

REGULAR MEETING
DELAWARE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS

OCTOBER 22, 2025

The regular meeting of the Delaware County Board of Supervisors was held Wednesday, October 22, 2025, at 1:02 p.m. in the Supervisors' Room of the Senator Charles D. Cook County Office Building, 111 Main Street, Delhi, New York, with Chairman Tina Molé presiding.

The Clerk called the roll and all Supervisors were present except Mrs. Walley and Mr. Smith. Supervisor Smith arrived partway through the meeting.

Chaplain Donna Ladner offered the invocation.

Mrs. Driscoll led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

The minutes of the previous Board meeting and public hearings were accepted as presented.

The Clerk noted that all communications received have been referred to their respective committees for review.

Ms. Molé granted privilege of the floor to Supervisor Merrill who introduced Senior Relationship Specialist Tyler Frame of finance consulting service Three+One.

Mr. Frame expressed excitement to attend the meeting and showcase Delaware County to the entire state of New York. He stated Three+One provides third-party liquidity data to help ensure every taxpayer dollar is maximized from the moment it is received to the moment it needs to be spent, and ensure the County is always earning and saving the most possible.

Mr. Frame stated it is challenging for counties to provide more resources to the public without raising taxes, and Three+One helps the County do just that. He highlighted successes Delaware County has achieved since working with Three+One beginning in 2019.

Mr. Frame said Delaware County generated \$678,000 in interest revenue within the first 12-month period working with Three+One, whereas within the most recent 12-month period, Delaware County generated over \$5.4 million in interest revenue. He stated Delaware County was initially generating approximately 37.5% of the 30-day treasury benchmark, but within the last 12-month period, Delaware County was generating 91%.

Mr. Frame stated Three+One also helps the County put more cash to work. He stated as interest rates have dropped slightly, Three+One helps identify how much cash can be invested safely while still protecting the County when interest rates change again. Mr. Frame stated Delaware County has increased the amount of cash invested by over 20%.

Mr. Frame then presented Delaware County with the CashVest 90+ Award. He explained the 90+ Award considers five components of cash management, and to qualify for the award Delaware County must have received a CashVest score of 90 or higher for the last four consecutive quarters. He stated Delaware County has done that, putting them in the 75th percentile of other counties in New York State that work with Three+One that also qualified for this award.

Mr. Frame thanked Treasurer Beverly Shields for her financial stewardship, stating it does not go unnoticed. He also thanked Fiscal Manager Carli Pinner and stated he was glad to have her as part of the team.

Mr. Frame acknowledged cash management is something that can be sometimes overlooked and they sought to ensure Supervisors that taxpayer dollars are going as far as they possibly can.

Mrs. Shields recognized earning the award was a team effort and wanted to thank those who made it possible. She stated herself, Ms. Pinner, Mr. Frame, and former Fiscal Manager Kathy Preston all worked well together to manage and invest taxpayer dollars efficiently.

Mrs. Shields credited Mr. Frame for being adept at presenting information in a questioning style and always being informative and helpful. She stated she was initially unsure how Mr. Frame and Ms. Pinner would work together, but Ms. Pinner answered all of Mr. Frame's questions while displaying total knowledge of the County accounts and cash flow.

Mrs. Shields said she was thankful for the award and thankful for the current fiscal team Delaware County has working together to benefit the County. She acknowledged Mr. Frame and Ms. Pinner do the bulk of the work, with Mr. Frame determining the liquidity amount and providing guidance, and Ms. Pinner staggering the investments to gain the highest amount of interest.

Mrs. Shields thanked the Supervisors for the time to do a presentation of this award.

Ms. Molé granted privilege of the floor to Supervisor Vernold who introduced Desiree Keever, Cornell Cooperative Extension of Delaware County's Farm Business Manager to provide an update on the progress of the Delaware County Farm Enhancement Program.

Mrs. Keever stated the program was funded by a portion of Delaware County's American Rescue Plan Act (ARPA) funds, and she would share both the intended and unexpected successes of the program that exceeded all expectations.

Mrs. Keever stated the funding for the grant program came in three rounds. She said the first round of funding was \$500,000 to be granted to farms in Delaware County, the second around was another \$500,000, and the third round was \$200,000 that was unused from other projects funded by ARPA dollars.

Mrs. Keever stated the total \$1.2 million allocation helped to fund 59 projects out of the

106 applications received for the program. She stated the program was intended to invest in farms across Delaware County to keep agriculture vibrant and help farms recover from some of the losses sustained from price increases in supply chain shortages during the Covid-19 pandemic.

Mrs. Keever stated in addition to funding projects and helping infuse local farms with immediate economic stability, several farms were successful in securing grants to enrich their operations and support agriculture throughout the county.

Mrs. Keever said the Farm Enhancement Program was rolled out in three phases. She stated the first phase was communication of the project to farms and the agriculture community across the county. She stated the second phase was helping to facilitate project development over the course of each individual project, and the third phase was following up with grant recipients to tell their story.

Mrs. Keever highlighted several unanticipated successes, including several recipients successfully securing additional grant funds at a variety of levels from entities such as New York State Ag and Markets and the United States Department of Agriculture. She stated more dollars are being infused into Delaware County allowing farms to implement new technologies for the longevity of their farms and strengthening the local food system.

