

**Village of Candor Dissolution Study Committee**  
**Meeting - November 8, 2010**

The meeting was called to order by Chairman Gwen Isham at 7:00 PM. attending members: Jerry Ahart, Fred Quinlan, Teresa Twarz, Butch Crowe, Frank Musgrave, Bob Houck and Steve Truesdail. Ad Hoc members Mayor Steve Sparling and Town Supervisor Darlene Cobler. Several community residents and one media rep.

**Public comment period:** None. Gwen asked if anyone wanted to comment on the Final Options report - None.

**Acceptance of minutes of October 25<sup>th</sup>.** Bob Houck made a motion, 2nd. By Teresa Twarz to accept the minutes. All members voted in favor - Motion was carried.

**Review of “Draft Resolution Plan” dated November 4, 2010:** Copies were passed out to all interested parties and Gwen went over each item where changes were suggested. These are the pages and items reviewed: Page 1 – Par. #2; Page 11 – last par. Added “Tax impact for specific properties” also table 12; Page 14 – table 13. This was not in CGR’s plan – Gwen made a note to discuss with Charlie Zettek to have it included. Page 14 – “Water District” - 2<sup>nd</sup>. par. Also, the last two words in that paragraph should be changed from “school land” to “water and electric.” Page 15 – Candor Free Library – this is a new section. Val Kelly commented that the library would use the school district boundaries for population numbers in the event of dissolution.

Page 19 – “Fiscal Impact” paragraph. Committee members were concerned that the information on potential costs of up to \$50,000 was not contained in the original statement as this would have an impact on the tax rate. A lively discussion ensued and it was agreed that this cost should be explained in a more definitive manner and included in the original “tax savings information.” CGR will be notified.

**Shared services:** CGR had submitted a 1-1/2 page draft document with suggested changes. Steve Sparling said the committee did not discuss in any detail shared services alternatives in the event dissolution does not occur. Steve had reviewed the minutes and they do not support any discussion. He said this was part of the contract and that is why he brought it up to CGR. Charlie Zettek said he felt that any discussions would take place after the vote. Again, there was a discussion among the committee as to how to handle this document. Butch Crowe then made the statement that since the committee could not come up with any viable shared services for DPW and Water that the document be included as part of the minutes of this meeting as it is written. There was no objection so it will be included. It was mentioned that the committee did discuss shared services of code enforcement and Justice Services.

**Draft Dissolution Plan - dated November 8, 2010:** Gwen handed out copies to all committee members. She said this is a summary of the Options Report. She asked committee members to review the report and contact her by Friday, November 12 with any

suggestions for changes or corrections. CGR would then have the final draft ready for the meeting on November 22.

**Committee member comments:** Frank Musgrave said he felt that what was needed for public review is a narrative of reasons to dissolve and reasons not to dissolve. He went on to say that he felt the presence of current services – such as Police and DPW are important and should be considered more fully. Frank had other opinions that he expressed on this issue.

The meeting was adjourned at 8:10.

Fred Quinlan, Secretary

**Suggested changes to the Shared Services section –  
CGR Draft for Committee Consideration 11/4/10**

**Draft language on DPW shared service opportunities for Candor Options Report:**

**[current Section 2 introduction with slight modification and new DPW/Water section added]**

The Committee reviewed all functional areas for shared service opportunities and did not find any good alternatives, including DPW and Water operations as further outlined below. The Committee has identified two opportunities for functional mergers between the Town and Village that would result in efficiency savings if the Village does not dissolve: Code Enforcement and Court.

### ***DPW and Water Operations***

The Village DPW department is currently staffed with 1 full-time employee who splits his services 64% to DPW and the remaining 36% to the Village water department. The actual percentage of time spent between DPW and water services will vary throughout the year depending on the needs and demands of the particular service (e.g., water breaks needing immediate attention or seasonal DPW tasks requiring more hours in a given week). The current Village DPW/water department staffing allows for ongoing flexibility in allocating time required for providing the variable services of these two complementary but distinct functions throughout the year.

The Town currently does not have a water department, making consolidation and service sharing not a viable option for consideration. If the 64%, or 25.6 hours, of the current DPW staff work were contracted with the Town, the Village would be responsible to compensate the Town for these services. If the Town hired the current Village DPW staff to provide these services as a Town employee, the position would be considered part-time as it is fewer than 30 hours a week, therefore the employee would be paid hourly and would not be eligible, under the Town's current benefits, to accrue vacation, sick time, or holidays. Removing the DPW functions from the current Village position would result in a part-time water department position with a consistent 14.4 hours a-week. Dividing the positions into these discrete and restricted units removes the benefit of flexibility discussed above and may make it more difficult to find and retain consistent staffing in the future for reduced hours and compensation.

Currently, the Village allocates \$10,500 to snow removal which includes \$2,500 in expenditures for staff, with the balance for contracting and equipment. The Village could specifically contract with the Town for this service, assuming the Town would provide it for the \$10,500. However, if the Village were to do just that, and otherwise retain the current Village DPW operations, there would be revenue shortfalls to the Village, because a portion of the overall DPW operations are covered by the snow removal budget. As in the previous paragraph regarding water, because routine DPW operations and snow removal are integrated (using the same staff and equipment), separating snow removal into a discrete element that can be contracted to the Town does not appear to provide efficiency savings.

The Village receives approximately \$4,500 annually in state CHIPS funds (Consolidated Local Street and Highway Improvement Program) for road repairs and improvements, while the Town receives \$246,000. If the Village contracted with the Town for road repairs and maintenance, the \$4500 in CHIPS revenue would conceivably be transferred to the Town to provide this service. Unless the Town were to combine the Village and Town CHIPS funding and consider the 2.68 center lane miles of Village streets as part of the overall Town road repair/maintenance program, it is not clear to the Committee that the Village would receive any more attention to its roads than it currently receives from the Village DPW department, which is responsible for spending CHIPS money on Village only projects.

Sharing or consolidating facility space was not considered a viable option. The current Town Highway facility is at capacity, while the Village DPW garage would not accommodate the facility needs of the Town. The Village completed renovations of its current facility in 2003 and does not have an immediate need to invest in an alternate or new joint location.

Considering the above, the Committee concluded that there did not appear to be worthwhile efficiency savings from combining DPW, Highway or Water Operations.