PROPOSAL TO REDUCE THE COST OF GOVERNMENT THROUGH REFORM OF GOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

November 1997

Final Report
Prepared for the Governor
by the Task Force on Intergovernmental Structure

00475
TAS

Property of
MAINE STATE PLANNING OFFICE
MAINE STATE PLANNING OFFICE

00475
TA5
Intergovernmental
relations

EXECUTIVE SUMMARY

This report is a product of the Task Force on Intergovernmental Structure, a 21-member group of municipal, county, and state officials. The Commission was authorized by Governor Angus King in an Executive Order dated October 1, 1996, for the purpose of :

- relieving property taxes through more efficient delivery of local services;
- reducing duplication and fragmentation of services between levels and among units of government;
- matching the responsibility for providing governmental services with the responsibility for funding those services; and
- improving communications and consultations between levels of government.

The Task Force is proposing reform in state-county-local relations that will:

a. Permanently reduce property taxes collected by counties statewide by an estimated 62% (by county, this ranges from about 50% to 85%).
b. Greatly expand the opportunity for joint municipal services, using county government as a vehicle for voluntary cooperation. Such voluntary cooperation can save potentially millions of dollars annually. For every 1% of efficiencies gained statewide, there would be savings of $5 million. The state also will have opportunities to turn to counties and municipalities where decentralization of its services makes sense.
c. Reduce duplication and improve cooperation at all levels of government.

It will do this by:

a. **Having state government pay for the mandates** it requires of county government and that now are paid for by the property tax. These include jails, support for the district attorneys' offices and the courts, the registries of deeds and probate, and other law enforcement functions. These come to about 62% of all county costs now paid by the property tax, roughly $37 to $38 million per year. The payment would be made to counties through establishing a **county revenue sharing program**, similar to the community revenue sharing program. The Task Force is asking the Legislature's Taxation Committee to include funding for this shift in costs in its tax reform package for the second session of the 118th Legislature.

b. **Freezing, by state law, the property taxes** charged to municipal governments to pay for the remaining 38% of costs of county services (with flexibility in case of emergencies or needed new debt service).

c. Assuring that the shift in funding of county services from the property tax to broad-based state taxes **does not translate into an increase in overall tax burden in the state.**

d. **Enabling county governments to design and offer local governments**, on a competitive, fee-for-service basis, an array of municipal services, and encouraging local governments to take advantage of such joint services where they would reduce costs or improve effectiveness.

e. **Assuring that county government has the capacity** to design and deliver such services reliably. Professional administration would be required, and those seeking the office of treasurer would need to meet minimum qualifications.

By the end of CY2003 each county would be required to prepare new or amended charters incorporating these provisions and to put the charters to referendum. Voters may choose either to adopt the charter or to keep their present structure of county government. The new fiscal arrangement, in which the state takes responsibility for designated county expenses and local property tax rates charged for county services are frozen, would take effect upon adoption by a county of a new charter.

The proposal also urges the Maine Municipal Association, the Maine County Commissioners Association, and the Governor to **create, by a memorandum of agreement, an Intergovernmental Advisory Commission** to monitor progress under the reform, improve communications among the three levels of government, sponsor pilot projects, and recommend additional efficiencies.

BACKGROUND

1. Turning county government into an effective, intermediate level of government is the key to more efficient intergovernmental structure.

- ❑ Counties not now structured as an intermediate level of government.
- ❑ They are structured as an administrative subdivision of the state, and the basic structure hasn't changed in more than 200 years.
- ❑ Some county duties, such as county courts and road maintenance, have been taken over by other levels of government over the years, while some, such as emergency management, have been added. But most basic duties of the counties, which are performed on behalf of and at the direction of the state, haven't changed much:
  - Deeds
  - Jails
  - Rural patrols and other law enforcement
  - Support staff, space, and services for district attorneys
  - Probate
- ❑ There is a serious disconnection between duties carried out on behalf of the state, as an administrative subdivision thereof, and the source of funding of these duties (local property taxes).
- ❑ Some incremental change in county governance has taken place as a result of concern about demand for local property taxes without any local control.
  - Locally appointed or elected budget committees, most with advisory power, some with final authority over budgets
  - A few counties (Aroostook, Cumberland, York) have moved to professional county manager or administrator
  - Counties can adopt charters to determine their own administrative structure, but have no home rule and cannot add to authority

2. Counties are enabled to deliver (a) local services, on a case-by-case, contractual basis (Title 30-A, Sec. 107), (b) regional solid waste services (Title 30-A, Sec. 902), and (c) communications (dispatch) services for rescue, fire, and police departments (Title 30-A, Sec. 453).

