

Intermunicipal Cooperation & Consolidation Activities in New York State

A SNAPSHOT



INTERGOVERNMENTAL STUDIES PROGRAM

Rockefeller College of Public Affairs & Policy ■ University at Albany

Intermunicipal Cooperation & Consolidation Activities in New York State: *A SNAPSHOT*

Published October 2004

Authors: Sydney Cresswell, Jordan Wishy

Editor/Designer: Stephanie Simon

©2004 Intergovernmental Studies Program

The Program grants permission to reprint this document provided the cover and this title page are included.

Intergovernmental Studies Program

Rockefeller College of Public Affairs & Policy, University at Albany
135 Western Avenue, Albany, NY 12222

Phone: (518) 442-5293 Email: sgc@albany.edu

Website: www.albany.edu/igsp

The Intergovernmental Studies Program (IGSP) works to improve intergovernmental performance and collaborative outcomes for state and local governments. We build an understanding of effective intergovernmental practices through case research and partnership projects with state agencies and local governments. The IGSP team shares project results with government professionals to provide a fresh view of the systems in which they participate, and to support the development of a community of intergovernmental practitioners.

Table of Contents

Overview.....	1
Questions Guiding Data Gathering	1
Existing Data.....	1
Methods of Data Gathering.....	1
Conceptual Limitations.....	2
Helping Municipalities Weigh Cooperation.....	3
Further Study.....	4
End Notes.....	5
Table of Intermunicipal Cooperation Activities.....	6

Overview

In support of legislative interest in intermunicipal consolidation, the Intergovernmental Studies Program (IGSP) agreed to assemble a snapshot of consolidation activities among municipalities in New York State. The work was conducted over the course of a week, beginning in late September 2004. While clearly neither rigorous nor exhaustive, the following snapshot offers a glimpse of such activities using the best available resources.

Questions Guiding Data Gathering

Three questions guided the data gathering effort:

- Which municipalities are currently discussing, investigating, or crafting consolidation agreements?
- What forms of integration are being considered?
- What forms of assistance do local governments need as they weigh cooperative arrangements, and which government entities can reasonably provide the help?

Existing Data

In the span of one week, IGSP was unable to locate a data set that systematically captures information on intermunicipal cooperation. We examined reports from the New York State Attorney General's Office, the New York State Department of State, and the New York State Office of the State Comptroller (OSC).(1) None of the reports claim systematic study or an exhaustive search of cooperation and consolidation activities across the state. The OSC report was different from the other two in that it was statewide in scope and reported levels of cooperation in dollar terms. The Comptroller's study used a revenue category embedded in annual financial documents that reports revenue derived from local government sources. This revenue figure served as a proxy measure for cooperation agreements. In this respect, the OSC report employs a consistent measure, is inclusive of all municipalities, and captures enacted agreements for which service fees are collected.

Other entities, which include regional councils, local government associations, research groups, and special government units, produced reports in recent years that IGSP did not examine. Though worthy, these reports were either outdated, geographically bound, or comprised of voluntary, self-reported data. IGSP sought consistently gathered information to serve as a baseline. County legislative proceedings were considered as a data source, but could not be systematically gathered or surveyed in the allotted time.(2)

Methods of Data Gathering

Given the timeframe for assembling this snapshot, and the nature of the task, IGSP chose to use three information streams. For its consistency, we chose the OSC report on cooperation and consolidation, interviewing a staff author of the report to assess the fit of their data to our central questions. We then interviewed the chief examiners (regional directors) in five of the seven regions (not including New York

City) for which we had access during the week of data gathering. These professionals shared current information on the status of cooperation and consolidation activities across their regions. The decision to interview the chief examiners was based on several factors. First, the regional staff in the Local Government Services Unit of OSC actively engages in consulting services related to cooperation and consolidation under the aegis of the agency's Cooperation and Consolidation Consulting Services (3CS) program. Secondly, OSC is committed to performance measurement and maintains a monthly log of 3CS activities across the state. This provides current data on intermunicipal cooperation efforts supported with OSC resources. To the extent that cooperation and consolidation initiatives reflect fiscal solutions, it seemed reasonable that OSC would be informed or engaged in intermunicipal initiatives.

News drawn from New York State daily newspapers provided the third information stream and allowed the IGSP team to cross-check the cumulative OSC activity summaries. Using more than 200 articles pulled from a Lexis-Nexis search and a preexisting clip file, IGSP compiled a table of activities reported in the daily papers. To the extent that time allowed, the news reports and OSC summaries were reconciled. The table beginning on page six details the cooperation activities covered in the news reports.