Mrs. Keever also highlighted several farms that were unsuccessful in securing Delaware County Farm Enhancement funds but used the feedback they received to apply for and successfully secure grants from other sources of funding.

Mrs. Keever then highlighted Farm Enhancement program recipient Roxbury Mountain Maple. She stated Roxbury Mountain Maple went on to receive three other separate grant awards to enhance direct marketing capabilities and solar sustainability on the farm. She played a video to highlight the farm's successes.

Mrs. Keever said storytelling was another unanticipated success of the grant program which improved direct farm-to-consumer marketing capabilities and strengthened farms' market position. She stated 39% of participant farms in the 59 funded projects have either expanded or initiated direct-to-consumer marketing which strengthens Delaware County's local food system, increases availability of Delaware County produced foods to the public, and ensures stability of the local food system.

Mrs. Keever said 70% of farmers invested at least 5% of their own money into their project, 61.5% invested at least 10% of their own funds, and 10% of farms invested as much as 90% of their own funds into projects. She stated for every dollar of grant funding awarded it generated an additional \$.80 of spending on average. She stated 50% of those funds were spent in Delaware County.

Mrs. Keever also highlighted recipient Maplewood Farm and Orchard and how the funding enabled the repositioning of the farm's future. She stated while the sugarbush was being tapped, the land was uncultivated for several years and this funding helped to expand the farm's

apple orchard and bring new life, diversification, and sustainability to the farm's production.

Mrs. Keever stated agritourism in Delaware County is approaching the point where a family can visit and make an entire day out of visiting different farms and participating in farm activities. She stated the boost to agritourism will not only benefit local farms but also increase traffic to food establishments and potentially lodging.

Mrs. Keever said the Delaware County Farm Enhancement Program has garnered success nationally, being recognized as a New York State winner in the National Association County Agricultural Agents' Search for Excellence in Sustainable Agriculture, as well as being the only New York program featured as a professional improvement conference session. She stated there have been several other programs modeled after Delaware County's program.

Mrs. Keever also highlighted a recent food system project funded through a grant by Delaware County Economic Development. She stated Cornell Cooperative Extension created Delaware Bounty which is a local food map displaying over 70 participating farms, with 52 locations published on the physical map. She stated a website is in development to display information about local farms and local producers to increase accessibility to consumers.

Mrs. Keever mentioned an ongoing initiative called Ag in the Classroom. She stated that Cornell Cooperative Extension has a collaboration with Franklin Central School where an in-school educator delivers educational programming to Pre-K – Sixth grade students, focusing on Delaware County agriculture.

Mrs. Keever also announced Cornell Cooperative Extension was recently awarded an education grant from the New York State Department of Ag and Markets to work on a dairy strategic plan to help pose the local dairy industry for success in case of challenging times. She stated the strategic plan will help position smaller dairy farms in a competitive space so they can continue to compete in the market and have vibrant futures. She said the strategic plan development will take approximately two years beginning in 2026.

In response to Mrs. Keever's presentation, Supervisor Marshfield said the first issuance of ARPA grant funds was in 2021. He stated in his opinion, the \$1.2 million allocated to the Delaware County Farm Enhancement Program was the best use of those funds. He stated Cornell Cooperative Extension has a good structure for the program and Supervisors were impressed with the operation of the program itself and the number of farms that received funds.

Supervisor Scott stated the program came at a time when many farms were struggling, dumping milk, and people were not traveling. She stated receiving farm enhancement funds likely aided in the continued success of many farms and enabled them to stay in business.

In response, Mrs. Keever stated the program funds enabled many farms to complete projects they otherwise may not have been able to, or secure additional funding with match requirements that may otherwise could not be met.

Mrs. Scott reiterated that many of the program dollars awarded to farms were spent in Delaware County meaning local businesses benefited from the awards as well.

Mrs. Keever stated over 50% of program dollars were spent in Delaware County and she will share more detailed reporting with Supervisors as it becomes available.

Mr. Gladstone stated as a recipient of a Delaware County Farm Enhancement Program, the funding allowed farmers to buy or improve something needed on the farm that would not normally be able to be cash flowed. He stated it was a greatly beneficial program.

Mrs. Driscoll asked where residents could find copies of the physical food maps. In response, Mrs. Keever stated Delaware County Food Maps can be found in several stores across the county, at public libraries, and were distributed at the Delaware County Fair. She said 3,000 copies of the food maps were printed but only a stock of 300 remains. Mrs. Keever stated another printing of updated food maps will take place in Spring 2026 including any additional farms that would like to participate.

Mr. Gladstone offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION NO. 171

TITLE: EXCEPTION TO RESOLUTION NO. 269 OF 1990 DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY SERVICES

WHEREAS Resolution No. 269-1990 prohibited County employees from holding more than one County position simultaneously except if such dual employment is specifically authorized by resolution of the Board of Supervisors; and

WHEREAS, the Emergency Services Department, at times, experiences difficulties in filling all open dispatchers shifts; and

WHEREAS, from time to time employees in other County Departments are willing to work on a per-hour, as-needed basis in the Emergency Services Department.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Resolution No. 269 is hereby temporarily waived until December 31, 2026, for County employees who are willing to work on a per-hour, as-needed basis in the Emergency Services Department.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Faulkner and unanimously adopted.

