

## **REGULAR MEETING**

### **DELAWARE COUNTY BOARD OF SUPERVISORS**

**APRIL 8, 2009**

The regular meeting of the Delaware County Board of Supervisors was held Wednesday, April 8, 2009 at 1:00 p.m. in the Supervisors' Room of the Senator Charles D. Cook County Office Building, 111 Main Street, Delhi, New York, Chairman James E. Eisel, Sr. presiding.

The Clerk called the roll and all Supervisors were present except Ms. Molé and Mr. Maddalone.

Mr. Marshfield offered the invocation.

Mr. Homovich led the Board in the Pledge of Allegiance to the Flag.

The minutes of the previous meeting were accepted as presented.

The Clerk stated that the flags are being flown at half mass in honor of the victims of the tragedy at Binghamton's American Civic Association on Friday, April 3<sup>rd</sup>.

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

Chairman Eisel granted privilege of the floor to John Meredith. Mr. Meredith introduced Jim Thomson of the Mang Insurance Agency (Mang).

Mr. Thomson thanked the County for choosing Mang for their insurance needs. He introduced New York Municipal Insurance Reciprocal (NYMIR) Executive Director Kevin Crawford to provide an update on the NYMIR program.

Mr. Crawford introduced New York State Association of Counties representative Mark Levine.

Mr. Crawford explained that NYMIR is a not-for-profit, tax-exempt organization that began sixteen years ago as a cooperative effort between the counties, the Association of Towns and the Conference of Mayors. Mang is one of six designated agencies that understood the concept of a municipal cooperative reciprocal as a vehicle focused on the exposures that matter most to New York local governments and were very instrumental in bringing together the first twenty-six members. Today there are approximately six hundred members from all across New York State.

Monies received into the program are carefully managed and are invested only in federal treasuries that are completely secure. As a result of good fiscal management NYMIR is now in a position to share the fruits of their efforts with its members and has initiated a three year program of returning a portion of its members capital contribution totaling \$7.5 million dollars as the first phase of sharing in the program.

Mr. Levine presented Chairman Eisel with a check payable to the County in the amount of \$16,978.75. Mr. Crawford thanked the Board for its loyalty and pointed out for the next two years upon renewal the County will be presented with another distribution check. A check was also presented to the Towns of Delhi, Sidney and Walton.

Mr. Marshfield thanked Mr. Crawford for coming to the Board and commented that the Town of Hamden was among the first towns to join NYMIR about twelve years ago and have been very pleased with their services. He noted that the Town of Hamden received a notice from NYMIR advising them of a rate reduction for the 2009-2010 renewal of approximately 5-6 percent.

In response to Mr. Marshfield, Mr. Crawford said that he fully anticipates rates to remain flat or lower upon renewal. NYMIR has just successfully completed negotiating reductions. New York State (NYS) local governments know that NYMIR is well managed. Even though NYMIR had suffered significant losses, paying out over \$6 million in claims as a result of flooding in 2006, NYMIR negotiated a five percent reduction on property insurance rates. He felt confident that members could continue to count on NYMIR to keep rates stable, predictable, and flat with a gradual reduction overtime.

Chairman Eisel thanked Mr. Crawford and Mr. Levine for their presentation.

Chairman Eisel granted Privilege of the Floor to Mr. Hynes. Mr. Hynes introduced Director of Planning Nicole Franzese.

Ms. Franzese stated in 2000 the Farmland Board commissioned a study to be done on farmland. She introduced Amy Kenyon who provided a powerpoint presentation entitled: *Property Taxes on Farms*.

Ms. Kenyon stated that she has been working with the Agricultural Farmland Protection Board and determined that one of the problems being faced by farmers is taxes. She introduced the farmers in the audience, former Town of Meredith Supervisor, farmer and Soil and Water Conservation District (SWCD) Board Member Frank Bachler, farmer and Chair of SWCD Dennis Hill, farmer and President of the Delaware County Farm Bureau Roger Hamilton, farmer and member of the Farmland Protection Board member MaryAnn Kiraly (also an employee of Cornell Cooperative Extension), and farmers Barbara Hanselman and Carol Brannen.

