



Los Gatos ♦ San Luis Obispo

Avery & Associates

Report to the Town of Mammoth Lakes

January 5, 2011

William Avery & Associates
3 ½ N. Santa Cruz Ave., Suite A
Los Gatos, CA 95030
408.399.4424
Fax: 408.399.4423

REPORT TO THE TOWN OF MAMMOTH LAKES

I. INTRODUCTION

In October 2010, The Town entered into an agreement with Avery and Associates (Les White, Principal Consultant for Avery and Associates and Project Manager for this agreement) to perform the following tasks (see Attachment I, Agreement, and Exhibit A-Work Plan):

1. Project Manager to conduct one-day meetings and discussions on-site with the Town Manager and other individuals he recommended. Sixteen interviews were conducted (two by telephone) in mid-October with department heads, two members of the Council, two County officials, a high-level manager of the Mammoth Mountain Ski Area, the Water District General Manager and the Town Manager. Observations from those interviewed will be covered in a subsequent section of this report. During this onsite visit, The Project Manager also determined from discussions and information provided by the Town Manager key questions for the survey and the agencies to survey.
2. Avery Associates also agreed to conduct website searches and surveys of approximately six to eight jurisdictions. The focus of the survey was largely on contracting services in or out. This will be discussed in a contracting section of this report.
3. Also included are additional areas requested by the Town Manager. They have been incorporated into this report and the Project Manager will present Items 1, 2, and 3 at a Town Council meeting in January 2011.

II. BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM INTERVIEWS

We used the attached questionnaire (Attachment II) to obtain information from the survey towns and cities. Most of these questions were also discussed with Town Council and staff members and representatives of other agencies. The most prevalent observations from these interviews are highlighted below and reflect the opinions of interviewees and not necessarily the conclusions of Avery Associates:

1. The Town has significantly decreased its administrative capacity with the elimination of staff that did considerable negotiations, human resource functions, risk management, contract management and several other major duties.
2. While TOT revenues have stayed strong, there needs to be a careful definition of a process for monitoring and collecting TOT through any contract services provided to the Town due to the complexity of thoroughly managing TOT collections from condominium rentals, private residences and hotels/motels. The Town staff program was generally an effective monitoring and collection process.
3. Contracting out patrol and investigation work does not seem practical in view of the limited capacity of the County to do additional work; however, there may be some opportunities for specific contractual work to augment and supplant Town sworn and non-sworn duties, such as, special events, animal control and prisoner transport. Also, there is a perspective by some that police staffing levels could be further reduced. Conversely, some believe there is a lack of staffing, including supervision to provide adequate seven day-24 hour coverage. The Town Council should be clear about its collective expectation and perspective regarding the level of public safety service desired for the Town.

4. There should be careful consideration of performance criteria for the Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access non-profit (MLTPA) contract for trail system development and any other work that the Town might contract with this agency to perform. In addition, alternative staffing scenarios should be reviewed with Town staff before moving forward on a Recreation Director.
5. There is general acceptance of the efficacy of the Public Works Department. However, there may be some opportunity to contract out (and in) some additional functions.
6. There should be a review internally within the Town and comparatively with other jurisdictions of enhanced use of volunteers to supplement Town services.
7. There should be a review of the number of professional staff in Community Development and additional staff time allocated to code enforcement.
8. There is dissatisfaction that the MOUs cannot be reopened given what is happening in other jurisdictions.
9. The current fiscal condition of the Town is relatively sound and TOT revenues have been surprisingly strong despite economic conditions in other towns and cities.
10. Contracting could provide a more cost effective alternative to in-house services primarily because of labor cost differences. One person expressed the opinion that the cost of employee services has virtually doubled over the past several years
11. An opinion was expressed that the Town has lacked a review of best practices in other agencies and in the private sector and has not acted in a timely way to manage leased space to secure savings or to transition out of an obsolete computer system.
12. There are budget and fiscal issues—the budget is difficult to read, the fiscal picture will not improve dramatically, therefore, the Town should be “thinking outside the box” about more economical ways of doing Town business.
13. There are several functions where the Town, Water District and the County might collaborate on providing consolidated functions, such as human resource management, particularly training and payroll functions.
14. There should be continued discussion between the Town and Mammoth Ski Resort on providing integrated transit services through one agency.
15. There is a need for the staff and Town Council to thoroughly understand what constitutes a reasonable process for contracting out Town services.
16. One non-Town government official commented that the fire district, water district and Town have similar boundaries and all have fiscal and human resource operations, training programs, risk management, legal services and, therefore, some consolidation of services should be explored. Also, there might be some further merging of County and Town activities in areas such as the garage operations, snow removal, planning, engineering, etc. Another non-Town government official said his agency would be willing to talk about merging overhead positions and jointly doing some public works functions together particularly, street paving and maintenance. Both officials thought it would be a good idea to have several meetings to seriously explore consolidation and contracting opportunities. One official also said his agency had good computer hardware and financial systems as well as a firm in the Town that provided IT functions.

III. THE CASE FOR CONTRACTING OUT GOVERNMENT SERVICES

Contracting services is an option for helping to control costs, when carefully evaluated, on a case-by-case basis. A more detailed discussion of this approach is included in this section.

Reductions in governmental services have been going on longer than the current national economic downturn. The severity of the economic downturn has made the need for cost reductions in the delivery of services more critical.

Even when the economy recovers, there will most likely be continued structural imbalances for many, if not most, local California governments. “Creative budgeting” as used, for example, by the State of California will no longer be sufficient to hide these imbalances. Factors such as continued reduced funding from federal and state levels, anemic local revenues, combined with increased costs, such as, health benefits, energy consumption and retirement will continue to take a larger portion of discretionary general fund resources. In the short-term, major revenue increases will be difficult to come by to mitigate these imbalances, and this will continue to force local governments to change the way they do business. Accordingly, cities are continuing to contract out services to the private sector for-profits and non-profit firms or creating and/or joining consortiums such as joint powers authorities (JPAs) for sharing or consolidating services through agreements with other governmental units. This latter strategy can involve both contracting out and contracting in services to or from other local governments. The International City-County Management Association (ICMA) notes that local governments on average contract out 17 percent of all services to for-profit businesses, 16 percent to other governments, 5 percent to non-profit organizations and less than 2 percent to volunteers.

Some other insights into the contracting process are offered in several studies. One author indicated that contracting out is most successful when three principles occur:

1. If a task can be specified precisely in advance and measured after the fact.
2. If it is relatively easy to replace contractors whose performance is disappointing or unacceptable (possibly a critical factor for some types of contracts given Mammoth Lakes remote location).
3. If the government is more concerned about results than procedures.

