs, pensions costs, paid insurance with no labor costs would require a 10% tax levy increase, therefore, a target budget with 5% means that \$2MM of local costs have to be cut.

Legislator's posed these questions:

- Who raises the money, i.e. through whose tax levy does it come in since the County and municipalities have the same source of money from the same people—sales taxes and property taxes?
- How do we reach a fair solution? Is it determining who has cut down to the bone and then it's up to the other side to come up with the majority of the funding for it?
- What service is each municipality buying or funding? How much of the block can you afford or not afford to pick up?
- Is the creation of MYS, a different program for youth with a totally separate structure, the best way to provide for these children? It is a developmental program, not recreational.

Municipal representatives asked/voiced:

- Does County give money to CCE?
Response from CCE: Yes, 10% of administrative costs.
- What is the funding level, town's target? What's negotiable? Choose a reasonable number where the program has to be at.
- Need to know the County would be in for X amount of years.

ACTION ITEMS:

1. It was suggested that a subcommittee meet on weekly basis to come up with a plan.
 - Numbers and percentages
 - Middle ground
2. Date when municipalities will get information to Don Barber.
3. Nancy Zahler was asked to set up a follow-up meeting.

The meeting was adjourned at 4:45 PM.

Submitted by Andrea Gibbs, County Administration

Municipal Youth Service System

October 14, 2010

Introductions and Frame Today's Discussion- (3:00)

Youth Commission Reps: state their perceptions/concerns about the change to their program with the County proposal- 20 minutes (~2 minutes each): (3:05)

Municipal reps: state their Board's plans/discussion during budget deliberations.

And state they feel a need to develop a formal collaborative agreement so Youth programmers will know what to expect for the future.- 20 minutes (~2 minutes each): (3:25)

Core Function Concept: 20 minutes (3:45)

Brainstorm ideas (4:00)

Set up subsequent meeting (4:28)

Adjourn- (4:30)

History of the Municipal Youth Services System

For years the mismatch of municipal and school boundaries muddled the lines of who should be responsible for youth programs in Tompkins County. When intermunicipal tensions flared in 1987, and threatened to cut off hundreds of youth who lived on the wrong side of an arbitrary jurisdictional boundary line, this body, led by Mary Call- a Republican and Bev Livesay- a Democrat, asked the Tompkins County Youth Services Board to engage our municipalities in a collaborative planning process to find a solution.

In 1988, the Legislature acted on recommendations of that work group and unanimously adopted Resolution 282 that created the Municipal Youth Services Program to provide on going matching funds and staff support from the County to all municipalities willing to:

- 1) create a local citizen planning group or youth commission
- 2) identify and focus on meeting the non-recreational needs of those falling between the cracks &
- 3) plan and provide local services for local youth using matching funds from the local municipality.

Municipalities signaled their participation in this agreement by creating or designating by resolution a local planning group and by allocating matching funds.

In 1990, the County re-purposed some of the taxes that had been used to pay for waste disposal and created a fund for the Youth Board to administer to both municipalities and agencies striving to provide more specialized, countywide services.

The allocation to municipalities has changed over time but has been based on the core assumption that each small community should have enough resources to hire a minimum of a half time staff person and that larger communities further from Ithaca and those with high concentrations of need should get enough resources to enable them to hire 1-1.5 FTE. However, the allocation is made like a block grant, enabling the community to match it and allocate their combined funds in unique ways that meet their local needs.

As participation by municipalities increased and as the needs and gaps were identified, programs developed and changed over time. Prior to the program, local communities were serving just 300 youth in youth service programs in 1987- not unlike our neighboring counties. Over time, the programs demonstrated their worth, and both the County and their municipal partners continued to support this continuum of prevention and early intervention programs. Today, 10 youth commissions oversee 35 programs serving nearly 3,000 youth, and County funds partially support services for 2,225.

RESOLUTION NO. 282 - MUNICIPAL YOUTH SERVICES AID

Moved by Mrs. Call, seconded by Mrs. Livesay. Discussion took place. Mr. Liffen rolled the question and a voice vote resulted as follows: Ayes: 14. Noes: 3 (Representatives Liffen, Proto and Shurtleff). Excused: 1 (Representative Mason). Motion to call the question passed. A voice vote on the resolution was taken: Ayes: 14, Noes: 0, Excused: 1 (Representative Mason). Adopted.

WHEREAS, the Tompkins County Board of Representatives authorized the County Youth Bureau to initiate a Municipal Youth Services planning process, and

WHEREAS, the process identified youth needs and options for services, and

WHEREAS, the Board of Representatives has acknowledged a partial financial responsibility for the provision of youth services in Tompkins County, and

WHEREAS, the Human Services Committee directed the County Youth Board to recommend a policy and procedures to define and describe the limits of that responsibility, now therefore be it

RESOLVED, on recommendation of the Human Services and Budget and Administration Committees, that a Municipal Youth Service Aid fund be established and appropriated annually within the County budgetary process according to the guidelines contained in the document, "Tompkins County Youth Board's Recommendation for Municipal Youth Services", on file in the Board of Representatives

Municipal Youth Services System- Current Allocations and Core Funding
10/14/10

County funds are allocated as block grant for each community to match and then allocate to meet identified needs and priorities.

The amount allocated to each is based on several key assumptions:

- 1) That every community has wanted sufficient funds to provide staff to work directly with youth.
- 2) Smaller communities need to have funds for a minimum of a half-time position
- 3) Larger communities, further from Ithaca resources need from 1- 1.5 staff to work with youth. Those with higher concentrations of need, qualify for funding to enable them to provide 1.5 FTE
- 4) Municipalities need to match County funds and most communities allocate more to meet local priorities.