Mr. Ellis offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION NO. 172

TITLE: AMENDMENT TO CIVIL SERVICE RULES FOR DELAWARE COUNTY AND ITS POLITICAL SUBDIVISIONS PERSONNEL OFFICE

WHEREAS, the Personnel Officer deems it necessary to make certain changes to the Text and Appendices of the Delaware County Civil Service Rules; and

WHEREAS, the Personnel Officer has duly advertised and has on October 8th, 2025, held a public hearing on the matter.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that subject to the approval of the State Civil Service Commission, the following changes be made to the Text and Appendices of the Delaware County Civil Service Rules:

Text

RULE I

DELETE:

Unless otherwise expressly stated or unless the context or subject matter requires a different meaning, the several terms hereinafter mentioned, whenever used in these Rules, shall be construed as follows:

1. "Personnel Office" means the Personnel Office for the County of Delaware.
2. "Employee" means the incumbent of a position holding the position in accordance with these rules and the Civil Service Law.
3. "Position" means an office or employment involving an aggregation of duties to be performed and responsibilities to be exercised by one person.
4. "Compensation" means the remuneration of a position and shall include lodging, food, maintenance and commutation when the same is furnished.
5. "Eligible List" means an official record kept in the Personnel Office as a public record which contains the names of those persons who have their final ratings from the highest to the lowest rank.
6. "Part-Time Employment" means any employment of a combination of one or more employments in a civil division in which an individual works less than fifty percent of the time prescribed as a normal work week by the appropriate governing body or other appropriate authority of the civil division.
7. "Transfer" means the change, without further examination, of a permanent employee from a position under the jurisdiction of one appointing authority to a similar position under the jurisdiction of another appointing authority, or to a position in a different title in the same salary grade under the jurisdiction of the same appointing authority.

8. "Reassignment" means the change, without further examination, of a permanent employee from one position to another similar position under the jurisdiction of the same appointing authority.
9. "Municipality" means county, town, city, village or special district.

ADD:

Unless otherwise expressly stated, or unless the context or subject matter requires a different meaning, the several terms hereinafter mentioned, whenever used in these Rules, shall be construed as follows:

1. "Compensation" means the remuneration of a position and shall include lodging, food, maintenance and commutation when the same is furnished.
2. "Eligible List" means an official record kept in the Personnel Office as a public record which contains the names of those persons who have their final ratings from the highest to the lowest rank.
3. "Employee" means the incumbent of a position or multiple positions, where authorized by the Personnel Officer, holding the position(s) in accordance with these rules and the Civil Service Law.
4. "Employment in Multiple Positions" means the employment of an individual in more than one position, where authorized by the Personnel Officer, in one or more civil divisions. Appointments to each position must be in accordance with these rules and the Civil Service Law.
5. "Municipality" means county, town, city, village or special district.
6. "Part-Time Employment" means any employment in a position or combination of positions in one or more civil divisions in which an individual works less than fifty percent of the time prescribed as a normal work week by the appropriate governing body or other appropriate authority of the civil division.
7. "Personnel Office" means the Personnel Office for the County of Delaware.
8. "Position" means an office or employment involving an aggregation of duties to be performed and responsibilities to be exercised by one person.
9. "Reassignment" means the change, without further examination, of a permanent employee from one position to another similar position under the jurisdiction of the same appointing authority.
10. "Transfer" means the change, without further examination, of a permanent employee from a position under the jurisdiction of one appointing authority to a similar position under the jurisdiction of another appointing authority, or to a position in a different title in the same salary grade under the jurisdiction of the same appointing authority.

Appendices

EXEMPT CLASS

DELETE: Not applicable

ADD: Second Deputy County Treasurer

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Merrill and unanimously adopted.

Mr. Gladstone offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION NO. 173

**TITLE: CONTINUATION OF DELAWARE COUNTY EMS AMBULANCE SERVICE
DEPARTMENT OF EMERGENCY SERVICES**

WHEREAS, the Delaware County Board of Supervisors passed Resolution No. 75 on April 27, 2022 titled Delaware County EMS Ambulance Service, authorizing the County to enter into a contract for Ambulance Services with American Medical Response; and

WHEREAS, said contract is set to expire on November 30, 2025; and

WHEREAS, it would be in the best interest of the public safety and residents of Delaware County to continue to contract with an ambulance service provider to provide (2) Basic Life Support (BLS) staffed ambulances and an Advanced Life Support (ALS) Fly Car 24 hours a day, 7 days a week to supplement all Delaware County EMS agencies; and

WHEREAS, the Delaware County Public Safety Committee and Delaware County Department of Emergency Services have examined proposals by Countywide Certificate of Need (CON) holders Ambulnz by DocGo and American Medical Response; and

WHEREAS, based on cost comparisons from data gathered over the previous three years, as well as an excellent established working relationship, exhibited professionalism and responsibility, American Medical Response (AMR) provided the best proposal to fit the needs of Delaware County at this time.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that Delaware County continue its current contract with American Medical Response for a 3-year period of 12/1/2025 – 11/30/2028 at a cost of \$2,199,487.50 for the first year with 5% annual increases each year thereafter.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Hinkley.

Mr. Gladstone stated the partnership with AMR has been very successful and has provided a lot of relief for local volunteer EMS personnel. He stated AMR has helped reduce the average ambulance response time from 45 minutes to 15 minutes and has met all stipulations included within the service contract with no lapse in coverage.