Another expert in the area of government contracting said that privatization is most promising when the government clearly knows what it is buying, who can deliver it effectively and the government agency knows how to judge what it is buying.

We are further informed about the concept of contracting services by the following excerpts from an article in the May/June 2006 edition of Public Administration Review entitled “Managing Public Service Contracts: Aligning Values, Institutions, and Markets”:

“Contracting proponents, who often have roots in public sector economics, champion contracting as a way to reduce service costs through competitive efficiencies and economies of scale. Contracting critics, who often have roots in traditional public administration fields, counter that contracting tends to sacrifice key public interest values (e.g., equality of treatment) and reduces service delivery capacity. In the midst of this discussion, several things are clear at this point in the evolution of the contract state:

- ▶ Contracting is and will continue to be a major task facing public managers.
- ▶ Public managers do not always have a choice about contracting and may be required by elected officials to do so under less-than-optimal market conditions.

- ▶ Public managers charged with contracting operate in politically charged environments that put a premium on balancing competing stakeholder values.
- ▶ One-size-fits-all judgments about contracting are generally unrealistic: Contracting can improve service delivery or it can be a disaster, depending on the underlying market conditions and management efficacy.”

The Public Administration Review further notes...Our approach is founded on the interaction of three central factors culled from the strategic management and planning, public law and institutions, and economics literatures. These are, respectively, public values, institutions, and service markets. In our framework, (1) stakeholder preferences and democratic processes establish the values to be optimized in service delivery; (2) public law and organizational arrangements determine the contracting tools available for balancing competing values; and (3) the characteristics of service markets influence which contracting tools and vendors are best suited to achieve stakeholder values.

...In elaborating our approach, we illustrate what the existing research suggests about how managers can use the lenses of stakeholder and public interest values, institutions, and service markets to improve service delivery. We examine the interaction of these factors in three key stages of contract management: (1) deciding whether to “make or buy” the services, (2) selecting vendors to produce them, and (3) deploying monitoring tools for overseeing the implementation of contracts.”

Other Studies

According to the Governor’s website, “The State of California currently contracts out more than 13,000 projects to the private sector every year. Local governments up and down California, as well as across the nation, contract a variety of services to save taxpayer dollars and improve service quality.”

According to the California Legislative Analysts’ Office, the “privatization” of government services has potential cost saving benefits and is usually discussed when municipal budgets experience negative growth. Savings from privatization can be used to close budget deficits or used for other services. In many cases, services are contracted out by local governments because these jurisdictions lack expertise in the subject area and lack the delivery infrastructure. Contracting out also allows for cost savings by leveraging a competitive bidding process. David Osborne and Ted Gaebler with Reinventing America say that “business tends to be better at performing economic tasks, innovating, replicating successful experiments, adapting to rapid change, abandoning unsuccessful or obsolete activities, and performing complex or technical tasks.” The public sector, in many cases, is not driven by cost considerations when they deliver services and goods, as opposed to the private sector, which is driven in large part by costs. In a market model, the public sector and civil servants have no market incentive as a whole to deliver goods and services quickly, efficiently, and with cost in mind. Although budgetary constraints may be an issue with the public sector, they are usually a secondary or tertiary priority. For the public sector, cost and quality is the primary consideration. “It’s easier to get rid of a service when a private contract runs out than when you have to cut civil service workers,” said Terry Christensen, chair of the San Jose State University political science department. It can be complicated, time consuming and hard to reduce city costs by negotiating with the public employee unions. Contracting out allows government entities to pay for performance and results and easily allows the city to reduce costs when a project has been completed. Competitive bidding for government services and goods allows the private sector to compete in the market of providing services and goods. Competitive bidding also drives down the costs. Private entities may not always have the lowest bid; in fact, in some cases, the public sector may be able to provide services and goods at a lower cost. Providing a competitive bidding system where the private sector can bid for goods and services alongside the public sector introduces market forces that ultimately drives down costs, according to the California Legislative Analysts’ Office. (We should note that City oversight is critical to the success of any contracted service or

program, particularly those large in scope or funding. As mentioned in the section below, it is important to set up performance goals, monitor the contract regularly, report the findings to the City Manager or Town Council, and make course corrections early and as needed to ensure compliance and the realization of actual costs savings.)

Summary of the California Legislative Analysts' Office potential advantages of contracting out government services are:

- Cost Savings for Taxpayers
- Increased Flexibility in Providing Services
- Competitiveness in the Market
- No Capital Outlay Needed
- Performance Based Contracts to Connect Funding to Results
- Customer Service Provided More Efficiently
- Success in Other Cities, Counties, and States Increased Expertise and Knowledge in Private or Non-Profit Sectors

Policy and Administrative Principles

Policy and administrative considerations for contracting out or consolidating with other agencies can vary depending on what strategies are adopted. It is important to separate an objective analysis of performance criteria, cost, customer service and other criteria from preconceived notions that the private sector is "more efficient" or that the public sector "cares more about the quality and timeliness of service." The following factors help to inform and guide an objective assessment of the best way for a community to provide service.

- **Business Plan:** A business plan should be developed for each outsourcing or consolidation proposal considered. This plan should factor in all operational and administrative support required and all costs for any new proposal.
- **Measure current cost:** One of the primary justifications is cost reduction with any new service delivery approach. Unless there is a clearly demonstrated cost advantage and an ongoing way to assure continued savings then a local government should assess specific reasons why any change would be beneficial. In a number of cases comparing in-house cost of providing services to contractual services may resolve which is the most cost effective way to do business is. The City of Phoenix, AZ, initiated an approach in the 1980s to compare contract proposals with city staff proposals.
- **Loss of Control:** Perceived loss of control can result in contracting, even sharing services or consolidations with other local governmental units can have that effect. There is a need to honestly address fears about loss of control and "turf" so that discussions of contractual and consolidations of service are not just an exercise in futility.
- **Personnel Impacts:** Employee considerations are important and most policy makers will want to assure employees that a fair process is followed. Employees will want to know how changes in service delivery will affect them. It is important for both management and elected officials to communicate promptly with employees and unions regarding contracting affects employees.
- **Contracting services to the private sector or consolidation of services between government agencies can be complicated by different pay rates, retirement plans and benefits. These factors need to be explicitly considered and discussed with employees who will be impacted by any changes.**