- ❑ Local participation is voluntary
- ❑ Most frequent and virtually only contracted local service is sheriff's services, beyond normal rural patrols
- ❑ There are few examples of county-sponsored, regional solid waste services--mostly recycling, e.g., Lincoln County

3. Municipal cooperation is enabled under the Interlocal Cooperation Act, but, while good examples exist, the number and purpose of interlocal agreements are spotty. They are the exception rather than the rule. Agreements are almost always single purpose.

- MDF/SPO 1996 survey of 85 service center communities and 16 counties (49 communities and 9 counties responded) found 127 interlocal or contractual agreements, almost all in the areas of public works and public safety. Another 129 were cooperating under less formal agreements or in special purpose districts.

4. Regional planning agencies widely provide municipalities and regions with planning, economic development, and community development services, and several provide for joint purchasing. They also promote cooperative arrangements among their members, but examples of the agencies themselves delivering shared, line services (code enforcement, police and fire protection, public works services, recreation, etc.) are rare.

CORE CONCEPTS FOR RESTRUCTURING INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

A. CORE CONCEPTS

- ***State should assume financial responsibility for those services it has traditionally demanded of county government but are now paid for by the property tax.*** These services are: jails, support for courts and the district attorney, a share of law enforcement activities, Registry of Deeds, Register of Probate, and a share of the maintenance of facilities housing these functions. The state's financial support of these functions should be contingent on: (a) Assuring that the shift in funding of county services from the property tax to broad-based state taxes does not translate into an increase in overall tax burden in the state and (b) a restructuring of county government.

- ***State, county, and local governments should have a formal system for collaborating on policy relating to these and other services.*** Not only should such a system improve state-county relationships, but also should be used to improve efficiencies. Examples are jails and law enforcement. Can build on efforts already underway between state police and some counties.

- ***County government should be repositioned so that municipalities are their primary customers.*** This will require counties to restructure themselves to gain municipal trust. Management must become more professional and entrepreneurial. Counties should gain broad authority to offer municipal services on a fee-for-service basis. Municipal participation in the services would be voluntary.

- ***Municipal government should aggressively seek opportunities to avail themselves of joint services,*** both through a stronger county mechanism and through existing authority to enter into interlocal agreements. A system of incentives may be needed.

B. ELEMENTS OF RESTRUCTURED INTERGOVERNMENTAL RELATIONS

I. State should assume financial responsibility for those services it has traditionally demanded of county government but are now paid for by the property tax.

- Services should be delineated as follows:

  - **State responsibility** (in addition to existing state obligations):
    - Support services relating to district attorney
    - Court rents and services
    - Registry of deeds
    - Registry of probate
    - Jails and other support for prisoners
    - 40% of sheriff's non-jail, non-contract services (incl. communications)
    - 50% of maintenance of general facilities, which house many of these functions

  - **Continued responsibility of property tax**, paid by all municipalities based on assessed value:
    - Local share of EMA
    - Commissioners and county administration
    - Management information services
    - 40% of sheriff's non-jail, non-contract services (incl. communications)
    - 50% of maintenance of general facilities
    - Maintenance of special facilities (airports, parking garages, etc.)
    - Treasurer
    - Debt service
    - Grants to organizations
    - Bridges that are county responsibilities
    - Other

  - **In addition, 20% of sheriff's non-jail, non-contract services would be paid for by property tax payers in communities without full-time police departments**. A full-time police department is one that is staffed no fewer than 16 hours per day, seven days per week. A full-time police department must include at least one officer employed full time (at least 40 hours per week) who has successfully completed the Maine Criminal Justice Academy's municipal-county basic police course and holds a valid certification from the Academy's Board, or is otherwise sufficiently trained to hold and in fact does hold a

valid certification from the Academy's Board. All other law enforcement officers must meet all the minimum employment requirements of Title 25, chap. 341. The status of a full-time police department may be achieved either by a municipality's own department or by contract with another governmental entity that meets the above requirements.