Ms. Kenyon advised that the Agricultural Property Tax Study was funded by the New

York State Department of Agriculture and Markets and focuses on towns in Delaware County. The study indicated that Delaware County has 137,358 acres, representing 14.7 percent of the acreage receiving the agricultural tax exemption. A large majority of the agricultural parcels are locally owned, approximately 153 farms make more than \$100,000 annually and agriculture sales are about \$60 to \$70 million annually. The study also indicated that agricultural exemptions are much less than exemptions for non-profits, local government, or state owned property.

There are varying perceptions on this issue. Farmers feel they pay too much in taxes, assessors feel there may be some abuses of the farmland tax exemption, residents want their assessments to be equitable and there is the feeling that agriculture is in a decline.

Ms. Kenyon explained that NYS provides guidelines on assessing working farms, which are different from how a non-working farm or a home on a rural estate would be valued. NYS guidelines indicate that farms are to be valued at their current use. The sales approach, which considers what another farmer would pay for the property, is an appropriate tool for valuing a farm. Homes on a farm are to be included in the valuation of the farm, not valued at what a non-farmer might pay for a house. The study which surveyed farms for sale and sold around NYS in 2008, including Delaware County farms sold as working farms, were used to develop an example baseline for farm valuations. The survey found that farms over fifty acres averaged \$2,000 per acre, including improvements, farms with prime soils, an extra home, or a new barn averaged \$2,700 an acre with improvements. Land values for farms are between \$1,000 and \$2,000 an acre, representing at least 50 percent of the assessed value.

The study recommended that farmers should talk to their local assessor if they feel they have been over-assessed and to utilize the services of the Cornell Cooperative Extension to assist in providing information and support regarding the assessment process. The Board of Supervisors is urged to provide support to the towns for regular data collection every three to five years to improve equity of assessments and should support farmers with an agricultural economic specialist who could provide baseline data for assessors each year on farm sales for valuation. The towns and assessors should collect the agricultural exemptions back from owners who convert an agricultural parcel for development. NYS should provide more baseline data for assessing farm buildings, consider changing the assessment to provide a higher exemption for full-time farmers to reflect their larger contribution to the local economy of a town.

In conclusion, Ms. Kenyon said the next steps are to discuss these findings with the Agriculture and Finance committees. Once completed, a final report of the study will be prepared and shared with the Supervisors.

In answer to Mr. Triolo, Ms. Kenyon said the study concentrated on local issues and did not look at farmer's school tax credit which is offered by the NYS.

Ms. Kenyon said in reply to Mr. Marshfield, that Mr. Sabansky and the Office of Real Property Tax Services were a valuable resource. It is important to get the individual town data to

the town assessors to review for potential problems as the assessors have the closest relationship with the farmers.

Ms. Kenyon stated in reply to Mr. Hynes, if a farmhouse selling for \$200,000 to \$300,000 on a non-working farm may be valued at \$100,000 when assessing farm property. Using the sales approach, homes are to be included in the valuation of the farm, not valued at what a non-farmer might pay for the house. She pointed out that this is where the assessing becomes complicated.

Mrs. Kiraly remarked buildings that are used as a single purpose structures are normally very old and require a lot of maintenance. If these single purpose structures were to be used for any other purpose, they would require major renovation and expense. In addition, she felt that part of the State's rationale in valuing homes on a working farm less is that living on a farm has some very undesirable characteristics, such as noise, fumes and odors.

In response to Chairman Eisel, Ms. Kenyon explained that each town assessor may be assessing land and farm buildings differently but, in theory a farmhouse on a working farm should be worth less than a farmhouse on a non-working farm.

Mr. Hamilton commented that another reason for the difference is that a portion of the farmhouse on a working farm serves as an office.

Ms. Kenyon stressed the importance of regular data collection. In her opinion, this would remove the problem of over or under valuing land and buildings throughout the county. She noted that the Town of Davenport found properties during their recent data collection that were not on the tax rolls.

Mr. Valente encouraged farmers to learn the system they are living under and avail themselves of the various tools to correct their assessment.