- **Planned Implementation:** A well thought out conversion and implementation plan is essential to assure a smooth transition and to assure no lapses in service. This can include creation of a new management structure, employee transition and relocation, stakeholder involvement and job and customer service training.
- **Governance Structure:** Consolidations especially through JPAs may require new governance structures that will establish policies for the organization. Often this can result in a mix of existing elected officials from participating jurisdictions serving in a part-time appointed capacity. In other cases it can involve appointments of community members or a combination of both.
- **Ongoing costs and funding:** A fair and balanced way to allocate costs or charge for services must be agreed to by all parties ahead of time. In addition one-time set up costs should be predetermined and both funding and cost amortization strategies should be considered in the fully developed business plan. Both asset and in-kind contributions from participants should be accounted for.
- **Importance of ongoing monitoring:** An effective reporting, evaluation, cost control and auditing components must be put in place to monitor the provider’s performance.
- **Termination:** Clear termination provisions need to be included in a contract for distributing assets and liabilities when a contract ends.
- **Local governments should consider a number of key ingredients for effective consolidations, shared services and JPAs including:**
 1. Develop positive relationships and some levels of mutual trust before initiating shared service arrangements.
 2. Engage the top managers and policy makers in discussions and support of the potential benefits of shared services.
 3. Inventory opportunities to identify high-value opportunities to collaborate and achieve mutual benefit.
 4. Find a staff “champion” and executive sponsor in each organization to make the project happen.
 5. Start small to develop working relationships, accomplishments and momentum for bigger efforts.
 6. Avoid a complicated or unwieldy governance structure.

In contracting services, it should be noted that some agencies have constraints built into labor agreements that must be considered. If not a legally binding requirement to meet and confer on contracting out services performed by city staff, then at a minimum there is usually a requirement to consult with employee labor organizations before laying off employees.

IV. BACKGROUND INFORMATION FROM SURVEYS

A major aspect of this project has involved a review of several cities to focus on “operational efficiencies particularly those that may occur as a result of contracting out, contracting in sharing or consolidating of services with the private sector or other governmental agencies.” The survey cities were determined as a result of discussions with the Town Manager and reflect a group of cities the Town staff has used in previous surveys that are similar in size and tourism activities. Those cities are: Aspen, CO, Breckenridge, CO, Park City, UT, South Lake Tahoe, CA, Telluride, CO, Truckee, CA and Vail, CO.

Clearly, the seven cities surveyed (the Survey results are shown in Attachment III) have been engaged in a thoughtful and strategic process to reduce costs and generate income to deal with the harsh economic reality of declining city revenues and rising general fund costs. Reducing the workforce, consolidating departments or functions to create greater efficiencies, exploring partnerships with other entities either to promote cost savings or to generate revenue are steps many of these cities are taking to innovate and reduce costs while maintaining a commitment to high-level customer service and programs.

Below are all findings from the seven survey cities:

1. All seven cities began reducing staffing levels - some as early as 2008 - through layoffs, retirement, freezing positions, attrition, or a combination thereof. The remaining work has been absorbed by existing staff.
2. All cities contract out, and expect to continue to contract out, functions in maintenance services. These services range from garbage recycling, snow removal, custodial services, refuse collection, facility maintenance, and landscaping.
3. Six cities contract with a chamber of commerce or a visitor's authority for tourism and marketing services. Funding is through the general fund, business improvement districts, transfer occupancy taxes, or a combination of these funds.
4. All cities directly provide or fund contract transit services that include free transit and shuttle buses.
5. Three cities combined departmental functions or eliminated management and non-management positions by: (1) moving to a "self-management" team function (explained in more detail below); thereby, eliminating several department directors; (2) consolidating community development under the city manager's office, which eliminated a director position; (3) consolidating economic development with housing and redevelopment; and (4) merging planning with the building department.
6. Half of the cities contract out engineering and planning functions, and one expects to contract out inspection services in January 2011.
7. Four cities contract in services and three receive 100% cost recovery from those services.
8. In survey cities, volunteers perform tasks, such as tree planting, trail and open space maintenance, and traffic control for festival and special events, but no major services.
9. Three cities contract out recreation instructors. One city uses contract employees for after school programs, and two cities have a Park District that provides recreation and after school programs.
10. No city contracts out administrative services; however, it is noteworthy that the Town of Breckenridge contracts out legal and prosecutorial services.
11. Two cities contract in IT and Finance services: 1. City of Aspen contracts in IT to a County and 2. South Lake Tahoe contracts in revenue collection/billing, disbursement of funds, accounts payable, budgeting and financial reporting to several improvement districts and revenue collection (property liens) for refuse franchisee.

- 12. Five cities contract out some areas of Police Services. For example, the City of Aspen contracts with the County for Communications Service, and the City of South Lake Tahoe contracts out parking enforcement and snow removal parking enforcement. Other services contracted out include: dispatch services (with other towns) and security for special events, festivals, and concerts.
- 13. Two cities contract in police services: 1. Drug enforcement and domestic violence (through grants) and 2. Emergency dispatch services for a county.
- 14. No city contracts-in engineering services.
- 15. Only the town of Breckenridge jointly bid fuel, sand, and noxious weed control.
- 16. Five cities have been exploring shared services with counties, school districts, and other cities. One city official commented that it is difficult to reach consensus.
- 17. Five cities have been creative in reducing costs - one through inter-agency agreements to construct a new ice arena, and others through joint dispatching, a joint authority for affordable housing, animal control, cost sharing for GIS, and contracting for snow removal.

We explored further Park City’s “self management” idea to better understand their philosophy and practice. The self-management concept was established to diminish silos and provide interdependence and problem solving among groups. Currently, Park City has 5 leadership teams, which all report to the City Manager:

- City Manager – City Attorney
- Engineering – Building – Planning
- Public Works – Public Safety
- IT – Budget – HR – Finance
- Recreation – Library

These teams are individually accountable for their specific area and collectively accountable for the responsibilities of the team. Managers within the teams do performance reviews of each other and are accountable as a team. Below is a table that clarifies the level of teams. Most of Park City’s teams are at least level III.

“X”	GROUP INTERACTION	TEAM TYPE	LEADERSHIP	REPORTING STRUCTURE
	Manager that assigns projects, directs group members, and manages in a traditional manner.	I	Traditional Work Group	Manager reports and is accountable for results.
	Manager guides process of defining objectives, roles, job descriptions, and workflow. Group has input but manager retains final say.	II	Manager-Led Group	Manager reports and is accountable for results.
	Manager acts as team leader and facilitates clarification of roles, job descriptions, and work processes. Decisions are consensus and team ensures objectives are met.	III	Facilitator-led Team	Reporting person changes as needed. Team is accountable for results.