This 40%, 40%, 20% split of responsibility for the sheriff's non-jail, non-contract services among state government, local property tax payers in the county as a whole, and rural communities links the costs of these services to their beneficiaries. The state benefits because sheriff's activities reduce the demand on state police. Local property tax payers in the county as a whole benefit from a law enforcement capacity available to all. Rural communities without organized police departments of their own benefit disproportionately, since they are directly served by the rural patrols.

- Based on review of 16 county budgets, it appears that this delineation **would require the state to pick up approximately 62% of county costs now paid by the property tax**. See attached preliminary summary. The total 1997 county requirement for property taxes is $59.9 million; the new state cost would be between $37 million and $38 million per year (in 1997 dollars).

- What form should this payment by the state to the counties take? Two concerns are likely:

  - First, if the payments are part of a biennial allocation in the state budget, counties will worry that the state will not always keep its obligation.
  - Second, state will worry that it will face a biennial bill over which it has little control--a "blank check."

  Therefore, **establish a county revenue sharing program similar to the existing community revenue sharing program,** sharing with the counties a percentage of income and sales tax revenues. No biennial budget allocations are required, because revenue sharing is taken "off the top" and put into a fund separate from the budget. And the state would be protected from the "blank check"--revenues would grow according to the economy, and the counties would have to live within those limits.

  Currently, revenue sharing is based on 5.1% of income and sales tax revenues, or about $76 million per year. One percent

equals about $15 million. Therefore, if this approach were favored, revenue sharing would have to increase by approximately 2.55 percentage points (to 7.65% of income and sales tax revenues) to raise the preliminary estimate of $38 million of new state obligations. Funds would go directly to the counties. It is the intention of the task force that this shift in funding **not translate into an increase in overall tax burden in the state.**

The revenue sharing formula for counties would be structured to **keep each county whole as of 1997**.

In addition, if these county costs are to be paid through enhanced revenue sharing, it probably makes sense to **fold existing state payments to the county -- i.e., the community corrections program -- into the same vehicle**. This will streamline administration at both the county and state levels. The community corrections program costs the state approximately $5 million annually. If folded into the enhanced revenue sharing program, the increase in percentage of income and sales tax revenues going to the counties would be slightly more than 2.55 percentage points -- about 2.6 percentage points.

- Where will this $37 - $38 million (in 1997 dollars) come from at the state level? **Should be part of tax reform** that will be considered by the Taxation Committee in preparation for the second session of the 118th Legislature. One goal of the tax reform is property tax relief, of which this should be a part.

  The full amount will not be needed all at once, since the shift from the property tax to county revenue sharing will depend on county reform, which the Task Force estimates will take three to five years to fully implement (see element III on restructuring of county government). Accounting for inflation (assumed at 3% per year) between FY 1997 and FY 2003, the $38 million will equal about $45 million as of FY 2003.

  Specifically, the Task Force recommends:

  - For state FY 1999, fund county revenue sharing through a percentage of state income and sales tax collections sufficient to raise $15 million, with the General Fund replenished by $15 million of the increase in cigarette tax revenues already enacted by the Legislature and earmarked for tax relief.

- For state FY 2000 and FY 2001, increase the rate of state income and sales tax collections devoted to county revenue sharing sufficient to raise an additional $15 million. This increase would be drawn from projected growth in General Fund revenues in FY 2000 and 2001 (more accurately, from the increment in revenues resulting from a reprojection of revenues by the Revenue Forecasting Commission, in light of stronger than anticipated economic growth).

- For state FY 2002 and FY 2003, increase the rate of state income and sales tax collections devoted to county revenue sharing sufficient to raise an additional $15 million and fully fund the county revenue sharing program ($38 million in 1997 dollars, or about $45 million as of 2003, assuming 3% per year inflation). Again, this increase would be drawn from projected growth in General Revenue funds in FY 2002 and 2003.

II. State, county, and local governments should have a formal system for collaborating on policy relating to services that are required by one level of government and performed or paid for by another, or that are performed by two or more levels with needless duplication and opportunity for conflict.

- ❑ The Maine Municipal Association, the Maine County Commissioners Association, and the Governor's Office should, by memorandum of agreement, establish **a permanent statewide Intergovernmental Advisory Commission,** whose duty would be to look for ways to reduce duplication among all three levels of government in Maine as well as within each level of government; to promote communications, cooperation, and efficient delivery of services; and to monitor and discuss demands made by one level of government of another level. The make-up of the Task Force on Intergovernmental Structure also would be appropriate for a permanent commission: 21 members comprising 7 from the state (5 commissioners and 2 legislators appointed by the Governor), 7 county officials appointed by the MCCA, and 7 municipal officials appointed by the MMA. The State Planning Office, MMA, and MCCA should staff the commission out of existing resources and contribute funds equally to pay for any agreed upon expenses.