Delaware County Emergency Services Director Steve Hood confirmed there has been no lapse in coverage from AMR over the last three years, and AMR has completely fulfilled their contract with coverage 24 hours a day, seven days a week.

Mr. Marshfield stated the projected annual revenue in the proposed contract seemed a bit low. He estimated the revenue will be approximately \$50,000 - \$100,000 higher but stated it was a good conservative estimate.

Mr. Smith questioned whether Delaware County has investigated the possibility of running a self-funded County ambulance service. He stated there are several communities within the Delaware County that successfully run their own ambulance services, yet the County continues to fund an ambulance service contract with an outside corporation that answers to stockholders and not the people of Delaware County.

Mr. Hood confirmed a locally facilitated ambulance service was considered but it would be much more expensive to fund than a service contract with AMR. He stated the personnel costs alone would be over \$1.2 million annually.

Mr. Marshfield questioned if AMR medics are local residents, which Mr. Hood did confirm. He stated nearly all AMR employees covered under this contract are local residents.

In response to Ms. Boukai as to what the salary/hourly rates are for AMR employees, AMR Regional Director William McGarrity stated AMR pays entry-level medics with little to no experience \$18 per hour. He stated EMTs receive up to seven years of credit for experience with a 2% pay increase for each year. Mr. McGarrity said paramedics' hourly rates begin at approximately \$23 per hour and receive a similar pay increase for up to 10 years of experience.

In comparison, Mr. Hood stated if the County funded an ambulance service, all employees would be considered Civil Service employees and the County would be required to pay Civil Service fringes and benefits, and likely an hourly wage/salary much higher than paid by AMR currently.

Mr. Cetta highlighted that does not include any administrative costs.

Mr. Smith reiterated that several communities within Delaware County seem to be making locally facilitated ambulance services successful. He stated that at some point corporations have a dollar value they need to reach to keep their shareholders happy and believes a number of people would like the security of being employed by a municipality like Delaware County rather than a corporation like AMR.

Mr. Smith stated he is looking at the long-term value of the ambulance contract with AMR. He believes it is similar to the waste management issue Delaware County faced several years ago, where many people believed Delaware County was wasting money by funding a locally facilitated waste management program rather than contract with an outside waste management company. He stated that in the long-term scheme of things, waste management is no longer an issue for Delaware County whereas other counties are scrambling with the future of waste management.

Mr. Smith stated he would hate to see Delaware County in a similar situation with EMS when there is something they could do about it now. He stated he would like to see a cost

comparison of how much it would cost to initiate a locally facilitated County ambulance service versus what it would cost several years into operation.

In response, Mr. Hood said he could put together cost estimates and comparisons but still feels that the ambulance contract with AMR is more financially prudent than a locally facilitated ambulance service. He stated all ambulance services are battling for the same employees and Delaware County's 911 Dispatch has not met its minimum staffing requirements over the last three years. He stated there have been days when staffing has been cut back to only two staff members because there is no one available to work, whereas AMR has found people to staff ambulances regardless.

Ms. Molé said the County investigated the costs of a locally facilitated County ambulance service initially and it could not be done at a similar cost to the ambulance service contract with AMR.

Mr. Smith stated the County can be proud of the fact that townships are supportive of their emergency services and doesn't believe it would be difficult to find other local ambulance services willing to donate vehicles or equipment to a locally facilitated County ambulance service to help mitigate some of the initial costs. He stated he does not believe he has ever seen a situation in Delaware County where an emergency service entity has run into major issues and the community does not come together to support them. He stated he does not ever want to see that kind of community support disappear in Delaware County.

Mr. McGarrity assured Mr. Smith that all AMR employees who work in Delaware County are either Delaware County residents or reside in a neighboring county. He stated while AMR is part of a larger corporation, the Delaware County stations are very local.

Mr. Vernold stated while he was not complaining about the service provided by AMR, he was complaining about the way it has been implemented. He stated 10 years ago the town of Hancock funded its own ambulance service and since then, taxpayers have paid over \$2.5 million to support it and are now required to pay additional taxes to fund the County ambulance service. He stated Deposit taxpayers are covered by Broome County ambulance services but are also required to pay taxes towards the Delaware County ambulance service.

Mr. Vernold stated according to a summary of service from AMR, County ambulances have responded to 600 service calls in Delhi and Davenport so far in 2025, whereas in Hancock and Deposit the County ambulance has only responded to 19 service calls. He stated he would like to see some kind of program developed by the Finance Committee that could help ease the burden on taxpayers.

Mr. Vernold said that would be a good example for the proposal to share Delaware County sales tax revenue. He stated he needs to have an explanation to his local taxpayers why they must pay a second tax for an ambulance service they do not really need.

Mr. Hood stated the County ambulance is meant to serve as a backup service for all municipalities and that is what it is currently doing. He stated the County ambulance service has

provided backup for Hancock's ambulance service even though it is not as much as other municipalities.

Mr. Vernold stated it was like "taxation without representation" and Hancock taxpayers are unhappy with it.

Mr. Marshfield suggested a report could be generated showing the rate per 1,000 the County ambulance service is costing each taxpayer. He believed the rate per 1,000 cost would likely be low and a good figure to show Hancock taxpayers.

Mr. Vernold stated the Hancock ambulance service costs each taxpayer approximately \$150 per year.

