



**Princeton Joint  
Consolidation/Shared Services  
Study Commission --  
on  
Consolidation**

[www.cgr.org/princeton](http://www.cgr.org/princeton)

1



**Princeton Joint  
Consolidation/Shared Services  
Study Commission --  
on  
Consolidation**

Public Engagement

[www.cgr.org/princeton](http://www.cgr.org/princeton)

2



## Public Engagement *Listening to the Community*

- Established formal Community Engagement Subcommittee
  - Concerted effort to listen to community *from the outset*
  - Meetings with stakeholder groups (e.g. Witherspoon Jackson Neighborhood Assoc.), institutions (e.g. Princeton Seminary and IAS)
  - In-home “neighborhood” gatherings
    - 40+ neighborhood meetings (through August 2011)
    - From Ettl Farms to Riverside
    - Borough *and* Township

3



## Public Engagement *Listening to the Community*

- What we heard: *The dominant themes and our responses*
  - **Address Financial issues** –At \$3.16m the savings are significant; 5% of taxes for Township and Borough Municipal Budgets
  - **Gain Efficiencies** – Consolidation does just that by proactively reengineering our municipal structure to be more efficient and effective, to better manage current economic stress and prevent future crisis
  - **Protect/enhance services** - (esp. Police and DPW)- Emergency management, Police services enhanced in downtown patrols and traffic enforcement, solid waste removal extended to Township; improved Affordable Housing.

4



## Public Engagement

- **Strengthen a sense of community** –We believe there is much more similarity than difference between the two groups of Princetonians; very similar demographics, consolidation presents an opportunity to reinforce these common bonds.
- **Preserve citizen representation** – We believe consolidation achieves accountability to all citizens of Princeton;

5



## Public Engagement

- **Manage transition costs** - We are seeking support from the state and have alternatives.
- **Relationship with the University** --a combined Princeton may have more leverage with the University and other entities.
- **Keep it simple!**

6



**Princeton Joint  
Consolidation/Shared Services  
Study Commission --**

**Form of Government**  
Options, Analysis, and Recommendations

[www.cgr.org/princeton](http://www.cgr.org/princeton)

7



**Form of Government  
Subcommittee**

Subcommittee Studied and Recommended  
Form of Government

- Bernie Miller, Chair
- David Goldfarb
- Chad Goerner
- Ryan Lilienthal
- Patrick Simon
- Anton Lahnston
- Eugene McCarthy, DCA Liaison

8



	Borough	Township	OMCL Mayor-Council	OMCL Council-Manager	OMCL Mayor-Council-Admin	Commission	Municipal Manager
Directly Elected Mayor	Yes	No	Yes	Optional	Yes	No	No
Mayor Vote in Council	Ties, Veto	Votes	Voice, No Vote, Veto	Votes	Tie, Veto	Votes	Votes
Mayor Term of Office	4	1	4	4 or 2	4	4	4
Governing Body Size	6	3 or 5	5, 7 or 9	5, 7 or 9	6	5 if pop is > 12,000	3, 5, 7 or 9
Governing Body Presiding Officer	Mayor	Mayor	Council President	Mayor	Mayor	Mayor	Mayor
Governing Body Term of Office	3	3	4	4	3	4	4
Require Chief Administrator	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	Yes
Limit Staff Contact	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	No	No
Use of Wards	No	No	Optional	Optional	No	No	No
Non-Partisan Elections	No	No	Optional	Optional	No	Yes	Yes
Staggered Terms	Yes	Yes	Optional	Optional	Yes	No	No
Initiative and Referendum	No	No	Yes	Yes	Yes	Yes	No
<b>USE</b>	<b>218</b>	<b>141</b>	<b>70</b>	<b>43</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>30</b>	<b>7</b>

9



## Form of Government Analysis

- Primary Criteria
  - Directly Elected Mayor
  - Access to Staff by Elected Officials
- Screen 1 - Mayor Not Directly Elected
  - Township
  - Commission
  - Municipal Manager
- Screen 2 - Council Members Not Permitted Contact with Professional Staff
  - Optional Municipal Charter Law (OMCL): Mayor - Council
  - OMCL: Council Manager
  - OMCL: Mayor - Council - Administrator

10



## Form of Government Recommendation

The Subcommittee And Full Commission Recommended Adoption Of The **Borough** Form of Government In the Event Of Consolidation.