Conceptual Limitations

A contribution of this report is a more nuanced classification system for intermunicipal agreements. As data gathering progressed, it became apparent that the value of information was confounded by the limits of the terms and categories in use. Reports produced by the Attorney General and OSC distinguish between cooperation and consolidation similarly. Cooperation is defined as two or more governments working together "...to provide a service for the benefit of all the municipalities involved."⁽³⁾ Each report further specifies that cooperation agreements follow one of two forms, a service agreement (one municipality enters into a fee-based contract with another local government for services) and joint agreements (municipalities share in the provision of a service).⁽⁴⁾ As defined, consolidation also has two forms: consolidation of services, which involves merging one or more functional units between municipalities; and consolidation of jurisdictions, which involves the dissolution of one or more governments.⁽⁵⁾

While cooperation and consolidation appear to be reasonably cast and distinguishable as categories, in practice it proved difficult to assign certain arrangements to one category or another. This was especially true for agreements that evolved quickly following enactment. Some municipalities enter into a service for fee agreement where the 'fees' are actually transferred through a swap of resources or exchange of services. Other intermunicipal service agreements effectively merge functions over time as municipalities work outside of their contracts to engage in joint decision making and performance review of services provided. In interviews with OSC research staff and chief examiners, as well as other experts, there was general agreement that current terminology does not sufficiently capture the complexities of arrangements or the true range of cooperative models. The OSC report on cooperation, as the staff author candidly allows, most likely includes agreements that are hybrid forms. This report suggests a revised classification of activities based on nuances apparent across several types of municipal agreements.⁽⁶⁾

Helping Municipalities Weigh Cooperation

Interviews with chief examiners (regional directors) in the Local Government Services Unit of OSC, and other content experts, helped produce a picture of local needs associated with cooperative agreements. Their collected comments are presented here under *deliberative process needs* and *potential areas for legislative action*. It should be noted that these comments were captured in the snapshot process and showcase the insights of a small sample of reflective practitioners. As such, the following recommendations are not offered as necessarily comprehensive, representative, or exhaustive. The content experts and the OSC chief examiners are well versed and well qualified to discuss local government fiscal conditions and struggles. Moreover, they understand community fears and concerns with respect to deliberating intermunicipal cooperation, and have a close-up view of local needs that consistently arise across integration initiatives.

Deliberative Process Needs

- **Accurate and detailed financial data.** OSC has financial data from all municipalities and can provide a range of detailed reports. However, in intermunicipal cooperation deliberations, municipalities usually require inventories of expenditures within individual service categories. It is the exception for local governments to have such records, and most government entities do not have the staff available to gather the data needed to support the decision making process.
- **Ability to develop long-term views and sensibilities.** Short-term perspectives have proved insufficient to envisioning the savings over time that can accrue from cooperative agreements. These savings can be derived from expenditures such as personnel and retirements, or can be realized from the investments made in developing a common vision among municipalities and shared successes in cooperating.
- **Accurate and detailed personnel data.** Respondents report that most municipalities do not have staffing data other than simple employee statistics. For the purposes of deliberations relevant to cooperation, municipalities need records of full-time, part-time, and seasonal employees, indexed against their technical and professional abilities. This information is crucial to estimating the savings derived from sharing, reducing, or redeploying staff. As with the financial data needed to inform the fiscal savings picture, there is little slack in these communities to absorb the workload.
- **Process skills.** OSC offers municipalities help in defining a process to guide deliberations. Without sustained guidance, however, many small municipalities do not have the process skills to progress through the stages of deliberation. These include meeting management skills, an executable understanding of brainstorming and group decision processes, presentation skills, and the ability to craft messages that inform key stakeholders.

-
- **Mechanisms for sharing results.** As the table of intermunicipal integration activities illustrates, there is considerable local government activity ongoing with respect to cooperation. These activities range from nervous discussion to fully implemented plans, and include joint planning, resource sharing, joint operations agreements, service agreements, and consolidation initiatives. There are valuable lessons, best practices, great anecdotes, surprises, failures, and blueprints for change among these initiatives. Sharing the stories through a variety of mechanisms (reports, case studies, diaries, capital plans, journalistic forms), in the words of one respondent, “lifts all boats.”

