

IOWA COUNTY SHARED SERVICE FEASIBILITY STUDY

Prepared For:
Larry Bierke, County Administrator
Iowa County Board of Supervisors

Prepared by:
Mary Baumgartner and Max Prestigiacomo

UniverCity Alliance
June 25, 2024



WISCONSIN
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements.....	iii
Executive Summary.....	1
Background	2
Methods & Criteria	3
Recommendation #1: Road Maintenance Services	6
Recommendation #2: GIS Services	6
Recommendation #3: Asphalt Production.....	17
Appendix A: List of Suggestions Generated.....	24
Appendix B: Model Shared Maintenance Agreement.....	37
Appendix C: Model Intergovernmental Agreement	40
Appendix D: Wis. Stats. on Intergovernmental Cooperation	48
Appendix E: Survey of Iowa County Officials	52
Appendix F: Survey of Iowa County Localities	53
Appendix G: Presentation to the County Board	54

Acknowledgements

This research was conducted in partnership between Iowa County and the University of Wisconsin-Madison's [UniverCity Alliance](#). Mary Baumgartner, a Master of Public Affairs Candidate at UW-Madison's La Follette School of Public Affairs, and Max Prestigiacomo, an undergraduate student at UW-Madison, prepared this report with guidance from Assistant Professor of Public Affairs, Ross Milton, Ph.D. Special thanks go to Gavin Luter, Managing Director of UniverCity Alliance, for coordinating the project and Larry Bierke, Iowa County Administrator, for guidance and advice. Finally, thank you to all the Iowa County staff, municipal staff, regional officials, and experts for contributing time and expertise to this project.

Executive Summary

Additional intergovernmental cooperation opportunities are an important consideration for many counties and municipalities as they work to be fiscally responsible stewards for their communities. This project explored shared service opportunities for Iowa County with other governmental entities, both within the County and outside of it. Motivations for this research included efforts to alleviate the operating levy burden, staff recruitment and retention issues, and service demands. From 2 surveys, 25 respondents, 12 interviews, 17 shared service options considered, as well as a review of existing literature, we find that there is a strong demand for collaboration. With cost savings, generalizability of service, efficiency, and co-benefits as our selection criteria, we recommend three shared services to the Iowa County Board & County Administrator: road maintenance services, Geographic Information System (GIS) operations, and asphalt production.

Within road maintenance services, *cataloging shared service events* is our initial recommendation, as it is the most feasible given that the County already shares equipment with other localities on a more casual basis. This current sharing demonstrates political feasibility, and this option is financially feasible as well, given that formalizing the process likely will not require set up costs. Additionally, *cataloging shared service events* is our first recommendation because it is a foundational step for subsequent shared road maintenance services, including a *shared equipment pilot program* and a *formal shared equipment program*.

In addition to road maintenance services, we recommend two other shared service opportunities. Geographic information services (GIS) offers shared service potential because of the focus Richland County is placing on such services as well as added benefits GIS collaboration offers for other departments and municipalities. Asphalt production is our third recommendation because of the market advantage Iowa County has regarding production and pricing.

Pursuing these options is worthwhile given 2023 Act 12, which included innovation grants for Wisconsin counties and municipalities for service transfers to counties that yield savings of 10 percent or more. Important next steps include discussing these shared service ideas with other stakeholders and further study of their benefits.

Background

Shared services are becoming an increasingly effective solution to distressed operating budgets, staff retention, and the growing demand for services in Wisconsin. A recent report documents nearly 100 inter-governmental collaborations in Wisconsin (Local Government Institute of Wisconsin, 2012). Enabling Wis. Stat. § 66.0301, “Intergovernmental cooperation,” gives broad authority to localities and counties “for the receipt or furnishing of services or the joint exercise of any power or duty required or authorized by law.” See Appendix D for this statute and Appendix C for a model Intergovernmental Agreement. Additionally, home rule authority as set forth in Wis. Stat. § 59.03 allows counties to pursue consolidation of “municipal services and functions in the county.”

The charge of this research project was to explore shared service opportunities or collaboration between Iowa County and other entities: localities, non-profits, private entities, etc. Appendix A documents all suggestions generated through this research, regardless of their merit or feasibility, including proposals to outsource services that we immediately rejected due to political complexity outside this study’s scope. Finally, our initial research charge included recommending a service feasible enough to include in the 2025 budget cycle.

This project considered context in Iowa County, including, but not limited to, an operating levy bringing in \$11 million annually, high inflationary costs, volatile local provision of services due to staff retention and recruitment issues, state-mandated barriers to efficiency and cost-savings, growth in Eastern Iowa County, good regional communication networks between county officials, and some connectivity between County officials and localities.

Methods & Criteria

Methods

This study used surveys, informational interviews, and literature review to generate suggestions for shared services in Iowa County. We then assessed these suggestions against a set of criteria described below.

After initial planning meetings, we drafted two surveys for Iowa County officials (Appendix E) and local officials (Appendix F) within Iowa County. We used these surveys solely to identify proposals and not to determine recommendations in this report. We sent the first survey (Appendix E) to 21 Iowa County staff members and had a response rate of 42.8 percent (9 people). We sent the second survey (Appendix F) to 134 local officials and had a response rate of 8.9 percent (12 people). Additionally, we conducted 6 interviews with leadership in Iowa County's Highway Department (two times), Finance Department, Planning & Development & GIS/LR Department, EMS, UW-Extension, as well as 6 interviews with legal professionals, policy professionals, and elected officials from surrounding counties and jurisdictions within Iowa County.

A literature review revealed a growing list of intergovernmental collaborations within Wisconsin and models in other United States counties (Kim, 2015; Nesbitt & Acquario, 2019; Local Government Institute of Wisconsin, 2012). Within Wisconsin, Iowa County's context shares some similarities with jurisdictions that have begun to regionalize services.

Ultimately, we created evaluation criteria based on the literature detailed below. Through snowball sampling, targeted surveys, interviews, and literature review, we compiled a list of 17 shared service suggestions and assessed their feasibility through our criteria and discussions with staff. Appendix A shows the full list of shared services suggestions generated and their ratings using the criteria below.

Criteria

To evaluate shared service proposals generated from this research, we adapted an evaluation framework created by the Wisconsin Policy Forum (Henken, Brown, & Cramer, 2023). These criteria were initially created to study the feasibility of shared services between the City of and County of Milwaukee. We adapted these four criteria to fit the charge of the research project and Iowa County's unique context; evaluated suggestions were subsequently advanced or rejected.

Shared Service Evaluating Criteria

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
<p>Cost-savings associated with the policy: cost-savings must be short-term (does not include any policy with high overhead costs and long-term cost-savings), savings must be for Iowa County, and priority given to operating budget cost savings.</p>	<p>Similarity in specialization or lack of specialization in terms of the nature, size, and administration of the function for each government; generalizable only if all entities involved have a pre-existing budget line-items or until very recently for the considered shared service.</p>	<p>Enhancing the quality of service and the efficiency of provisions, including greater county operations efficiency regardless of sharing opportunities. Including reduced duplication of services and enhanced operational connectivity between localities.</p>	<p>Addressing a specific need or problem for any locality within Iowa County or County operations like staff recruitment/retention, technology enhancement via collaboration, additional county revenue, and enhanced communication between localities and Iowa County.</p>

Criteria Model Source: Wisconsin Policy Forum (Henken, Brown, & Cramer, 2023)

Iowa County Shared Service Recommendations

Service		Pros & Cons	Feasibility	Stakeholders
Road Maintenance	Shared Service Catalog	+ Existing precedent + Data source - Limited capacity may require funds	High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway Department • SW Counties • Municipalities • Private companies
	1-2 New Shared Service Agreements	+ Depreciates ownership costs - Market factors - Scheduling challenges	Medium	
	Formal Shared Equipment Program	- May need budget mechanisms		
Geographic Information Services (GIS)	Shared Service Contract with Richland County and/or Regionally	+ Richland County Interest + Past regional GIS collaboration + Southwest Regional Planning Commission project support + Dept. Efficiencies + Esri discount - Logistics to sort	Medium-to-High	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iowa County • Richland County • Southwest Regional Planning Commission • Municipalities
	Expand Intra-County GIS Services & Access	+ Municipal access + Dept. Efficiencies + Esri discount - Upfront costs - Municipal buy-in	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Iowa County • Municipalities

Asphalt Production	Joint Venture for Asphalt Production	+ Market advantage + Central location + Diffused costs - Distance limitations - Market risks (i.e. environmental)	Medium	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Highway Department • SW Counties • Municipalities • Private companies
-------------------------------	--	--	--------	--

Recommendation #1: Road Maintenance Services

Research identified several road maintenance services with capacity to expand into an intergovernmental collaboration. In addition to broad authority granted by Wis. Stat. § 66.0301 “Intergovernmental Coordination,” Wis. Stat. § 83.035 “Streets and highways, construction” enables counties to “enter into contracts with cities, villages and towns within the county borders to enable the county to construct and maintain streets and highways in such municipalities.” Further, Wis. Stat. 83.018 “Road supplies; committee may sell to municipalities,” grants counties the ability to sell “building and maintenance supplies” to localities. Given capacity, demand, and market edge, we recommend the County expand shared use of County-owned road maintenance equipment and consider formalizing this process.

Background & Status Quo

Road maintenance services are offered by three entities: (1) Iowa County, (2) larger localities, i.e. Dodgeville, and (3) outside firms or counties via contract. Iowa County exclusively maintains county-owned roads and is responsible for maintaining most state-owned highways and infrastructure, but the county is only eligible for on average 70% reimbursement for costs.

Intergovernmental collaboration for highway and road services is prevalent in Wisconsin. Iowa County currently provides services informally with other localities and counties, but most localities within the County contract with outside firms. The towns of Dodgeville, Mineral Point, Waldwick, Wyoming, the city of Dodgeville and the City of Mineral Point are all localities serviced by the Highway Department. Additionally, Grant, Green, Rock, Lafayette, Sauk, Richland, and Crawford counties all informally share highway and road services. These collaborations exist across the state: Adams, Marquette, Waushara, Waupaca, and Green Lake Counties, for example, entered into a cooperative agreement in 2006 to share highway equipment and labor resources (Local Government Institute of Wisconsin, 2012).

Well-established and efficient communication networks between Highway Commissioners and other local infrastructure officials facilitate existing shared-uses of equipment. According to

interviews, there is an unspoken understanding that counties do not work in each other’s areas unless Highway Commissioners have agreed to it. The process often occurs via email with a subsequent financial exchange, but these agreements are informal and only financially documented.

County-run road maintenance services are notable for their ability to offer below-market-rate pricing for services, depending on transportation costs. For example, the county can offer seal coating service to localities for considerably less than private contractors. This benefit, in addition to comparative scheduling flexibility for equipment use, makes road maintenance services suitable for shared-use.

Table 1. Road Maintenance Service Criteria Evaluation

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
✓	✓	✓	✓

Recommendation 1(a): Catalog Shared Service Events

Feasibility: High – functional feasibility enhanced by existing shared service documentation and lack of need for budgetary mechanisms.

Overview

We recommend establishing a catalog system to track the existing use of these assets to serve other localities and the frequency of contracts. Shared service events, defined as when the County enters into an agreement to provide one-time services for another jurisdiction, are already common. Cataloging may include documenting certain event variables including but not limited to: expected cost, actual cost, parties involved, time of year, duration of service, size or volume or service, transportation costs, labor costs, workforce availability, and location.

The size and scope of cataloging can shift depending on capacity and resources available. A document should be drafted to outline variables to measure and collect from shared service events; this process can better inform future scheduling and pricing of shared services. This document may also determine whether and how to retroactively document past shared services. If there is a lack of capacity within the Highway Department, we recommend looking to other departments or entities who may manage cataloging.