“X”	GROUP INTERACTION	TEAM TYPE	LEADERSHIP	REPORTING STRUCTURE
	Team selects leader (may rotate). Team clarifies roles, job descriptions, work processes and ensures the achievement of objectives.	IV	Self-directed Team	A designated team member reports and team is accountable for results.
	Team matures and becomes high-performance. They determine own objectives beyond those expected by the organization.	V	High-performance Team	A designated team member reports and team is accountable for results.

From these leadership teams, specific self-managed teams are set up within their certain work areas. For example, the Library Director is a member of the Recreation – Library Leadership team. This team also has four other members, one from golf, one from recreation and two from ice recreation activities. Library then has a self-managed team at the library that oversees library operations only.

Over the last 7 years, the City has moved to this structure and it appears to work efficiently for the city. Adopting this structure eliminated several, but not all, department head positions. Since this approach has been used in Park City as a way to supplant department head positions and other top management position reductions, it is worth exploring a more structured team approach in the Town.

Findings from Other Studies, Interviews, and Surveys

One recent survey of ten larger California cities identified other outsourcing and consolidation trends by local governments:

1. Four of eight contract out janitorial services.
2. Three report contracting out landscaping maintenance and/or tree trimming and three use a combination of city staff and contracts.
3. One of the cities reported contracting one of the following services; police and fire services (provided by county), legal services, some commercial plan reviews, parking enforcement, building inspections and animal licensing.

Outsourcing, shared service and consolidation initiatives, which came to our attention from both San Mateo and Santa Clara counties include:

- Several San Mateo cities have consolidated emergency dispatch operations.
- A number of San Mateo cities have formed a JPA to provide employee training.
- The City of San Carlos has recently contracted police operations with the County Sheriff and previously consolidated its fire service with Belmont. However, it has just voted to dissolve the current agreement with the city of Belmont and issued an RFP to get a new partner because it has taken on a higher portion of costs in the current arrangement.
- Other cities in San Mateo County have formed a JPA for municipal waste collection.
- A variety of local governments have contracted with Palo Alto for regional water treatment, animal services and computer support.

- A number of cities in Santa Clara contract with the county for library services, fire services and police services through the Sheriff's Office.
- San Mateo County has an older payroll system and is working with Santa Clara County on a study to consider having Santa Clara provide payroll services and HR services through PeopleSoft. This arrangement would require that San Mateo secure its own software license but could save millions on software conversion costs. Upon completion of the study both counties will explore the possibility of Santa Clara providing its SAP Enterprise Resource Planning (ERP) System under a similar arrangement.
- A number of cities in both counties with utility operations contract billing, remittance processing or both.

We are also aware of other sharing possibilities such as:

- Several cities and the county forming a regional fire authority
- Sharing services and equipment such as hazmat response
- Combining purchasing power for equipment, services or materials such as slurry sealing.

Along with our surveys, we would add the following areas that have been outsourced to the private sector or consolidated with other agencies.

Accounting
Airports
Animal Shelter operations and management
Building operations and maintenance
Revenue collections
Engineering
Golf courses
Human resource administration
Information services
Legal Services
Park operations and maintenance
Payroll
Parking control and ticket processing
Planning and permitting
Public Works
Risk management
Road maintenance
Stadium and convention center management
Street cleaning
Swimming pools
Treasury and investment services
Food services
Vehicle maintenance
Liability insurance
Employment training

V. ANALYSIS OF INFORMATION

Based on interviews, updated and existing surveys and the consultants' perspectives, we will offer comments on staffing, contracting opportunities, performance standards and some additional general observations.

Staffing

In reviewing previously collected information regarding comparative staffing, we found a wide divergence among the comparative towns and cities. Some of the smaller jurisdictions have substantially more employees than Mammoth Lakes while other larger jurisdictions, such as, Truckee have fewer employees per 1000 residents. Some of the jurisdictions reported populations during peak tourist seasons ranging from 15,000 to 40,000 population, with Mammoth Lakes reporting 35,000. Annual skier visits ranged from 1.2 million to 1.8 million per year with Mammoth Lakes at 1.2 million.

Town/City	Population*	Employees (FTE's)**	Employees Per 1000
Mammoth Lakes	7,390	89	12
Aspen	6,090	288	47
Breckenridge	2,665	293	109
Park City	8,130	80	10
South Lake Tahoe	23,500	212	9
Telluride	2,400	65	27
Truckee	16,260	94	6
Vail	4,840	288	59

(*<http://www.city-data.com/>)

**There are wide variations in services with some of the jurisdictions having more utility operations, fire services and recreation facilities than Mammoth Lakes. The employee information was based on an online review of staffing levels reported by the various agencies in their annual budgets.)

Even with the variations in services, it appears that Mammoth Lakes staffing is in a reasonable range compared to other jurisdictions.

Contracting Services

In reviewing memoranda the Project Manager requested from the Town Manager information regarding contracting and Town-County shared services. It is apparent that the Town is certainly comparable to a number of comparison resort communities in utilizing contract services and working with the County to share certain services. Attachment IV are two memos (dated October 12, 2010, by the Town Manager) that summarize what the County is doing on a contractual basis—except the accounting services to ESTA have been terminated as a result of recent staff reductions in Finance. We would suggest that further use of contract services is possible, as well as some other changes noted below:

Police - The Town should explore the use of contractual services to transport prisoners as a cheaper alternative to sworn officers. The Town Council needs to be clear about what level of police service it wants for the

community. Full 24-hour seven-day service with effective supervision may require additional sworn personnel. However, the Town may not desire that level of service. Also, discussions with the County suggest that while the County may provide police services at a lower cost; its resources are spread thin in servicing the County as a whole. With regard to volunteer services, the Police Department currently has 55 active members in Citizens Emergency Response Team. They train monthly and participate in the Town's emergency operations training. The members range from young adults to retired people. There still may be opportunities to further expand the use of volunteers for additional non-sworn duties.

Public Works - There appears to be a fairly high level of satisfaction with the services provided by the Public Works Department. However, there may be opportunities to further contract some public works services—custodial, parks maintenance and engineering services—as shown in the comparative information are frequently contracted out. It really is a matter of whether it can be done cheaper and more effectively by contract. Also, the Town should explore offering additional services to the County, Water District, and other local government entities. Currently, the Town has an effective contract for equipment maintenance that can serve as a good model for contracting in other services. One government agency manager indicated that his agency should explore jointly bidding paving projects with the Town. A meeting with the Water District, the County, and Town top managers should be pursued with a goal of identifying areas where consolidation of services, contracting in or out and/or joint projects (e.g., street design, construction and inspection) might be pursued in the public works area. While some agencies contract for snow removal, there appears to be a high level of satisfaction with how the Town administers this service.