Potential Areas for Legislative Action

- **Need for a legal designation for dissolved entities.** Municipalities considering dissolution have expressed interest in having a legal designation for their community that preserves some remnant of local identity. The authors interpret this to mean that such a legal designation serves as leverage for community interests within the broader political spectrum of the merged municipality.
- **Constitutional changes to allow the creation of municipal governments.** Counties, and their constituent municipalities interested in mergers, will be unable to form municipal governments without constitutional amendment. Whether this is an appropriate direction or a feasible solution for fiscally distressed regions is a matter for legislative discourse—the issue is simply noted here.
- **Need to address incentives and disincentives to intergovernmental solutions.** It may be important to reexamine a number of funding resources that are viewed as hurdles to change. These may include the structure of sales tax distribution, general-purpose aid formulas, and more.

Further Study

The findings contained within this snapshot suggest that the deliberative bodies of the state have much to gain by engaging in a collaborative and systematic study of cooperation and consolidation. A greater understanding of (1) readiness factors that might ensure success, (2) initiatives and strategies that work as intermunicipal discussion and deliberation progress, (3) constructive assistance the state can render, and (4) the correlates of success embedded in the strategies that evolve after adoption, would serve municipalities pursuing fiscal viability.

Potential Areas for State Assistance

- **Provision of consulting services in support of local initiatives.** Municipalities often do not have the knowledge and competencies to discern the process, stakeholder, legal, and financial issues involved in undertaking an exploration of cooperation and consolidation. Support for direct, independent, one-on-one professional services may encourage municipalities to consider their options thoroughly and realistically.

-
- **Provision of financial incentives in support of local initiatives.** Cooperation and consolidation efforts often incur extra initial expenses that are outweighed by long-term cost savings and service improvements. Grants and loans could help offset extra initial expenses; changes in early retirement and civil service requirements may also be helpful.
 - **Investigation of modifications to existing State law to accelerate local initiatives.** Local municipalities are entities created by the State. The defining and enabling statutes may not have anticipated the possibility of cooperation and consolidation among municipalities. Existing statutes may present unnecessary hurdles to some multiunit efforts.

End Notes

- (1) These reports serve municipalities by explaining the terminology of cooperation and consolidation, describing the steps and stages in legal or fiscal terms, discussing the merits of such endeavors, and offering examples.
- (2) A requirement that counties submit a bound volume of legislative proceedings annually to the State Library is not enforced. The collection is therefore incomplete.
- (3) New York State Office of the State Comptroller Report. *Intermunicipal Cooperation and Consolidation*. November 2003.
- (4) New York State Office of the State Comptroller Report. *Intermunicipal Cooperation and Consolidation*. November 2003.
- (5) New York State Office of the State Comptroller Report. *Intermunicipal Cooperation and Consolidation*. November 2003.
- (6) There is no one-size-fits-all approach to intermunicipal agreement. Municipalities customize to fit local conditions. Contracts can include service swaps, fees for service, and equipment changes within a single agreement.

Intermunicipal Cooperation Activities

Region*	Municipalities	Function	Type of Government	Level or Extent of Service Integration	Activities Integrated	Status
<p><i>* See page 18 for descriptions of regional designations</i></p>				<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Planning • Resource Sharing • Consolidation • Contractual Services Agreement • Joint Operations Agreement • Cooperative • Assistance • Incentives 		
<p>Albany</p> <p>(ATU 2/19/03)* <i>See page 18 for news source code</i></p>	Albany County and Municipalities Within	Purchasing	County and Municipalities	Cooperative	Initiated an Internet based shared bidding and purchasing program	Action Taken
<p>Albany</p> <p>(DG 2/19/03)</p>	Albany, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Schenectady	Detention Facility	4 Counties	Joint Operations Agreement	Cooperated to jointly construct the Capital District Juvenile Detention Center	Action Taken
<p>Albany</p> <p>(UOD 12/7/03)</p>	Clinton and Kirkland	Police	2 Towns	Contractual Services Agreement	Clinton eliminated police force in 1994 and contracted with Town of Kirkland for services	Action Taken
<p>Albany</p> <p>(ATU 7/20/01)</p>	Clifton Park, Halfmoon	Hazardous waste	Town, Town	Joint Operations Agreement	Towns will share household hazardous waste removal day	Action Taken