Mr. Faulkner stated there has been good discussion at the committee level and he is in full support of the umbrella service to all municipalities provided by the County ambulance service. Speaking for Middletown, Mr. Faulkner said another conversation coming up frequently is that it would be nice if going forward Finance Committee members could consider financial opportunities to ensure local ambulances services remain strong and community based. He stated the best solution for emergency services is not to put all eggs in one basket.

Mr. Hood stated regardless of whether local emergency services in municipalities are privatized or not they are still receiving money from taxpayers and fire district taxpayers, and the County ambulance service provides a backup to all of them. He stated for municipalities like Margaretville and Sidney, the County ambulance service may allow local ambulance services to provide services they normally cannot do such as transport patients out of the local hospital. He stated having the County ambulance service as a backup provides local emergency responders with peace of mind and can bring money back into the community by transporting a patient to a high-level care facility.

Mr. Smith stated the County ambulance service was initially considered due to state mandates that put a strain on nearly all local volunteer ambulance services while not providing any support to help local ambulance services meet the mandates. He stated Delaware County needed an immediate ambulance program to provide efficient ambulance coverage for several municipalities.

Mr. Smith suggested a locally facilitated County ambulance program could include five services around the County that all work in conjunction with one another, using the Delaware County 911 Dispatch Center, and local volunteer services could fill in the gaps. He stated he strongly felt it was something to consider in the future but clarified his suggestion was not a criticism of the services provided by AMR.

In response, Mr. Hood said he agreed, and a perfect example of what Mr. Smith was explaining was the Headwaters EMS service in the Northern end of the County. He stated Headwaters EMS currently covers three townships and several fire districts and was developed after the Stamford Fire Department discontinued its ambulance service and residents in the Northern end of the county were waiting 50-60 minutes for an ambulance response.

In reply to Mr. Marshfield, AMR Operations Manager William Beevers said the County ambulance service responds to approximately 10 calls per day on average though some of those calls are eventually cancelled.

In response to Mr. Marshfield as to whether the County ambulance service has seen an increase in revenue after a recent State law was passed allowing ambulance services to bill insurance providers for services directly, Mr. McGarrity confirmed AMR has seen an increase in revenues.

Mr. Smith asked if AMR would still be in Delaware County if the County were to develop its own locally facilitated ambulance service and still needed additional support. In response, Mr. McGarrity said AMR would still be in the area, but resources would no longer be dedicated to the County specifically.

In reply to Mr. Vernold, Mrs. Scott said she would compare to towns with local police departments. She stated several town taxpayers in Delaware County fund local police departments as well as paying taxes to help fund the Delaware County Sheriff's Office.

Mr. Merrill agreed and stated the Colchester Police Department has a \$500,000 budget but continues to support the Delaware County Sheriff's Office. He stated he believes it is the duty of county residents to support the County in whatever roles come up, and sometimes the financial burden may be a little more difficult in one community than the other but all in all it is fair and everyone is provided with services from the different agencies.

Mr. Merrill stated the Hancock ambulance service was not going to provide services to residents of Stamford and other surrounding municipalities when the local ambulance service dissolved, therefore a broader County ambulance service was required.

Mr. Wilson suggested Mr. Vernold was asking if there was a way to develop a structure where municipalities using the County ambulance service often pay a higher percentage of the cost than those municipalities not using the County ambulance service as much.

Mrs. Scott stated in some cases towns are small and do not have the call volume to justify funding an ambulance service of their own and it would be unfair to disproportionately charge those taxpayers more because they are small and cannot afford a private ambulance service. She stated the budget for the Hancock ambulance service is a quarter of Masonville's overall town budget and they could not raise taxes high enough to fund a private ambulance service.

Mr. Vernold agreed with Mrs. Scott but did not agree with having to pay the additional tax for both the local and County ambulance service.

Mrs. Scott said she believed the per capita cost of the County ambulance service is likely so miniscule it would negate the argument entirely.

Mr. Smith again stated he believes taxpayers would feel better paying the additional taxes knowing their money is going towards a locally facilitated ambulance service that keeps their

money within Delaware County while taking care of the Delaware County community versus being contracted out to a corporation.

Mr. Merrill stated the cost of a County-facilitated ambulance service was impossible.

In response, Mr. Smith questioned how that is possible when several other counties provide a similar service. He stated he did not believe other counties, such as Otsego County, were being foolish with their finances.

Mr. Marshfield said Otsego County is geographically smaller than Delaware County with a larger population. Mr. Merrill added that there are major metropolitan areas in Otsego County unlike in Delaware County.

Delaware County 911 Coordinator Mark Rossley said Otsego County provides interfacility work in addition to 911 dispatching unlike Delaware County that is focused on a 911 system. He stated the two services are not comparable.

Mrs. Scott highlighted that another issue the contracted service with AMR resolved was facility-to-facility transports. She stated AMR's emphasis is on facility-to-facility transports because they are reimbursed for those transports, but with resources dedicated specifically to Delaware County, AMR has two ambulances available to County residents in need of immediate assistance.

Mrs. Scott argued that while the County ambulance service only responded to nine calls in Hancock, that was nine times Hancock's ambulance service could not provide immediate response to their own residents.

