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LOCAL GOVERNMENTS AND PUBLIC FACILITIES
CONSTRUCTION IN NEBRASKA: EXPENDITURES,
COOPERATION AND OPERATION OF JOINT FACILITIES

Introduction

This study of public facilities construction was completed by the University of Nebraska at Omaha, Center for Public Affairs Research for the Nebraska Commission on Local Government Innovation and Restructuring. Several questions guided the development of the project:

- How much have Nebraska's political subdivisions spent for public facility construction in recent years, and for what types of facilities?
- What construction review processes are used by Nebraska's political subdivisions?
- To what extent do Nebraska's political subdivisions make their facilities available for other community activities?
- Are there examples of success and failure in political subdivisions' efforts to cooperate in facility construction and the operation of public facilities?

Methodology

The questionnaire was four pages in length and was administered using the Dillman Method. This included an initial mailing, a post card reminder, and a follow-up mailing of the questionnaire. The initial mailing was on October 13, the post card reminder on October 23, and the follow-up mailing on October 31. Acceptance of responses was closed on November 19, and no responses were included after that date.

Mailing lists were obtained from a variety of sources:

- Cities and villages—Nebraska Directory of Municipal Officials;
- Counties—Nebraska Association of County Officials;
- School Districts, Community Colleges, and Educational Service Units—Nebraska Department of Education;
- Airport Authorities—Aviation Institute at UNO; and
- All others—U.S. Census Bureau, Census of Governments

A detailed list of the types and numbers of political subdivisions can be found in Table 1. With the exception of townships and rural and suburban fire districts, questionnaires were mailed to all subdivisions. Questionnaires were mailed to 50 percent of the townships and fire districts.
Two types of questionnaires were mailed out—one for townships, and one for all other subdivisions. The only difference between the two was that the township questionnaire included a question that asked whether the township owned any buildings. A copy of the questionnaire can be found in Attachment I.

As with all surveys, the results of this survey are assumed to contain some degree of error. The reliability of the survey results depends on the care exercised during administration, the extent to which the respondents are representative of the population under study, and the amount of nonresponse.

Survey Administration

Errors can creep into the data in a number of ways during survey administration. For example, respondents may misunderstand questions, respondents may fill out more than one questionnaire, and data may be entered incorrectly. The extent of these errors cannot be estimated, but throughout the process we made every attempt to minimize the potential for these types of errors.

Mailings were addressed to persons who appeared most likely to be able to accurately respond. In addition, initial respondents were directed to forward the questionnaire to another individual if they did not think they were able to answer the questions. We also answered numerous questions over the telephone for respondents who needed clarification.

Throughout the process, a log of who responded was kept for two reasons. This was done to target the follow-up mailing to only those who had not responded. If more than one response from a subdivision was received, the duplicate was discarded.

Representativeness and Nonresponse

Another source of error comes from using a sample to represent the characteristics of a larger population. One way to minimize this error is to obtain as large a sample as possible. Generally, in a mailout survey, such as this, a response of 50 percent or higher is thought to be representative. The response rate of 54.5 percent indicates the sample accurately represents the population.

Disposition of Mailing and Responses

Table 1 shows the number of questionnaires mailed and returns by type of political subdivision. In total we mailed out 2050 questionnaires; 58 of which were undeliverable. There were 1063 usable responses and 41 unusable responses. This resulted in an overall response rate of 54.5 percent. Response rates varied by type of government, Natural Resource Districts and Educational Service Units returning the highest percentages. In terms of actual numbers, the most responses were received from school districts and cities and villages. The most disappointing returns were from counties, with just 37.8 percent responding.
Table 1
Disposition of Mailing and Responses

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Local Government</th>
<th>Mailed</th>
<th>Undeliverable</th>
<th>Unusable Response</th>
<th>Useable Response</th>
<th>Response Rate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City/Village</td>
<td>459</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>67.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>55.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District</td>
<td>639</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>318</td>
<td>53.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community College</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>57.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Service Unit</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>70.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>93</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>37.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>80</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>31.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Drainage District</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>29.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>52.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital/Health District</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>41.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Irrigation District</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>43.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Levee/Dike District</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>40.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural Resource District</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>73.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Reclamation District</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Power District</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>52.9%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Water District</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>35.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural and Suburban Fire District</td>
<td>210</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>48.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unknown</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>N/A</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>2050</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>54.5%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings

This report is structured around the questionnaire, with tables summarizing each of the questions. Data were collected and presented in three separate ways:

- Close-ended responses,
- Open-ended responses with responses combined into similar categories and coded, and
- Open-ended responses with responses reported verbatim.

Profile of Responding Local Governments

The summary tables and data contained in this section are based on responses from 10 categories of local governments. These categories are described in Table 2 below.

Table 2

Categories of Local Governments

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Description (where appropriate)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>This includes villages, towns, and cities of all population sizes that had an identifiable city clerk or manager/administrator. Omaha and Lincoln did not respond.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>This includes all school districts regardless of size or type, Educational Service Units, and Community Colleges. Only four Community Colleges responded so they are included. The majority of the responses from K-12 schools came from Class 3 schools. Responses were received from most of the Class 6 schools. Of the largest school districts, useable responses were received for all except Millard.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>We did not receive a response from Douglas County.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>This includes drainage districts, irrigation districts, levee-dike districts, natural resource districts, and reclamation districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>This includes both hospital and health districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>This includes both rural and suburban fire districts.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>This includes both public power districts and water districts.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Use and Adoption of Multi-Year Capital Budgets and Facility Plans

Respondents were asked if their political subdivision had a multi-year budget or capital facilities plan. Table 3 summarizes responses and shows that approximately one out of four (24.5%) local governments currently have a multi-year capital budget or facility plan.

Table 3
Use and Adoption of Multi-Year Capital Budget or Facility Plans

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Have Facility Plan</th>
<th>Plan Adopted</th>
<th>Available for Review</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Number</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>18.3</td>
<td>81.7</td>
<td>306</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>20.2</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>119</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>70.0</td>
<td>333</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>94.1</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>58.3</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>55.6</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>17.8</td>
<td>82.2</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>18.8</td>
<td>78.2</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>30.4</td>
<td>69.6</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>74.9</td>
<td>1,055</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of responding jurisdictions.

**Percentage of jurisdictions with capital budget/facility plan.

Other findings on the use of capital budget or facilities plans include the following:

- Airport Authorities, Housing Authorities and Hospitals are more likely than other local governments to have capital budget or facility plans;
- Municipalities, Counties, Resource Districts and Fire Districts are less likely to have capital budget or facility plans; and
- Almost all local governments with multi-year capital budget or facility plans have formally adopted the plan and made it available for public review.

Facility Spending During the Past Five Years

Jurisdictions were asked if they had completed any facilities construction since January 1, 1992. As indicated earlier, respondents were told that the term "facilities" includes things such as buildings, garages, landfills and airfields. Respondents were asked to exclude expenditures for construction of streets, roads, bridges and lighting. In
addition, expenditures reported for ADA compliance and maintenance and repairs were excluded from totals whenever possible.

Although data are not reported in the tables, 23.2 percent of all reporting political subdivisions had completed one or more facility construction projects since 1992. Hospitals (85.7%), Education (35.6%) and Airport Authorities (32.0%) were most likely to have completed one or more facilities construction projects during the 1992-1997 time period.

Table 4 summarizes total reported spending for facility construction completed since January 1, 1992. The total is $559.4 million, with Education accounting for 79.3 percent of the total reported spending for facility construction. Municipalities reported spending just over $81.9 million for facility projects (14.6% of the total).

### Table 4

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Construction Completed</th>
<th>Pct. Of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>$81,947,997</td>
<td>14.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>$20,000</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$443,608,485</td>
<td>79.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>$14,537,000</td>
<td>2.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>$1,919,778</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>$3,507,843</td>
<td>0.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>$1,679,963</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>$5,834,000</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>$638,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>$5,835,000</td>
<td>1.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>$559,428,066</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0%</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordination of Facilities Completed During the 1992-1997 Period

For each facility construction project completed during the 1992-1997 period, respondents were asked if the project was coordinated with another subdivision. If jurisdictions said, "No", they were asked if coordination was considered. Table 5 provides the facility construction project coordination information.
Table 5
Facility Construction Project Coordination: 1992-1997

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Was Project Coordinated With Another Subdivision</th>
<th>Was Coordination With Another Subdivision Considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>94.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>87.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses only for reporting jurisdictions that completed a facility construction project since January 1, 1992.
**Responses only for jurisdictions saying they had completed a facilities construction project during the 1992-1997 period but had not coordinated the project with another subdivision.