In reply to Mr. Marshfield, Ms. Kenyon explained that currently the farm exemption is the same for all farmers. One of the study's recommendation to NYS is to change the assessment to provide a higher exemption for full-time farmers to reflect their larger contribution to the local economy of a town.

Mr. Homovich remarked that there is a big difference between a part-time farmer and someone who is working a farm full-time and trying to make a living. He felt the \$10,000 exemption was established many years ago and there should be a higher exemption for full-time farmers. He further stated that there needs to be a broad overview of all the information before considering any exemption as once the exemption is given, the difference has to be made up elsewhere.

Chairman Eisel thanked Ms. Kenyon for her presentation.

Chairman Eisel granted privilege of the floor to Mr. Donnelly. Mr. Donnelly introduced Director of Real Property Tax Services Michael Sabansky.

Mr. Sabansky referenced his handout entitled: *Percent of County Taxes Paid by New York City*. He noted that the worksheet is based on 2008 data and additional properties have been purchased by New York City (NYC) in 2009. The worksheet indicates that the total County tax levy to be collected is \$24,797,577.80, of that figure, NYC will pay \$4,315,354.75 which represents 17.4 percent of the total County taxes to be collected.

Mr. Homovich expressed concern about the future of the towns if NYC is successful in reducing their assessments through the grieving process. The idea of changing classifications of what NYC owns is dangerous. He remarked that he did not want anyone negotiating the Town of Colchester's assessments without his knowledge and urged the Board to stay abreast of what NYC is doing regarding this matter.

Mr. Sabansky advised in reply to Mr. Homovich, that the town assessor would be involved in any negotiations of assessments and has to sign the roll.

Mr. Valente remarked that NYC should be assessed like any other business, they are selling water. He questioned whether NYC could be assessed on the water they take.

Mr. Sabansky said in reply to Mr. Valente, NYC can grieve their taxes the same as any other property owner. There are three ways property is assessed, the sales approach method, cost method, and the income and expense method.

Mr. Sabansky also reported on the matter of property classification. He explained that according to New York State Real Property Tax Law, each town must have an assessor. It is the assessor's responsibility to place an assessment on each parcel located in that town. Determination of the parcel classification and roll section are also determined by the town assessor. No two town assessors are exactly alike. Parcels owned by the City can be and are placed in Roll Section 1 and Roll Section 6 as determined by the assessor(s).

Mr. Sabansky stated he researched the rolls back to 1989. The roll sections where City owned properties are located have not been changed for at least 20 years. He also inquired as to whether any current assessor, some of whom have been in office for over 30 years, have made any changes while they were in office, the answer was no..

When tax bills are printed by the RPTS, Roll Sections 4, 5, 6 and 7 are removed before delivery to tax collectors and/or being mailed. They are bundled into groups according to ownership and mailed from the County to save on postage. Directions for payment are usually included in the packet.

There have been no changes to this procedure for the last five years. Accordingly, tax

payments have been made to the towns or the County Treasurer's Office. There have been no changes to the procedure for the 2008/09 tax bills for the Town of Middletown. It was Mr. Sabansky's assumption that perhaps there was a new clerk who followed the instructions mailed with the tax bills and sent the payment directly to the County Treasurer's Office.

For standing committee reports, Mr. Rowe advised that on March 31<sup>st</sup> the Federal Energy Regulatory Commission denied the New York Regional Interconnect's (NYRI) request. On April 6<sup>th</sup>, NYRI sent a letter to the New York Public Service Commission (PSC) administrative law judge officially announcing they were suspending their participation in the PSC's Article VII process. It is expected that the NYRI will withdraw its application.

Mr. Rowe noted there was a lot of money spent to win this fight and there are outstanding expenses that will need to be covered. A great deal of knowledge has been gained through the process but, any contractor or community can refer to the documentation this case created.

Chairman Eisel said the potential withdrawal by NYRI is great news and thanked Mr. Rowe for keeping the Board abreast of this issue. Hopefully, he stated, this will be the end of the fight.