Benefits

Cataloging may allow the county to accurately identify revenue and trends with existing shared service ventures. Additionally, documenting shared service events may better inform planning

for future shared service collaborations, equipment scheduling, workforce scheduling, revenue projections, and pricing. Finally, this recommendation is relatively simple and can shift in size to fit within capacity.

Limitations

If no office has the capacity to catalog shared services, this option may require a budgetary mechanism to increase FTEs.

Recommendation 1(b): New Shared Service Agreements

Feasibility: Medium– functional feasibility enhanced by existing shared service documentation and little to no budgetary mechanisms required.

Overview

We recommend maintaining the informal communication process and entering into 1-2 new shared service agreements with localities. Initial interviews with Highway Department staff identified a desire to increase the utilization of road maintenance equipment.

Like cataloging, the size and scale of this effort can shift in size dependent on staff capacity. Data collection during this expansion is strongly encouraged and may better inform future efforts. Finally, the county should assess workforce availability for shared-use opportunities and organize early stakeholder meetings to discuss needs and costs.

Benefits

Shared-use agreements generate more revenue for the County and offset depreciation costs. Further, by maintaining an informal process, the county may have more capacity to prepare for future expansion of service. This gradual start will grant flexibility in the planning process, as road service contracts are often the result of political decisions, and changing service providers is a slow and infrequent process.

A 2011 report by the New York State Office of the State Comptroller estimated that widespread sharing of highway services and maintenance equipment saved two to five percent of total costs. For example, in the case study, all municipalities in Franklin County used county paving equipment and had a formal shared equipment agreement. The total cost-savings from this individual shared service alone was \$80,402 annually at the time of publishing (New York State Comptroller's Office, 2011). Notably, Franklin County is also a fairly small, rural county (<50k

people) and has similar education and employment demographics (U.S. Census Bureau, 2022a; U.S. Census Bureau, 2022b).¹

Limitations

This recommendation is entirely dependent on the circumstances of local service markets. If there is no political will among municipalities to change service providers, there may be no opportunity for expansion.

Road maintenance is typically scheduled annually in tandem with workforce availability. Scheduling the labor force for shared services may require additional operating costs. Finally, management of this expansion effort may also require budgetary mechanisms (additional FTEs) and legislative authorizations.

Recommendation 1(c): Formal Shared Service Expansion

Feasibility: Medium – functional feasibility enhanced by existing standard agreements, little to no budgetary mechanisms required, but heavily dependent on market circumstances.

Overview

If market circumstances and political feasibility seem favorable to shared services, we recommend the county formalize a shared service expansion program through a budgetary mechanism; this expansion may include additional highway department FTEs or directing funds toward a entity to guide implementation. Regardless, the county should collect data and prepare a review of (1) existing shared road services, (2) the road service market in Iowa County and southwest Wisconsin, (3) workforce scheduling availability, (4) local and regional political feasibility, (5) road service pricing, and (6) potential marketing schemes to gain interest from localities within Iowa County.

Further, we recommend considering neighboring counties as prospective partners in a shared highway service agreement. Finally, allowing time in the initial planning stages for open-ended meetings with interested parties will aid this process.

Benefits

Increased utility of Highway Department assets will generate more revenue and offset depreciation costs; some assets sit idle for periods of time and have the capacity for more utilization.

¹ According to the 2022 [American Community Survey 5-Year Estimates](#), 22.1 percent of people in Franklin County and 27.8 percent of people in Iowa County have a Bachelor's degree or higher. In both places, the private sector is the largest source of employment, and the majority of the people commute to work by driving alone. Interestingly, median household income and gross rent are both higher in Iowa County than in Franklin County.

After Adams, Marquette and Waushara counties implemented a shared highway service agreement in 2006, all parties noted results including increased utilization of highway equipment and “flexibility with regards to staffing, workloads and equipment purchases” (Local Government Institute of Wisconsin, 2012). These counties all have population sizes comparable to Iowa County’s (between 15k and 24k as of 2022) and lower median household incomes (U.S. Census Bureau, 2022c; U.S. Census Bureau, 2022d; U.S. Census Bureau, 2022e).

Like Recommendation 1(a) and 1(b), this long-term nature of this recommendation will give the county much needed time to prepare and schedule for more shared uses.

Limitations

Like option 1(b), this option is entirely dependent on market circumstances and political will to change service providers. Further, managing the scheduling of the labor force, shared service agreements, and data-collection may require additional operating costs.

Recommendation #2: GIS Services

To better understand and communicate spatial data and relationships, governments use geographic information systems (GIS) (Evers, 2024). Intergovernmental cooperation and shared use of GIS services are possible in Wisconsin per Wis. Stat. § 66.0301(1) and (2) as well as Wis. Stat. §59.52(7), which provide broad authorization for counties and municipalities to jointly operate agencies with each other. Given historical cooperation among counties in the region, current efforts to expand GIS services in Richland County, and regional models offered in other states, we recommend that Iowa County pursue more GIS shared service opportunities.

Background & Status Quo

GIS Website Collaboration

Historically, there has been regional GIS collaboration to some extent. In 2008, due to a desire to improve the County's GIS website, Iowa County, Grant County, and Lafayette County merged their GIS websites and associated services, with Ruckert and Mielke as the vendor. Cost-savings were another motivating factor for the merger, as the contract allowed the counties to share fees. Since its creation, the website has provided geographic and land information to the community. Per the agreement at the time, Iowa County would pay half of the hosting fees, half of the development fees, and half of the *annual* hosting fees. Each county was responsible for its own update fees as necessary.

A few years into the collaboration, Lafayette chose to leave the partnership because it was allegedly not satisfied with Ruckert and Mielke's service. Grant remained with Iowa County, and updates became more frequent. Iowa County had Ruckert and Mielke set up weekly auto-updates, which saved the County money, as it only required an initial set-up fee. However, Grant County did not have the infrastructure capabilities to do auto-updates, so Grant County had to pay for each individual update, which ultimately became too costly for them. As of June 9, 2017, Grant County's information was no longer available through the Ruckert and Mielke website. Currently, Iowa County pays website costs through retained fees, which Wis. Stat. §59.72(5) authorizes as part of land record modernization funding. County staff are currently under the impression that Ruckert and Mielke may want to stop being a vendor in the next few years, so Iowa County will then have to decide if it should bring its GIS website "in-house" or not. It is worth noting that the website collaboration never required levy dollars.

According to Iowa County staff, aside from staff payment and "some incidental office supplies, the majority of [the current] budget comes out of retained fees, the [Wisconsin Land Information Program (WLIP)] Base Budget grant and WLIP strategic initiative grant." Per the 2023 WLIP report, "each county [was] eligible to receive a \$10k Strategic Initiative grant for

2024” as well as “a \$1k Training& Education grant, and the 55 counties that retained less than \$100k in recording fees during the previous fiscal year [were] eligible for Base Budget grants” (Wisconsin Land Information Program, 2023, p. 2). Thus, counties with lower populations are eligible for more Base Budget grants given their lower retained fees. Based on this information and Iowa County’s adopted budget for 2024, the tax levy covers \$107,872 for Planning & Development & GIS/LR (Iowa County, 2023, p. 9).

Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission

While Iowa County GIS work largely focuses on ensuring statutory compliance regarding land records, the Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SWWRPC) focuses largely on problem-solving and municipal planning, according to SWWRPC staff. The SWWRPC offers certain GIS services through ArcGIS, which is a single, comprehensive computer program for GIS provided through the company Esri (Esri, n.d.-a). Specifically, SWWRPC provides cemetery mapping, broadband mapping, and municipal zoning interactive mapping (Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, 2024a). Iowa County was the pilot for the broadband mapping program, and the “initiative has resulted in conversations with local communities and a few providers in anticipation of future grants” (Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission, 2024b). Most of the data SWWRPC uses, such as county tax roll data and parcel fabric layers, comes from other sources. According to Iowa County staff, the main collaboration between SWWRPC and Iowa County occurs when SWWRPC requests input or data from Iowa County GIS.

Status Quo

Counties in the southwest region currently share data with each other and with the SWWRPC. Relatedly, an Iowa County staff member reported that the counties “meet 2-4 times a year to discuss projects, legislation, GIS challenges and funding opportunities.” Iowa County is a regional leader in GIS work.

Currently, the State Agency Geospatial Information Committee (SAGIC) negotiates a biannual contract for the State of Wisconsin with Esri, and the negotiated prices are available to all state agencies, counties, and municipalities. The current 54 page contract can be found in the Box folder, or through the SAGIC website [here](#). Esri also offers the Small Municipal and County Government Enterprise Agreement (SGEA), which is a three-year agreement that provides ArcGIS services to a locality at a special rate based on population tier. Given Iowa County’s current population, it would qualify for the lowest cost tier of \$27,500 per year, assuming historical rates remain accurate in all parts of the country (City of Lathrop, 2023). Based on section 27, “Enterprise Agreements,” in the contract, it seems that Iowa County and other entities within the region could enter into an SGEA, as the section states:

An Authorized Entity may purchase an Enterprise Agreement under the terms and conditions of this MPA and additional terms and conditions for the Enterprise Agreement. The additional terms and conditions for the Enterprise Agreement will be between the Authorized Entity and Esri. (Esri, 2023, p. 49)

Iowa County staff reported that the County currently pays for one desktop - advanced, one desktop-standard, one 3D analyst, one publisher, and 3 desktop-basic single use licenses, which Emergency Management, the Highway Commissioner, and the Land Conservation Department use. Additionally, the County pays for an ArcGIS online server as well as ArcGIS online professional – advanced and ArcGIS online - spatial analyst licenses.

At this point, without knowing the exact price Iowa County pays for each of these products, it remains unclear to us whether the current, State negotiated rates are more cost-effective for the County. However, the possibility exists that an SGEA within the region could offer cost-savings, depending on the products purchased. This possibility is due in large part to the fact that the SGEA offer has “uncapped” quantities on certain products (i.e. desktop - advanced, desktop-standard, and desktop-basic). If we assume that the County’s current desktop licenses are all single-use, those alone cost \$20,485 in 2022 (\$10,710 + \$5950+(\$1275*3)) and \$22,497 in 2023 (\$11,743 +\$6545+(\$1403*3)).

Table 2. GIS Service Criteria Evaluation

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
✓	✓	✓	✓

Recommendation 2(a): Shared Service Contract with Richland County and/or Regionally
 Feasibility: Medium-to-High – political feasibility enhanced by historical context, current interest from Richland County CA; fiscal feasibility strong based on past collaboration model, which demonstrates areas for improvement. Cost-savings expected by sharing costs for expanded services across governments. Generalizability met because GIS services apply to most, if not all, counties and municipalities in the region. Efficiency is possible by reducing duplication of products, such as through the Small Municipal and County Government Enterprise Agreement. Co-benefits met because increased collaboration allows for offering new GIS services and expanding the number of localities who are able to use them.

Overview

During an interview, we learned that Richland County is considering whether to bring its GIS operations “in-house.” Leadership in Richland County expressed interest in inter-county GIS

shared services and also noted that Richland County is beginning to evaluate such opportunities, given the growing importance of GIS operations. Counties also have recently been collaborating on E-911 efforts, as their data have to match seamlessly for the program. These are positive indicators for political feasibility. One potential model discussed during the interview is to create a multi-county agency with one central GIS employee with multiple support staff focusing on specific GIS projects. In Minnesota, the Metropolitan Council helped establish MetroGIS, which is “is an award-winning, regional geographic information systems initiative serving Minnesota’s Minneapolis-St Paul metropolitan area” (Metropolitan Council, n.d.). MetroGIS leadership consists of a policy board, made up of county commissioners, senior county staff, and other elected officials; a coordinating committee, made up of management and technical staff from various localities and non-profits; and work groups (MetroGIS, n.d.-a). Notable, measurable results for MetroGIS include expansion of resources and data availability, decrease in redundant costs and data conflicts, reduction of project costs through collaborative bidding,” and greater efficiencies due to data standardization (MetroGIS, n.d.-b).