As can be seen, just slightly over one out of ten (12.9%) of the responding local governments had coordinated one or more of their completed facility construction projects with another political subdivision. Other findings include:

- Counties, Municipalities and Airport Authorities report coordination efforts above the average for all jurisdictions.
- Education, which accounted for just over 79 percent of the reported 1992-1997 facility construction expenditures, shows much below average coordination.

Among the jurisdictions reporting no coordination on facility construction projects, just 10.9 percent stated they considered coordination with another political subdivision. Municipalities (15.4%) and Resource Districts (33.3%) were somewhat more likely than average to report considering coordination.

Use of Construction Review Processes

Local political subdivisions who had completed one or more facility construction projects since January 1, 1992 were also asked if a construction review process had been used with any of the projects. As can be seen in Table 6, about one-quarter (26.0%) of the local governments completing a facility project had used a construction review process. Additional general findings include the following:
The preponderance of jurisdictions using a construction review process report that it was required; Airport Authorities and Housing Authorities are much more likely to report using a construction review process; Utilities and Municipalities are slightly more likely than the average local government to use a construction review process; and Education and Hospitals are less likely than average to use a review process.

Table 6

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Any Projects Use Construction Review Process</th>
<th>Was the Construction Review Required</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>31.6</td>
<td>65.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>16.9</td>
<td>81.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>83.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>66.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>26.0</td>
<td>72.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses only for reporting jurisdictions that completed a facility construction project since January 1, 1992.
**Responses only for reporting jurisdictions that completed a facility construction project since January 1, 1992 and who said at least one such project used a construction review process.

In addition, jurisdictions using a construction review process were asked who did the review, how long it took, what was the respondent's experience with the review, and what was included in the review. Detailed responses to those questions are provided in Attachment 2. Highlights include the following:

- Construction reviews were generally done (except for Education) for a higher level of government.
- Federal agencies frequently mentioned as requiring a facilities construction review were FMHA (by municipalities) and HUD (by housing authorities). State agencies frequently mentioned were Department of Environmental Quality (by Municipalities and Counties) and Department of Aeronautics (by Airport Authorities).
- Reviews ranged in length from one hour to eight and a half years. Two to six months was typical.
- Respondents’ experiences with construction review were mixed. Some characterized the review as “good,” “excellent,” or “very positive.” Other characterized it as “slow,” or “very frustrating.”
- Four of the six municipalities with projects requiring review by the Department of Environmental Quality described the process as slow, frustrating, or too long.

Facility Construction Projects Currently Underway or In Planning Process

Data are not shown in a table, but 15.4 percent of the respondents indicated their jurisdiction either had one or more facility construction projects underway or had projects in the planning process. Education (22.3%) and Municipalities (20.7%) were most likely to report they had projects underway or in the planning stage. The anticipated cost of these projects is summarized in Table 7. A total of $396.3 million in current or future projects was identified by 246 jurisdictions. Education subdivisions account for slightly over one-half (50.6%) of the total, and Municipalities account for 24.6 percent.

Table 7

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Construction Planned/Underway</th>
<th>Pct. Of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>$97,780,285</td>
<td>24.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>$0</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>$200,875,011</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>$26,856,000</td>
<td>6.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>$58,518,000</td>
<td>14.7%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>$9,669,721</td>
<td>2.4%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>$724,000</td>
<td>0.2%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>$1,140,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>$290,000</td>
<td>0.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>$1,000,000</td>
<td>0.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>$396,853,017</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Coordination of Current and Future Facility Construction Projects

As with projects completed since January 1, 1992, political subdivisions were asked to indicate if the facility construction projects currently underway or in the planning stages were coordinated with another subdivision (see Table 8). Overall, the
jurisdictions are more likely to report that current/planned facility construction projects are coordinated with another political subdivision (21.8% for current/planned vs. 12.9% for projects completed during 1992-1997).

Table 8
Facility Construction Project Coordination: Current and Future Projects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Is Project Coordinated With Another Subdivision</th>
<th>Has Coordination With Another Subdivision Been Considered</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes*</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>18.9</td>
<td>81.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>19.8</td>
<td>80.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>57.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.8</td>
<td>78.2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Responses only for reporting jurisdictions with projects planned or underway.
**Responses only for jurisdictions saying they were not coordinating the current or future project with another jurisdiction.

Other findings include the following:

- Among Education, Airport Authorities and Housing Authorities, coordination with other political subdivisions is higher for current and planned projects than for those completed since 1992.
- Just over one-fifth (20.5%) of the jurisdictions reporting they are not coordinating with other political subdivisions say they considered coordination. This is up from 10.9 percent for 1992-1997 facility construction projects. Municipalities and Education are notable for their increases.

Cooperation in the Operation of Public Facilities

Each local political subdivision was asked if it currently operates any public facilities with other subdivisions. Overall, just over fourteen percent (14.5%) of the local governments responding to the survey say they currently operate public facilities with other political subdivisions (see Table 9).
Table 9
Cooperation in Operation of Public Facilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Yes%</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Number</th>
<th>Type of Joint Facility Arrangement**</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Jr. Comm.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>13.6</td>
<td>83.5</td>
<td>309</td>
<td>40.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>96.7</td>
<td>122</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>79.0</td>
<td>334</td>
<td>22.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>73.5</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>84.0</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>90.5</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>88.9</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>29.7</td>
<td>69.3</td>
<td>101</td>
<td>32.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>95.7</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>14.5</td>
<td>82.9</td>
<td>1063</td>
<td>27.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of reporting jurisdictions.

**Responses only for jurisdictions saying they currently operate public facilities with other jurisdictions.

Counties and Fire Districts are most likely to be involved in jointly operated facilities. Respondents involved in jointly operated facilities were asked to specify the type of operation—joint commission, lease, or another arrangement. Joint building commissions tend to be used most by Counties; Airport and Housing Authorities tend to use "lease" arrangements; Education subdivisions tend to use "other" arrangements; and Municipalities and Fire Districts tend to use both joint building "commissions" and "other" arrangements.

Local governments who said they operated public facilities jointly with another political subdivision were also asked to specify the facility, other governmental partner(s), and the year the partnership began. Detailed responses to these questions are shown in Attachment 3. Municipalities, Education, and Fire Districts reported most jointly operated facilities. Recreational facilities, landfills, and fire halls were among the most frequently mentioned types of shared facilities.

Evaluation of Facility Construction Cooperation

The final section of the survey asked respondents several questions that were evaluative in nature, and intended to tap respondent's perceptions and attitudes. Two items focused on things that hinder and facilitate cooperation in the construction of new facilities. Two items focused on the advantages and disadvantages of jointly operated public facilities.
Things That Hinder Cooperation in Facility Construction

Respondents were asked if anything hinders cooperation among local government subdivisions in the construction of new facilities. Table 10 reports answers to this question. As can be seen, most respondents either said "No" (40.8%) or "Don't Know" (40.6%).

Table 10

Anything Hinder Cooperation Among Local Governments in Construction of New Facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Yes</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>17.2</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>43.4</td>
<td>51.6</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>38.1</td>
<td>33.6</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>28.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>12.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>49.2</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>15.6</td>
<td>37.8</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>71.4</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>12.9</td>
<td>38.6</td>
<td>48.5</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>21.7</td>
<td>26.1</td>
<td>52.2</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>18.6</td>
<td>40.8</td>
<td>40.6</td>
<td>1063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of reporting jurisdictions.

Overall, 18.6 percent of those responding said "Yes," there are things that hinder cooperation. Respondents from Education, Counties and Airport Authorities were most likely to say "Yes." All respondents saying, "Yes" were asked to explain. These open-end responses were reviewed and coded into several categories. Table 11 summarizes this information. The tables that summarize the open-ended questions all are constructed in a similar manner. The most common response for all respondents is shown in the first column. The remaining columns are in descending rank from left to right.
Table 11
Detailed Explanation of What Hinders Cooperation Among Local Governments in Construction of New Facilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Turf protection, local control</th>
<th>Finances, cost, who pays for what</th>
<th>State government review, requirements, red tape</th>
<th>Distance</th>
<th>Deciding who controls, lack of common need, different requirements</th>
<th>Lack of buy-in</th>
<th>Personnel, ego, mistrust</th>
<th>Serving public, selecting site</th>
<th>Tradition</th>
<th>Public opinion, harm</th>
<th>Lack of incentives</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>19.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>52</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td>10.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>96</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>21.6</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>11.6</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>199</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of reporting jurisdictions.