- ❑ The commission would create technical committees to resolve conflicts and duplication in specific, intergovernmental areas, such as corrections and public safety. The technical committees would bring together practitioners from each level of government to make recommendations to the commission.

- The commission would initiate at least one pilot project in which the state, county, and municipal levels of government would work together to solve a problem of duplicated or overlapping duties; or in which the state, through a contractual arrangement with the counties, could improve the efficiency of a delivered service.

- The commission also would:
  - track performance of the new intergovernmental structure, for example, with regard to the number of municipalities acquiring services jointly through the counties and the dollars saved by doing so;
  - further the study and improvement of intergovernmental structure in Maine;
  - prepare an annual report to the Governor, Legislature, counties, and municipalities.

- Among its early considerations, the commission also should review the manner in which municipal services now are delivered to the unorganized territory and make recommendations as to whether counties should acquire limited home rule authority over such services; and should review whether municipalities should be able to seek contracts for municipal police services through the state police.

- The commission should be established no later than June 1998. Until then, the Executive Order establishing the Task Force should be extended.

III. County government should be repositioned so that municipalities are a primary customer

- ***Place in the intergovernmental structure***:

  - Reposition county government for **stronger emphasis on direct services to municipalities**, so that municipalities have a ready-made alternative to buy services cooperatively.
  - Basic authority to serve municipalities can be derived from a hybrid of Title 30-A, Secs. 107 and 902. Counties given broad authority to initiate on their own and to offer municipal services; each municipality decides for itself whether to use and pay for the service. Counties, professionally run, would have to be entrepreneurial and competitive to create the services and capture local "customers." A municipality in one county could purchase a service from another county if it wished.

- Centralized model of county government familiar in much of the country outside of New England is not appropriate for Maine.
- Counties **still will serve as an administrative subdivision of the state for key services** (deeds, jails, probate, emergency management, support for D.A., certain law enforcement functions), operating with the same authority over these functions as at present.
- The Task Force does not view this repositioning of county government as a replacement of regional planning agencies, which will continue to play an important role in the provision of planning, community development, economic development and other services to municipalities and their regions; may serve as a resource to counties as they upgrade their capacities to provide municipal services; and may seek opportunities for joint ventures or contracts with counties as counties reorient themselves toward shared services desired by municipalities.

❑ ***Governance (see also Implementation):***

By 2003, each county will be required to have drafted a new or amended charter that includes provisions to create the capacity for designing, marketing, and delivering joint municipal services professionally and reliably.

- Provisions governing county charters are contained in Title 30-A, Chapter 11. This Chapter details the purpose (Subchapter I), procedures (Subchapter II), and powers (Subchapter III) of county charters, which are prepared by charter commissions and must be ratified by county voters.

- These existing provisions are a sufficient vehicle to bring about the necessary improvements to county government, including the following, which the Task Force considers the minimum required to demonstrate capacity for the county role envisioned by this proposal:

  - **Maintaining elected commissioners** (Title 30-A, Sec. 1351[3] provides that the charter must provide for the election of county officers from 3, 5, or 7 districts).

  - **Appointing an administrator**, who should be chosen solely on the basis of experience and administrative qualifications with special reference to the actual experience in, or knowledge of, the duties of the office as set forth by the county commissioners and by law. The administrator should be appointed by the

commissioners and removable by the commissioners for cause, and should fulfill the following duties:

- appoint, with the consent of the county commissioners, and when necessary remove with the consent of the commissioners such heads of departments as are appointed per the county's charter.
- prepare the annual budget and submit it to the county commissioners.
- attend the meetings of the county commissioners and keep the commissioners advised of the financial condition and future needs of the county.
- make appropriate recommendations to the county commissioners on the promulgation of policy.
- see that all laws governing the county are faithfully executed.
- perform such other duties as may be prescribed by county charter, law, or duties prescribed by the county commissioners.