Benefits

Richland County is already examining ways to improve GIS services and collaboration within the region, so there is a willing partner who has already started the research process. Whether led by Iowa County, Richland County, or the SWWRPC, regionalizing GIS services is likely to yield efficiencies because “geographic data do not end at governmental boundaries, [so] GIS technology lends itself well to regional collaboration” (Fleming, 2016, p.5). Efficiencies are also likely to stem from the fact that the “more geospatial data that are collected and available for analysis, the greater the understanding of how decisions can affect a region” (Fleming, 2016, p.5). Based on evidence from other localities around the country, sharing GIS services help localities expand their GIS work. Conversations revealed that a substantial portion of the work done by Iowa County GIS staff is for parcel mapping. Interestingly, a case study from Carver County, MN noted “the value of GIS for management and administration purposes” and that making maps is “only 5 percent of what [the GIS technology] does” (Fleming, 2016, p.7).

Limitations

Based on conversations with Iowa County staff, expanding GIS operations with current staffing levels would be challenging due to workload and data integration needs. The benefits of collaboration will also depend on the GIS services under consideration. For example, parcel mapping is so nuanced and specific to localities that it would be difficult for one person to do it for multiple counties.

Recommendation 2(b): Expanding Intra-County GIS Services & Access

Feasibility: Medium – due to upfront costs and the need to garner support of localities. However, existing programs offer opportunities to aid this process.

Overview

Iowa County's GIS services currently focus on mapping, including zoning for the county, parcel mapping, E-911 mapping, survey reviews, state parcel dataset submissions for grant eligibility, and voting ward map updates to the state. According to interviews, Iowa County will provide towns and other localities with whatever maps they need, such as parcel maps for addresses or maps for first responders. Expanding intra-county GIS services and access to localities within Iowa County could include helping places manage their own data, such as for utilities or rental housing, rather than using a request system (Fleming, 2016, pp. 5-6). The SGEA software could be a powerful tool for helping improve access and utilization. Some localities have received even lower rates when they first begin their Esri partnership, but, again, to determine if lower rates may apply for Iowa County, it is necessary to see first the exact current rates paid (City of Willmar, 2021).

Benefits

Across the nation, other counties have experienced cost savings when sharing GIS services. In 2021, St. Louis County, MN saw the potential to save approximately \$220,000 on highway maintenance costs due to adopt-a-highway GIS-efficiencies (Esri, n.d.-b). This number stems from 888 hours of reported group volunteer time for cleaning highways, with an assumed average of five people per group and a highway maintenance rate of \$50 per hour (888 x 5 x \$50) (Esri, n.d.-b). While the Iowa County Highway Department extensively uses GIS mobile apps and resources, and while County GIS staff have created adopt-a-highway layers, it is unclear if other localities are utilizing such information to the extent that they could be. Relatedly, Carver County noted that its SGEA with Esri both provided enhanced GIS access to localities that would not have been able to afford the services on their own and reduced the County's cost by having "cities pay a portion of the GIS system costs based on their population size, which [amounted] to significantly less than paying for a desktop system" (Fleming, 2016, p.7).

In March 2015, Ozaukee County's Land Information Office conducted an analysis on the County's GIS uses and noted several efficiency, operational, strategic, and external benefits. One notable efficiency benefit is the use of GIS on mobile devices to aid fieldwork through data acquisition (Ozaukee County Land Information Office, 2015). The Carver County, MN case study noted this benefit as well for its Water Management and Planning Department (Fleming, 2016). Iowa County data is currently available in mobile app formats for departments to use in the

field. Enhanced interdepartmental cooperation for county and municipal services is another notable efficiency (Ozaukee County Land Information Office, 2015). Interestingly, the City of Santa Rosa, CA used value-added GIS services as a revenue raiser (McHenry, 2009). For businesses interested in customized GIS data, the City offered the additional information for a fee, noting that “the subscription service [was] growing as developers, architects, engineering firms and other businesses begin to rely on GIS data to streamline their internal work” (McHenry, 2009). Like Iowa County and many other localities, the private sector is the largest source of employment in Santa Rosa (U.S. Census Bureau, 2022f).

Limitations

As mentioned, there are price data about which we are still uncertain. Without knowing that information, we cannot be sure about the potential net additional costs associated with this expansion, which the County and localities would need to discuss. If localities are currently satisfied with their GIS contract offerings through the state, as well as the support they receive through existing Iowa County GIS operations, there may be little motivation for this expansion. Limited staff capacity for localities is another possible limitation.

Recommendation #3: Asphalt Production

Research identified the Iowa County Asphalt Plant and Quarry site located at 3307 Co. Rd. Z Dodgeville, WI 53533 as having high potential for intergovernmental collaboration because it is hot use mix plant, which allows for flexibility, and has 10 years in use left but currently is not utilized to provide the County a full return on the investment. Per interviews, Iowa County’s plant has capacity to put out approximately 60,000 ton a summer, assuming a summer with 40 workdays. However, the County is only using its plant to the level of 12 to 15,000 ton in a summer.

In addition to broad authority granted by Wis. Stat. § 66.0301 “Intergovernmental Coordination,” Wis. Stat. 83.018 “Road supplies; committee may sell to municipalities,” grants counties the ability to sell “building and maintenance supplies” to localities. Given the approximate amount of time before expiration of the facility, the cost-savings and efficiency of the facility, and universal demand for asphalt, we recommend the County explore a joint venture with jurisdictions in southwestern Wisconsin.

Background & Status Quo

Iowa County solely operates the asphalt production facility. Most counties in Wisconsin elect to contract with private firms for asphalt rather than operate their own. With this facility’s looming expiration date, there seem to be three likely options for maintaining road maintenance service: (1) re-use and re-purpose the production facility, (2) invest into a new facility at another location, or (3) divest from asphalt production and contract with outside firms or counties for asphalt.

The facility produces a variety of mixes and enables the County to procure materials at less than the market rate. Additionally, the central location of the facility in Iowa County lends flexibility with scheduling and efficiency or cost of materials transportation. Further, the facility offers a variety of mixes for a variety of road maintenance services. This flexibility in mixing is an opportunity given the rigid mix availabilities of private asphalt production facilities.

Table 3. Asphalt Production Service Criteria Evaluation

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
✓	X	✓	✓

Recommendation 3(a): Joint Venture for Asphalt Production

Feasibility: Medium – many budgetary mechanisms, negotiations, and staff capacity required; high initial capital costs; relatively long lifespan of existing operation lends time to plan effectively.

Overview

This research repeatedly raised the asphalt production facility operated by Iowa County as an opportunity to enter into a joint venture. We recommend the County begin discussions with regional officials in southwestern Wisconsin. The focus of these meetings should be a potential joint venture for asphalt production to distribute costs and benefits of owning a facility.

Like the road maintenance recommendations, the County should internally assess needs, staff capacity, and budgetary projections. Following this process, leadership should develop communication strategies and organize meetings. Several reports from the Wisconsin Policy Forum detail frameworks for establishing these types of collaborations (Henken, Brown, & Cramer, 2023; University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1999).

Benefits

Entering a joint venture would distribute the overall capital and operating costs, reducing Iowa County's expenses. For example, Highway Department staff informed us that the County bought a new paint truck approximately three years ago at a cost of about \$475,000. Recovering those costs takes substantial time, and the existing shared service Iowa County does with other localities, including five counties in the region, helps to reduce that amount of time. This paint truck agreement demonstrates a willingness to engage in similar inter-county cooperative projects.

Regarding a joint venture for asphalt, the easiest, but most costly, options are (1) maintaining sole-ownership and construction of a new facility or (2) divestiture or sourcing asphalt via contract elsewhere. The large capital or operating costs associated with these options give merit to a regionalization of asphalt production service that would distribute those costs across members of the agreement. Depending on the location, the benefits of the current facility will remain the same (low-cost, flexible mixing) and will become available to a larger regional market at a reduced cost to Iowa County.

Iowa County staff identified Grant County and Lafayette County as regional partners to consider, especially because Grant previously had an asphalt facility but now operates a portable plant, which involves conditional use permits in localities, largely due to high fixed costs (Grant County, 2023). Even as Grant County operates a portable plant, conversations with

Iowa County Highway Department staff indicated that Grant County has difficulty accessing necessary materials from the private sector, as the private sector agenda often differs from that of counties. Notably, as reported in interviews, Iowa County plant's production costs per tonnage are comparable to four of the private sector plants in the area – more specifically plus or minus one dollar and generally somewhere in the middle of the price options, thereby indicating a productivity return. Additional conversations among the regional counties likely will clarify benefits.

Limitations

The construction of the facility will require large capital expenses and financial commitments by interested jurisdictions. The benefit to operating an asphalt production facility will likely interest regional officials, but the distance materials can be transported limits the scale of the project. Based on interviews, the estimated service range for “hot mix” is approximately an hour and a half to two hours of driving distance. “Warm mix” offers additional travel time of approximately 15 to 20 minutes. Thus, partnerships will depend in large part on relative location to the plant. The county may lose this benefit.

Additionally, if the joint venture requires the construction of a new facility at a new location, the limited transportation range of the new facility may mean pockets of Iowa County lose existing coverage. The county will have to assess its willingness to lose service coverage if applicable, perhaps by supplementing supply for these pockets with mixes from private vendors. Regardless, if a new location is needed, the county may have difficulty in the planning process ensuring existing service coverage remains reliable and cost-effective.

Finally, existing asphalt production processes are harmful to the environment (Khare et al., 2020). There is risk to constructing a new facility as environmentally friendly alternatives like recycled asphalt (RAP) or bio-modified rubber may become more cost-effective and available in the future (Pouranian & Shishehbor, 2019; Fini et al., 2013).

Discussion

Considerations

The short timeline of this research project prevented: (1) deep quantitative projections and budgetary methodology assessment, although this report covers budget contexts, and (2) early implementation of any proposal. No meetings between potential interested parties and jurisdictions have been organized, but this report includes resources and recommendations for doing so.

At its core, organizing regional coordination requires designating staff, analyzing feasibility and stakeholders, surveying to assess needs, [identifying strengths in prospective partners](#), piloting programs, and organizing meetings that include staff with technical expertise (Zeemering & Delabbio, 2013). For steps tailored to specific projects, there are a variety of checklists available for [shared service agreements](#) and [workforce development](#) (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1999; National Association of Counties, 2018).

Future Work

Based on criteria of cost savings, generalizability of service, efficiency, and co-benefits, we recommend the Iowa County Board & county administrator pursue shared services relating to road maintenance, Geographic Information System (GIS) operations, and asphalt production, with cataloging shared equipment as the first effort given its high feasibility. Other considered shared service options warrant future consideration as well and can be found in Appendix A. Notably, police shared services and cooperative purchasing are two areas especially worth additional investigation.

Garnering stakeholder support through discussing this report and pursuing additional research into these shared services are important next steps. The County should improve its organization of data to ensure future work can easily access asset costs and revenues. Future partnerships with UniverCity Alliance and the La Follette School of Public Affairs can address the latter step. Specifically, formal cost-benefit analyses could estimate dollar amounts for each recommendation. Each fall, the La Follette School of Public Affairs offers a course in which students conduct cost-benefit analyses for community partners. Intergovernmental collaboration is a growing priority for fiscally-conscious communities, especially in light of 2023 Wisconsin Act 12's innovation grants, demonstrating how this work is worthwhile and timely.

To reduce duplication of efforts locating documents for future research, we created a Box folder of relevant documents that can be found here:

<https://uwmadison.box.com/s/1ffab0g3mfgs47tigwuiwyn92u33miw3>.