11



### Other Governance Recommendations *(Additional Savings possible through Efficiencies in Operational Delivery of Services)*

Department	Recommendation	Est. Annual Savings
Governing Body	Borough Form of Gov.	\$61,000
Administrator	Reduce 1.0 FTE	\$206,000
Clerk	Reduce 2.0 FTE	\$199,000
Finance and Tax Collection	Reduce 2.0 FTE	\$217,000
Engineering (See Public Works)	Reduce 1.0 FTE	\$177,000
Court	Reduce 1.0 FTE	\$79,000
Construction – (Fee Based Serv.)	No Reduction in Personnel	0
Affordable Housing	No Reduction in Personnel	0
Emergency Management	No Reduction in Personnel	0
Tax Assessment	Reduce 0.5 FTE	\$17,000
Zoning and Historic Pres.	No Reduction in Personnel	0
Information Technology	No Reduction in Personnel	0



## Princeton Joint Consolidation/Shared Services Study Commission --

Public Works  
Recommendations

[www.cgr.org/princeton](http://www.cgr.org/princeton)

13



## Our Recommendations and Why: *Public Works*

Current State

- Separate Borough and Township Public Works Depts
- Joint Sewer Operating Committee (“PSOC”) lodged in Borough
- Joint Recreation Department with maintenance responsibility for “active” park areas lodged in Township
- Separate Borough and Township Engineering Departments, each with oversight of respective DPWs

14



## Public Works Subcommittee Process

In conjunction with CGR, subcommittee had multiple meetings with Township and Borough Engineers, DPW Supers, PSOC Manager, Rec Dept and other staff.

Subcommittee toured public works and PSOC facilities and studied the facilities analysis commissioned by the two governing bodies in 2009.

Through community engagement, the subcommittee found that residents have a strong desire to maintain current levels of service.

15



## Public Works Findings

- These Departments provide a high level of service that is valued by residents.  
*Objective: Maintain or improve current levels of service in all areas of the community at less cost through increased efficiency.*
- DPW and PSOC Departments function with inadequate and outmoded facilities on scattered sites.  
*Objective: Suggest facilities upgrades to preserve capital equipment, improve administration and provide long term savings at reasonable cost.*

16



## Public Works Staffing Recommendation

**Full Consolidation**

- Cross-departmental model w/ Engineering, DPW, PSOC and Recreation Maintenance in a unified structure
  - *Preservation of existing levels of service throughout the community.*
  - *Savings of \$442K*

17



## Consolidated Engineering/Public Works/PSOC

- Proposed Organization Chart: Public Works (High Level)

```

    graph TD
      Admin[Princeton Administrator] --> Eng[Engineer]
      Eng --> EngDept[Engineering Department]
      Eng --> PSOC[PSOC Department]
      Eng --> PW[Public Works Department]
      PW --> DM[Downtown Maintenance]
      PW --> RPM[Roads/Parks Maintenance]
    
```

18



## Public Works Facilities Recommendation

### Staged Reconfiguration of Existing Facilities

- Rely on existing facilities initially
- Transition out of John Street and Valley Road
- Relocate some operations, storage to River Road
- Retain Harrison as a *light use* facility focused primarily on the downtown

19



## Recommendation Against DPW Shared Service

- Savings and efficiency of consolidated model is based on bringing engineering, public works, PSOC and Rec Maintenance functions under one management.
- Savings through merger of DPWs alone not sufficient to warrant the effort required.
- Both departments support a consolidated model but advise against a shared service reporting to two governing bodies.

20



## Princeton Joint Consolidation/Shared Services Study Commission --

### Police Recommendations

[www.cgr.org/princeton](http://www.cgr.org/princeton)

21



## Police Subcommittee

<p>Members</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Bill Metro, Chairman</li> <li>• Bernie Miller, Twp</li> <li>• Mildred Trotman, Boro</li> <li>• Ryan Lilienthal, Boro</li> <li>• Anton Lahnston, Boro and Joe Stepho, CGR participated frequently.</li> </ul>	<p>Included a Police Task Force</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Both Departments             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>– Chief Buchanan, Twp</li> <li>– Chief Dudeck, Boro</li> <li>– Several Sworn representatives</li> <li>– Civilian representatives from information technology and 911 Communications Center</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	--

***Police Task Force supplied information to the subcommittee on topics such as department size and composition, operational procedures, scheduling, training, cost of operation, technology, 9-1-1 emergency communications, similarities and differences, consolidation issues, etc.***