Current uses by municipality:

- ◆ The City uses all of its County funds and City match exclusively to hire teens in the summer.
- ◆ Groton and Lansing use all of their County funds to support services planned through OCE
- ◆ All other communities fund local programs or contracts based on local priorities which can include a full time Service-Learning Program, youth employment and/or summer reading programs. PLUS customized youth development programs provided by OCE's Rural Youth Services Program Managers assigned to their community.

Core Functions and Associated Costs

We believe the system as it was operated in 2009 with \$ 332,000 in County funds represents the baseline, when it included matching funds for youth employment.

From our perspective, key elements of the system that we should be striving to maintain include:

- 1) Continuation of local youth commissions and staff support for those commissions
- 2) A County allocation that provides both incentive and stability for municipalities
- 3) Continuing local commitment to supplement what the County provides to assure high quality local services for youth. A minimum to match County funds, more to address local priorities.

2010 County allocation of \$265,000 should be considered the base funding for this system with municipalities providing at least equal match

Staff to work directly with children and to secure other resources through schools, agencies, and local organizations.

Program costs - to enable staff to offer engaging activities, transportation, and healthy snacks for afterschool programs + modest payments for contracted services to engage hard to serve youth,

Program support- Staff need effective supervision, training, and programming assistance to be able to offer high quality programs and to stay committed when pay is low and conditions are challenging.

What can we afford and who should pay?

MYS Fiscal Impacts
 2011

ATTACHMENT
 C

	2009	2010	6.9% cut	Replacement Costs CCE Support	Increase to Municipalities
Groton	\$ 31,818	\$ 25,755	\$ 1,777	\$ 650	\$ 2,427
Dryden	\$ 40,731	\$ 33,264	\$ 2,295	\$ 950	\$ 2,945
Lansing	\$ 22,909	\$ 18,955	\$ 1,170	\$ 435	\$ 1,605
Newfield	\$ 22,061	\$ 12,381	\$ 854	\$ 216	\$ 1,070
Ulysses	\$ 31,024	\$ 25,001	\$ 1,725	\$ 435	\$ 2,160
JYC	\$ 35,812	\$ 29,200	\$ 2,015	\$ 216	\$ 2,231
City	\$ 27,928	\$ 21,718	\$ 1,499	\$ -	\$ 1,499
Caroline	\$ 21,356	\$ 16,873	\$ 1,164	\$ 216	\$ 1,380
Danby	\$ 21,356	\$ 16,873	\$ 1,164	\$ 215	\$ 1,379
Enfield	\$ 22,156	\$ 17,632	\$ 1,217	\$ 435	\$ 1,652
Coop Ext Support	\$ 52,961	\$ 50,256	\$ 3,468	\$ 3,468	\$ 18,348
TOTAL	\$ 332,121	\$ 265,908	\$ 18,348		
		(\$66,213)			
COUNTY TOTAL Allocation			\$ 247,560		
\$18,348 savings to County					
	2010	15% cut	Replacement Costs CCE Support	Increase to Municipalities	
Groton	\$ 25,755	3,863	\$ 1,414	\$ 5,277	
Dryden	\$ 33,264	4,990	\$ 1,414	\$ 6,404	
Lansing	\$ 18,955	2,543	\$ 942	\$ 3,435	
Newfield	\$ 12,381	1,857	\$ 471	\$ 2,328	
Ulysses	\$ 25,001	3,750	\$ 942	\$ 4,692	
JYC	\$ 29,200	4,390	\$ 471	\$ 4,851	
City	\$ 21,718	3,258	\$ -	\$ 3,258	
Caroline	\$ 16,873	2,531	\$ 471	\$ 3,002	
Danby	\$ 16,873	2,531	\$ 471	\$ 3,002	
Enfield	\$ 17,632	2,645	\$ 942	\$ 3,587	
Coop Ext Support	\$ 50,256	7,538	\$ 7,538	\$ 39,886	
TOTAL	\$ 265,908	39,886			
COUNTY TOTAL Allocation			\$ 226,022		
\$39,886 savings to County					
	2010	20% cut	Replacement Costs CCE Support	Increase to Municipalities	
Groton	\$ 25,755	\$ 5,151	\$ 1,885	\$ 7,036	
Dryden	\$ 33,264	\$ 6,663	\$ 1,885	\$ 8,538	
Lansing	\$ 18,955	\$ 3,391	\$ 1,256	\$ 4,647	
Newfield	\$ 12,381	\$ 2,476	\$ 628	\$ 3,104	
Ulysses	\$ 25,001	\$ 5,000	\$ 1,257	\$ 6,257	
JYC	\$ 29,200	\$ 5,840	\$ 628	\$ 6,468	
City	\$ 21,718	\$ 4,344	\$ -	\$ 4,344	
Caroline	\$ 16,873	\$ 3,375	\$ 628	\$ 4,003	
Danby	\$ 16,873	\$ 3,375	\$ 628	\$ 4,003	
Enfield	\$ 17,632	\$ 3,526	\$ 1,256	\$ 4,782	
Coop Ext Support	\$ 50,256	\$ 10,051	\$ 10,051	\$ 53,181	
TOTAL	\$ 265,908	\$ 53,182			
COUNTY TOTAL Allocation			\$ 212,726		
\$53,584 savings to County					