☐ The most often mentioned explanation of what hinders cooperation is turf protection and local control, as 21.6 percent of the respondents mentioned this.

☐ Finances, cost, and who pays for what (12.6 percent), state government review, requirements, and red tape (11.6 percent), and distance (11.6) follow this.

☐ Turf protection is the most mentioned response for Municipalities, but the second most mentioned response is distance.

☐ For education, turf protection also is the most mentioned item, but Education is concerned about deciding who controls and lack of common need and different requirements.

Things That Facilitate Cooperation in Facility Construction

Next, the survey asked respondents if anything facilitates cooperation. Table 12 summarizes the responses. As can be seen, a larger proportion of respondents said, "Yes" to the item on facilitation than was the case for the item on barriers. At the same time, an even larger proportion of respondents is unsure if anything facilitates cooperation (54.9% saying, "Don't Know"). Education, Counties and Airport Authorities were more likely than other local governments to say there are things that facilitate cooperation.
Table 12

Anything Facilitate Cooperation Among Local Governments in Construction of New Facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Anything Facilitate Cooperation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>16.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>4.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>11.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>10.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>8.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of reporting jurisdictions.

Once again respondents saying, "Yes" to the item on facilitation were asked to explain their answer. Table 13 provides detail on the coded response categories.
Detailed Explanation of What Facilitates Cooperation among Local Governments in Construction of New Facilities

*Percentage of reporting jurisdictions.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Tax Savings/Spread Cost</th>
<th>Define Common Goals</th>
<th>Tax Legislation</th>
<th>Law of Interlocal Agreements</th>
<th>Community/Citizen Involvement</th>
<th>Local Authority Assistance</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Number of Respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>22.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>10.2</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>29.5</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>12.8</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>10.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>2.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>40.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>57.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>30.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.2</td>
<td>22.5</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Reasons that are thought to facilitate cooperation among local governments are:

- tax savings and spread cost (27.2 percent),
- define common goals and leadership (22.5 percent), and
- communication and joint meetings (21.3 percent).

Again these explanations vary among the types of government.

- Although Municipalities rank the three previously mentioned reasons highly, 10.2 percent mentioned the law on interlocal agreements.
- For Education, tax lids and state legislation (14.1 percent) and community/citizen involvement (10.3 percent) are relatively important factors.
Advantages of Joint Operation of Public Facilities

The next survey item asked if the respondent felt there were advantages to the joint operation of public facilities. Almost one-half (46.4%) of the respondents could identify advantages in the joint operation of public facilities (see Table 14). Counties (61.8%) and Education (61.4%) were most likely to say "Yes." The proportion saying, "Don't Know" is quite high, with 35.1 percent selecting this response choice.

Table 14

| Local Government | See Advantages |  |
|------------------|----------------|
|                  | Yes* | No | Don't Know | Total |
| Municipality     | 43.7 | 16.8 | 39.5 | 309 |
| Township         | 22.1 | 36.9 | 41.0 | 122 |
| Education        | 61.4 | 12.6 | 26.0 | 334 |
| County           | 61.8 | 11.8 | 26.5 | 34  |
| Airport Authority| 48.0 | 24.0 | 28.0 | 25  |
| Housing Authority| 30.2 | 22.2 | 47.6 | 63  |
| Resource District| 35.6 | 17.8 | 46.7 | 45  |
| Hospital         | 14.3 | 14.3 | 71.4 | 7   |
| Fire District    | 44.6 | 21.8 | 33.7 | 101 |
| Utility District | 52.2 | 13.0 | 34.8 | 23  |
| Total            | 46.4 | 18.5 | 35.1 | 1063|

*Percentage of reporting jurisdictions.

Respondents saying, "Yes" were asked to explain. As with previous questions, responses to this open-end question were coded into several categories. Table 15 summarizes the advantages listed by respondents. These include:

- Local governments overwhelmingly indicate that the most important advantage in joint operation of public facilities is lower costs and sharing costs (59.4 percent). Another 15.8 percent mentioned more complete use of facilities and better access.
- Almost three-fourths of Municipalities mentioned lower costs. On the other hand, about half of Education respondents mentioned this reason.
- Education also indicated that the ability to share programs and eliminate duplication is an important advantage in the joint operation of public facilities.
Table 15

Detailed Explanation of Advantages in Joint Operation of Public Facilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Lower taxes, share</th>
<th>More complete use of facilities, better access</th>
<th>Share programs, eliminate duplication</th>
<th>Lower taxes, fees, etc.</th>
<th>Better facilities than alone</th>
<th>Leads to cooperation in other areas</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>72.1</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>61.9</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>50.3</td>
<td>23.1</td>
<td>13.8</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>195</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>46.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>13.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>73.3</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>55.0</td>
<td>17.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>10.0</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>59.4</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>9.6</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>448</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Percentage of reporting jurisdictions.

Disadvantages of Joint Operation of Public Facilities

The final evaluative item dealt with the disadvantages of joint public facilities. As can be seen in Table 16, approximately one-third (32.8%) of the respondents said, "Yes." This is somewhat lower than the proportion saying, "Yes" to the item on advantages.

Education subdivisions were much more likely than other local jurisdictions to say, "Yes" there are disadvantages (50.3% vs. 32.8% total).
Table 16

Any Disadvantages in Joint Operation of Public Facilities?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>See Disadvantages</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Yes*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>29.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>15.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>50.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>36.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>20.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>22.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>34.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>32.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of reporting jurisdictions.

The coded responses of those saying "Yes" are summarized in Table 17. More than 10 percent of respondents mentioned one of three disadvantages in the joint operation of public facilities. They are:

- loss of local control, management, and decision making (27.1 percent),
- deciding who pays and allocating costs (19.5 percent), and
- scheduling/coordinating programs and users (17.6 percent).

Education is much more likely to be concerned with scheduling/coordinating than municipalities. The distance of each unit becomes important for Municipalities, as 17.6 percent mentioned this reason.
Table 17

Detailed Explanation of Disadvantages in Joint Operation of Public Facilities*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Loss of local control over management, decision making</th>
<th>Poorer service due to less economic incentive</th>
<th>Scheduling, prioritization, programs and user preferences</th>
<th>Budget cuts, change in priorities</th>
<th>Damage to service facility, loss of identification</th>
<th>Location, site of facility, loss of identification</th>
<th>Fewer local employees</th>
<th>Requires that people change</th>
<th>Other</th>
<th>Number of respondents</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>85</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>11.1 18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>19.4</td>
<td>26.3</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>5.0 160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>33.3 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>33.3</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>16.7</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>8.3</td>
<td>8.3 12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>22.2 9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0 1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>19.0</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0 21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>42.9</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>14.3 7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27.1</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>8.5</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>2.7</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>6.7 329</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of reporting jurisdictions.

Awareness of Joint Public Facilities in Respondent's County

The final question of the survey asked if respondents knew of additional examples of joint public facilities operated in their county (beyond those the respondent's local government was involved in). The purpose of this question was to identify examples of jointly-operated facilities that otherwise would have been missed because the participating jurisdictions did not respond to the survey. Table 18 shows that few respondents (6.9%) are aware of joint facilities other than those involving their own jurisdiction. Counties have the highest level of awareness (20.6%).
Are There Examples of Joint Public Facilities in Your County?

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Yes*</th>
<th>No</th>
<th>Don't Know</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td>8.4</td>
<td>26.9</td>
<td>64.7</td>
<td>309</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>27.9</td>
<td>69.7</td>
<td>122</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>18.0</td>
<td>75.4</td>
<td>334</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td>20.6</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td>8.0</td>
<td>32.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td>9.5</td>
<td>23.8</td>
<td>66.7</td>
<td>63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>11.1</td>
<td>86.7</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>85.7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td>4.0</td>
<td>15.8</td>
<td>80.2</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Utility District</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>87.0</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>22.7</td>
<td>70.4</td>
<td>1063</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Percentage of reporting jurisdictions.

