

## Benefits of Dissolution

### Figures from CGR report on shared services

- The Town and Village each operate separate courts. Personnel overlap provides the opportunity for smooth transition if a merged court were pursued. A merger would simplify court services in the community and could potentially yield increased efficiency.
- Not all of the potential for shared services and efficiency is being tapped within the joint facility. Recommend configuring existing resources to increase efficiency and potentially reduce costs.
- Co-locating (merging town/village) would put valuable parcels back on municipal tax rolls, with the potential of generating additional revenue for local governments.
- Some options result in cost savings, while others enhance services provided to residents and create efficiencies by eliminating redundant duplicative or overlapping functions, even though doing so may not result in meaningful direct cost reduction.
- Based upon the budgeted expenditures, per capita costs for the two communities only differ by approximately 10%. Using the 2009 census estimates, per capita costs in the Village are roughly \$1,213, compared to \$1,103 in the TOV.
- With regard to revenues, the largest category in both the Town and Village is the local property tax – the Village generates \$2.03 million (over 70% of all its general revenue) from the local tax, while the Town generates general property taxes (General, General TOV, Highway, Highway TOV) of \$1.00 million (48% of total general revenue).
- Village residents pay for 83% of the courts and see 79% of the community's total court activity. Examined on a cost-per-case basis, the Village spends approximately \$25, compared to nearly \$65 in the Town.
- Village tends not to buy new equipment as such purchases are costly and funding is usually scarce. In many cases, comparable piece of equipment sits on the other side of the garage under Town ownership. Such instances suggest that better communication and coordination between the departments could yield savings in cost and efficiency beyond what is already occurring.
- Village operation costs roughly \$35,800 per mile while Town Highway operation costs roughly \$13,695 per mile.
- Using the OSC data as a proxy for municipal budgets, the cost per mile of the Village is about 60% higher than the cost per mile of the Town.
- By merging Village and Town Highway departments, some efficiencies will be realized in year one allowing the same amount of work to be done with fewer people resulting in potential 15% savings in year 1. Village tax payers would see a \$6.92 per thousand reduction in the Village tax. The Town taxpayers outside the village increase highway tax would be \$3.35 per thousand.
- All Town tax payers would reap the benefits of a reduction in Town-level MEOs through attrition, resulting in a cost reduction of approximately \$123,000. This would result in net savings for Village tax payers of \$4.02 per thousand and a net increase for TOV taxpayer of \$3.99.
- While taxes are a driving factor in the decision making process, other less tangible factors should be considered as well. For instance, the process for purchasing major equipment is streamlined into one department. This may save money for future

capital purchases by eliminating the need for multiple purchases of similar pieces of equipment. There is also better coordination of personnel for snow plowing routes and storm clean-up when being coordinated by one leader. Better use of manpower means higher levels of productivity.

- It is important to consider the services that Village and TOV residents receive compared to what they pay for such services. Village residents make up approximately 58 percent of the town wide taxable assessed value.
- Analysis using information provided from Town officials led CGR to determine that the Village benefits very little from services provided directly by the Town Highway Department. Village residents are theoretically “overpaying” for town wide highway services (while TOV residents pay nothing for Village services). TOV residents pay no Village tax yet benefit from Village DPW services when they enter the Village (as happens frequently). This inequity could be addressed in any of the consolidation scenarios.
- Merge the existing Village parks laborer position with the Town cemetery sexton position, reassign duties so that the responsibilities of the new position cover maintenance of the Village parks, the Town cemetery, and the waterfront and trail network along the Erie Canal. The part-time cemetery maintenance staff could be used to assist with Village trail maintenance. Little to no additional equipment or manpower would be necessary.
- Merging administrative functions from their current locations would allow for desirable property to be put back on the tax roll, especially in the case of the Village. Village property could easily be renovated into a lucrative storefront business, leading to increased revenue for the Town and Village. Although relocation from the Village square is seen as a disadvantage to Village officials, the economic benefits of such a move carry great potential.