Albany (ATU 2/19/03)	Cohoes	Purchasing	City and School District	Cooperative	City of Cohoes joined the school district's fuel purchasing cooperative	Action Taken
Albany (UOD)	Ossining	Police	Village, Town	Consolidation	There are talks to negotiate a merger	Under Discussion
Albany (UOD)	Ossining	Treasurer Office, Parks Department, Police Dispatching System, Public Facilities	Village, town	Consolidation	Merger of these functional departments	Action Taken
Albany (DG 8/1/03)	Schenectady	Police	County, City	Contractual Services Agreement	County Sheriff's Department to perform arrest booking function	Proposed
Albany (DG 4/28/04)	Schenectady County and all Municipalities	Police, Dispatching	County, Towns, Villages, and Cities	Joint Operations Agreement	County to perform all dispatching; equipment provided by municipalities	Proposed
Albany (ATU 3/22/01)	Schenectady County, Glenville	Water	County, Town	Planning	Towns avoid duplicate planning efforts	Action Taken
Albany (DG 1/19/04)	Stillwater	Judicial System	Village and Town	Consolidation	Merging of two judicial systems	Under Discussion
Albany (DG 1/19/04)	Stillwater	Public Works	Village and Town	Consolidation	Merging of two public works departments	Under Discussion
Albany (ATU 10/9/99)	Watervliet, Colonie	Water	Town, Town	Contractual Services Agreement	One entity maintains water main that passes through the other	Action Taken

Buffalo (BN 2/10/00)	Akron, Newstead	Master plan	2 Towns	Planning	Towns are working together to complete land use survey. Joint master plan committee reviews zoning, floodplains, agriculture districts, sewer districts, etc.	Action Taken
Buffalo (BN 04/22/03)	Akron, Newstead	Staff	Village, Town	Joint Operations Agreement	Two communities hired a single grant writer for both towns	Action Taken
Buffalo (BN 06/19/02)	Amherst and Contiguous Municipalities	Recreation	Multiple Municipalities	Planning	Intermunicipal citizens' committee IDs opportunities for planning recreational railways between towns.	Proposed
Buffalo (BN 7/10/02)	Jamestown	Solid waste	City and Surrounding Municipalities	Contractual Services Agreement	City drafted law that would amend Charter and permit City to collect garbage from other municipalities	Proposed
Buffalo (BN 10/31/1999, BN 11/10/2003)	Buffalo and Erie	Government	City, County	Consolidation	All	Proposed
Buffalo (JPJ 2/23/03)	Carroll, Ellington, and Poland	Equipment	3 Towns	Resource Sharing	The Towns share equipment	Action Taken
Buffalo (BN 2/28/01)	Chautauqua and Falconer	Equipment	County and Village	Resource Sharing	The County and Village share equipment	Action Taken

Buffalo (BN 11/01/02)	Chautauqua County, Celoron	Lighthouse	County, Village	Assistance	County workers assisted Village workers in moving and reconstructing a lighthouse	Action Taken
Buffalo (BN 02/04/03, BN 3/3/03)	Depew, Cheektowaga, Lancaster, Alden, and Elma	Solid Waste		Cooperative	Met to discuss collective bidding on garbage removal services	Under Discussion
Buffalo (BN 2/3/03, BN 10/06/03, BN 11/03/03)	Erie and Buffalo	Water	City and County	Consolidation	City and County are in talks for merger of water services	Under Discussion
Buffalo (BN 2/23/03)	Falconer and Endicott	Police	Village, Town	Consolidation	Merged police forces	Action Taken
Buffalo (BN 02/22/03)	Hamburg, Neighboring Municipalities	Recreation	Town, Neighboring Municipalities	Assistance	Town developed a skate park and shared lessons learned with surrounding communities	Action Taken
Buffalo (BN 4/10/01)	Hamburg, Blasdell	Transportation	Town, Village	Joint Operations Agreement	Construction and maintenance of an access road to improve traffic flow and enhance economic development	Approved
Buffalo (JPJ 2/23/03)	Lakewood and Busti	Police	Village, Town	Consolidation	Merged police forces	Action Taken
Buffalo (BN 3/11/04)	Lancaster, Cheektowaga, Depew	Police	2 Towns, Village	Consolidation	Examining feasibility of consolidating Village of Depew's police department with that of Lancaster and Cheektowaga	Proposed