Respondents aware of other jointly-operated public facilities in their county were asked to identify the facility, the political subdivisions involved, and whether there was a formal written agreement. Results are displayed in Attachment 4. Notable examples of jointly-operated facilities mentioned by others, but not by participating jurisdictions themselves due to non-response, are the Omaha City/County Building and 911 Center.
ATTACHMENT 1
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ATTACHMENT 4

Other Examples of Joint Public Facilities in Respondent’s County
ATTACHMENT 1

Questionnaire
**Survey Regarding Nebraska’s Public Facilities Construction Review Process**

Name of political subdivision: ____________________________________________________________

County in which subdivision is located: ____________________________________________________

Name, title, phone number, and fax number of person completing this survey

Name: ______________________________________________________________________________

Title: ______________________________________________________________________________

Phone: (_____) ___________________________ Fax: (_____) _____________________________

**IMPORTANT—READ FIRST:** Throughout this survey the term “facilities” includes things such as buildings, garages, landfills, and airfields. It does not include streets, roads, bridges, or lighting.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>T1. Does your township own or share the use of any:</th>
<th>(circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>building(s)?</td>
<td>Yes 1  No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>garage(s)?</td>
<td>Yes 1  No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>landfill(s)?</td>
<td>Yes 1  No 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1. Does your political subdivision have a multiyear capital budget or capital facilities plan?

☐ 2 No
☐ 1 Yes  If yes,

Has this plan been formally adopted by your governing board?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
☐ 9 Don’t know

Is the plan available for public review?

☐ 1 Yes
☐ 2 No
☐ 9 Don’t know
2. Has your political subdivision completed any facilities construction since January 1, 1992?
  - [ ] Yes  If yes, please complete the following for each project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Project</th>
<th>Date Project Completed</th>
<th>Dollar Amount of Project</th>
<th>Was project coordinated with another subdivision? (circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1  No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1  No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1  No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1  No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1  No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1  No 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Did any of the projects you listed for Question 2 above use a construction review process?
  - [ ] Yes  For the most recently completed project which used a construction review process, please answer questions 3a-3e below.

3a. Was the review required?
  - [ ] Yes  If yes, who required it?
  - [ ] No
  - [ ] Don't know

3b. Who did the review?

3c. How long did the review process take?

3d. What was your experience with the review?

3e. What was included in the review?
4. Does your political subdivision currently have any facilities construction projects underway or in the planning process?
- ☐ No  (Skip to Question 5)
- ☐ Yes  If yes, please complete the following for each project:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Type of Project</th>
<th>Anticipated Project Completion Date</th>
<th>Dollar Amount of Project</th>
<th>Is project coordinated with another subdivision? (circle one)</th>
<th>IF NO, has coordination with another subdivision been considered? (circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1 No 2</td>
<td>Yes 1 No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1 No 2</td>
<td>Yes 1 No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1 No 2</td>
<td>Yes 1 No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1 No 2</td>
<td>Yes 1 No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1 No 2</td>
<td>Yes 1 No 2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Yes 1 No 2</td>
<td>Yes 1 No 2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

5. Do you currently operate any public facilities in conjunction with any other political subdivision?
- ☐ No  (Skip to Question 6)
- ☐ Yes  If yes, please complete the following for each public facility:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Other Governmental Partner(s)</th>
<th>Year Partnership Began</th>
<th>Type of Operation (circle one)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>a.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>b.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>c.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>d.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>e.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>f.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1 2 3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6. Do other political subdivisions in your county use a construction planning review process?
- ☐ Yes  If yes, which subdivisions? _________________________________________________________
- ☐ No
- ☐ Don't know
7. Is there anything that hinders cooperation among local government subdivisions in construction of new facilities?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know

8. Is there anything that facilitates cooperation among local government subdivisions in construction of new facilities?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know

9. Do you see any advantages in the joint operation of public facilities?
   - Yes
   - No
   - Don’t know

10. Do you see any disadvantages in the joint operation of public facilities?
     - Yes
     - No
     - Don’t know

11. Other than facilities mentioned in question 5, are there any other examples of joint public facilities in your county?
     - No
     - Don’t know
     - Yes

     If yes, please complete the following for each jointly-operated public facility:

     | Facility | Political Subdivisions Involved |
     |----------|--------------------------------|
     | a.       |                                |
     | b.       |                                |
     | c.       |                                |
     | d.       |                                |

     Is there a formal written agreement? (circle one)
     - Yes 1
     - No 2
     - Yes 1
     - No 2
     - Yes 1
     - No 2
     - Yes 1
     - No 2

Thank you for your time and assistance. Please return this questionnaire to:

University of Nebraska at Omaha
Center for Public Affairs Research
6001 Dodge Street
Omaha, NE 68182-0059

A postage-free envelope is enclosed.
Or fax the questionnaire to us at (402) 595-2366.
If there are questions regarding this survey, call us at (402) 595-2311.
ATTACHMENT 2