Works Cited

- City of Lathrop. (2023). "Item 4.6: City Manager's Report." February 13.
https://www.ci.lathrop.ca.us/sites/default/files/fileattachments/city_council/meeting/24781/2023-02-13_item_4.6_approve_gis_software_enterprise_license_agreement.pdf.
- City of Willmar. (2021). "Community Development Committee Meeting." January 25.
<https://www.willmarmn.gov/01.25.21%20Agenda%20&%20Packet.pdf>.
- Esri. (2023). "Amendment No. 13 | Agreement No. 279240." March 24.
- Esri. (n.d.-a). "Introduction to ArcGIS." *ArcGIS Architecture Center*. Esri.
<https://architecture.arcgis.com/en/overview/introduction-to-arcgis/introduction.html>.
- Esri. (n.d.-b). "St. Louis County, Minnesota, Saves over \$200,000 in Keeping Roads Clean with GIS." Esri. <https://www.esri.com/en-us/lg/industry/government/stories/st-louis-county-minnesota-saves-over-200-000-in-keeping-roads-clean-with-gis>.
- Evers, J. (2024). "GIS (Geographic Information System). *National Geographic Society*.
<https://education.nationalgeographic.org/resource/geographic-information-system-gis/>.
- Fini, E. H., Oldham, D., & Abu-Lebdeh, T. (2013). *Bio-Modified Rubber: A Sustainable Alternative for Use in Asphalt Pavements*. 489–499. <https://doi.org/10.1061/9780784412688.059>
- Fleming, C. (2016). "THE BENEFITS OF GIS FOR ALL: Carver County, Minnesota." *Esri Smart Communities Case Study Series*. Esri & ICMA.
- Grant County. (2023). "Grant County Comprehensive Zoning Ordinance."
<http://www.co.grant.wi.gov/docview.asp?docid=22970&locid=147>.
- Henken, R., Brown, A., & Cramer, D. (2023). *Partnering up: A scan of back office service sharing possibilities for the City and County of Milwaukee*. Wisconsin Policy Forum.
- Iowa County. (2023). "2024 Adopted Budget."
- Khare, P., et al. (2020). "Asphalt-related emissions are a major missing nontraditional source of secondary organic aerosol precursors." *Science Advances*, 6(eabb9785).
<https://doi.org/10.1126/sciadv.abb9785>.
- Kim, J. (2015). "Northeastern Illinois Local Government Northeastern Illinois Local Government Shared Services Survey Report." Metropolitan Mayors' Caucus.
- Local Government Institute of Wisconsin. (2012). *Local government collaboration in Wisconsin: Case studies*. Local Government Institute of Wisconsin.
- MetroGIS. (n.d.-a). "Governance Overview." Metropolitan Council. Retrieved from
<https://www.metrogis.org/teams-governance/overview-guidelines.aspx>.
- MetroGIS. (n.d.-b). "Overview." Metropolitan Council. Retrieved from
<https://www.metrogis.org/why-metrogis-matters/overview.aspx>.
- Metropolitan Council. (n.d). "MetroGIS." Metropolitan Council. Retrieved from
<https://metro council.org/Data-and-Maps/MetroGIS.aspx>.

- McHenry, E. (2009). "How GIS Can Save Money and Increase Efficiency for Cities." *Western City*. <https://www.westerncity.com/article/how-gis-can-save-money-and-increase-efficiency-cities>.
- National Association of Counties. (2018). Shared service agreements require governments to work together. National Association of Counties. Retrieved from <https://www.naco.org/articles/shared-service-agreements-require-governments-work-together>.
- Nesbitt, C. H. Jr., & Acquario, S.J. (2019). "County-Wide Shared Services Initiative." New York State Association of Counties.
- New York State Comptroller's Office. (2011). *Highway spending*. [PDF file]. Retrieved from <https://www.osc.ny.gov/files/local-government/publications/pdf/highwayspending.pdf>.
- Ozaukee County Land Information Office. (2015). "An Analysis of Benefits from Use of Geographic Information Systems by Ozaukee County, Wisconsin."
- Pouranian, M. R., & Shishehbor, M. (2019). Sustainability Assessment of Green Asphalt Mixtures: A Review. *Environments*, 6(6), Article 6. <https://doi.org/10.3390/environments6060073>
- Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission. (2024a). "GIS Mapping." <https://www.swwrpc.org/services/gis-mapping>.
- Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission. (2024b). "Broadband Mapping." <https://www.swwrpc.org/services/gis-mapping/broadband-mapping>.
- University of Wisconsin-Madison. (1999). *High performance partnerships: Winning solutions for employers and workers*. Retrieved from <https://highroad.wisc.edu/wp-content/uploads/sites/1368/2020/05/1999-High-Performance-Partnerships-Winning-Solutions-for-Employers-and-Workers.pdf>.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2022a). "Franklin County, New York." *Census Data Profiles*. Retrieved from https://data.census.gov/profile/Franklin_County,_New_York?g=050XX00US36033#populations-and-people.
- U.S. Census Bureau. (2022b). "Iowa County, Wisconsin." *Census Data Profiles*. Retrieved from https://data.census.gov/profile/Iowa_County,_Wisconsin?g=050XX00US55049.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2022c). "Adams County, Wisconsin." *Census Data Profiles*. Retrieved from https://data.census.gov/profile/Adams_County,_Wisconsin?g=050XX00US55001.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2022d). "Marquette County, Wisconsin." *Census Data Profiles*. Retrieved from <https://data.census.gov/profile?q=marquette%20county,wi>.
- U.S. Census Bureau (2022e). "Waushara County, Wisconsin." *Census Data Profiles*. Retrieved from https://data.census.gov/profile/Waushara_County,_Wisconsin?g=050XX00US55137.

- U.S. Census Bureau (2022f). "Santa Rosa city, California." *Census Data Profiles*. Retrieved from https://data.census.gov/profile/Santa_Rosa_city,_California?g=160XX00US0670098#employment.
- Wisconsin Land Information Program. (2023). "2023 WLIP Report." Wisconsin Department of Administration. Retrieved from <https://doa.wi.gov/Pages/LocalGovtsGrants/WLIP.aspx>.
- Zeemering, E., & Delabbio, D. (2013). *A county manager's guide to shared services in local government*. IBM Center for the Business of Government. Retrieved from <http://www.businessofgovernment.org/report/success-factors-implementing-shared-services-government>

Appendix A: List of Suggestions Generated

Asphalt Production

Iowa County currently operates an asphalt production facility with a market edge. The facility has approximately 10 years of utilization left. This study considered a joint venture to operate the existing asphalt facility or a future facility.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
✓	X	✓	✓

Comments

See documents in Box folder.

Assessment Services

Iowa County localities all contract assessment services to outside firms. This study considered county assessment or regional assessment services and enabling statute Wis. Stat. § 70.99.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
X	✓	X	✓

Comments

We did not advance this suggestion due to the complex political decisions, negotiations and high initial operating costs associated with it; localities have the statutory right to determine the provider of its services, thus we did not advance this suggestion; this program would require complex political decisions, negotiations, and high initial operating costs.

Further, Wis. Stat. § 70.99 mandates that a counter assessor shall have permanent tenure after a successful probationary period and the assessor shall not be an “at-will” employee; the Department of Revenue (DOR) has the ability to choose to study the feasibility of an assessor and the county shall cover the cost; the Department of Administration (DOA) recommends a salary which the county has no jurisdiction over; the county does not have autonomy on budgetary deliberations and the DOR assists; the county assessor assumes all responsibilities of each city, village and city assessor in the county, starting Jan. 1 the year following adoption; the

county assessor must revalue all cities, villages and town within 4 years of being created and the county must create a Board of Review.

Building Inspection

Iowa County localities primarily contract with firms for building inspection services. This study considered centralization, housed within Iowa County improving efficiencies with county and state permitting processes.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
X	✓	✓	✓

Comments

We did not advance this suggestion due to the complex political negotiations and high initial operating costs.

Comprehensive Planning

Iowa County planning is in-house and localities often look to Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SWWRPC), which offers planning services. Intergovernmental cooperation is possible by providing service to localities via contract.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
X	✓	✓	✓

Comments

We did not advance this suggestion due to high initial operating costs.

Cooperative Purchasing

Request for Proposal (FRP) “piggy-backing” onto procurement contracts common within Southwest Wisconsin. This study considered expanding or formalizing “piggy-backing”

agreements and potential cost-pooling opportunities for large expenses among jurisdictions in southwest Wisconsin.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
✓	✓	✓	✓

Comments

We were unable to collect enough information from experts to present a recommendation. The current informal procurement process occurs via amazon with approval from the County Clerk. Research raised a suggestion to establish Regional procurement network and a process for securing volume discounts by distributing the cost of one-time, annual, and long-term expenses.

In addition to broad authority granted by Wis. Stat. § 66.0301 “Intergovernmental Coordination,” localities are able to “buy goods and services at discounted prices under contracts already negotiated by the State of Wisconsin and the University of Wisconsin System as long as the contracts allow for Cooperative Purchasing” ([Wisconsin Department of Administration, 2024](#)). Wis. Stat. § 16.73 “Cooperative purchasing” explicitly grants this authority. Given the relative procurement bundling flexibility granted to local jurisdictions, we recommend Iowa County expand cooperative purchasing. Further, Wis. Stat. § 59.52(29)(a) “County administration” clarifies that all public work (construction, repair, remodeling, improvement, furnishing of supplies or materials, etc.) with an estimated cost of above \$25,000 “shall be let by contract to the lowest responsible bidder.” Any contracts not exceeding this amount are let by contract at the County Board’s discretion. Notably, Wisconsin state statutes do not prohibit jurisdictions from cooperative purchasing agreements and piggybacking outside state lines. Iowa County also has no local ordinance that dictates this process. Given this flexibility, we recommend the County explore more cooperative purchasing opportunities in Wisconsin and nationally.

Procurement is a powerful tool localities can use to decide where tax dollars go and by extension the firms, employee benefits, and industrial practices it supports. The bidding process is relatively centralized for bidders with private RFP aggregates like *VendorNet* or public portals like *WISBuy*. Localities have statutory rights to contract for the furnishment of services individually, but in practice, localities often “piggy-back” on RFPs from other jurisdictions. Piggy-backing “happens when an agency uses another agency’s contract, even though it was not a party to the original solicitation and contract award” and contracts typically have volume discounts and save staff administrative capacity ([OMNIA Partners, 2024](#)).

Localities in Wisconsin most commonly “piggy-back” onto RFPs. A wide range of products are available for discount including through the State Department of Administration, office supplies janitorial supplies and equipment personal computers and software clothing and uniforms paper products: “facial tissue, napkins, toilet paper, envelopes and stationary cars, tires and retreads light bulbs and lamps furniture and office equipment” ([Wisconsin Department of Administration, 2024](#)). Piggy-backing also occurs across county lines and between counties for services similar in nature. The U.S. General Services Agency (GSA) also operates a cooperative purchasing program. Localities often use their shopping portals that “offer a wide array of commercial information technology (IT) and law enforcement products, services and integrated solutions” ([U.S. General Services Administration, 2024](#)).

Iowa County and its localities have hundreds of contracts and many more incoming. Some of these contracts for service include assessment services, building inspection, election materials, and information technology (software, servers, records hosting, etc.). Unlike the centralized private side of procurement, the centralization of piggybacking process isn’t widespread; though, similar to *VendorNet*, *CoProcure*, is a free search tool to find and compare cooperative contracts from national and regional cooperatives. *SourceWell* offers a similar model for local governments in the Midwest.

Council of Government (CoG)

Regional intergovernmental entities like Southwestern Wisconsin Regional Planning Commission (SWWRPC), Southern Health Consortium, and the Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC) of Southwest Wisconsin exist but are limited to their separate service provisions. This study considered a centralized regional entity to provision these services, which was more like a regionally financed “Council of Government (CoG).”

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
X	✓	✓	✓

Comments

We did not advance this suggestion due to lack of precedent, legal expertise, and high initial operating costs.