Buffalo (4/13/04)	Lancaster	Police	Village, Town	Consolidation	Merged Village police force into Town police force in 2003	Action Taken
Buffalo (12/23/01)	Lewiston, Niagara Falls, Niagara	Water	County, City, Towns	Contractual Services Agreement	City to provide water services for other municipalities instead of County	Proposed
Buffalo (BN 11/20/02)	Lewiston	Multiple services (e.g., highway and water), possibly leading to eventual government consolidation	Town, Village	Consolidation	Lewiston town and village boards discuss better relationships between boards and consolidation of 2 governments. Also possibility of merging with Porter	Under Discussion
Buffalo (BN 5/1/01)	Mayville and Chautauqua	School	2 School Districts	Consolidation	The Mayville and Chautauqua school districts merged to become the Chautauqua Lake Central School District	Action Taken
Buffalo (BN 08/04/02)	Niagara County	General	County, Municipalities	Incentives	County legislator proposed offering the County's localities cash incentives for saving money through shared services and consolidation	Proposed
Buffalo (BN 06/30/01)	Niagara County, Grand Island	Assessment	County, Town	Contractual Services Agreement	County will perform tax assessment functions for the Town	Action Taken

Buffalo (BN 7/20/00)	Chautauqua, Fredonia, Dunkirk, Westfield, Brocton, and Others	Water	County, 2 Towns, 2 Villages	Contractual Services Agreement	County provides funding for infrastructure; to be leased to municipalities	Under Discussion
Glens Falls (GFPS 2/15/04)	Argyle and Fort Edward	Some Services	Village and Town	Consolidation	Suggested consolidation of services by State Comptroller by transference to Town of Fort Edward	Under Discussion
Glens Falls (GFPS 2/15/04)	Fort Edward	Garbage Collection	Town and Village	Contractual Services Agreement	Town collects Village's garbage	Action Taken
Glens Falls (GFPS 2/15/04)	Fort Edward	Government Facilities	Town and Village	Joint Operations Agreement	The Town and Village share office and building space.	Action Taken
Glens Falls (GFPS 2/15/04)	Fort Edward	Water	Town and Village	Contractual Services Agreement	Village negotiating an agreement to sell water to Town	Proposed
Glens Falls (DG 11/22/98)	Fulton	Code Enforcement	County	Consolidation	The County planning board is discussing the merit of county-wide code enforcement	Under Discussion (1998)
Glens Falls (DG 2/15/04, 11/22/98)	Fulton	Fuel Depot	Approximately 30 Jurisdictions	Cooperative	A County fuel depot serves thirty jurisdictions, from school districts to public agencies	In Action
Glens Falls (DG 11/22/98)	Fulton	Police	County	Consolidation	Emergency services central dispatching	In Action

Glens Falls (DG 2/15/04)	Fulton	Police, water, assessment and tax collection, animal control, garbage collection, fire, and highway, villages	County	Consolidation	County Administrative Officer Jon Stead laid out long range plans to consolidate many municipal services at the County level	Proposed
Glens Falls (DG 11/22/98)	Fulton	Purchasing	Almost All Municipalities	Cooperative	Almost all the County's municipalities participate in joint liability insurance coverage	In Action
Glens Falls (DG 11/22/98)	Fulton	Tax Assessment	All Municipalities	Consolidation	Voters rejected a proposal to consolidate tax assessment within county government	Rejected
Glens Falls (DG 2/15/04)	Fulton and Johnstown	Police	Town and County	Consolidation	Common Council rejected idea to have County Sheriff's Department takeover Town police force	Rejected
Glens Falls (DG 2/19/03)	Gloversville and Johnstown	Purchasing	City and Town	Cooperative	Cooperate on purchase of fuel, insurance, and highway equipment	In Action
Glens Falls (DG 2/15/04)	Mayfield	Dissolution	Village	Consolidation	Village voters rejected two referenda to dissolve the Village during the last decade	Rejected
Glens Falls (GFPS 6/28/04)	Queensbury	Fire	Town	Consolidation	Intra-governmental consolidation of volunteer fire department companies	Proposed

Glens Falls (GFPS 2/15/04)	Ticonderoga	Government	Village	Consolidation	Dissolution of Village government by voters in 1989	Action Taken
Glens Falls (GFPS 3/8/04)	Lake George	Judicial System, Landfill Transfer Station, and Department of Public Works	Village and Town	Consolidation	Merger of these functions and services	Action Taken
Glens Falls (GFPS 3/8/04)	Warren and Glens Falls	Police	County and City	Contractual Services Agreement	Suggestion the County Sheriff's Department take over police dispatching from City of Glens Falls	Under Discussion
Hauppauge (NYT 2/00)	Hempstead, 6 Villages	Solid Waste	Town, 6 villages	Cooperative	Hempstead contracted with private organization to construct waste management facility while entering into intermunicipal agreements with several villages to deliver their waste to the facility to ensure enough business and enable recovery of investment costs	Action Taken
Hauppauge (NYT 4/28/04)	Nassau and Oyster Bay	Snow Plowing	County, Town	Contractual Services Agreement	Agreement between parties to exchange County Land in return for Town operation and maintenance of some county roads	Action Taken