- **Determining the method of selecting officers, officials, and employees** (including whether they are to be elected or appointed, **except for the sheriff, the registry of probate, and the judge of probate, all of whom must be elected** according to the State Constitution). See Title 30-A, Sec. 1351(1)(B) and (C). The Task Force takes no position on the election or appointment of county officials, leaving those decisions to the county charter commissions and county voters. The relationship between the county commissioners and other county officials is defined in state law at Title 30-A, Sec. 102, which states: "The county commissioners have final authority over the operation of all county offices by elected or appointed county officials...."

- **Requiring the Treasurer**, whether elected or appointed, to have minimum qualifications in matters of business administration and finance.

- **Creating or retaining budget, budget advisory, or finance committees**, with authority over the county budget as determined by the county charters, notwithstanding Title 30-A, Articles 2 through 13, or Title 30-A, Sec. 1353 (which detail this relationship in the various counties under current law).

The committees will have the added role of advising the county commissioners on the kinds of joint municipal services that the county should consider offering and the design of those services (in this role, the committee is serving as the eyes and ears of the county's municipal customers, anticipating the need for joint services).

- ***Fiscal:***

Counties would have three basic sources of outside funds:

- **County revenue sharing** as payment for duties carried out as an administrative subdivision of the state. As indicated earlier, the county revenue sharing initially will be distributed to counties in a manner that would compensate each county for state-required services per its actual, audited 1997 expenditures. The revenue sharing dollars can be expected to grow, in real terms, over time as the economy and income and sales taxes grow. Therefore, a formula is needed for the distribution of the increase in these dollars to the counties. (Proposed formula not yet determined.)

- **County property tax, frozen at rates necessary to keep counties whole as of their 1997 budgets (actual expenditures)**. Municipalities would fund a base portion of the county budget via the property tax, but this would be frozen at a rate below present levels, since the state would be paying for services it requires counties to deliver. There would be one rate for municipalities with their own police departments, and one for municipalities without their own police departments. These base payments would recognize that certain county services are carried out on behalf of all county residents and would help pay for professional administration of county government.

  - The frozen rates would vary by county, using 1997 county budgets (actual expenditures) as a base for calculating the rates.
  - Based on analysis of county budgets, the frozen rates would be on the order of 50% to 85% (median of 62%) lower than current rates for municipalities **with police departments** and on the order of 25% to 60% (median of 47%) lower than current rates for municipalities **without police departments** (these are preliminary estimates).

- The frozen rates would be flexible to the following extent:

  - Upon a unanimous vote of the county commissioners, subject to override by a two-thirds vote of the budget committee, the frozen rate can be adjusted one time within 12 months of adoption of a county charter to account for unusual or unmet costs incurred between 1997 and the adoption of the charter.
  - Upon a unanimous vote of the county commissioners, subject to override by a two-thirds vote of the budget committee, the frozen rate could be increased by the lesser of $.05 per $1,000 of valuation or the level necessary to raise up to $100,000 in 1997 dollars to help pay for professional administration.
  - Upon a unanimous vote of the county commissioners, subject to override by a two-thirds vote of the budget committee, the frozen rate could be increased by the lesser of $.05 per $1,000 of valuation or the level necessary to raise up to $100,000 in 1997 dollars for a period of up to one year to help pay for the startup costs of one or more joint municipal services. The rate could be similarly increased for a period of up to one year to help pay for the startup costs of each subsequent start up services in subsequent years.
  - In the cases of (a) emergencies or (b) capital expenditures made pursuant to Title 30-A, Sec. 921, or by bond issues approved by the voters, an expenditure that would cause a breach of the frozen rate must first be approved by a unanimous vote of the county commissioners, subject to override by a two-thirds vote of the budget committee. State legislative approval would not be required.

- **Fees for contracted services.** Local dollars also would come from fees for municipal services offered by counties. Fees would be paid by those municipalities participating in the service. As indicated earlier, counties will be given broad authority to offer municipal services of their choosing.

- ***Implementation:***

  - The state's assumption of financial responsibility for certain county services and the related frozen rates on local

property taxes for the payment of county services will apply only in those counties that approve the new or amended charter.

- The Intergovernmental Advisory Commission formed by agreement among the MCCA, MMA, and Governor's Office will draft model charter provisions relating to the proposed restructuring to serve as guidance; this would be an advisory document only.
- Where the state legislature still has final approval authority over county budgets, such authority will end upon adoption of a new charter.