Dispatch Services

Iowa County dispatch is provided in-house and financed through the general fund. This study considered cooperation with Green County that is currently reviewing a proposal for a new law enforcement center.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
✓	✓	✓	✓

Comments

We did not advance this suggestion due to lack of political feasibility within Green County.

Economic Development Services

Iowa County Economic Development is in-house. This study considered shared economic development services with other local jurisdictions and service offerings.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
X	✓	✓	✓

Comments

We did not advance this suggestion due to lack of cost-savings.

Emergency Management (EM)

Emergency Management is housed within the Iowa County Sheriff's Department. This study considered expanded equipment sharing.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
X	✓	X	X

Comments

We did not advance this suggestion due to existing agreements between EM departments in southwest Wisconsin and the “Wisconsin Statewide Mutual Aid Compact;” equipment is regularly shared between departments already.

Emergency Medical Services (EMS)

EMS services are provided by several entities within Iowa County; Iowa County does operate any independent EMS agency. This study considered shared equipment agreements, joint-training, and centralization within the County.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
X	X	✓	✓

Comments

We did not advance this suggestion due to lack of cost-savings and generalizability (lack of current operating or capital expenses within the county budget). Further, mutual aid agreements and compacts (WiSMAC) between EMS agencies are prevalent.

Research revealed precedent for expanded shared EMS models and local officials reported regular problems with staff retention and recruitment through survey.

Facilities Management

Each county department maintains their respective facilities. This study considered centralization within the county and maintenance shared service agreements with local jurisdictions.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
X	✓	X	✓

Comments

We did not advance this suggestion due to lack of cost-savings and efficiencies.

Fire Services

Several agencies within Iowa County provide fire services; the County does not operate an independent fire department. This study considered shared equipment agreements, joint-training and retention, and centralization.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
X	✓	✓	✓

Comments

We did not advance this suggestion due to lack of cost-savings and lack of existing county department.

Research revealed precedent in Wisconsin for regional agreements and collaborations. Localities frequently reported problems with staff retention, recruitment and costs associated with maintaining fire service through survey.

GIS Services

Iowa County employs a GIS Coordinator and no formal shared service agreement with any other entity exists. This study considered restoring previous shared GIS service agreements and offering GIS service to localities.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
✓	✓	✓	✓

Comments

See documents in Box folder.

Human Services

Iowa County offers health and human services alongside several other localities and entities. This study considered expanding shared service agreements with the ADRC of Southwest Wisconsin and other similar service providers.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
X	✓	✓	✓

Comments

We were unable to connect with relevant staff and experts; thus, we did not advance this suggestion.

Information Technology (IT)

Iowa County allocated \$772,223 for the IT department made up of 3 FTEs. Major software expenses are often contracted to private firms. This study considered contracted service offerings to localities, regional cost-pooling for expenses, or regional centralization of IT services similar to the SWWRPC model.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
✓	✓	✓	✓

Comments

We were unable to connect with relevant staff and experts; thus, we did not advance this suggestion.

Localities reported deficient technological capabilities and expressed a desire for collaboration with the county.

Police Services

The Sheriff, local departments, or part-time patrols in the smallest localities offers police services in Iowa County. The service market changes; in 2024, the Village of Arena dissolved its police department and contracted for service with the Iowa County Sheriff. This study considered expanded shared equipment agreements, joint-recruitment or training, and centralization.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
X	✓	✓	✓

Comments

We did not advance this suggestion due to lack of frequent access to the Sheriff’s Department, but research identified this shared service as very feasible and has precedent in Wisconsin.

In addition to broad authority granted by Wis. Stat. § 66.0301 “Intergovernmental Coordination,” Wis. Stat. § 61.65 “Police and fire departments; pension funds” gives all localities the ability to contract “for police protective services with a city or town, with another village, or with a county” and Wis. Stat. § 62.13(2s)(a) “Police and fire departments” grants municipalities the right to dissolve their police and contract for services with the Sheriff’s Department. Given the broad cooperative authority granted by state statute, we recommend the County explore the many service structures of law enforcement available.

In practice, law enforcement has well-established networks of mutual aid agreements that serve well in times of crisis. In this research, we found sufficient evidence that collaborative Police agreements have precedent and are very feasible.

This study initially considered the following service collaborations:

(1) joint-training; the Sheriff’s department expressed support for such collaboration, and they exist to some degree for police collaborations like “Project Life Saver,” which is a collaborative program between police to respond to residents in mental distress.

(2) joint-recruitment & retention; several joint-recruitment models exist in the US; this suggestion remains feasible with adequate financing and cost-pooling. Though, the Sheriff indicated that the distinct “culture” of individual departments is worth preserving and centralizing recruitment may hinder that.

(3) dispatch case management; this study considered a suggestion to distribute costs for a part-time or less-than part-time case-manager or outreach specialist to handle “repeat-users” of police services. The Sheriff confirmed such residents in Iowa County and was amiable to the suggestion of a regionally-financed FTE to handle such matters.

(4) vehicle & equipment maintenance; this study considered shared maintenance agreements and shared equipment uses. The Sheriff’s office confirmed feasibility, but saw procurement of equipment like tires and replacement parts as a potential for collaboration. For example,

placing larger orders of parts based on needs from surrounding agencies to seek volume discounts.

(5) station-sharing; this study considered sharing of police facilities, likely just the largest localities like the City of Dodgeville. The Sheriff indicated a lack of need for such cost-savings measures at this current time.

(6) centralized county services; this study considered a suggestion to have the Sheriff's department operate all police services within Iowa County. The Sheriff's office did not see a direct need, but shared that it would be feasible given adequate financing.

Finally, Local officials expressed concern over staff retention, recruitment problems and high costs of maintaining police services through survey. Several officials suggested more day-to-day police collaboration.

Road Maintenance

Road maintenance service is offered typically by counties, outside firms, and larger localities. Iowa County offers service to the state and localities in the region, often informally through well-established communication networks. This study considered expanded shared use of equipment and road service offerings.

Cost-Savings	Generalizability	Efficiency	Co-Benefits
✓	✓	✓	✓

Comments

This study considered countywide centralization of road maintenance, meaning the county provides service for all roads within its geographical boundaries. Due to low feasibility, we were unable to recommend this option. This recommendation is described below:

Centralized County-Led Road Maintenance

Feasibility: Low – many budgetary mechanisms, negotiations, and staff capacity required; high initial capital and operating costs

Overview

Centralizing road maintenance within the Highway Department for all roads within the county boundary. Procuring all maintenance equipment the County can operate at least without a net operating loss.

Benefits

A notable benefit is more control to Iowa County over employment contracts and employee benefits. Such control may keep county dollars within Iowa County.

Limitations & Implementation

High initial operating costs and large overhead capital expenses are major limitations. Further, localities have a statutory right to contract with any entity for furnishment of services. The implementation of such a policy would require lengthy negotiations with localities and regular contract re-assessments. Given the costs, it is difficult to determine if the County may be able to continuously maintain below-market-rate offerings and market interruptions may catastrophically leave the County with high-cost equipment and a lack of revenue to support it.

Given the low feasibility, if the County were to identify full centralization as a long-term goal, it should begin road maintenance shared services starting with recommendation 2(a)

Similar to other formalizations, the County should follow a process of needs identification, assessment of demand, and regular communication with potential clients. Pilot programs and data collections are critical to success. The High Road Strategy Center's "*High performance partnerships: Winning solutions for employers and workers*" provides a model process for organizing these types of collaborations (University of Wisconsin-Madison, 1999).

Inter-Departmental Suggestions Generated from Research

Financial Accounting & Payments

Some individual county departments employ FTEs with a portion dedicated to financial accounting, in addition to the three (3) FTEs in the Finance Department. A suggestion was raised to centralize financial responsibilities and billing within the Finance Department, relieving staff capacity in other departments. Another suggestion was raised to fully decentralize this process, transferring Finance Department FTEs into others. Another proposal suggested the digitization of all payable duties, centralized on one online portal.

Employee Relations & Hiring

Employment recruitment and hiring is housed within the Employee Relations Department. The Director of Employee Relations has discretion to delegate, but maintains full control over this process. A suggestion was raised to decentralize this process and allow departments to conduct their own hiring or recruitment processes.

Property Documents Accessibility

We were unable to explore this proposal given lack of capacity. A suggestion was raised to allow county staff access to deeds and property document without fees.

Information Technology (IT)

IT has three (3) FTEs budgeted in the 2024 fiscal year. A suggestion was raised to decentralize this expertise: eliminate the FTEs in the IT department and disperse the responsibilities within individual departments, increasing FTEs if necessary.

Facilities Management

Maintenance of facilities is often under the jurisdiction of individual departments. A proposal was raised to centralize these responsibilities in an office of its own within Iowa County.

Miscellaneous Suggestions Generated from Research

Planning & Land Conservation Departments

A proposal was raised to merge both departments for potential reduction in managerial costs.

Health & Human Services Operating Costs

Initial meetings discussed an operating cost overhead for Health & Human Services office space. A suggestion was raised to have the UW Extension Office vacate its County office space for use by the Health and Human Services department. UW Extension staff seemed amiable to the suggestion.

Energy Assistance Program

A proposal was raised to outsource the county's energy assistance program to reduce operating costs.

County-Municipality Relations

Throughout surveys and interviews, research identified a widespread desire for more shared services between municipalities and Iowa County. Further, many suggested regular meetings or structured communication. We recommend annual meetings between Iowa County localities County officials.

Appendix B: Model Shared Maintenance Agreement

MAINTENANCE AGREEMENT

This Maintenance Agreement ("Agreement") is entered into as of the latest date set forth below by and between the Town of Fond du Lac ("Town") and Fond du Lac County ("County").

Whereas, the Town would like to retain the services of the County to provide certain highway maintenance services during the period from January 1, 2013 to December 31, 2013; and

Whereas, the County is willing and able to perform the maintenance services for the Town during this period on the terms described below.

NOW, THEREFORE, in consideration of the above recitals, which are contractual, and for other good and valuable consideration, the receipt and sufficiency of which is mutually acknowledged, the parties agree as follows:

1. Maintenance Services. For purposes of this Agreement, "Winter Maintenance Services" refers to snow removal, application of chlorides and anti-icing materials, and snow fencing. "General Maintenance Services" refers to surface maintenance, shoulder maintenance, maintenance of safety appurtenances, guard and security fencing, bridge railings, and attenuators, maintenance of drainage facilities, culverts, ditches, and catch basins, traffic control, marking and signage, and pavement ratings. Collectively, these types of maintenance services are referred to as "Maintenance Services."
2. Performance of Maintenance Services. The County shall perform Winter Maintenance Services on the following Town roads:
 - a. Esterbrook Road from CTH OO south to STH 23.
 - b. Forest Avenue from the Town line east to the cul de sac.
 - c. Roads within Airport Industrial Park.
 - d. Esterbrook Road from Rogersville Road south to the cul de sac.
 - e. Miranda Way from Esterbrook Road to CTH D.
 - f. Town Line Road from CTH T south to USH 151.
 - g. Brown Road from Townline Road east to CTH D.
 - h. River Road from CTH D south to the Town line.
 - i. Martin Road from USH 151 south to the Town line.
 - j. Reinhardt Road from CTH V east to CTH K.

The County shall perform General Maintenance Services on the above roads and any other Town roads on an as-needed basis, when requested by the Town.

3. Non-Subject Highways. The Town will be responsible for all Maintenance Services on all other Town roads, except as may be set forth in any other agreement between the Town and any other party, including the County.
4. Term of Agreement. The County shall be responsible to perform Maintenance Services in accordance with this Agreement from its date through December 31, 2013.
5. Payment. The County shall submit invoices by the 10th day of each month for all Maintenance Services performed during the preceding month. The wage rates, material costs, and machinery rental rates established from time to time by the County shall apply. All work will be billed on a time-and-material basis.