Administrative Services - Probably the most dramatically altered Town services has occurred in administrative functions (general administration, finance, human resources, risk management, information systems), with the reduction of key positions. Some fiscal functions such as payroll could be contracted with a private agency to offload some of the financial workload. Human resource and risk management functions have been assumed by the Town Manager along with real estate negotiations. This has impacted his allocation of time by his recent estimate of approximately 40% devoted to these newly assumed functions. Contractual services for risk management and human resource management can be explored to offset the loss of personnel. In addition, there is a local firm that provides IT services and the Town could explore contractual IT services through them. This is also an area that other local government agencies have expressed an interest in exploring contractual, shared, or consolidated services with the Town since each one provides similar administrative services in or near the Town. If the Town explores contracting administrative functions to the private sector or another public agency, that will set it apart from a number of the other comparison agencies who do little contracting of administrative services.

Contracts with Non-Profits - Currently the Town has contracts with single purpose non-profits: Mammoth Lakes Trails and Public Access, (MLTPA), Mammoth Lakes Tourism (MLT), and Mammoth Lakes Housing (MLH). As is the case for Town operations, contractual agencies need to have performance measures that are regularly evaluated by Town staff and the Town Council. This is particularly necessary with the two new areas of contractual services through MLTPA and MLT. These are large contracts using public funding sources, and public accountability and transparency for the use of such funds is important. Town staff and the contractors need to agree on performance measures and a reporting schedule. In the case of the MLT Agreement, Attachments A-1 and A-2 to that agreement begin to do that. For example, the following measures are examples, which could help to assess MLT results:

- ✓ leveraging public TOT dollars with private dollars
- ✓ website hits
- ✓ type of tourism information distributed
- ✓ tourism ads and articles placed
- ✓ increases in tourism (year round)
- ✓ events and activities sponsored/initiated

- ✓ welcome center contacts
- ✓ promotion of commercial flights into Mammoth Lakes
- ✓ providing private financial support for commercial air service revenue guarantees
- ✓ customer service feedback through an annual survey of key interest groups such as Mammoth Ski Resort, the local Chamber of Commerce, key Town staff, the Town Council and business representatives (hotels, restaurants, property managers, etc.)
- ✓ new marketing strategies developed and implemented
- ✓ promotional events attended (conventions, trade shows)
- ✓ sales leads generated—booked nights
- ✓ expenditures within budget forecast
- ✓ results of periodic performance and annual fiscal audits
- ✓ comparison of ski and other tourist visitors and room nights booked with other resort communities

If it has not already occurred, Town staff and the contractor need to review these attachments and define performance measures immediately.

For MLTPA, some measures would be:

- ✓ expenditures within budget forecast
- ✓ results of periodic performance and annual audits
- ✓ community input regarding high priority projects from seniors, youth, tourists, businesses, residents, campers and hikers, etc.
- ✓ based on priority projects, developing work plans and monitoring projects
- ✓ telephone survey of level of satisfaction of customers regarding services
- ✓ maintain a modest level of administrative and planning costs for permanent and contract staff (10-15%)—in this area the emphasis needs to be on planning and designing projects, such as, high priority trail segments, adding signage for trails, finishing partially completed park projects, and developing other highly valued community sports/recreation facilities such as the track facility while minimizing planning and administrative costs.

Many of these performance measures would apply to recreation facilities and programs as well.

Obviously, if the Town is providing the services, the same types of performance measures need to be used and reported to the Town Council.

Community Development - Several jurisdictions contract out inspection, major planning projects, such as, preparation of a general plan, review of complex development projects, environmental reviews, and plan checks. Most agencies maintain a core staff and provide a level of contractual services to correspond to economic growth fluctuations. While the professional community development staff is in line with other jurisdictions (and, in fact, below some of the jurisdictions), there still may be opportunities to reduce staff as key planning projects, such as a zoning code update, are completed. Doing some of the large planning projects in house can be cheaper than hiring professional planners at hourly rates that are higher and paying for travel and lodging costs. In some of these instances, it is prudent to do a disciplined comparison of in-house staff versus contract proposals to ensure the Town is getting the best possible economic arrangement.

Transit Services - Currently the ski resort and the Town, through ESTA (The Town provides transit through a contract with ESTA), provide transit services. While they serve different areas, both run buses, develop schedules, employ staff and provide some level of supervision. It would seem advisable to reconsider whether these two functions need to be separate or if the Town or ski resort could contract with the other entity and

manage one system with transit routes and schedules that serve both sets of customers; there may be some advantages from economies of scale. Currently, MMSA is doing a minor contract with ESTA and wants to contract for more as ESTA offers some contractual advantages.

Recreation Services - The Town Council needs to resolve recreation staffing between the Town and the MLTPA with an emphasis on not duplicating staff. Currently, the Town has several staff members, and this would seem to be sufficient staffing levels with possibly some contractual help to manage recreation programs. The key is to engage stakeholders in community meetings (Recreation Commission members, MLTPA members, stakeholders with an interest in these areas—seniors and youth groups, sports groups, Town professional recreation staff, etc.) to set priorities for desired and affordable recreation programs offering direct benefits to residents and tourists while minimizing overhead costs. Also, any new recreation facilities must be carefully evaluated from the standpoint of maintenance and programming costs.

Mono County and Special Districts - While alluded to in various sections of the report, it is important to emphasize that some of the most unique opportunities for the Town may be with other local government agencies in the form of contracting in some services, contracting out to those agencies, and/or consolidating some services. In the case of three agencies, the Town Manager and the CEO's of two public agencies expressed a willingness to explore ways to work together including, but not limited to, assessing sharing/consolidating administrative services (finance/payroll), contracting animal control services, transporting prisoners and joint training of employees. It is important that one of the agencies, starting with its policy body, take the initiative to start those service delivery discussions.

Other Considerations - In reviewing what other jurisdictions and the Town do, we have two other observations that bear on managing service delivery in the Town:

First, in the comparative agencies and in the Town, there seemed to be more opportunities for the use of volunteers. In another study conducted by Avery and Associates, we reported that the International City Management Association recently found a “58% increase in volunteers signing up to help in communities partly driven by an increased need for volunteers to maintain services and partly by an abundance of baby boom talent available to volunteer.” In that same study we found that a number of cities were using volunteers for neighborhood cleanup, graffiti removal, reporting code enforcement problems, supplementing police services (senior patrols, police reserves) and other service areas. While we did not review this area in the Town, as with most local governments, there is probably room for further use of volunteers.