❑ ***Geography:***

- Still 16 counties configured as at present, but allow a municipality in one county to contract with another county for services if it wishes. Allow counties, at their option, to consolidate or redraw boundaries.

- The Intergovernmental Advisory Commission should consider whether there are opportunities for state agencies to reconfigure their divisional boundaries to follow county lines or to otherwise conform with other common geographies.

IV. Municipal government should aggressively seek opportunities to avail themselves of joint services.

❑ A major purpose of repositioning and restructuring county government is to provide an easy opportunity for municipalities to avail themselves of joint services. The success of this system depends both on the entrepreneurialism and managerial skills of the counties and on the willingness of municipalities to participate.

❑ The state's assumption of financial responsibilities that now fall on the county property tax and the related freeze on county property taxes to pay for the base portion of the county budget are strong incentives for local governments and their voters to accept new or amended county charters. However, participation by municipalities will evolve only as counties demonstrate their acumen in delivering less costly services on a joint bases, as the municipalities begin to see successes, and as they are willing to shed their own provincialism. To this end, the Intergovernmental Advisory Commission should:

- encourage pilot projects in the counties;
- advertise successes;

- make recommendations to the Governor, Legislature, and state agency commissioners that would direct state public infrastructure dollars particularly to municipalities that have demonstrated a willingness to improve their efficiency and productivity through the joint purchase or delivery of services;
- identify models for interlocal cooperation in other states.

Allocation of Costs Between State Budget and Property Taxes

Draft for Discussion – Not Administration or Departmental Policy
Per June 26, 1997, Task Force Meeting (uses .4 - .4 - .2 split for sheriff non-jail costs)
Summary of Possible New State Share of Cost of County Services to Relieve Property Taxes
Based on 1997 County Budgets
*******ALL NUMBERS ARE PRELIMINARY, SUBJECT TO VERIFICATION*******

Item	Androscog	Aroostook	Cumbland	Franklin	Hancock	Kennebec	Knox	Lincoln
District Attorney	$245,241	$145,803	$745,459	$77,546	$175,630	$345,764	$161,102	$66,224
Court Rent/Services	$10,000	$118,738	$0	$4,000	$0	$0	$0	$15,231
Registry of Deeds	$0	$8,412	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
Registry of Probate	$83,974	$95,278	$116,952	$62,645	$47,603	$148,706	$63,252	$43,797
Sheriff:								
Jail	$2,187,593	$1,256,449	$4,909,972	$670,946	$791,753	$2,107,533	$1,350,570	$777,209
40% of Non-jail	$334,090	$185,228	$1,030,430	$381,359	$281,029	$477,857	$405,414	$490,668
Civil Processing	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
50% Gen. Facilities	$193,024	$76,649	$792,223	$32,521	$65,461	$104,078	$72,925	$54,519
Total	**$3,053,922**	**$1,886,557**	**$7,595,036**	**$1,229,017**	**$1,361,476**	**$3,183,938**	**$2,053,263**	**$1,447,648**
1997 Property Taxes	$4,636,447	$3,305,131	$12,930,861	$2,177,807	$2,261,289	$4,949,091	$3,347,974	$2,825,771
% Picked up by State	65.9%	57.1%	58.7%	56.4%	60.2%	64.3%	61.3%	51.2%
Base Property Tax	**$1,415,480**	**$1,565,960**	**$4,820,609**	**$958,110**	**$899,301**	**$1,826,495**	**$1,274,090**	**$1,132,789**
Current Prop. Tax Rate	$1.19	$1.20	$0.85	$1.03	$0.46	$1.02	$1.20	$0.88
Base Prop. Tax Rate	$0.36	$0.57	$0.32	$0.45	$0.18	$0.38	$0.46	$0.35
Percent change	-70%	-53%	-62%	-56%	-61%	-63%	-62%	-60%
Rate Towns w/o police	$0.54	$0.64	$0.50	$0.73	$0.24	$0.50	$0.60	$0.47
Percent change	-55%	-47%	-41%	-29%	-48%	-51%	-50%	-47%