22



## Police - Today Borough & Township

<p><b>Princeton Borough P.D.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$3,952,040 / Yr.</li> <li>• Patrol Area = 1.9 sq miles</li> <li>• Organization                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 30 Sworn Officers</li> <li>- 2 Divisions (Patrol &amp; Ops)</li> <li>- 4 Patrol Squads</li> <li>- 2 Parking Officers</li> <li>- 3 Clerical Staff</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Princeton Township P.D.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• \$4,194,930 / Yr.</li> <li>• Patrol Area = 16 sq miles</li> <li>• Organization                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 30 Sworn Officers</li> <li>- 2 Divisions (Admin &amp; Ops)</li> <li>- 4 Patrol Squads</li> <li>- 3 Clerical Staff</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---

***Similar in many ways. Back each other up, interoperable communications...  
Difference mainly in territory served, some training, some services.***

23



## Police - Today Two 9-1-1 Communication Centers

<p><b>Princeton Borough P.D.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9-1-1 Dispatch                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 54 calls for service/day(avg.)</li> <li>- 5 FT Dispatchers</li> <li>- One Dispatcher / Shift</li> <li>- Dispatch area is tight</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Facility                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Needs renovation</li> <li>- Tight quarters</li> <li>- Could NOT accommodate a combined force.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>	<p><b>Princeton Township P.D.</b></p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• 9-1-1 Dispatch                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- 49 calls for service/day(avg.)</li> <li>- 1 Comm. Coordinator</li> <li>- 1 Lead Comm. Officer</li> <li>- 4 FT Dispatchers</li> <li>- Two Dispatchers Day Shift</li> <li>- One Dispatcher Night Shift</li> </ul> </li> <li>• Facility                             <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Newer and well designed</li> <li>- Could accommodate combined force, with some modifications.</li> </ul> </li> </ul>
--	---

24



## Police – Task Force Comments

- Both departments have voiced their support for consolidation and submitted potential department designs.
- Both departments can foresee multiple ways to improve service - reinstating some services that have been cut in the past like Safe-Neighborhoods and Traffic units in the Borough, and improving coordination with Princeton University's Department of Public Safety, despite reductions.
- Emphasized the need to maintain adequate supervision.
- Both departments are currently in need of technology upgrades that could exceed \$2M over the next few years.
- Both departments have expressed serious concerns about implementing a "Shared Police Service" with two governing bodies.

25



## Police – Recommendation to Consolidate

- High order tenet – *“ Provide as good or better services than provided today with less cost”*
- Evaluated eight potential organizational options:
  - Three provided by Borough (66, 60, 56)
  - Two provided by Township (60, 59)
  - Three provided by CGR (54, 51, 46)
- Narrowed to four options in the 60 – 51 range.
- In order to reduce various duplications , and to improve operational efficiency, we are recommending a single, police department.



## Police – Recommendation to Consolidate

- 1-Yr Transition Period - 2012
  - Plan & Prepare for the new “*Princeton Police Department*”.
- Starting in 2013 -Combine, realign, and repurpose.
  - Initially 60 sworn officers will be combined, realigned.
  - Continue repurposing positions down to 51 in 2014-2015
    - In accordance with attrition and retirement estimates.
- Township police facility and technology would be used and enhanced as needed.
- Achieve \$2.1M / Yr in savings at full implementation, based on 2011 budget figures.



## Police – Benefits of Consolidation

- ***Operational Efficiency***: achieved by restructuring the administrative command level and patrol boundaries, greater deployment flexibility.
- ***Cost Efficiency***: A greater percentage of overall costs can be applied to providing law enforcement services to the public and less at the administrative command levels.
- ***Reduced Duplication***: achieved by supporting one technology platform instead of two.
- ***Increased 9-1-1 Call Center Capacity***: By combining dispatch personnel, better call answering capacity will be achieved during busy times. Consistent standards and supervision can be provided.

28



## Police – Challenges with Consolidation

- **Management and Direction** - Selecting a Chief, defining policies and procedures, and bringing together two similar, yet different, police operations.
- **Records and Data Management** - Relocating paper documents and loading/converting automated data.
- **9-1-1** - Need to add at least one more dispatch position and enhance technologies at the Township dispatch center.
- **Evidence Tracking and Property Storage** - Adding several thousand pieces of Borough property/evidence may exceed current Township property room storage capacity.
- **Parking** - More parking spaces need to be found around Township Municipal Complex.