Second, part of effectively adding contracting out projects stems from effectively managing the work of the Town as a whole. In that regard, using goal-setting sessions of the Town Council to determine priorities and managing those through an effective work plan process is extremely important. Having effective performance measures to review how the Town is doing in accomplishing those goals is an important part of that process. And, we believe the most effective measuring process results from citizen surveys that sample a cross section of the populace.

As with any organization, there will be new projects added and deleted during the year, but these should be weighed for importance against those projects approved by the Council in any annual goal setting sessions and through the budget approval process. It is in this context that the Town should use, and modify if necessary, its work plan process so the Council can review projects that represent its priority work items and evaluate additional requests.

A Council needs to keep three major areas in mind when it reviews the work of the Town:

- ▶ Day to day services and programs in the operating budget, which represent the bulk of the work for most employees.

- ▶ Capital budgets, which represent the major activities of engineering and design staff.
- ▶ Administrative projects which represent a significant amount of assignments to professional staff and managers.

Frequently, the workload that is not tracked on a regular basis are administrative project assignments - plans, studies, review of processes, audits, investigations, new procedures - the somewhat intangible items that allows the organization to change and progress.

The Town should use a rather simplified way of tracking these projects, when they are scheduled to be completed and to whom they are assigned. A simple work plan is relatively easy to update once the original projects are entered. It informs the Council and public of the progress on major projects, it requires staff to plan when work will get done, it is a tool for ensuring accountability and measuring individual and team performance, it can identify interdepartmental and interagency projects to help foster improved project coordination; and, it provides a framework for the Council to assess just how much work has been assigned to departments. Within this context, opportunities for further contracting of services may become more apparent.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSIONS

In reviewing the scope of the project, we have concluded that the Town has made a significant effort to reduce staff and contract out services when compared to other jurisdictions. Of course, there is always room to improve.

Regarding staffing, there still may be some opportunities to expand the use of volunteers to assist with non-sworn police duties and to use seniors and youth in other areas of local government service. The Town should review public works and planning staffing for further reductions, particularly if the economy continues to contract and as major planning projects are completed. While we were not asked to do any expansive evaluation of staffing, we did update some of the previously collected Town data and found that the Town was performing at comparable and, in some cases, lower staffing levels.

We have described some of the logic and critical steps in having effective contractual services. Contracting out services should not be viewed as a panacea for necessarily being the most effective and least costly way to provide Town services. That will depend on market conditions, location considerations - what is practical in densely populated urban areas may not be as feasible in sparsely populated, remote areas - on-site service requirements and other factors cited above.

Considering the survey information, few agencies contract out administrative service areas, but it is an area to explore, particularly, in view of the Town Manager and other local government agency executives expressed willingness to contract in or out or consolidate some administrative services such as payroll, information systems, human resource management, etc. Additionally, planning, some public works and public safety support services should be reviewed as well. All the agencies, as well as the Town, have contractual services in various areas so in the world of contractual services virtually anything is possible.

Once the decision to contract out or consolidate services has been made then performance measures, auditing practices and regular monitoring of contracts needs to be clearly defined. It would appear that two works-in-progress are the MLT and MLTPA contracts. Both need well-defined performance measures and contract monitoring processes to ensure that the substantial public funds allocated to these contracts are being used effectively. In addition, regular fiscal and periodic performance audits will help to ensure that outcome.

The decision to contract or consolidate services should be reviewed in the context of Town goals and work plans. This will ensure that careful choices are made based on the priorities of the Town. Often, we have

found that open and rigorous discussion of goals and priorities are not translated into a thorough and disciplined review of key administrative and capital projects through a comprehensive work plan process. The Town has a framework for such reviews and the Town Council and staff should refine its goal setting and work plan processes to ensure that priority projects are moving ahead promptly.

Finally, we would suggest that the Town Council and staff ensure that the following actions are taken over the next several months:

1. Conduct a Council goal setting session in January or early February and use the results to help shape the FY 2011-12 budget, staffing and work plan priority projects.
2. Convene a process with Town, County, Water District and Fire District participation to consider shared and contracted Administrative Services.
3. Have the PD look further into the contracting and volunteer options.
4. Negotiate contracts with specific performance standards for MLT and MLTPA and any other major non-profits, such as, MLH, or private contractors doing business with the Town.
5. Continue to transition MMSA provided transit into contracted services with ESTA.
6. Based on discussions with the County and various districts in the area and the survey information, identify other potential contractual services to pursue in FY 2011-12.

We wish to thank the Town Council members, Town Manager and his staff, and representatives of other agencies we interviewed. We also would like to thank the agencies that cooperated in the survey we conducted. Finally, special thanks to Robin Picken for arranging interviews and assorted project details.

ATTACHMENT I

BIOGRAPHICAL BRIEFS OF MANAGEMENT TEAM

Les White

Les White has over forty years of management experience in primarily local governments. He was the City Manager of Fullerton and San Jose and Assistant City Manager of Fresno. He also served as an interim city manager and department head of five California cities. He has held high level management positions for a community college, several non-profits and in the private sector. He has done a variety of consulting assignments for non-profits, local governments and special districts with a particular emphasis on organizational assessments, team building, and executive evaluations and coaching.

Les is on the board of the Institute for Local Government (ILG) and is a member of ICMA and the World Futurist Society. He is a graduate of Fresno State and the University of Pennsylvania with degrees in Government Administration.

Eva M. Terrazas

Eva is an experienced public policy and public affairs manager who has worked in a variety of sectors: government, higher education, and non-profit. She recently worked at the San Jose Redevelopment Agency as a Senior Community Relations Officer working on legislative and community involvement strategies, budget, and special projects, including the Sunshine Reform Ordinance, the open government initiative. Previous professional experience includes Program Manager at the Center for the Study of Journalism and Democracy during its critical start up phase; Public Affairs/Communications Manager at the San Jose Mercury News managing a community involvement strategy that included policy issues in housing, transportation, and the health of non-profit organizations; and, Senior Policy Advisor to Mayor Susan Hammer focusing on Arts and Culture, Redevelopment, and community engagement strategies. She is recipient of the 1997 Board Leadership Award provided by Compass Point, San Jose, CA.