For reference, the current estimated hourly rate for winter maintenance is \$140 - \$160 per hour, which rate includes, at a minimum, a five-yard truck, plow, wing and salter with operator. The cost for salt shall be approximately \$65.00 per ton and liquid de-icing shall be approximately \$0.20 per gallon for salt brine and \$1.20 per gallon for magnesium chloride.

Each invoice shall provide information substantiating the amount due, including the number of hours worked and the applicable rate as well as the amount and price of all materials used. The Town shall pay each invoice within 45 days of its receipt.

6. Timing of Maintenance Services. Maintenance Services shall generally occur between the hours of 4:00 a.m. and 8:00 p.m. During snow emergencies, the County Trunk Highway System shall take precedence over Town roads provided that the County uses its best efforts not to delay the provision of Maintenance Services on Town roads.
7. Anti-Discrimination. Neither party shall discriminate against any employee or applicant for employment because of age, race, religion, color, handicap, sex, physical condition, developmental disability, sexual orientation as defined in Wis. Stat. § 51.01(5), or national origin. This provision shall include, but not be limited to, the following: employment, upgrading, demotion or transfer, recruitment or recruitment advertising, layoff or termination, rates of pay or other forms of compensation, and selection for training including apprenticeship.
8. Indemnification. The County shall indemnify, defend, and hold harmless the Town, its Board, officers, employees, representatives, and insurers from and of all claims (including claims by employees such as worker's compensation claims), losses, damages, and attorneys' fees that may arise out of the County's performance of Maintenance

Services under this Agreement. This obligation shall not apply to the extent the claim, loss, or damage arises out of the Town's negligence.

9. Termination. This Agreement may be terminated by either party upon 30 days' written notice.
10. Independent Contractor. Nothing herein shall be deemed to constitute the Town and County as partners, joint venturers, agents, or employees of each other, or otherwise associated in or with the business of the other. The County is an independent contractor of the Town in its performance of this Agreement.
11. Miscellaneous. This Agreement constitutes the entire agreement between the parties pertaining to the subject matter hereto. No failure on the part of either party to insist on the performance of any of the terms of this Agreement shall affect the party's ability to insist on the performance of such terms in the future. This Agreement may be executed in counterparts, and facsimile, pdf, digital, and electronic signatures shall operate as original signatures.

TOWN OF FOND DU LAC

Harold Manske, Town Chairperson

Attest:

Patti Supple, Town Clerk

FOND DU LAC COUNTY

Thomas J. Janke, Commissioner
Fond du Lac County Highway Dept.

Appendix C: Model Intergovernmental Agreement

INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION AGREEMENT BETWEEN TOWN OF HARRISON AND VILLAGE OF HARRISON

The Parties to this Intergovernmental Cooperation Agreement (hereinafter "Agreement") are the Town of Harrison (hereinafter the "Town") and the Village of Harrison (hereinafter the "Village").

RECITALS

WHEREAS, on or about March 8, 2013, the Secretary of State for the State of Wisconsin issued an incorporation certificate, recognizing the Village as an independent Wisconsin municipality consisting of lands that were formerly located in the Town of Harrison and the Town of Buchanan; and,

WHEREAS, the Town provided municipal services to the property owners and residents of the Town prior to the incorporation of said Village; and,

WHEREAS, in order to continue the adequate provision of said services on a cost-effective basis, the Town and Village wish to enter into an agreement whereby the Town will continue to provide some municipal services for the benefit of the Town and the Village; whereby the Village will provide other municipal services for the benefit of the Town and Village, and the Town and Village will share the costs of said services in accordance with the proportions and other terms herein; and,

WHEREAS, the Town and the Village wish to adjust the boundary line separating the Town and the Village, leaving only the remaining "growth area" (as identified in two separate Intermunicipal Agreements between the Town of Harrison and the City of Appleton and between the Town of Harrison and the City of Menasha, respectively), located within the Town; and,

WHEREAS, Wisconsin statute §66.0235 requires the Town and Village to apportion assets and liabilities as a result of the recent incorporation of the Village and further apportionment will be required in accordance with the boundary adjustments detailed in this Agreement; and,

WHEREAS, the Town and Village wish to establish rules and procedures for said apportionment in the context of this Agreement; and,

WHEREAS, Wisconsin statute §66.0301 allows municipalities to cooperate and contract in a binding fashion for the receipt and furnishing of services, for the joint exercise of powers or duties required or authorized by law, for the apportionment of expenses involved, for the adjustment of boundary lines, and for the exercises of other duties and rights as stated in §66.0301.

WHEREAS, a joint public hearing was held on this proposed Agreement on Tuesday July 2, 2013, and said public hearing was noticed in accordance with Wisconsin Statutes §66.0301(6)(c).

NOW THEREFORE, the Town and Village hereby enter into an Intergovernmental Cooperation Agreement pursuant to the authority granted to them by Wisconsin statutes §66.0301, on the following terms:

I. Term of Agreement. The Term of this Agreement shall be ten (10) years from the Effective Date. The "Effective Date" shall be the later of 1) the first date that this Agreement is signed by an authorized representative of both Parties, or 2) if, for any reason, this Agreement does not or cannot become effective on the first date it is signed by an authorized representative of both Parties, it shall become effective on the first date thereafter that this Agreement may become effective under Wisconsin law.

II. Agreement Procedure. Prior to approving this Agreement by resolution, the Town and Village has held a joint public hearing in accordance with Wisconsin statute §66.0301(6)(c), and the Town and Village provided notice of a pending agreement and public hearing by publishing a class 1 notice and by giving notice to each property owner affected by certified mail at least 20 days before the public hearing, in accordance with Wisconsin statutes §66.0301(6)(c).

III. Apportionments of Assets and Liabilities. Unless stated herein, the apportionment of assets and liabilities between the Town and Village shall be determined pursuant to Wisconsin statutes §66.0235.

a. The Apportionment Board, consisting of representatives of the Town and Village, shall convene immediately to begin discussions regarding apportionment of assets between the Town and Village, in accordance with §66.0235.

b. Notwithstanding the foregoing subparagraph (a), because the boundary line between the Town and Village will change (due to the operation of this Agreement) before a proper apportionment of assets and liabilities could be completed by the Apportionment Board, the Apportionment Board shall wait until the new boundary line is established before completing the apportionment process. The post-boundary-line-change areas of the Town and Village, respectively, shall be used to determine the average assessed values of the Town area and Village areas for the preceding five years. After a boundary-change ordinance is adopted, filed, and recorded by the Town under §66.0301(6)(c), the Apportionment Board shall finalize the apportionment process in accordance with §66.0235.

c. However, notwithstanding the foregoing subparagraph (b), if the boundary line change contemplated by this Agreement does not occur prior to December 31, 2013, the Apportionment Board shall complete its apportionment of assets and liabilities on an

interim basis and then reapportion assets and liabilities at such time that the boundary line change referenced in this Agreement takes effect.

d. Before apportioning any other asset or liability, all unrestricted monetary assets and liabilities presently owned or owed by the Town shall be apportioned in accordance with the formula contained at §66.0235(2)(b) based upon the average assessed valuation for the preceding five (5) years of the post-boundary-line change Town and Village areas, respectively. Because most non-monetary assets will be transferred by the Town to the Village or leased by the Town to the Village post apportionment, the goal of this paragraph is to ensure that monetary assets and liabilities are divided in the appropriate proportion before deciding the apportionment of any other tangible asset.

e. Any monetary funds that are restricted for a particular use shall retain said restrictions after apportionment.

f. During and after the apportionment process, non-monetary assets such as vehicles, land, buildings and/or inventory, may, at the option of the Apportionment Board, remain Town property or may be transferred to the Village in accordance with the formulas contained in §66.0235; in the alternative, the Apportionment Board may decide that certain assets will be jointly owned by the Town and Village in a proportion to be determined by the Apportionment Board (for example, the Apportionment Board could decide that the present Town Hall will be jointly owned in a certain percentage by the Town and a certain percentage by the Village, respectively). If the Apportionment Board decides that any asset shall be jointly owned post-apportionment, the Apportionment Board shall also allocate responsibility for the maintenance, insurance, preservation, and other obligations related to said asset. Deeds or other instruments reflecting changes in ownership shall be executed and recorded as necessary.

g. Following apportionment, the Town shall lease any real estate, buildings, road maintenance equipment, snowplowing equipment, ditch and culvert equipment, signage, mowers, tractors, park equipment, inventory, chippers, vehicles, fire and rescue equipment including engines, rescue vehicles, brush trucks, tankers, ATVs, snowmobiles, and similar equipment, garbage and recycling equipment, and other similar non-monetary assets that it retains after apportionment, to the Village in exchange for payment of \$1.00 in annual consideration (the Village's compliance with the other terms and conditions contained in this Agreement will serve as additional consideration for said lease).

IV. Provision of Municipal Services.

a. **Public Works.** All public works and related services that were previously provided by the Town for the benefit of the Town, shall hereafter be provided by the Village for the benefit of the Town and Village. Said public works services shall include, but are not necessarily limited to, road maintenance, snowplowing, ditch and culvert

work, wood chipping, signage, minor storm water management projects, mowing, park maintenance, equipment replacement, salting, and other daily and special maintenance.

b. Public Safety. The Village shall provide fire and rescue services to its own property owners and residents and to the Town's property owners and residents.

c. Refuse and Recycling Services. The Town is presently a party to a contract with a private contracted service providing refuse and recycling services to property owners and residents. Said contract shall continue in force and effect for the duration of their term. When said contracts expire, the Town and Village may jointly negotiate a new contract with a third party of their choosing or may elect to provide refuse and recycling services by any other means.

d. Parks. The Village shall be responsible for the maintenance of all parks located in the Town and Village.

e. Administrative Employees and Staff. At the outset of this Agreement, the Town and Village shall share all employees and administrative staff, including, but not limited to, an Administrator and Planner. Said employees and administrative staff shall be terminated by the Town and shall become employees of the Village, according to the terms outlined in this Agreement. Although said employees and administrative staff shall be employees of the Village for payroll, record keeping, and other purposes, the Town will also proportionally contribute to the total cost of said employees and administrative staff according to the terms herein, and said employees and administrative staff shall serve at the pleasure of both the Village Board of Trustees and the Town Board. In the event that the Town Board and Village Board of Trustees cannot agree on the allocation of time that the Administrator and Planner are spending on Town and Village business, respectively, said time shall be proportionally allocated in accordance with the assessed values of all Town real and personal property versus the assessed value of all Village real and personal property in the prior year. The Town and Village shall attempt to appoint a common clerk and treasurer when practical, and share the cost thereof in accordance with this paragraph. This paragraph is not intended to change or alter the "at-will" or other status of any current employee of the Town when employed by the Village.

f. Payment of Expenses Related to Shared Services and Services Provided by the Town or Village for the benefit of both. Unless otherwise agreed by the Parties, the Town and Village shall be jointly responsible for the cost of all shared services in the nature of public works, public safety, refuse and recycling, parks, administrative staff, and costs resulting from the provision of similar services, as referenced above. The Town and Village shall each pay the proportion of total expenses equal to their respective share of the total assessed value of all real and personal property located in the Town and Village in the prior year.

g. Capital Expenditures. The cost of any new capital equipment or other asset necessary or useful for the provision of the municipal services contemplated herein,

shall be apportioned between the Town and Village in a proportion equal to their respective shares of the total assessed value of all real and personal property located in the Town and Village in the prior year.

V. **Employees.** All employees of the Town shall be terminated by the Town and rehired by the Village on terms identical to the terms of their current employment with the Town. At-will employees shall remain at-will employees and employees under contract or other similar arrangement shall remain a party to said contract or other arrangement except that the Town's rights and obligations under said contract shall become the Village's rights and obligations. The Town and Village shall cooperate with each other and with any state agency to the extent necessary to effectuate this provision. Said transfer of employees from the Town to the Village shall be in a seamless fashion so as not to disrupt the provision of payroll, benefits, or other similar matters.