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 61**

**TITLE: DELAWARE COUNTY PUBLIC HEALTH NURSING SERVICE  
CELEBRATES NATIONAL PUBLIC HEALTH WEEK  
APRIL 6 - 12, 2009**

**WHEREAS**, for more than a decade, communities around the country have celebrated National Public Health Week (NPHW) each April to help protect and improve our nation's health; and

**WHEREAS**, the NPHW 2009 theme is "*Building the Foundation for a Healthy America*" and includes supporting healthy employees and businesses and protecting and promoting health in our daily lives; and

**WHEREAS**, Delaware County Public Health is committed to working with individuals, families, work sites and community partners to promote healthy choices and hold educational health fairs, provide wellness programs, provide education and provide coordination and direct services to people living and working in Delaware County; and

**WHEREAS**, Public Health works to protect and promote health in our county in our communities, workplaces, schools and homes

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that Delaware County recognizes April 6<sup>th</sup> through April 12<sup>th</sup> 2009 as National Public Health Week.

The resolution was seconded by Mrs. Capouya and unanimously adopted.

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 62**

**TITLE: 2009 BUDGET AMENDMENT  
TRANSFER OF FUNDS  
OFFICE FOR THE AGING**

**WHEREAS**, the Office for the Aging has included funding in the 2009 County budget to purchase a new vehicle; and

**WHEREAS**, the bid price for this vehicle is \$152.75 more than was allocated for in the agency's budget

**THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the following transfer of funds be authorized:

**FROM:**

10-16772-54595320/6772020/977	General Grant Related Expenses	\$152.75
-------------------------------	--------------------------------	----------

**TO:**

10-16772-52200000/6772020/977	Equipment	\$152.75
-------------------------------	-----------	----------

The resolution was seconded by Mrs. Capouya and adopted by the following vote: Ayes 4129, Noes 0, Absent 677 (Molé, Maddalone).

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 63**

**TITLE: APPROVAL OF MODIFICATIONS AND RENEWAL OF  
AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT 3**

**WHEREAS**, Delaware County has complied with the eight year review procedure of Agricultural Districts 3 in the Towns of Andes, Bovina, Colchester, Delhi, Hamden, Middletown & Roxbury; and

**WHEREAS**, the Delaware County Board of Supervisors held a Public Hearing on Wednesday September 10, 2008 at 6:45 p.m. for any public comment; and

**WHEREAS**, the Agricultural and Farmland Protection Board and the County Planning Board have reviewed said Districts and have recommended that said Agricultural District 3 be renewed with the following modifications:

**Town of Andes**

MODIFICATION	ACREAGE
Additions	2,662.50
Removed	5,852.06
Transfers from Ag 9	5,607.75
<b>After modifications</b>	<b>8,617.08</b>

**Town of Bovina**

MODIFICATION	ACREAGE
Additions	489.89
Removed	5,177.56
Transfers from Ag 9	11,061.38
<b>After modifications</b>	<b>11,551.27</b>

**Town of Colchester**

MODIFICATION	ACREAGE
Additions	0
Removed	0
Transfers from Ag 9	170.68
<b>After modifications</b>	<b>170.68</b>

**Town of Delhi**

MODIFICATION	ACREAGE
Additions	
Removed	1,384.02
Transfers from Ag 9	60.91
<b>After modifications</b>	<b>60.91</b>

**Town of Hamden**

MODIFICATION	ACREAGE
Additions	0
Removed	384.26
Transfers from Ag 9	0
<b>After modifications</b>	<b>0</b>

**Town of Middletown**

MODIFICATION	ACREAGE
Additions	33.28
Removed	4,279.78
Transfers from Ag 9	0

**After modifications** 5,349.20

**Town of Roxbury**

MODIFICATION	ACREAGE
Additions	0
Removed	581.45
<b>After modifications</b>	<b>53.88</b>

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that Agricultural District #3 be renewed with the above recommended modifications.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Utter

Mr. Marshfield said that he was brought up on a dairy farm and that his brothers are still running a dairy farm. He expressed concern that this resolution is taking approximately 18,000 acres out of the agricultural district. In 1982, there were 297,000 acres being used for farming, in 1997 there were only 184,000 acres, which is a loss of 113,000 acres in just 15 years. Based on that historical data, he assumes that there may be only 100,000 acres left being used for farming. In 1998, \$49 million was generated from agriculture in this County of which 83 percent was dairy farms. In 2000, when the Agricultural and Farm land Protection Plan came out, the Town of Hamden had 13 farms, today there are eight. The Town of Hamden is devoted to revitalizing or stabilizing the farming industry in the town and he urged the individual towns to do the same.