29



## Princeton Joint Consolidation/Shared Services Study Commission --

**Finance and Tax Impacts**  
Analysis and Recommendations

[www.cgr.org/princeton](http://www.cgr.org/princeton)

30



## Our Recommendations and Why *Consolidation: Quantified*

- The potential financial savings from consolidation are significant. Specifically, the following financial benefits are achievable within three years if we consolidate:
  - Financial savings for existing municipal services of \$3.2M.
  - Savings achieved by extending municipal garbage collection to Princeton Township residents, which works out to approximately \$0.8M.
  - Police staffing for traffic and community service police officers, over and above what we have today. The estimated value of those services is \$0.7M.
  - PSOC savings of \$160,000, which would get passed on to PSOC customers.
  - Total: \$4.8M

31



## Our Recommendations and Why *Financial and Tax Impact*

- At full implementation in approximately three (3) years, the annual, recurring municipal savings total \$3.2 million
- Estimated taxpayer impacts based on 2011 data with extension of solid waste pickup to the entire community:
  - *Direct Impacts (derived from efficiency savings)*
    - The direct property tax impact of consolidation would result in annual savings of **\$201** for the average Borough property, and **\$240** for the average Township property
  - *With Indirect Impacts (net effect of equalization, open space tax and solid waste changes)*
    - When the secondary impacts of consolidation are factored in, the average Borough property would see total savings (i.e. tax and non-tax) of **\$591**, while the average Township property would see total savings of **\$416**

32



### Our Recommendations and Why *Financial and Tax Impact*

	Borough	Township
<i>Currently</i>		
Real Property Tax Levy	\$9,457,716	\$20,070,600
Taxable Assessed Value	\$2,196,649,214	\$4,617,801,381
Tax Rate	0.431	0.435
Average Property Value	\$747,665	\$826,636
Average Property Tax Bill	<b>\$3,222</b>	<b>\$3,596</b>
<i>With Direct Savings from Consolidation</i>		
Average Property Tax Bill	<b>\$3,021</b>	<b>\$3,356</b>
Net Savings	(\$201)	(\$240)
<i>With Direct Savings <u>and</u> Indirect Impacts from Consolidation</i>		
Average Property Tax Bill	<b>\$2,631</b>	<b>\$3,180</b>
Net Savings	(\$591)	(\$416)

33

- 
- ### Financial Impact *Interpretation*
- How should we interpret the financial impact?
    - Only the “direct impact savings” are under the full control of the municipal government. Those are:
      - Borough **\$201**, Township **\$240**.
      - Estimated total direct impact: \$2.0M.
    - If consolidation were already fully implemented in 2011, consistent with the commission’s recommendations, then the combined property taxes + spending on garbage pickup for average homes would have been reduced by these totals:
      - Borough **\$591**, Township **\$416**.
      - Estimated total direct and indirect impact: \$4.0M
    - If we implement consolidation, then at full implementation, the savings compared with 2011 would be the same, excluding inflation and factors we cannot predict at this time.
- 34



## What about Transition Costs?

The commission has identified approximately \$1.7M in one time transition costs associated with consolidation based upon input and review from department heads in both municipalities.

- Of this amount, approximately \$300,000 is for salary harmonization. This is already accounted for in the identified municipal savings of \$3.16m. Thus, the true estimated costs are approximately \$1.4m (\$1.7 - 300k)
- Approximately \$616,591 could be capitalized and paid for over a 5 year life. To that end, the finance subcommittee identified several options assuming no state aid to minimize taxpayer impact:
  - Option 1 - Fund all transition costs through surplus/reserve balances.
  - Option 2 - Capitalize a portion and pay the remaining from surplus.
  - Option 3 - Capitalize a portion, defer some costs and use surplus.
- Some transition costs would be incurred with or without consolidation (i.e. police items).
- Overall, the committee felt that the impact to Borough and Township residents would be relatively minimal and could be controlled if the governing body / transition team decided to utilize capitalization or cost deferral.

35



## Financial Impact *Long Term*

- If we compare what happens if the Princetons consolidate vs. if we do not, longer term:
  - Equalization effects wash out on average. The changes in school and county taxes due to consolidation are similar to the median estimate for those changes over the long term.
  - Borough spending from surplus must come to an end. Under consolidation, the Township would pay 68% of any upcoming Borough tax increase.
  - Taking into account these factors, the net impact of consolidation for average homes is a reduction of:
    - Borough **\$449**, Township **\$507**
    - Estimated total impact: \$4.0M

36



**Financial Impact**  
*Long Term Considerations*

- Long Term Considerations
  - Analysis of Surplus/Reserve balance trends in the Township and the Borough
  - Continued fluctuation of school and county taxes based upon county equalization ratios
  - Addition of new ratables
  - Budget flexibility under Consolidation versus remaining separate
  - Potential Cost Avoidance - Buildings and Police Services
  - Bond Ratings

37