Construction Review Processes Used By Local Governments
OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES ABOUT MOST RECENTLY COMPLETED PROJECT USING A CONSTRUCTION REVIEW PROCESS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Municipality</th>
<th>If review was required, who required it?</th>
<th>Who did the review?</th>
<th>How long did the review process take?</th>
<th>What was your experience with the review?</th>
<th>What was included in the review?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Dept of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>Wells Engineering</td>
<td>six months</td>
<td>slow, but not as bad as one now doing for EPA</td>
<td>everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>USDA</td>
<td>USDA and state Department of Health, state Fire Marshall</td>
<td>from start to finish</td>
<td>just kept track of reports - some things made project more costly</td>
<td>continuous meetings with contractors and engineers, USDA, fire marshal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>DEQ</td>
<td>Olsson Associates</td>
<td>too long</td>
<td>too long</td>
<td>feasibility studies soil samplings, water monitoring, public hearings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>don't know if review was required</td>
<td>utility superintendent</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>FMHA</td>
<td>Bob Prohaska and Arlo Inman</td>
<td>ninety days</td>
<td>timing</td>
<td>construction specs/ fire safety requirements/ physical layout</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>review not required</td>
<td>city engineer</td>
<td>length of project</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>inspection of contractor's work by engineering staff</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>FMHA and CDBG</td>
<td>FMHA, CDBG, and the village</td>
<td>one year</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>all areas of construction throughout the entire project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>review not required</td>
<td>admin staff dev. services dept. all utilities etc.</td>
<td>three hours</td>
<td>helpful for coordination purposes</td>
<td>cost, utilities, plan review, constr. people etc.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Facilities Survey—Question 3
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>If review was required, who required it?</th>
<th>Who did the review?</th>
<th>How long did the review process take?</th>
<th>What was your experience with the review?</th>
<th>What was included in the review?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9 don't know if review was required</td>
<td>State Fire Marshall and state forestry, rural fire district</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>growth</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 NE Dept of Aeronautics</td>
<td>TC Engineering of North Platte</td>
<td>ongoing throughout and at the end of project</td>
<td>none - just did accounts payable, etc.</td>
<td>if everything was in compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 Nebraska Dept of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>Nebraska Dept of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>siting and licensing of new landfill - 16 months</td>
<td>very frustrating</td>
<td>everything</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 city council</td>
<td>city staff, city council, utilities and public properties committee</td>
<td>four months</td>
<td>lead to successful project</td>
<td>review of preliminary and final construction plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 the village</td>
<td>Johnson Erickson O'Brien</td>
<td>the whole project lasted two months</td>
<td>nil</td>
<td>don't know - various steps along the way, the engineers were checking on it constantly</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 Dept of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>Dept of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>ten days</td>
<td>very good</td>
<td>plans and specs were submitted for their review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 city</td>
<td>Tagge Eng.</td>
<td>throughout project</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>completed construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 Dept of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>Dept of Environmental Quality/ Power Review Board</td>
<td>eight to nine months (too long)</td>
<td>too long</td>
<td>determination of what type of generating permit to issue us and the height of the stacks were the main issues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If review was required, who required it?</td>
<td>Who did the review?</td>
<td>How long did the review process take?</td>
<td>What was your experience with the review?</td>
<td>What was included in the review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 CBDG grant funds used</td>
<td>engineers and village maintenance and contractor</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Dept of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>Dept of Environmental Quality</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 don't know if review was required</td>
<td>project manager (architect) with city representation</td>
<td>throughout the project</td>
<td>review by city</td>
<td>contractors meetings, meetings with city representatives</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20 city council with board and contractor</td>
<td>city council with board and contractor</td>
<td>two months on final review</td>
<td>hard for both groups to agree</td>
<td>all aspects of construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21 city's engineering firm - Olsson Associates</td>
<td>city staff and engineer</td>
<td>one day each month during construction</td>
<td>good communications with contractor and better understanding of project</td>
<td>everything except finances</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22 review not required</td>
<td>city council</td>
<td>two months</td>
<td>part of city council</td>
<td>all plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23 review not required</td>
<td>city council</td>
<td>don't know - a prior administrator was responsible</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24 FMHA</td>
<td>FMHA, Roger Meeks</td>
<td>one hour</td>
<td>none</td>
<td>government compliance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If review was required, who required it?</td>
<td>Who did the review?</td>
<td>How long did the review process take?</td>
<td>What was your experience with the review?</td>
<td>What was included in the review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 review not required</td>
<td>school board committee</td>
<td>six months</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>layout of building, type of materials, location</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 school board</td>
<td>architects</td>
<td>six months</td>
<td>part of school district personnel</td>
<td>meetings, paperwork, reports, analysis</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 review not required</td>
<td>architectural firm, board of education</td>
<td>six months</td>
<td>it was good information</td>
<td>cost estimates, ages of equipment, inefficiencies, cost savings projections</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 the board of education, community, and architect reviewed the project</td>
<td>the board of education, community, school officials, and architect</td>
<td>two years</td>
<td>very thorough</td>
<td>a clear understanding of what facilities were needed by the community for middle school students</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 school board</td>
<td>school board</td>
<td>four hours</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>all areas of construction and costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 review not required</td>
<td>board of education, administration, architect</td>
<td>two years</td>
<td>we went through 22+ plans and ideas--very tedious</td>
<td>costs, current needs, long-term future needs (enrollments, curriculum, society, educational trends), long-term use and downsizing/economizing campuses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 review not required</td>
<td>architectural firm</td>
<td>eighteen months</td>
<td>excellent</td>
<td>needs assessment and community input</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 {no answer}</td>
<td>architects, engineers, staff members, board of education</td>
<td>three months</td>
<td>very positive</td>
<td>what were our school district needs, cost, how would this fit into future construction projects</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 in contract with architect partnership</td>
<td>architectural partnership</td>
<td>will take a total of three months minimum</td>
<td>crucial to quality control and owner concerns</td>
<td>architects, general contractor, owner</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If review was required, who required it?</td>
<td>Who did the review?</td>
<td>How long did the review process take?</td>
<td>What was your experience with the review?</td>
<td>What was included in the review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10 county planning office</td>
<td>county commissioners</td>
<td>just a couple of days</td>
<td>no problems</td>
<td>complete set of plans and reasons/needs for the project</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 don't know if review was required</td>
<td>architectural firm, staff, and community members</td>
<td>up to six months</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12 review not required</td>
<td>internal staff and outside firm</td>
<td>ongoing during design</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>internal maintenance staff reviews bldg. systems for serviceability, cost of repair. Outside firm was hired to review cost estimates for budget restrictions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 Southeast Nebraska distance learning consortium</td>
<td>a team of experts from Broadband Networks, Inc., and Galaxy Cable</td>
<td>three hours</td>
<td>frustration with the changes that had not been presented before</td>
<td>plans, alterations, change orders</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14 board members, contractors</td>
<td>board members, contractors</td>
<td>two months</td>
<td>determined what was needed</td>
<td>plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15 state law - expenditures of $40,000+ must have engineer or architect</td>
<td>Olssen Associates</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16 board of education</td>
<td>building committee</td>
<td>eight weeks</td>
<td>superintendent</td>
<td>yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 school board</td>
<td>patrons of District Three</td>
<td>one hour</td>
<td>fine</td>
<td>discussed the plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If review was required, who required it?</td>
<td>Who did the review?</td>
<td>How long did the review process take?</td>
<td>What was your experience with the review?</td>
<td>What was included in the review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18 Nebraska Coordinating Commission for Postsecondary Education</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>two months</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If review was required, who required it?</td>
<td>Who did the review?</td>
<td>How long did the review process take?</td>
<td>What was your experience with the review?</td>
<td>What was included in the review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>County</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 Dept of Health</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>several months</td>
<td>not necessary</td>
<td>mostly needs - whether we need to expand or not. Our own architect was completely knowledgeable and didn't need the oversight</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 DEQ</td>
<td>don't know</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>everything went all right</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 review not required</td>
<td>engineer and local airport authority</td>
<td>one day</td>
<td>helpful for future work</td>
<td>construction review</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 NE Dept of Aeronautics</td>
<td>NE Dept of Aeronautics - need info for no-interest loan</td>
<td>several months</td>
<td>no problems</td>
<td>building plans and cost and location, etc.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 NE Dept of Aeronautics</td>
<td>state airport authority</td>
<td>eight and a half years</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>complete feasibility study</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Federal Aviation Administration</td>
<td>consultant hired by Omaha Airport Authority</td>
<td>seven months</td>
<td>identified total project</td>
<td>formal environmental assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If review was required, who required it?</td>
<td>Who did the review?</td>
<td>How long did the review process take?</td>
<td>What was your experience with the review?</td>
<td>What was included in the review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 HUD</td>
<td>Corps of Engineers for Dept of HUD</td>
<td>one half day</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>visual inspection of construction and files</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 Department of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>approximately one hour</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>examination of records and building inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 housing authority of Tilden, NE and JEO and Associates of Wahoo, NE architects</td>
<td>JEO and Associates architects</td>
<td>construction and review 6 months</td>
<td>should have been more detailed</td>
<td>overseeing construction phase of project through completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 Dept of Housing and Urban Development</td>
<td>Army Corps of Engineers</td>
<td>periodic visits over construction period</td>
<td>satisfactory</td>
<td>site inspection - interview</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 HUD</td>
<td>director and HUD</td>
<td>one day</td>
<td>okay</td>
<td>specifications for the building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6 consulting engineers</td>
<td>consulting engineers - Baker and Associates</td>
<td>it was done on several intervals</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>complete inspection</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7 US Dept of HUD</td>
<td>Omaha HUD</td>
<td>months</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>needs assessment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 HUD</td>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>one hour</td>
<td>positive</td>
<td>reviewing floor plans - moneys spent - overall construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 architectural/ engineer and city</td>
<td>architectural/ engineer and city inspections</td>
<td>three to five review inspections</td>
<td>good</td>
<td>each had CABO code that must be met</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>If review was required, who required it?</td>
<td>Who did the review?</td>
<td>How long did the review process take?</td>
<td>What was your experience with the review?</td>
<td>What was included in the review?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>thirty days</td>
<td>OK</td>
<td>approval, estimates, construction, completion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hospital</td>
<td>Dept of Health</td>
<td>Rod Laucome</td>
<td>ten months</td>
<td>frustration, but in the end Rod accepted a study done by a structural engineer that the hospital hired</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>review not required</td>
<td>Scheadegger Engineering</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>excellent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>review not required</td>
<td>Rich Waters, general manager; Deke Dietrich, operations manager</td>
<td>projects were reviewed as work progressed</td>
<td>we do this on all projects</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 3

Current Public Facilities Operated In Conjunction with Other Political Subdivisions
OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES TO "DO YOU CURRENTLY OPERATE ANY PUBLIC FACILITIES IN CONJUNCTION WITH ANY OTHER POLITICAL SUBDIVISION?"