Rochester (SPS 03/07/02)	Monroe, Including Towns and School Districts	Entire Governments	City, County, Towns, School Districts	Consolidation	All municipal governments and school districts in Monroe County folded into one big entity. Monroe County would become 14 th largest city in country; increase national visibility	Proposed
Rochester (From interview with OSC)	Naples	Municipal consolidation	Town, Village	Consolidation	The Town and Village of Naples have consolidated	Action Taken
Rochester (OSC Interview)	Palmyra, Wayne	Highways	Town, County	Cooperation	One highway department for all public works. Employment and equipment are interchangeable.	Action Taken
Rochester (RDC 10/6/04)	Webster, Penfield	Fire	1 Village, 2 Towns	Consolidation	Village and Town of Webster and Town of Penfield will be served by one consolidated fire department.	Action Taken
Syracuse (SPS 12/16/00)	Auburn, Oswego, Ithaca	Sewage Treatment	3 Towns	Contractual Services Agreement	Auburn will earn a profit incinerating the sewage of the other Towns	Action Taken
Syracuse (SPS 12/28/00)	Baldwinsville, Van Buren	Fire	Village, Town	Joint Operations Agreement	The two Towns proposed building and operating a joint fire station	Proposed

Syracuse (UOD 12/7/03)	New Hartford	Police	Village and Town	Consolidation	Merged Village and Town police forces in the mid-1980s	Action Taken
Syracuse (SPS 03/14/04)	Syracuse, Onondaga County	Economic Development Offices	City, County	Consolidation	Merger of economic development offices	Proposed
Syracuse (SPS 11/21/00, 3/2/04)	Onondaga, Syracuse	Finance	County, City	Resource Sharing	The County will provide Syracuse 30% of sales tax revenue resulting from mall expansion	Proposed
Syracuse (SPS 05/11/00, 05/12/00, 03/02/04)	Onondaga, Syracuse	Purchasing	County, City	Consolidation	County and City may merge purchasing departments. Mayor is trying force situation by removing funding for City purchasing department from budget	Proposed
Syracuse (SPS 5/24/01)	Van Buren, Baldwinsville	Transportation	Two Towns	Joint Operations Agreement	One town will put project out to bid; both towns will share cost	Action Taken
Syracuse (UOD 4/29/97)	Whitestown and its villages	Police	Town and its villages	Consolidation	On the discussion agenda for at least two decades	Under Discussion

Definitions

Planning — Two or more municipalities agree to coordinate planning activities

Resource Sharing — Two or more municipalities agree to share resources

Consolidation — Two or more municipalities agree to consolidate one or more public agencies and/or governmental units

Contractual Services Agreement — A contract between two or more municipalities where one provides a service to the other(s)

Joint Operations Agreement — Two or more municipalities jointly operate a service

Cooperative — Two or more municipalities cooperate by pooling their resources to enhance municipal buying power with private organizations

Assistance—One or more municipalities agree to provide operational assistance to another municipality or group of municipalities

Incentives—One or more units of government, most likely the county government, provides incentives to other units of government or public agencies to enter into intermunicipal agreements and/or activities

Regions (*regional designations, and the counties included in them, conform to OSC regional divisions*)

Albany: Albany, Columbia, Dutchess, Greene, Orange, Putnam, Rockland, Schenectady, Ulster, Westchester

Buffalo: Allegany, Cattaraugus, Chautauqua, Erie, Genesee, Niagara, Orleans, Wyoming

Binghamton: Broome, Chenango, Cortland, Delaware, Otsego, Schoharie, Sullivan, Tioga, Tompkins

Hauppauge: Nassau, Suffolk

Glens Falls: Clinton, Essex, Franklin, Fulton, Hamilton, Montgomery, Rensselaer, Saratoga, Warren, Washington

Rochester: Cayuga, Chemung, Livingston, Monroe, Ontario, Schuyler, Seneca, Steuben, Wayne, Yates

Syracuse: Herkimer, Jefferson, Lewis, Madison, Oneida, Onondaga, Oswego, St. Lawrence

Newspaper Legend

ATU Albany Times Union

BN Buffalo News

DG Daily Gazette (Schenectady)

GFPS Glens Falls Post Star

JPJ Jamestown Post Journal

NYLJ New York Law Journal

NYT New York Times

RDC Rochester Democrat & Chronicle

SPS Syracuse Post-Standard

UOD Utica Observer Dispatch