Mr. Vernold said he was not arguing that but is arguing against Hancock residents paying additional tax money for a service used less than other municipalities. He asked what it would cost for the County ambulance service to staff and station another ambulance if the Hancock ambulance service dissolved.

In response, Mr. Hood said the additional cost would go under the County's contract as a whole and while he was unsure what the exact cost would be, he was sure the contract amount would increase.

Mr. Vernold said it would be cheaper in the long run for Delaware County to share a portion of sales tax with municipalities to help offset some of the costs for those municipalities with ambulance services to prevent them from dissolving and adding costs to the County's service contract with AMR.

Mr. Vernold said his taxpayers have stated they feel as if they are, in a way, being punished for creating their own ambulance service.

Mrs. Driscoll said if that was to be the case then municipalities with police departments should get a portion of sales tax too, in addition to municipalities like Harpersfield and Stamford

whose taxpayers fund Headwaters EMS. She suggested Hancock may be benefiting from other resources within Delaware County that towns like Delhi do not benefit from as much and that the cost overall balances out somewhere else in the budget.

Mr. Marshfield stated that many of the calls responded to in Delhi were to the Delhi Rehabilitation and Nursing Center and residents from across Delaware County are served by the nursing center, therefore those responses are indirectly serving more than just the town of Delhi.

In response to Supervisor Kosier, Mr. Hood said the number of calls in the Northern part of the County has certainly decreased, though not drastically. He stated Headwaters EMS being available has also reduced the ambulance response time for emergency calls. Mr. Hood stated that since Headwaters EMS began operation in January, the County ambulance service responses in the Stamford area initially decreased but have slowly risen again since.

The resolution was adopted by the following vote: Ayes 158, Noes 23 (Smith, Vernold), Absent 19 (Kelso, Walley).

Mr. Merrill introduced Local Law Intro. No. 3 of 2025 to Override the Tax Levy Limit.

LOCAL LAW INTRO. NO. 3 OF 2025

LOCAL LAW TO OVERRIDE THE TAX LEVY LIMIT ESTABLISHED IN GENERAL MUNICIPAL LAW §3-c

Be it enacted by the Board of Supervisors of the County of Delaware as follows:

Section 1. Legislative Intent: It is the intent of this local law to override the limit on the amount of real property taxes that may be levied by the County of Delaware pursuant to General Municipal Law §3-c, and to allow the County of Delaware to adopt a budget for the fiscal year beginning January 1, 2026 and ending December 31, 2026 that requires a real property tax levy in excess of the “tax levy limit” as defined by General Municipal Law §3-c.

Section 2. Authority: This local law is adopted pursuant to subdivision 5 of General Municipal Law §3-c, which expressly authorizes the Board of Supervisors to override the tax levy limit by the adoption of a local law approved by vote of at least sixty (60%) of the Board.

Section 3. Tax Levy Limit Override: The Board of Supervisors of the County of Delaware is hereby authorized to adopt a budget for the fiscal year 2026 that requires a real property tax levy in excess of the amount otherwise prescribed in General Municipal Law §3-c.

Section 4. Severability: If any clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, or part of this Local Law or the application thereof to any person, firm or corporation, or circumstance, shall be adjusted by any court of competent jurisdiction to be invalid or unconstitutional, such order or judgment shall not affect, impair, or invalidate the remainder thereof, but shall be confined in its operation to the clause, sentence, paragraph, subdivision, or part of this Local Law or in its

application to the person, individual, firm or corporation or circumstance, directly involved in the controversy in which such judgment or order shall be rendered.

Section 5. Effective date: This local law shall take effect immediately upon filing with the Secretary of State.

Mr. Merrill stated the local law is being introduced just in case it is necessary to exceed the 2% tax levy limit.

Mr. Merrill offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION NO. 174

TITLE: PUBLIC HEARING ON LOCAL LAW INTRO. NO. 3 OF 2025 RESOLUTION OF THE BOARD OF SUPERVISORS ACCEPTING PROPOSED LOCAL LAW TO OVERRIDE THE TAX LEVY LIMIT ESTABLISHED IN GENERAL MUNICIPAL LAW §3-c AND SCHEDULING PUBLIC HEARING FOR SAME

WHEREAS, on June 24, 2011 the New York State Legislature enacted Chapter 97 of the NYS Laws of 2011, hereinafter referred to as the “General Municipal Law §3-c”; and

WHEREAS, General Municipal Law §3-c expressly authorized local governments to override the tax levy limit by the adoption of a local law approved by a vote of at least sixty percent (60%) of the total voting power of the governing body (in this case, the “Delaware County Board of Supervisors”); and

WHEREAS, the County’s Attorney has prepared a proposed Local Law to Override the Tax Levy Limit Established in General Municipal Law §3-c; and

WHEREAS, the Board of Supervisors has reviewed and modified the proposed Local Law to Override the Tax Levy Limit Established in General Municipal Law §3-c.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the proposed law is ready for consideration by the Board of Supervisors; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Board of Supervisors shall hold a public hearing for consideration of the Local Law to Override the Tax Levy Limit Established in General Municipal Law §3-c on November 12, 2025 at 1:00 p.m. in the Supervisors’ Room of the Senator Charles D. Cook County Office Building, 111 Main Street, Delhi, New York; and

BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED that the Clerk of the Board is hereby authorized and directed to publish notice of said hearing in the Hancock Herald and Mountain Eagle and to post copies of such notice in the manner specified by law.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Cetta and unanimously adopted.