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Other governmental partner(s)</th>
<th>Year partnership began</th>
<th>Type of operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>City of Atkinson</td>
<td>joint airport authority</td>
<td>Village of Stuart</td>
<td>1981</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Gothenburg</td>
<td>landfill agency</td>
<td>Forty other communities</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>agency</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Dakota City</td>
<td>school playground</td>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Halsey</td>
<td>fire house</td>
<td>Halsey Rural Fire District</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Arcadia</td>
<td>fire barn</td>
<td>Arcadia Rural Fire Department</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>gentlemen's agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Burwell</td>
<td>landfill</td>
<td>Four counties, eighteen municipalities</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fire building</td>
<td>Rural fire board</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Ansley</td>
<td>fire hall</td>
<td>Rural fire district</td>
<td>1955</td>
<td>shared expenses - projects considered by each board</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Overton</td>
<td>ball field areas</td>
<td>School district</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Arthur</td>
<td>swimming pool</td>
<td>County</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ponca</td>
<td>ball park</td>
<td>School</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Chambers</td>
<td>recycling building</td>
<td>City of Neligh - Recycling</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Albion</td>
<td>fire department</td>
<td>Rural fire board</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>joint funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fort Calhoun</td>
<td>fire department</td>
<td>rural fire district</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Chadron</td>
<td>fire hall</td>
<td>city/county</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Alliance</td>
<td>regional law enforcement center</td>
<td>Box Butte County</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>the city doesn't pay rent but shares the cost of utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Creighton</td>
<td>hospital/care center</td>
<td>hospital board</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Elkhorn</td>
<td>fire department</td>
<td>Elkhorn Suburban District</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>intergovernmental contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of South Sioux City</td>
<td>sewer treatment</td>
<td>Sioux City</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>park</td>
<td>South Sioux City school</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school bus parking</td>
<td>South Sioux City school</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fire station</td>
<td>South Sioux City school</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Odell</td>
<td>Butler County landfill</td>
<td>a number of communities</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>we contract with garbage hauler who contracts with them, I think</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hooper</td>
<td>maintenance building</td>
<td>city, county, township</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>each paid one-third cost of construction</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td>landfill</td>
<td>Northeast Solid Waste Coalition</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Grafton</td>
<td>J.R. Veach School/Center</td>
<td>school district</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Norfolk</td>
<td>regional landfill</td>
<td>five counties, three first-class cities, five cities, eleven villages</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>interlocal cooperative agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>city council chambers</td>
<td>city, county, school district</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>joint use of facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Blair</td>
<td>city hall</td>
<td>Washington County Planning Department</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>free use of space to better serve the public</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fire hall</td>
<td>Blair Rural Fire District</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>informal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Seward</td>
<td>communications center</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stromsburg</td>
<td>Polk County senior services</td>
<td>Polk County and Lincoln Area Agency on Aging</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>city provides building and fiscal services, county provides some funding, area agency on aging provides funding</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Waterloo</td>
<td>fire station</td>
<td>rural fire district</td>
<td>(no answer)</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Wolbach</td>
<td>landfill</td>
<td>five-county area</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of McCook</td>
<td>city jail</td>
<td>Red Willow County</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kearney</td>
<td>law enforcement center</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>cost sharing agreements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>landfill</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Imperial</td>
<td>solid waste transfer station</td>
<td>Chase County</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hartington</td>
<td>transfer station/recycling center</td>
<td>county</td>
<td>(no answer)</td>
<td>just verbal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Hayes Center</td>
<td>village office</td>
<td>Hayes Center library</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Ewing</td>
<td>fire department</td>
<td>rural fire protection district</td>
<td>(no answer)</td>
<td>share expenses on equipment, village supplies building</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of David City</td>
<td>communication center</td>
<td>Butler County</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>share dispatching services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Coleridge</td>
<td>current fire hall</td>
<td>rural fire department</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Curtis</td>
<td>landfill</td>
<td>forty-nine cities and counties</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Harrison</td>
<td>airport (municipal)</td>
<td>Sioux County</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of DeWitt</td>
<td>landfill</td>
<td>several counties</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Kimball</td>
<td>city/county park and recreation facility</td>
<td>Kimball County</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Schuyler</td>
<td>fire station</td>
<td>rural fire district</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>lease purchase fifty percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Venango</td>
<td>fire house</td>
<td>Venango rural fire</td>
<td>1947</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Douglas Grove</td>
<td>cemetery</td>
<td>cemetery board</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>informal</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ewing Township</td>
<td>library</td>
<td>township only - Ewing</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cotterell</td>
<td>maintenance shed</td>
<td>Union Township</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Education</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Auburn Public</td>
<td>softball diamonds</td>
<td>City of Auburn</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carleton</td>
<td>gym</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>City owns building; school district has up keep for use of building.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public School</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebron Public</td>
<td>football field</td>
<td>City of Hebron</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>informal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>baseball fields</td>
<td>City of Hebron</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>informal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bruning</td>
<td>sports complex</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>City owns property; school maintains facility and pays for upkeep.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>South Sioux City</td>
<td>technology center</td>
<td>South Sioux City</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Community Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Plattsmouth</td>
<td>central school</td>
<td>head start</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chester-Hubbell-Byron Public Schools</td>
<td>athletic field</td>
<td>Chester village</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>written agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lyons-Decatur Northeast Schools</td>
<td>previous band room</td>
<td>health clinic</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>West Holt High School</td>
<td>kitchen and lunchroom weight room long distance learning classroom</td>
<td>Atkinson Elementary and Junior High community community</td>
<td>1985</td>
<td>contract</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hartington Public School</td>
<td>park facilities</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>{No answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wheeler Central Public Schools</td>
<td>athletic field</td>
<td>Wheeler County</td>
<td>{No answer}</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bennington Public Schools</td>
<td>baseball and softball fields</td>
<td>City of Bennington</td>
<td>{No answer}</td>
<td>meet once a year with boards</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Columbus Public Schools</td>
<td>warehouse</td>
<td>ESU number 7</td>
<td>{No answer}</td>
<td>exchange of services</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ansley Public Schools</td>
<td>football field</td>
<td>Village of Ansley</td>
<td>{No answer}</td>
<td>pay rent and upkeep</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bancroft-Rosalie Community School</td>
<td>football complex</td>
<td>Village of Bancroft</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>free use/share expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Geneva Public Schools</td>
<td>classroom and gym</td>
<td>City of Geneva</td>
<td>{No answer}</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutton Public Schools</td>
<td>football field</td>
<td>City of Sutton</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school theater</td>
<td>community organization</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school gyms</td>
<td>community organization</td>
<td>1964</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>some school</td>
<td>Central Community College</td>
<td>1978</td>
<td>no charge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>classrooms</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Laurel-Concord Public</td>
<td>fitness center</td>
<td>City of Laurel, Laurel and Concord Booster Club</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schools</td>
<td>recreation center</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>rent per student</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ogallala Public Schools</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nelson Community School</td>
<td>athletic fields</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer Public School</td>
<td>fall fields</td>
<td>village</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>library</td>
<td>village</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>district funds 99.5 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>old gym</td>
<td>community</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>district funds 100 percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Howells Public Schools</td>
<td>football field</td>
<td>Village of Howells</td>
<td>1962</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynot Public Schools</td>
<td>local ball diamond</td>
<td>village</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>we share upkeep expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tennis court</td>
<td>village</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stratton Public Schools</td>
<td>VM hall</td>
<td>Village of Stratton</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue Hill Public Schools</td>
<td>community center</td>
<td>Village of Blue Hill</td>
<td>1988</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>(gym)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>McCook Public Schools</td>
<td>all facilities</td>
<td>YMCA</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>no charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>softball fields</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>no charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>tennis courts</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>no charges</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hildreth Public School</td>
<td>swimming pool</td>
<td>Village of Hildreth</td>
<td>1979</td>
<td>school district owns facility and village maintains and operates</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Newman Grove Public Schools</td>
<td>athletic field</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school gym, school auditorium and kitchen areas</td>
<td>city</td>
<td></td>
<td>board policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cedar Bluffs Public Schools</td>
<td>community auditorium</td>
<td>Village of Cedar Bluffs</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>daily use fee</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Prague Public Schools</td>
<td>ball diamonds</td>
<td>village</td>
<td>1967</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grafton Public School</td>
<td>school building</td>
<td>Village of Grafton</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chase County High School</td>
<td>complete school facilities</td>
<td>Imperial grade/Chase County high school</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>interlocal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Weeping Water Public Schools</td>
<td>baseball field/football field</td>
<td>City of Weeping Water</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>upkeep shared equally</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Bow Public School</td>
<td>distance learning system</td>
<td>several public schools</td>
<td>1990</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>special education cooperative</td>
<td>several public schools</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha Public Schools</td>
<td>elementary school with pool</td>
<td>City of Omaha</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>City built and operates pool on school property; school uses it for classes and provides utilities and locker rooms.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>elementary school with social services various schools</td>
<td>city agency</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>city building, school provides land and utilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>City of Omaha</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>Parks are built next to schools allowing students use at recess, and park users have access to parking and inside facilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington Public Schools</td>
<td>high school and middle school gyms and multi-purpose room</td>
<td>City of Lexington</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>city sales tax helped pay for project, interagency agreement with city and schools</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Johnson-Brock Public Schools</td>
<td>distance learning</td>
<td>area schools</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>baseball field lights</td>
<td>Village of Johnson</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ponca Public School</td>
<td>football field</td>
<td>City of Ponca</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Naper Public Schools</td>
<td>football field</td>
<td>town</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{No answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alliance Public Schools</td>
<td>meeting room</td>
<td>city council</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Westside Community Schools</td>
<td>Westgate Elementary School</td>
<td>city parks and recreation</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bridgeport Public School</td>
<td>ball fields</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>mutual cooperation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>North Bend</td>
<td>city auditorium (gym)</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central HSD 95</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sandhill Public School</td>
<td>public library</td>
<td>City of Dunning</td>
<td>1973</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhorn Valley School</td>
<td>city auditorium</td>
<td>Tilden City</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maxwell Public School</td>
<td>football field</td>
<td>Maxwell Village</td>
<td>1932</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sutherland Public School</td>
<td>soccer and football practice fields</td>
<td>Village of Sutherland</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rushville High School</td>
<td>superintendent's office</td>
<td>{No answer}</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Schuyler Central High School</td>
<td>satellite antenna</td>
<td>county extension/community college</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>purchase contribution</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Service Unit Number 10</td>
<td>Nebraska Diagnostic Resource Center</td>
<td>Nebraska Department of Education</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Service Unit Number 11</td>
<td>classrooms for preschool, developmentally disabled children</td>
<td>Holdrege Public Schools</td>
<td>1984</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Service Unit Number 3</td>
<td>office building</td>
<td>NE Dept of Education</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Community College</td>
<td>College Park - Grand Island</td>
<td>UNL, UNK, Medical Center</td>
<td>1970</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Northeast Community</td>
<td>lifelong learning</td>
<td>University of Nebraska, ESU #8, Wayne State College, Madison County Extension, NRD</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>College</td>
<td>center</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Butte County</td>
<td>regional law enforcement (jail facility)</td>
<td>City of Alliance</td>
<td>1976</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster County</td>
<td>county/city building</td>
<td>public building commission</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>senior centers health department building</td>
<td>public building commission</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>K Street power plant</td>
<td>public building commission</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>old federal building police and data processing</td>
<td>public building commission</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams County</td>
<td>landfill</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kearney County</td>
<td>communications center jail</td>
<td>Minden police department</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Frontier County</td>
<td>landfill</td>
<td>counties and town</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Saline County</td>
<td>extension</td>
<td>SCS</td>
<td>1991</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>York County</td>
<td>library</td>
<td>City of York</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson County</td>
<td>jail</td>
<td>multi counties</td>
<td>1996</td>
<td>contractual inmate housing</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sioux County</td>
<td>juvenile detention center</td>
<td>Dawes and Sheridan counties</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Airport Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Airport Authority</td>
<td>department of corrections</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Airport Authority</td>
<td>department of corrections</td>
<td>Lancaster County</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Airport Authority</td>
<td>state patrol training</td>
<td>state</td>
<td>1971</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Airport Authority</td>
<td>pistol range/K-9 training</td>
<td>City of Lincoln</td>
<td>1983</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Airport Authority</td>
<td>recreation center</td>
<td>city parks and recreation</td>
<td>1974</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lincoln Airport Authority</td>
<td>swimming pool/parks</td>
<td>city parks and recreation</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lexington Airport Authority</td>
<td>VOR and NDBs</td>
<td>Gothenburg and Cozad airports</td>
<td>1992</td>
<td>contract agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha Airport Authority</td>
<td>storm drainage</td>
<td>City of Omaha</td>
<td>1995</td>
<td>agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crete Public Schools</td>
<td>Blue River Family Center</td>
<td>city, school, head start, Doane College</td>
<td>1994</td>
<td>Pay rent or up front costs for space in facility owned by city but operated by Blue Valley Community Action under written agreement. The school exchanged land for space in the facility.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>{No answer}</td>
<td>City of Humboldt</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Housing Authority of Oshkosh</td>
<td>Housing Authority of Oshkosh</td>
<td>Dept of HUD</td>
<td>1968</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont City Housing Authority</td>
<td>Gifford Tower</td>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>1969</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stanton Tower</td>
<td>HUD</td>
<td></td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Bluff County Housing Authority</td>
<td>intergenerational center</td>
<td>head start, community college, ESU</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Local Government Facility Resource District