Eva holds a Bachelor of Arts in Political Science from San Jose State University.

ATTACHMENT II

MAMMOTH LAKES SURVEY OF COMPARABLE CITIES

At the direction of the Town Council of Mammoth Lakes, Ca. and the Town Manager, Robert Clark, Avery Associates is conducting a brief survey of comparable resort communities. The focus of this survey is on operational efficiencies particularly those that may occur as a result of contracting out, contracting in, sharing or consolidation of services with the private sector or other government agencies. We would appreciate your reviewing the following questions and providing the name of a person that can be contacted by Eva Terrazas, Consultant, Avery Associates at emterrazas2001@yahoo.com in order to discuss the answers to these questions. We will be happy to share results of the survey with you if you so indicate. Thank you.

3. In the adoption of 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 budgets did you reduce positions in your organization and if so in what areas? If so, was the work performed absorbed by others in your organization or another organization, eliminated or contracted out? Please specify:

4. Do you contract out administrative services to other agencies (cities, special districts, county, non-profits) such as legal services, city clerk functions, risk management, finance, (payroll, payables, purchasing, revenue collection), information systems, labor negotiations and human resources? Or, do you contract some of these services in and perform them for other agencies?

5. Do you contract out any police services such as dispatching, special event security, property and records management, etc., to other agencies/private sector or do you contract some of these services in and provide them to other government agencies or organizations?

6. Do you contract out engineering, community planning, inspection, plan checking or other engineering or planning related functions/services? Do you perform any of these services for other agencies by contract? Do you jointly bid construction or maintenance projects with other agencies to get the best possible prices for services and goods?

7. Do you contract out any of your maintenance functions to the private sector or other government agencies, such as, snow removal, parks and streets maintenance, facility maintenance, custodial services, garbage/recycling collection, fleet maintenance? Or, by contract do you provide these services to any other agencies?

8. If you provide your services to other agencies do you receive 100% cost recovery for those services or more?

9. Explain who provides services for tourism promotion (the city, by contract, a non-profit) and how those are funded. Also, if these services are provided by contract have you developed a set of performance standards and key deliverables for the contractor? If so, could we receive a copy of the contract?

10. Do you operate and/or fund by contract any form of transit services, e.g., a shuttle system between the city and ski resorts and/or within the city?

11. Does your city fund a variety of recreation programs and are those provided by city staff or by contract? Please specify those services provided by contract, if any.

12. As a means of improving efficiency and reducing costs, have you combined/consolidated any office or departmental functions and as a result eliminated management and non-management positions?

13. Have you conducted any meetings with other agencies (e.g., school district, special districts, county) to explore where you might contract with each other for select services or share services by consolidating or combining operations?

14. Are there any other areas where you think your city has been particularly creative in reducing costs through joint efforts with other agencies, contracts with the private sector, contracting out your services to raise revenues, or other efficiency innovations in the use of your own work force?

15. Identify how your city uses volunteers to perform major tasks such as reception duties, police reserves, recreation and cultural programs, maintenance tasks, neighborhood watch.....

16. Do you contract out areas such as recreation and after school classes, pool operations, ice rink operations or any other recreation related functions?

Again, thank you for assisting us in this survey and please let the Avery Associates consultant know if you would like a copy of the survey.

ATTACHMENT II

MAMMOTH LAKES SURVEY OF COMPARABLE CITIES

At the direction of the Town Council of Mammoth Lakes, Ca. and the Town Manager, Robert Clark, Avery Associates is conducting a brief survey of comparable resort communities. The focus of this survey is on operational efficiencies particularly those that may occur as a result of contracting out, contracting in, sharing or consolidation of services with the private sector or other government agencies. We would appreciate your reviewing the following questions and providing the name of a person that can be contacted by Eva Terrazas, Consultant, Avery Associates at emterrazas2001@yahoo.com in order to discuss the answers to these questions. We will be happy to share results of the survey with you if you so indicate. Thank you.

17. In the adoption of 2009-2010 and 2010-2011 budgets did you reduce positions in your organization and if so in what areas? If so, was the work performed absorbed by others in your organization or another organization, eliminated or contracted out? Please specify:

18. Do you contract out administrative services to other agencies (cities, special districts, county, non-profits) such as legal services, city clerk functions, risk management, finance, (payroll, payables, purchasing, revenue collection), information systems, labor negotiations and human resources? Or, do you contract some of these services in and perform them for other agencies?

19. Do you contract out any police services such as dispatching, special event security, property and records management, etc., to other agencies/private sector or do you contract some of these services in and provide them to other government agencies or organizations?

20. Do you contract out engineering, community planning, inspection, plan checking or other engineering or planning related functions/services? Do you perform any of these services for other agencies by contract? Do you jointly bid construction or maintenance projects with other agencies to get the best possible prices for services and goods?

21. Do you contract out any of your maintenance functions to the private sector or other government agencies, such as, snow removal, parks and streets maintenance, facility maintenance, custodial services, garbage/recycling collection, fleet maintenance? Or, by contract do you provide these services to any other agencies?

22. If you provide your services to other agencies do you receive 100% cost recovery for those services or more?

23. Explain who provides services for tourism promotion (the city, by contract, a non-profit) and how those are funded. Also, if these services are provided by contract have you developed a set of performance standards and key deliverables for the contractor? If so, could we receive a copy of the contract?

24. Do you operate and/or fund by contract any form of transit services, e.g., a shuttle system between the city and ski resorts and/or within the city?

25. Does your city fund a variety of recreation programs and are those provided by city staff or by contract? Please specify those services provided by contract, if any.

26. As a means of improving efficiency and reducing costs, have you combined/consolidated any office or departmental functions and as a result eliminated management and non-management positions?

27. Have you conducted any meetings with other agencies (e.g., school district, special districts, county) to explore where you might contract with each other for select services or share services by consolidating or combining operations?

28. Are there any other areas where you think your city has been particularly creative in reducing costs through joint efforts with other agencies, contracts with the private sector, contracting out your services to raise revenues, or other efficiency innovations in the use of your own work force?

29. Identify how your city uses volunteers to perform major tasks such as reception duties, police reserves, recreation and cultural programs, maintenance tasks, neighborhood watch.....

30. Do you contract out areas such as recreation and after school classes, pool operations, ice rink operations or any other recreation related functions?

Again, thank you for assisting us in this survey and please let the Avery Associates consultant know if you would like a copy of the survey.