Ms. Molé reiterated the public hearing will be held on Wednesday, November 12 at 1:00 p.m.

Mr. Haynes offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION NO. 175

**TITLE: AUTHORIZATION FOR DISPOSITION OF PERSONAL PROPERTY
NO LONGER NECESSARY FOR PUBLIC USE
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

WHEREAS, Section 215 of the County Law stipulates that the Board of Supervisors must authorize for the disposition of personal property no longer necessary for public use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Department of Public Works is authorized to sell by on-line auction or scrap the following items and all spare parts:

<u>Dept. Vehicle No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Serial Number/VIN</u>
DPW 41	2005 Ford Pickup	1FTNF21555EC36504
DPW 57	2015 Ford Pickup	1FT7X2B6XFEA46969
DPW 95	2010 Chevrolet Flatbed	1GB6KZB66AF103758
DPW 411	2015 International Dump	3HAWLAZR0FL617589
DPW 522	2002 Minivan	1C4GJ253X2B646101
DPW 721	2006 Gradall	0210017817
SWM 823	2005 Manitou MLT526 Forklift	176218

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Vernold and unanimously adopted.

Mr. Hinkley offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION NO. 176

**TITLE: 2025 BUDGET AMENDMENT
LEGAL AID TO INDIGENTS**

WHEREAS, additional funds are necessary to cover costs associated with 18-B assigned counsel for legal aid to indigents; and

WHEREAS, excess funds are available as Delaware County has received more funds from New York State Indigents Legal Services (ILS) than originally budgeted for 2025; and

WHEREAS, the excess funds are necessary to be transferred to cover 18-B assigned counsel costs through the end of 2025.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the 2025 Budget be amended as follows:

INCREASE REVENUE:

10-11170-43302500	State Aid Indigent Legal Services	\$30,000.00
-------------------	-----------------------------------	-------------

INCREASE APPROPRIATION:

10-11170-54535060	Professional Fees - Attorney	\$30,000.00
-------------------	------------------------------	-------------

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Vernold and adopted by the following vote:
Ayes 181, Noes 0 Absent 19 (Kelso, Walley).

Mr. Vernold offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION NO. 177

**TITLE: 2025 BUDGET AMENDMENT
TRANSFER OF FUNDS
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

WHEREAS, Delaware County entered into contract with the A. Lindsay and Olive B. O'Connor Foundation, Inc.; and

WHEREAS, Delaware County has received funding from the A. Lindsay and Olive B. O'Connor Foundation, Inc. for future projects to be completed including the development of a Strategic Comprehensive Plan for Delaware County, as per Resolution No. 193 of 2008 and Resolution No. 120 of 2014; and

WHEREAS, the Delaware County Strategic Comprehensive Plan will serve as a guide to promote the success, safety, and general welfare of Delaware County, providing a basis to guide the development of both the natural and built environment while working to sustain and improve quality of life for residents; and

WHEREAS, the Owl Meeting 3 Video Conference Camera allows for more efficient collaboration with involved agencies on the Plan as well as on future County projects, plans and developments; and

WHEREAS, funds for the purchase of equipment must be separated from the account for accurate reporting of expenses paid; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commissioner has requested and the Planning, Recreation, Culture and Community Committee in conjunction with the Finance Committee and Budget Officer, have agreed that the transfer of funds is needed for equipment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the following transfer of funds be made:

10-18020-54327005-8020018-908	O'Connor Grant County Comp Plan	\$809.19
-------------------------------	---------------------------------	----------

10-18020-52200001-8020018-908	Equipment Grant	\$809.19
-------------------------------	-----------------	----------

Mr. Vernold offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

**TITLE: 2025 BUDGET AMENDMENT
TRANSFER OF FUNDS
PLANNING DEPARTMENT**

WHEREAS, Delaware County has demolished all of the structures and restored the properties to open space; and

WHEREAS, Delaware County is responsible for maintaining the properties and providing for safe access on the sidewalks on the property as per the Village of Sidney Property and Maintenance Codes; and

WHEREAS, Delaware County has limited capacity to clear sidewalks during winter storms for safe access; and

WHEREAS, the Village of Sidney has worked with the Delaware County Planning, Parks and Watershed Affairs Department to find a solution for keeping safe access during the winter months using Village personnel to clear and salt the walkways if Delaware County would provide the necessary equipment; and

WHEREAS, Delaware County DPW has worked with the Village of Sidney Public Works Department to determine equipment needs for the most efficient removal of snow and ice, receiving a quote for all equipment not to exceed \$59,892.80; and

WHEREAS, the Planning Commissioner has requested and the Planning, Recreation, Culture and Community Committee in conjunction with the Finance Committee and Budget Officer, have agreed that the transfer of funds is needed for equipment.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the following transfer of funds be made:

TRANSFER FROM:

10-18020-51000000	Personal Services	\$59,892.80
-------------------	-------------------	-------------

TRANSFER TO:

10-18020-52200000	Equipment	\$59,892.80
-------------------	-----------	-------------

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Ellis and adopted by the following vote: Ayes 181, Noes 0 Absent 19 (Kelso, Walley).