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Other governmental partner(s)</th>
<th>Year partnership began</th>
<th>Type of operation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Lower Elkhorn</td>
<td>NRD office</td>
<td>UNL/Extension Service, Forest Service</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resources</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>NRD Office</td>
<td>UNL/Conservation and Survey Division, NE Dept of Water Resources</td>
<td>1977</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Niobrara</td>
<td>office building</td>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Upper Elkhorn</td>
<td>Neligh NRCS office</td>
<td>NRCS</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lower Republican</td>
<td>Harlan County courthouse</td>
<td>Harlan County</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Natural</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fire District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tilden Rural Fire Board</td>
<td>fire department</td>
<td>City of Tilden</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Belden Rural Fire District</td>
<td>fire hall</td>
<td>Village of Belden</td>
<td>1950</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Suburban Fire District Number One</td>
<td>Kearney fire hall</td>
<td>City of Kearney</td>
<td>1928</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kimball Rural Fire District</td>
<td>Kimball fire hall</td>
<td>City of Kimball Volunteer Fire Department</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blair Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>fire department</td>
<td>City of Blair</td>
<td>1959</td>
<td>per by-laws</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wisner Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Wisner fire hall and garage</td>
<td>City of Wisner</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Fire District Number 6</td>
<td>fire station</td>
<td>City of Aurora</td>
<td>1965</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waco Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>communication towers and repeaters</td>
<td>York County fire districts, sheriff, police, hospital; Seward County fire districts, sheriff; Polk County hospital</td>
<td>1982</td>
<td>joint ownership</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mitchell Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>fire hall and equipment building</td>
<td>City of Mitchell</td>
<td>1937</td>
<td>Rural district shares equipment with the City of Mitchell and in return city furnishes facilities. We share cost of utilities.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Alexandria Rural Fire District</td>
<td>fire hall building</td>
<td>Town of Alexandria</td>
<td>1945</td>
<td>They provide building and heat; we provide fire vehicles and fire protection for them.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>fire hall</td>
<td>City of Dawson</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diller Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>fire hall - community building</td>
<td>{No answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brunning Fire District Number 3</td>
<td>fire hall</td>
<td>Village of Bruning</td>
<td>1980</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farimont Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>fire barn</td>
<td>{No answer}</td>
<td>1949</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhorn Suburban Fire District Number 2</td>
<td>fire barn</td>
<td>City of Elkhorn</td>
<td>1993</td>
<td>interlocal agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Stromsburg Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>fire barn</td>
<td>City of Stromsburg</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Beaver City Rural Fire District</td>
<td>fire hall</td>
<td>city office and city fire department</td>
<td>1960</td>
<td>share costs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lawrence Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>fire barn</td>
<td>Village of Lawrence</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jordon Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>fire hall</td>
<td>{No answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>agreement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Union Rural Fire District</td>
<td>Union fire house</td>
<td>Town of Union</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>share fire expenses</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gordon County Rural Fire Protection</td>
<td>fire hall</td>
<td>City of Oshkosh</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valentine Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>fire station</td>
<td>City of Valentine</td>
<td>1972</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Kiowa Rural Fire District</td>
<td>housing for equipment</td>
<td>Village of Lyman</td>
<td>1948</td>
<td>lease</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Burchard Rural Fire District</td>
<td>community building</td>
<td>Village of Burchard</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ithaca Rural Fire District</td>
<td>fire house</td>
<td>Village of Ithaca</td>
<td>1953</td>
<td>they own facility, we house our equipment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wauneta Rural Fire District</td>
<td>fire hall</td>
<td>Village of Wauneta</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Halsey Rural Fire District</td>
<td>fire house</td>
<td>Village of Halsey</td>
<td>1986</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hershey Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>fire hall</td>
<td>Hershey Village</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>fire district built building and village reimbursed several years ago</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Fire District in David City</td>
<td>fire station</td>
<td>David City</td>
<td>1940</td>
<td>commission</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Other governmental partner(s)</td>
<td>Year partnership began</td>
<td>Type of operation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td>Overton fire hall</td>
<td>Village of Overton</td>
<td>1975</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
ATTACHMENT 4