Item	Oxford	Penobscot	Pisc'quis	Sag'hoc	Somerset	Waldo	Wash'ton	York
District Attorney	$112,033	$316,928	$86,672	$73,841	$185,615	$75,698	$158,316	$551,778
Court Rent/Services	$12,500	$0	$21,941	$7,250	$14,100	$20,303	$0	$0
Registry of Deeds	$0	$0	$18,520	$0	$19,196	$0	$8,635	$0
Registry of Probate	$75,408	$163,886	$74,387	$60,844	$102,053	$77,541	$80,605	$120,551
Sheriff:								
Jail	$751,888	$2,393,702	$412,244	$802,439	$1,045,790	$717,374	$1,039,770	$2,453,703
40% of Non-jail	$393,340	$557,592	$232,899	$334,570	$437,856	$265,217	$132,698	$576,050
Civil Processing	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0	$0
50% Gen. Facilities	$38,367	$223,631	$40,455	$36,396	$58,305	$66	$71,358	$112,055
Total	**$1,383,535**	**$3,655,740**	**$887,119**	**$1,315,340**	**$1,862,915**	**$1,156,198**	**$1,491,382**	**$3,814,137**
1997 Property Taxes	$2,230,985	$5,131,284	$1,662,623	$2,371,448	$3,017,296	$1,741,754	$2,779,774	$4,509,684
% Picked up by State	62.0%	71.2%	53.4%	55.5%	61.7%	66.4%	53.7%	84.6%
Base Property Tax	**$825,780**	**$1,596,748**	**$680,458**	**$906,774**	**$1,255,453**	**$517,948**	**$1,222,043**	**$707,023**
Current Prop. Tax Rate	$0.71	$0.87	$1.38	$1.34	$1.07	$1.07	$1.64	$0.43
Base Prop. Tax Rate	$0.26	$0.27	$0.57	$0.51	$0.45	$0.32	$0.72	$0.07
Percent change	-63%	-69%	-59%	-62%	-58%	-70%	-56%	-84%
Rate Towns w/o police	$0.39	$0.40	$0.69	$0.79	$0.61	$0.42	$0.78	$0.29
Percent change	-45%	-54%	-50%	-41%	-43%	-61%	-52%	-33%

Item	Total
District Attorney	$3,523,649
Court Rent/Services	$224,063
Registry of Deeds	$54,763
Registry of Probate	$1,417,482
Sheriff:	
Jail	$23,668,936
40% of Non-jail	$6,516,298
Civil Processing	$0
50% Gen. Facilities	$1,972,032
Total	**$37,377,223**
1997 Property Taxes	$59,879,219
% Picked up by State	62.4%
Base Property Tax	**$21,605,061**

File:stcolo/cumbco5.123/summary

Notes: proposed tax rates exclude possible addition to upgrade county management.

INTERGOVERNMENTAL TASK FORCE MEMBERS

COUNTY

Gordon Andrews
Somerset County Commissioner

Dennis Damon
Hancock County Commissioner

Emile Jacques
Androscoggin County Commissioner

Roland D. Martin
Aroostook County Administrator

Esther Clenott
Cumberland County Commissioner

Jim Gallagher
Lincoln County Commissioner

Mark Westrum
Sagadahoc County Sheriff

ALTERNATE

Nancy Rines
Kennebec County Commissioner

MUNICIPALS

Keith Bowles
Selectman, Berwick

Wendy Hanscom
Selectman, Newry

Brian Rines
Mayor, Gardiner

Donna Thornton
Mayor, Brewer

Robert Fiske
Town Councilor, Old Town

Dave Cole
Town Manager, Gorham

Ruth Joseph
Mayor, Waterville

Tom Stevens
City Manager, Presque Isle

ALTERNATE

Roger Moody
Town Manager, Camden

LEGISLATIVE REPRESENTATION

Senator Jill M. Goldthwait

Representative Jane Saxl

STATE OFFICIALS

Kevin Concannon, Commissioner
Dept. of Human Services

Evan Richert, Director
State Planning Office

Janet Waldron, Commissioner
Dept. Administrative & Financial Services

John Melrose, Commissioner
Dept. of Transportation

Malcolm Dow, Commissioner
Dept. of Public Safety

Denise Lord
Dept. of Corrections

ALTERNATE

Val Landry, Commissioner
Dept. of Labor

STAFF & ASSISTANCE

Henry Bourgeois, President
Maine Development Foundation

Beth Dellavalle
Senior Planner
State Planning Office

Bob Howe
Executive Director
Maine County Commissioners Association

Frank O'Hara
Planning Decisions

Geoff Herman
Legislative Assistant
for State/Federal Relations
Maine Municipal Association