VI. **Adjustment to Boundary Line Between Town and Village.**

a. Prior to the Effective Date, the boundary line between the Town and Village is/was as indicated in **Exhibit A.**

b. On or after the Effective Date, the Town and Village will alter the boundary line between the Town and Village so that the boundary line between the Town and Village becomes the lines between the Town and Village reflected in **Exhibit B.**

c. The lands transferred from the Town to the Village pursuant to the boundary line change include all lands available to be transferred from the Town to the Village under Wisconsin law described in the attachment hereto as **Exhibit C.**

d. On or after the Effective Date, the Village Board will adopt and file an ordinance to trigger the boundary line change in accordance with Wisconsin statute §66.0301(6). Said ordinance shall be filed and recorded immediately (or as soon thereafter as reasonably possible) in accordance with Wisconsin statute §66.0301(6), to effectuate the boundary line alternation between the Town and Village.

e. In accordance with Wisconsin statute §66.1105(4)(gm)(1), this Agreement constitutes a cooperative plan boundary agreement, and the Village will not be prohibited from exercising its TIF powers for a period of three years following the boundary line change.

VII. **Planning, Finance and Budgeting, and Ad Hoc Committees.**

Planning.

a. The Village of Harrison and the Town of Harrison agree to create a joint planning commission to be known as the Town/Village Joint Planning Commission.

b. The Town/Village Joint Planning Commission shall consist of seven members, three of whom are appointed by the Town Chairperson subject to confirmation by the Town Board and three of whom are appointed by the Village President subject to confirmation by the Village Board. The Town Chairperson and Village President shall appoint two residents of their respective municipalities who are not members of the Town or Village Board. The Town Chairperson shall also appoint one member of the Town Board. The Village President shall also appoint one member of the Village Board. The Village President will serve as chairman of the Town/Village Joint Planning Commission from the third week in April to the following third week in April, starting in odd numbered years and the Town Chairman shall serve as chairman of the Town/Village Joint Planning Commission from the third week in April to the following third week in April, starting in even numbered years.

c. The initial term of appointment for each Party's delegation shall be for a term of three years. The Village Board and Town Board members' terms shall follow their respective board terms. Following initial appointments, regular appointments shall be made in April of each year, as needed. Following initial appointments, all members of the Town/Village Joint Planning Commission shall serve for terms of three years.

d. A vacancy shall be created if a Town/Village member's residency terminates during the term of appointment or if the position is otherwise not occupied due to resignation, failure to continue in elected office if a member of the governing board or removal for cause by the governing board or the respective municipality. Vacancies shall be promptly filled for the unexpired term in the same manner as the original appointment and successors shall serve the remaining term.

e. The Town/Village Planning Commission shall have the same duties and responsibilities as granted under the Wisconsin State Statutes and local ordinances for both the Village and the Town in regards to planning commissions. Recommendations of the planning commission shall be forwarded to the appropriate municipalities' Board for review.

Finance and Budgeting.

a. The Village of Harrison and the Town of Harrison agree to create a joint finance committee to be known as the Town/Village Joint Finance Committee.

b. The purpose of the Town/Village Joint Finance Committee is to coordinate the financing and budgeting of both the Town of Harrison and Village of Harrison. The Town/Village Joint Finance Committee will assist the Village Manager in establishing the budget for both the Town of Harrison and the Village of Harrison. The Joint Finance Committee will also make recommendations to their respective boards on the purchase of any capital items or proposed capital improvement programs.

c. The Town/Village Joint Finance Committee shall consist of five members, two of whom are appointed by the Town Chairperson subject to confirmation by the Town Board and two of whom are appointed by the Village President subject to confirmation by the Village Board. The Town Chairperson and Village President shall appoint two members of their respective boards. The Village President will serve as chairman of the Town/Village Joint Finance Committee from the third week in April to the following third week in April, starting in even numbered years and the Town Chairman shall serve as chairman of the Town/Village Joint Finance Committee from the third week in April to the following third week in April, starting in odd numbered years.

d. The initial term of appointment for each Party's delegation shall be for a term of two years. Following initial appointments, regular appointments shall be made in April of each year, as needed. Following initial appointments, all members of the Town/Village Joint Finance Committee shall serve for terms of two years

e. A vacancy shall be created if a Town/Village member's residency terminates during the term of appointment or if the position is otherwise not occupied due to resignation, failure to continue in elected office or removal for cause by the governing board or the respective municipality. Vacancies shall be promptly filled for the unexpired term in the same manner as the original appointment and successors shall serve the remaining term.

Ad Hoc Committees.

The Town Board Chairman and Village President, by agreement, may establish additional ad hoc committees as used for or necessary to accomplish the subject matter contained in this Agreement.

VIII. Modification. This Agreement may be modified by the mutual agreement of the Town and Village.

IX. Construction of Agreement. Any court of competent jurisdiction that is interpreting and reviewing this Agreement, shall review it in the context that most favors enforceability. If a reviewing court interprets the statutes so as to require separate agreements for sharing of services under §66.0301(1-5) and boundary agreements under §66.0301(6), then a reviewing court shall read this Agreement as two separate Agreements, with one agreement addressing the issues addressed in §66.0301(1-5) and the other agreement addressing the issues presented in §66.0301(6). If, however, a reviewing court believes that this Agreement is most enforceable if interpreted as a single agreement, then it should interpret this Agreement as a single agreement.

The below-signed authorized individuals certify that this Intergovernmental Cooperation Agreement has been duly approved by their respective governing bodies in accordance with state

and local laws, rules and regulations, and that each has caused their duly authorized officers to execute this Agreement on the dates written before their respective signatures.

Dated: July 2ND 2013

VILLAGE OF HARRISON,
a Wisconsin municipal corporation

TOWN OF HARRISON,
a Wisconsin municipal corporation

DRAFTED BY:
Andrew J. Rossmeissl
Herring Clark Law Firm Ltd.
800 N. Lynndale Drive
Appleton, WI 54914
920/882-3219

Appendix D: Wis. Stats. on Intergovernmental Cooperation

SUBCHAPTER III INTERGOVERNMENTAL COOPERATION

66.0301 Intergovernmental cooperation. (1) (a) Except as provided in pars. (b) and (c), in this section “municipality” means the state or any department or agency thereof, or any city, village, town, county, or school district, the opportunity schools and partnership programs under subch. IX of ch. 115 and subch. II of ch. 119, the superintendent of schools opportunity schools and partnership program under s. 119.33, or any public library system, public inland lake protection and rehabilitation district, sanitary district, farm drainage district, metropolitan sewerage district, sewer utility district, solid waste management system created under s. 59.70 (2), local exposition district created under subch. II of ch. 229, local professional baseball park district created under subch. III of ch. 229, local professional football stadium district created under subch. IV of ch. 229, local cultural arts district created under subch. V of ch. 229, long-term care district under s. 46.2895, water utility district, mosquito control district, municipal electric company, county or city transit commission, commission created by contract under this section, taxation district, regional planning commission, housing authority created under s. 66.1201, redevelopment authority created under s. 66.1333, community development authority created under s. 66.1335, or city-county health department.

(b) If the purpose of the intergovernmental cooperation is the establishment of a joint transit commission, “municipality” means any city, village, town or county.

(c) For purposes of sub. (6), “municipality” means any city, village, or town.

(2) Subject to s. 59.794 (2), and in addition to the provisions of any other statutes specifically authorizing cooperation between municipalities, unless those statutes specifically exclude action under this section, any municipality may contract with other municipalities and with federally recognized Indian tribes and bands in this state, for the receipt or furnishing of services or the joint exercise of any power or duty required or authorized by law. If municipal or tribal parties to a contract have varying powers or duties under the law, each may act under the contract to the extent of its lawful powers and duties. A contract under this subsection may bind the contracting parties for the length of time specified in the contract. This section shall be interpreted liberally in favor of cooperative action between municipalities and between municipalities and Indian tribes and bands in this state. If a municipality is required to establish or maintain an agency, department, commission, or any other office or position to carry out a municipal responsibility, and the municipality joins with another municipality by entering into an intergovernmental cooperation contract under this subsection to jointly carry out the responsibility, the jointly established or maintained agency, department, commission, or any other office or position to which the contract applies fulfills, subject to sub. (7), the municipality’s obligation to establish or maintain such entities or positions until the contract entered into under this subsection expires or is terminated by the parties. In addition, if 2 or more municipalities enter into an intergovernmental cooperation contract and create a

commission under this section to jointly or regionally administer a function or project, the commission shall be considered, subject to sub. (7), to be a single entity that represents, and may act on behalf of, the joint interests of the signatories to the contract entered into under this section.

(3) Any contract under sub. (2) may provide a plan for administration of the function or project, which may include but is not limited to provisions as to proration of the expenses involved, deposit and disbursement of funds appropriated, submission and approval of budgets, creation of a commission, selection and removal of commissioners, and formation and letting of contracts.

(4) A commission created by contract under sub. (2) may finance the acquisition, development, remodeling, construction and equipment of land, buildings and facilities for regional projects under s. 66.0621. Participating municipalities acting jointly or separately may finance the projects, or an agreed share of the cost of the projects, under ch. 67.

(5) No commission created by contract under sub. (2) may, directly or indirectly, do any of the following:

(a) Acquire, construct or lease facilities used or useful in the business of a public utility engaged in production, transmission, delivery or furnishing of heat, light, power, natural gas or communications service, by any method except those set forth under this chapter or ch. 196, 197 or 198.

(b) Establish, lay out, construct, improve, discontinue, relocate, widen or maintain any road or highway outside the corporate limits of a village or city or acquire lands for those purposes except upon approval of the department of transportation and the county board of the county and the town board of the town in which the road is to be located.

(6) (a) Any 2 municipalities whose boundaries are immediately adjacent at any point may enter into a written agreement determining all or a portion of the common boundary line between the municipalities. An agreement under this subsection may include only the provisions authorized under this section and s. 66.0305, and one or more of the following:

1. That specified boundary lines apply on the effective date of the agreement.
2. That specified boundary line changes shall occur during the term of the agreement and the approximate dates by which the changes shall occur.
3. That specified boundary line changes may occur during the term of the agreement and the approximate dates by which the changes may occur.
4. That a required boundary line change under subd. 2. or an optional boundary line change under subd. 3. is subject to the occurrence of conditions set forth in the agreement.
5. That specified boundary lines may not be changed during the term of the agreement.

(b) The maximum term of an agreement under this subsection is 10 years. When an agreement expires, all provisions of the agreement expire, except that any boundary determined under the agreement remains in effect until subsequently changed.

(c) 1. Before an agreement under this subsection may take effect, and subject to par. (e), it must be approved by the governing body of each municipality by the adoption of a resolution. Before each municipality may adopt a resolution, each shall hold a public hearing on the agreement or both municipalities shall hold a joint public hearing on the agreement. Before the public hearing may be held, each municipality shall give notice of the pending agreement and public hearing by publishing a class 1 notice, under ch. 985, and by giving notice to each property owner whose property is currently located in that municipality and in, or immediately adjacent to, the territory whose jurisdiction will change. Notice shall be given at least 20 days before the public hearing and notice to property owners shall be made by certified mail.

2. An agreement under this subsection is subject to a referendum of the electors residing within the territory whose jurisdiction is subject to change as a result of the agreement. After each municipality approves the agreement by adoption of a resolution, each municipality shall publish the agreement in the territory whose jurisdiction is subject to change as a result of the agreement as a class 1 notice, under ch. 985. A referendum shall be held if, within 30 days after the publication of the agreement, a petition for a referendum conforming to the requirements of s. 8.40, signed by at least 20 percent of the electors residing within the territory whose jurisdiction is subject to change as a result of the agreement is filed, in accordance with s. 8.37, with the clerk of each municipality that is a party to the agreement. The referendum shall be conducted jointly by the municipalities and shall otherwise be conducted as are annexation referenda. If the agreement is approved in the referendum, it may take effect. If the agreement is not approved in the referendum, it may not take effect.