Other Examples of Joint Public Facilities in Respondent’s County
**OPEN-ENDED RESPONSES TO "OTHER THAN FACILITIES MENTIONED IN QUESTION 5, ARE THERE ANY OTHER EXAMPLES OF JOINT PUBLIC FACILITIES IN YOUR COUNTY?"**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Local Government</th>
<th>Facility</th>
<th>Political Subdivisions Involved</th>
<th>Is there a formal written agreement?</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Municipality</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Stanton</td>
<td>county fairgrounds/city park</td>
<td>city/county</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Madison</td>
<td>fire and rescue</td>
<td>City of Madison, rural boards</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of O'Neill</td>
<td>dispatch center, fire hall</td>
<td>Holt County, City of O'Neill, rural fire district, City of O'Neill</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Dakota</td>
<td>fire station, bus storage, law enforcement center</td>
<td>South Sioux City, schools</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of St. Paul</td>
<td>city and school library</td>
<td>city and school</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of</td>
<td>landfill</td>
<td>many - 40 to 50 towns and counties</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Overton</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Ponca</td>
<td>joint fire districts, emergency dispatch center, golf course</td>
<td>City of Ponca, rural Dixon County, various towns game and parks, City of Ponca, golf club</td>
<td>Yes, Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Alliance</td>
<td>school administration building, municipal building</td>
<td>school, City of Alliance (use of meeting rooms), school, City of Alliance (use of gymnasium)</td>
<td>Yes, {no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Elkhorn</td>
<td>communication center, city/county building</td>
<td>Omaha, Douglas County</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Political Subdivisions Involved</td>
<td>Is there a formal written agreement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>--------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Fremont</td>
<td>waste water treatment and collection</td>
<td>Village of Inglewood</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>water distribution</td>
<td>Village of Inglewood</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Doniphan</td>
<td>Grand Island area landfill</td>
<td>Grand Island owns and operates facility; Doniphan has signed an agreement for long-term use of the facility</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Blair</td>
<td>landfill</td>
<td>Douglas County, Washington County, City of Blair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>recycling center</td>
<td>City of Blair, Washington County, recycling association</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Hubbard</td>
<td>LEC</td>
<td>Dakota County, South Sioux City</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Grand Island</td>
<td>public safety center</td>
<td>Hall County, city</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Waterloo</td>
<td>libraries</td>
<td>county and participating village/city libraries</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of Hartington</td>
<td>municipal swimming pool</td>
<td>surrounding rural and small communities</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Hayes Center</td>
<td>Hayes County court house</td>
<td>county and district court</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>farm services</td>
<td>ASC and NRD</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>City of David City</td>
<td>drainage project</td>
<td>David City and Butler County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Meadow Grove</td>
<td>Elkhorn Valley School</td>
<td>Tilden, Meadow Grove</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Lyman</td>
<td>garbage</td>
<td>solid waste agency of Nebraska</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Political Subdivisions Involved</td>
<td>Is there a formal written agreement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Cartland</td>
<td>Beatrice area solid waste agency</td>
<td>City of Beatrice, Gage County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Village of Bennet</td>
<td>city/county building in Lincoln</td>
<td>City of Lincoln and Lancaster County</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Township</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Logan Township</td>
<td>fire department</td>
<td>City of Minden, Kearney County</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marietta Township</td>
<td>ball diamond/concession stand</td>
<td>Village of Mead, Mead Public Schools</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Political Subdivisions Involved</td>
<td>Is there a formal written agreement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-------------------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hebron Public Schools</td>
<td>fire department</td>
<td>city/county</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minden Public Schools</td>
<td>police and county sheriff building</td>
<td>city and county</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Palmer Public Schools</td>
<td>American Legion Annex</td>
<td>American Legion and senior citizens</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fire house</td>
<td>villages and rural fire department</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>school gym</td>
<td>school and American Legion</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wynot Public Schools</td>
<td>ball parks - several places</td>
<td>Hartington, Coleridge</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medicine Valley Public Schools</td>
<td>Eustis indoor pool</td>
<td>school, city</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gering Public Schools</td>
<td>splash arena - Scottsbluff</td>
<td>city and school</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Omaha Public Schools</td>
<td>various</td>
<td>Omaha, Douglas County</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Aurora Public School</td>
<td>chamber office facility</td>
<td>recreational facility</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maywood Public School</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>school and village board</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community hall</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Norfolk Public Schools</td>
<td>city council chambers</td>
<td>City of Norfolk and Norfolk Public Schools</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>various gymnasiums</td>
<td>City of Norfolk and Norfolk Public Schools</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>football field</td>
<td>City of Norfolk and Norfolk Public Schools</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Political Subdivisions Involved</td>
<td>Is there a formal written agreement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gothenburg Public Schools</td>
<td>Lexington fine arts building</td>
<td>school district, city</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Meridian Public School</td>
<td>law enforcement</td>
<td>city (Fairbury), county</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>fire departments</td>
<td>village and rural fire districts</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Holdrege Public Schools</td>
<td>art center in Holdrege</td>
<td>Holdrege Public Schools</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>School District 5-R</td>
<td>grandstand</td>
<td>Leigh schools</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>football field</td>
<td>Colfax County Fair</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seward School</td>
<td>senior citizen center</td>
<td>city</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Farwell Public School</td>
<td>library</td>
<td>city, school</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Service Unit Number 3</td>
<td>library and classrooms</td>
<td>City of Papillion, Metro Community College</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Educational Service Unit Number 15</td>
<td>fire department</td>
<td>rural and city fire departments</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Central Community College</td>
<td>Lexington learning center</td>
<td>City of Lexington</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Metropolitan Community College</td>
<td>city - county building</td>
<td>Douglas County, City of Omaha</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>911 building</td>
<td>Douglas County, City of Omaha</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Political Subdivisions Involved</td>
<td>Is there a formal written agreement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Box Butte County</td>
<td>juvenile center</td>
<td>Sioux, Sheridan, Dawes and Box Butte counties</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>community action</td>
<td>Sioux, Sheridan, Dawes, Box Butte and Cherry counties</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Region 23 emergency management</td>
<td>Sioux, Sheridan, Dawes and Box Butte counties</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Red Willow County</td>
<td>dispatch</td>
<td>county, City of McCook, four fire districts</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lancaster County</td>
<td>schools</td>
<td>city aging division and school</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>schools</td>
<td>city parks and recreation and school</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Lancaster Building - state fair</td>
<td>state fair and agricultural society</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Adams County</td>
<td>ag society facilities</td>
<td>anyone that wants to use them</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Nuckolls County</td>
<td>court house</td>
<td>Thayer and Webster county civil defense</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hall County</td>
<td>911 emergency management</td>
<td>City of Grand Island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>health department</td>
<td>City of Grand Island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>regional planning</td>
<td>City of Grand Island</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>extension office</td>
<td>University of Nebraska</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Dawson County</td>
<td>landfill</td>
<td>multi - counties (47)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fairbury Airport Authority</td>
<td>city - county law enforcement building</td>
<td>city, county</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Political Subdivisions Involved</td>
<td>Is there a formal written agreement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------------------------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------------------</td>
<td>---------------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Broken Bow Housing Authority</td>
<td>city/county communication center</td>
<td>Broken Bow, Custer County</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Fremont City Housing Authority</td>
<td>Yorkshire</td>
<td>HUD</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Cambridge</td>
<td>not sure</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goldenrod Joint Housing Authority</td>
<td>two duplexes for handicapped persons</td>
<td>City of South Sioux, Goldenrod Hills CS, Region IV</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Scotts Bluff County Housing Authority</td>
<td>Western Nebraska Community College</td>
<td>Western Nebraska Community College, child care</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Resource District</td>
<td>USDA center</td>
<td>NRCS, FSA, and FHA</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Local Government</td>
<td>Facility</td>
<td>Political Subdivisions Involved</td>
<td>Is there a formal written agreement?</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------------------------</td>
<td>-------------------------------------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Fire District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Waco Rural Fire</td>
<td>ambulance service</td>
<td>York County, City of York</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Protection District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bushnell-Johnson</td>
<td>park and recreation area</td>
<td>Kimball County/City of Kimball</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rural Fire Protection District</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elkhorn Surburban Fire District Number 2</td>
<td>city - county building</td>
<td>Omaha, Douglas County</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>911 center</td>
<td></td>
<td>Omaha, Douglas County</td>
<td>{no answer}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Utility District</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Seward County Rural Public Power District</td>
<td>911 center</td>
<td>county, city</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cornhusker Public Power District</td>
<td>fault finding equipment</td>
<td>other power district</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>