	ATTACHMENT III							
	TOWN OF MAMMOTH	CITY OF ASPEN	PARK CITY MUNICIPAL CORPORATION	SOUTH LAKE TAHOE	TOWN OF BRECKENRIDGE	TOWN OF TELLURIDE	TOWN OF TRUCKEE	TOWN OF VAIL
Total Population	7299	5914	7371	24087	2408	2201	16280	4531
Staffing level for FYs 2008, 2009, and 2010	2008 FTE 113.77 2009 FTE 103.77 2010 FTE 88.79	2008 FTE 317 2009 FTE 288.50 2010 FTE 283.70	2008 N/A 2009 FTE 81.42 2010 FTE 79.5	2008 FT 233.05 2009 FT 212.08 2010 N/A	2008 FTE 176.5; PTE 302.7 2009 FTE 178.0; PTE 307.0 2010 FTE 175.5; PTE 293.5	2008 FTE 75 2009 FTE 65 2010 FTE 65	2008 FTE 108; PT 23 2009 FTE 88; PTE 28 2010 FTE 94; PTE 32	2008 FTE 295.37; PTE 51.32 2009 FTE 239.56; PTE 54.03 2010 FTE 288.93; PTE 53.39
Did you reduce positions in FY2010-11? If so, was work performed by remaining staff or other arrangements?		Eliminated one building inspector in FY 2010-11. Most of staffing changes were made in the prior year when 30 positions were eliminated through either layoffs or attrition. The work in both cases were absorbed by others in the organization.	Yes. 1 Planning and 2 Building Dept staff. The work was absorbed by existing staff.	The City instituted three furlough days/or equivalent savings (all departments), frozen positions in Police and Fire, early retirements. Work has been absorbed internally.	In 2010, the Town reduced positions in Public works (2), Police (2), Recreation (1) and another 20,000 part-time and seasonal hours in Recreation and Public Works. In 2011 it will reduce another 2 positions in Community Development. Most work is being absorbed by existing staff. Will contract out in some areas if demand increases.	No. However it eliminated eight (8) full time positions in FY 09, and froze compensation at all levels, pursuant to the Town's Recession Plan. At this time, compensation remains frozen and none of the reduced positions have been backfilled.	No. However, in 2008 14 positions (both FTE and PTEs) were eliminated or frozen.	Yes. The town has eliminated positions mostly through attrition. It has reduced about 20 FTE's in the past several years. It is also eliminating its FTE for the Town Attorney and contract the services with the current town attorney.
Did you contract out any administrative services functions?	No.	No. City does not contract out administrative services.	No. City does not contract out administrative services.	No. City does not contract out administrative services.	Only Legal and prosecutor are contracted out.	The Town shares one employee with San Miguel County (building maintenance and repairs). The Town contracts with a non-profit (The New Communities Coalition) on various programs related to energy efficiency and sustainability. The Town contracts with a non-profit regional housing authority to help administer the Town's affordable housing programs. The Town also contracts with a for-profit company for IT services to supplement one in-house employee who functions in this capacity as well.	No. The Town has contracted payroll services to airport districts in the past.	No.
Do you contract in administrative services and perform them for other agencies?	Yes. Accounting (ESTA)	City provides IT services to the county under a contract.	No.	Yes. The City provides revenue collection, billing, disbursement of funds, accounts payable, budgeting and financial reporting to several improvement districts and revenue collection (property lens) for refuse franchisee.	No.	No.	No.	No.
Do you contract any police services?	Yes. Police Dispatch provided by Mono County.	The city contracts with the county for communication services.	No.	Yes. It contracts out parking enforcement and snow removal parking enforcement.	Yes. The Town has joint dispatch with other towns and county (quasi government operation). Also contracts some event security.	Yes. For larger events, outside security is contracted utilizing law enforcement officers from throughout the State (festivals and concerts).	Yes. Contract with the County (\$360K) for dispatch services, but continue to evaluate the contract. Until 2000, contracted with county for all services. The Town provides police services as of 2001.	No.



ATTACHMENT IV

OFFICE OF TOWN MANAGER

Robert F. Clark, Town Manager

P.O. Box 1609, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

MEMORANDUM

To: Les White
From: Robert F. Clark, Town Manager
Subject: Town-County Shared Services
Date: October 12, 2010

1. Police Dispatch (We contract with the County)
2. Landfill Operations/Transfer Station (We are working on a long term agreement)
3. State Lobbyist (50:50 split)
4. Off-Season Commercial Air Subsidy (County makes a small contribution)
5. Civic Center Land Ownership (we jointly purchased 10 acres)
6. Minaret Mall Office Space (they sublease from us & we share conference rooms)
7. Whitmore Pool Operation (50:50 cost split)
8. Eastern Sierra Transit Authority
9. GIS systems and staffing (50:50 split)
10. Mammoth Lakes Housing Board
11. School Resource Officer (County grant funding being considered)
12. Local Transportation Commission (Board and Staffing)
13. TOT Auditing (We contract with the County)

ATTACHMENT IV



OFFICE OF TOWN MANAGER

Robert F. Clark, Town Manager

P.O. Box 1609, Mammoth Lakes, CA 93546

MEMORANDUM

To: Les White
From: Robert F. Clark, Town Manager
Subject: Town Contract Services
Date: October 12, 2010

Services Provided by Others to the Town:

1. Police Dispatch (Mono County)
2. Solid Waste (Private Contractor)
3. Transit (Eastern Sierra Transit Authority)
4. Fixed Base Operator for General Aviation (Private Contractor)
5. Airport Engineering (Private Firm)
6. Parking Lot Snow Removal (Private Contractor)
7. Landscape Maintenance (Private Contractor)
8. Snow Pit Operation (Private Contractor)
9. Town Attorney (Private Contractor-Starts 2011)
10. Special Counsel (private law firms)
11. CEQA Document Preparation (private contractor)
12. Building Plan Check (private contractor)
13. Engineering Contract (private contractor)
14. Resort Marketing (Non-profit)
15. Chamber Services (Non-profit)
16. Trails Planning (Non-profit)
17. Workforce Housing (Non-profit)
18. Animal Shelter (County)
19. Parking Citation Collection (private contractor)
20. Assessment Districts (Bluffs, Juniper) Snow Removal (Private Contractor)
21. TOT Auditing (Mono County)

Services Provided by the Town to Others:

1. Mechanical Maintenance and fuel services(Fire District, School District, County, ESTA)
2. Accounting (ESTA)
3. Whitmore Recreation Area (County-Town shared)
4. Snow Removal for School District, College, Library
5. Town owned facility provided for \$1 Library