(d) An agreement under this subsection may provide that, during the term of the agreement, no other procedure for altering a municipality's boundaries may be used to alter a boundary that is affected by the agreement, except an annexation conducted under s. 281.43 (1m), regardless of whether the boundary is proposed to be maintained or changed or is allowed to be changed under the agreement. After the agreement has expired, the boundary may be altered.

(e) A boundary change included in an agreement under this subsection shall be accomplished by the enactment of an ordinance by the governing body designated to do so in the agreement. The filing and recording requirements under s. 66.0217 (9) (a), as they apply to cities and villages under s. 66.0217 (9) (a), apply to municipalities under this subsection. The requirements for the secretary of administration under s. 66.0217 (9) (b), as they apply under that section, apply to the secretary of administration when he or she receives an ordinance that is filed under this subsection.

(f) No action to contest the validity of an agreement under this subsection may be commenced after 60 days from the date the agreement becomes effective.

(g) This subsection is the exclusive authority under this section for entering into an agreement that determines all or a portion of the common boundary line between municipalities.

(h) An agreement under this section that has been entered into before January 19, 2008, that affects the location of a boundary between municipalities, is not invalid as lacking authority under this section to affect the location of the boundary.

(7) With regard to a contract entered into under sub. [\(2\)](#) between 2 or more counties, which relates to the provision of services or facilities under a contract with an officer or agency of the state, the contract may not take effect unless it is approved in writing by the officer or chief of the agency that has authority over the contract for the provision of services or facilities. The contract must be approved or disapproved in writing by the officer or chief of the agency with regard to the matters within the scope of the contract for the provision of services or facilities within 90 days after receipt of the contract. Any disapproval shall detail the specific respects in which the proposed contract fails to demonstrate that the signatories intend to fulfill their contractual responsibilities or obligations. If the officer or chief of the agency fails to approve or disapprove of the contract entered into under sub. [\(2\)](#) within 90 days after receipt, the contract shall be considered approved by the officer or chief of the agency.

Appendix E: Survey of Iowa County Officials

Iowa County and the University of Wisconsin-Madison's [UniverCity Alliance](#) are collaborating to research shared service opportunities with Iowa County municipalities to improve service quality and efficiency for both Iowa County and municipalities. **We're considering shared services as any collaboration to provision or finance services, including public-public and public-private partnerships. For this survey, we are concerned with collaborations between Iowa County and other local jurisdictions.** Given your expertise and familiarity with Iowa County operations, we kindly invite you to complete a survey for this research.

The survey takes roughly 5 minutes to complete and is confidential: UW-Madison will not include your name or other identifiable information when documenting survey results. UW-Madison will use the results to create a report for Iowa County considering shared services options in the region. UW-Madison will share the research report confidentially with all survey respondents, as well. If you have questions about UW-Madison's role, please contact Ross Milton (rtmilton@wisc.edu) and Gavin Luter (luter@wisc.edu; 608-261-1141). Thank you for your time and consideration!

Questions:

1. Name, Title, & Department
2. Are there any services within your department that you believe could be more efficient or cost-effective when shared with municipalities in Iowa County?
3. Are there any services that Iowa County provides that you believe could be more efficient or cost-effective by collaborating with other counties?
4. Are there other important details about how services work well or don't work well within Iowa County that we should consider?
5. Do you have any other individuals you recommend we talk to? Or resources to consult?

Appendix F: Survey of Iowa County Localities

Iowa County and the University of Wisconsin-Madison's [UniverCity Alliance](#) are collaborating to research shared service opportunities with Iowa County municipalities to improve service quality and efficiency for both Iowa County and municipalities. **We're considering shared services as any collaboration to provision or finance services, including public-public and public-private partnerships. For this survey, we are concerned with collaborations between Iowa County and municipalities.** Given your expertise and familiarity with Iowa County operations, we kindly invite you to complete a survey for this research.

The survey takes roughly 5 minutes to complete and is confidential: UW-Madison will not include your name or other identifiable information when documenting survey results. UW-Madison will use the results to create a report for Iowa County considering shared services options in the region. UW-Madison will share the research report confidentially with all survey respondents, as well. If you have questions about UW-Madison's role, please contact Ross Milton (rtmilton@wisc.edu) and Gavin Luter (luter@wisc.edu; 608-261-1141). Thank you for your time and consideration!

Questions:

1. Name, Title, & Affiliation/Local Jurisdiction
2. Are there any services or resources your local jurisdiction provides that may be more cost-effective or efficient to you if service was shared with the county? Please Explain
3. Are there any inefficiencies within your localities provisioning of services that you'd like to see addressed? Please Explain
4. Are there any particular problems with providing services or resources that you believe the County may assist with?
5. Are there any other comments questions or concerns you have about potential shared services between local jurisdictions and Iowa County? (Open-Ended)
6. Would you say your locality would be open to considering a shared service agreement with Iowa County or another municipality? (Y/N)
7. Would you be interested in speaking to us more about this? (Y/N)

Appendix G: Presentation to the County Board

Iowa County Shared Service Feasibility Study



County Board Project Update - 04/16/24

Prepared by:
Mary Baumgartner & Max Prestigiaco
Project Advisor: Ross Milton, Ph.D.



UniverCity Alliance
UNIVERSITY OF WISCONSIN-MADISON

Executive Summary

Project Goal: Explore shared service opportunities with other governmental or private entities (within Iowa County or outside).

Enabling Statute: [Wis. Stat. § 66.0301 Intergovernmental cooperation](#)

Summary: From 2 surveys, 25 respondents, 12 interviews, 23 shared service options considered, and a review of existing literature, we find that there is strong demand for collaboration and are currently reviewing three recommendations for Iowa County:

- (1) Geographic Information Systems (GIS),
- (2) Road Maintenance Services, & (3) Asphalt Production

Research Methods

155 Total Surveys Sent

21 Surveys sent to Iowa County Staff

- 9 Respondents
- 42.8% Response Rate

134 Surveys sent to Local Officials

- 12 Respondents
- 8.9% Response Rate

13 Total Informational Interviews

Iowa County Staff: 7

Regional County Officials: 4

Experts: 2

3 months invested in literature review, surveys, and drafting

Research Scope

Definition of Shared Services: "Collaboration between Iowa County and outside jurisdictions or entities (localities, non-profits, public entities, etc.)"

Notes:

- 1) Not including "shared services" between Iowa County Departments, like centralizing county financial services
- 1) Not including proposals that outsource any provisionment of services to the private sector due to political complexity outside of our scope

Evaluating Criteria

(A) Cost-Savings: Short-term cost-savings, particularly operational cost-savings.

(B) Generalizability: Similarity in specialization or lack of specialization in terms of the nature, size, and administration of the function for each government.

(C) Efficiency: Enhancing the quality of service and the efficiency of provisions, including greater county operations efficiency regardless of sharing opportunities.

(D) Co-Benefits: Addressing a specific need or problem within Iowa County like staff recruitment/retention or technology enhancement via sharing or collaboration.

Source: Wisconsin Policy Forum

Shared Services Considered

- Aging and Disability Resource Center (ADRC) Services
- GIS Services
- Asphalt Production
- Assessment Services
- Building Inspection
- Comprehensive Planning
- Cooperative Purchasing
- Council of Government (CoG)
- Court Services
- Dispatch Services
- Economic Development Services
- Emergency Medical Services (EMS)
- Emergency Management (EM)
- Facilities Management
- Fire Service
- Human Services
- Information Technology (IT)
- Police Services
- Records Management
- Road Maintenance
- Stormwater Management

✓ **Geographic Information Services (GIS)**

✓ **Road Maintenance Services**

✓ **Asphalt Production**

 UniverCity Alliance
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
RICHLAND COUNTY

Geographic Information Systems (GIS)

Description - GIS planning currently is in-house, limited to Iowla County. GIS work includes mapping, mapping zoning, surveys reviews, etc. Within Iowla County, funded through document and retained fees. Potential to expand on a larger scale: regional or across municipalities; Connecticut MetroCOG model for municipal expansion.

(A) Cost-Savings: Potential opportunities of scale regionally or within county; shared costs

(B) Generalizability: Richland County focused on GIS expansion→ open to helping lead this effort; past Iowla County overlap with Grant County

(C) Efficiency: Reduced duplication; cross-training opportunities

(D) Co-Benefits: Increased collaboration and information access re:critical issues (i.e. public health)

Comments: Report will explain rationale and include model explanations.

 UniverCity Alliance
UNIVERSITY OF MICHIGAN
RICHLAND COUNTY

Road Maintenance Services

Description: Road maintenance equipment (sealcoating trucks, etc.) are shared informally between localities, still capacity to maximize economic utility exists (idleness for periods of time). Informal scheduling of shared use done via email.

(A) Cost-Savings: Offset depreciation of equipment cost/reduced opportunity cost

(B) Generalizability: Demand for maintenance is universal

(C) Efficiency: Maximizing utilization of equipment

(D) Co-Benefits: Additional revenue for county, cost-savings for localities

Comments: Report will detail cost-savings & limitations. Recommendations will detail the benefit to formalizing agreements, scheduling, and communications between localities with multiple implementation tiers varying in feasibility.

Asphalt Production

Description: Iowa County currently operates an asphalt production facility with a market edge. The facility has approximately 10 years of utilization left. This study considered a joint venture to operate the existing asphalt facility or a future facility.

(A) Cost-Savings: reduced capital and operating costs

(B) Generalizability: lack of capital budget expenses in the region for asphalt production

(C) Efficiency: increasing utilization of facility

(D) Co-Benefits: cost-savings for members of joint venture

Comments: Report will review long-term organizing of this intergovernmental collaboration given the distance to expiration of the facility

Upcoming Report

A research report recommending multiple shared-services to Iowa County will be completed by **June 1**



Contents Include:

- Standard description of methods, criteria, and guidelines
- Policy analysis of the final tiered recommendations
- A full list of proposals raised during the research process
 - Shared-services & non-shared services
- Further implementation resources

Cty. Supervisor Survey

Sent to Your Email
3 Questions
Takes Less than 5 Minutes

Sources

Chicago Metropolitan Agency for Planning. 2020. "Shared services can strengthen local governments' response to COVID-19." CMAP.

Connecticut Metropolitan Council of Governments. N.d. "GIS Mapping & Shared Services." MetroCOG. Accessed: <https://ctmetro.org/gis-shared-services/>.

Goldstein, Phil. 2022. "GIS in State and Local Government: How Geographic Information Systems Aid Agencies." *StateTech*. Accessed: <https://statetechmagazine.com/article/2022/01/gis-state-and-local-government-how-geographic-information-systems-aid-agencies-perform>.

Kim, Jennifer. 2015. "Northeastern Illinois Local Government Shared Services Survey Report." Metropolitan Mayors Caucus.

Local Government Institute of Wisconsin. 2012. "Local Government Collaboration in Wisconsin: Case Studies." *Local Government Institute of Wisconsin*.

Nesbitt, Charles H. Jr. and Stephen J. Acquario. 2019. "County-Wide Shared Services Initiative." *New York State Association of Counties*.

Silverman, Claire. 2019. "Intergovernmental Cooperation in Wisconsin." *The Municipality*. League of Wisconsin Municipalities.



Thank you!

Contact Information

Max Prestigiaco
Email: mcprestigiaco@wisc.edu
Email: max.prestigiaco@gmail.com
Phone: +1 (608) 630 3986

Mary Baumgartner
Email: baumgartner3@wisc.edu
Email: mbaumga12@gmail.com
Phone: +1 (218) 491 0156