Mr. Marshfield offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION NO. 179

**TITLE: AUTHORIZATION FOR DISPOSITION OF PERSONAL PROPERTY
NO LONGER NECESSARY FOR PUBLIC USE
DEPARTMENT OF SOCIAL SERVICES**

WHEREAS, Section 215 of the County Law stipulates that the Board of Supervisors must authorize for the disposition of personal property no longer necessary for public use.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the Department of Social Services is authorized to sell by trade-in, on-line auction or for scrap the following item:

<u>Dept. Vehicle No.</u>	<u>Description</u>	<u>Serial Number/VIN</u>
DSS 459	2020 Chevrolet Malibu	1G1ZC5STXLF057786

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Vernold and unanimously adopted.

Mr. Merrill offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

RESOLUTION NO. 180**TITLE: PAYMENT OF AUDIT**

WHEREAS, bills and claims submitted and duly audited by the Clerk of the Board's office in the amount of \$2,800,044.26 are hereby presented to the Board of Supervisors for approval of payment;

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED that the County Treasurer be directed to pay said expenditures as listed below:

General Fund	\$1,308,117.67
OET	\$34,243.28
Public Safety Comm System	\$2,495.64
Insurance Risk	\$0.00
CAP 97 Main	\$112.96

CAP MH	\$5,250.00
CAP DSS	\$0.00

Highway Audits, as Follows:

Weights & Measures	\$0.00
Solid Waste/Landfill	\$47,656.16
Road	\$35,468.15
Machinery	\$86,432.67
Capital Solid Waste	\$243,061.24
Capital Road & Bridge	\$997,160.11
CAP DPW Complex	\$40,046.38

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Gladstone and adopted by the following vote:
Ayes 181, Noes 0 Absent 19 (Kelso, Walley).

For other business Ms. Boukai said in light of the ambulance discussion, several constituents raised concerns about public comment at the Board of Supervisors meeting and have asked questions about the sharing of Delaware County sales tax. She stated she was hoping to discuss both issues as a full Board and made a motion to discuss them.

Ms. Molé stated both issues are committee issues and are being discussed within their respective committees. She stated the 2026 Budget is in preparation so there is no answer on the prospect of sharing sales tax.

Ms. Boukai questioned whether an answer would be provided at the next meeting for either topic.

Ms. Molé stated it is up to committee members to decide if a conversation is brought to the full Board which is County procedure.

Ms. Boukai stated that while she understands the procedure, members of the public have asked and she is not on the committees discussing either issue, therefore she is requesting a conversation among all Supervisors. She clarified she is not asking for a decision but a conversation.

Mr. Gladstone seconded the motion.

Mr. Marshfield stated that there is a lot of cutting to be done within the 2026 Budget which is very preliminary at this point and committee members are not ready to discuss sales tax sharing. He stated the County is facing some astronomical yet necessary expenses and he is thankful a decision was never made on sharing sales tax. He stated the County Budget must take care of county expenses and there are some large issues that must be dealt with.

Mr. Cetta stated everything that is brought forward to the full Board goes through a committee first. He suggested Ms. Boukai approach the respective committee regarding an issue as the County is run by committees.

Ms. Boukai said while she understands that, public comment at Board of Supervisors meetings and the sharing of sales tax have been requested for the last two years and is being stalled within committee meetings. She stated both issues impact the entire county and all residents so she would like a conversation to be had among all Supervisors. She stated she understands there is committee procedure but both topics impact every single person.

Ms. Boukai said the conversation around the County ambulance contract suggests there may be some inequity regarding how municipalities are taxed and suggested the share of sales tax could be a potential way to alleviate the financial burden on municipalities that have police forces and ambulance services. She reiterated all she is asking for is a conversation.

Mr. Gladstone said Ms. Boukai is asking for the topics to be a full Board discussion rather than topics only discussed within their respective committees.

Mr. Cetta questioned if there has ever been a full Board discussion on something that did not come from a committee first. Mr. Cetta stated he does not want to break protocol or procedure and set a precedent because once it is allowed it will not stop, and everyone could bring up a committee topic during a Board of Supervisors meeting.

Ms. Boukai stated Supervisors are there to represent the public.

Mr. Cetta agreed but said all discussions begin at the committee level and everything must first go through a committee. He stated that was the first thing he learned after becoming Walton Supervisor – everything that happens at the Board level goes through a committee first.

Ms. Boukai said committees have been approached about these topics for two years and nothing has been decided, nor has the full Board received an update on either of the topics.

Mr. Marshfield stated he did not feel he could have a good conversation about sharing sales tax because of the variables currently being dealt with for the 2026 Budget.

Ms. Boukai said she understands and knows the 2026 Budget has not been presented. She asked when Supervisors will receive the preliminary 2026 Budget as a public hearing was set for the November 12 meeting.

Mr. Merrill clarified a public hearing to override the 2% tax cap was set for November 12 should it be necessary. He stated the preliminary 2026 Budget will be presented to all Supervisors in approximately one month.

Chairman Molé said Ms. Boukai is welcome to attend any committee meeting and ask questions instead of bringing them to the Board of Supervisors meetings. She stated committees are where Supervisors do all the work and Ms. Boukai is welcome to attend those meetings.

In response, Ms. Boukai said it has never been in her best interest to attend the committee meetings, which is why she brought the topics up before the full Board.

Upon a motion, the meeting was adjourned at 2:17 p.m.