Mr. Utter, speaking as a former dairy farmer, said that the majority of money received from farming is from dairy farming and is all outside money from wherever milk is sold. He noted that a farmer's dollar turns over 6.8 times in the community. Dairy farming is a very important part of our economy.

Mr. Donnelly agreed that farms need to be preserved before they are all gone. He referenced a successful farmland program used on Long Island which provided an exemption as long as the farm was a working farm. When farming ceased or the farm was sold for a purpose other than farming there was a formula that was used by the assessors to regain a portion of the money which was not paid in taxes. He felt the program should be looked into for Delaware County.

Mrs. Capouya felt that due to the intensive capital investment, it was becoming harder to get new people into farming and suggested the County look at encouraging more diverse types of farming to get people interested in starting farms.

Chairman Eisel said that farming on Long Island was crowded out by the growing population and need for homes, here the reason is that it is just not profitable.

Mr. Utter on behalf of all farmers in Delaware County thanked the County for offering

the farmers an exemption.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 64**

**TITLE: DESIGNATION OF A THIRTY DAY PERIOD  
FOR AGRICULTURAL DISTRICT REVIEW**

**WHEREAS**, Chapter 523 of the Laws of 2003 amended NYS Agricultural and Markets Law to require the County Legislative Body to designate a thirty-day review period in which landowners may submit requests for inclusion of predominately viable agricultural lands within a certified agricultural district prior to the County established review period; and

**WHEREAS**, the Delaware County Agricultural and Farmland Protection Board has recommended that the thirty-day period be from May 1, 2009 to May 30, 2009; and

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Delaware County Board of Supervisors does hereby designate the time period from May 1, 2009 to May 30, 2009 to be the annual thirty-day review period for the year 2009.

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

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 65**

**TITLE: AUTHORIZING THE IMPLEMENTATION AND FUNDING IN THE  
FIRST INSTANCE 100% OF THE FEDERAL-AID AND STATE "MARCHISELLI"  
PROGRAM-AID ELIGIBLE COSTS, OF A TRANSPORTATION FEDERAL-AID  
PROJECT AND APPROPRIATING FUNDS THEREFOR  
DEPARTMENT OF PUBLIC WORKS**

**WHEREAS**, a Project for County Route 2 over Bagley Brook (BIN 3352470) in the Town of Hamden, Delaware County, P.I.N. 9752.99 (the Project) is eligible for funding under Title 23 U.S. Code, as amended, that calls for the apportionment of the costs of such program to be borne at the ratio of 80% Federal funds and 20% non-Federal funds; and

**WHEREAS**, the County of Delaware desires to advance the Project by making a commitment of 100% of the Federal and non-Federal share of the Preliminary Engineering, Right-of-Way and Construction and Construction Supervision and Inspection work; and

**WHEREAS**, the County of Delaware has previously executed Supplemental Agreement #1(Resolution # 14 of 2008) and Federal Aid and Marchiselli Aid Project Agreement(Resolution #313 of 2004) and appropriated \$380,000 and \$54,282 for a total appropriation of \$434,282.

**NOW, THEREFORE**, the Delaware County Board, duly convened, does hereby

**RESOLVE**, that the Delaware County Board hereby approves the above subject project; and

**IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Delaware County Board hereby authorizes the County of Delaware to pay in the first instance 100% of the Federal and non-Federal share of the Preliminary Engineering, Right-of-Way and Construction and Construction Supervision and Inspection work for the Project or portions thereof; and

**IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the sum of \$2,512,693 is hereby appropriated from 34-15112-54000000 and made available to cover the cost increase of participation in the above phase of the Project; and

**IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED**, that in the event the full Federal and non-Federal share costs of the project exceeds the amount appropriated above, the Delaware County Board shall convene as soon as possible to appropriate said excess amount immediately upon the notification by the New York State Department of Transportation thereof; and

**IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED**, that the Chairman of the Delaware County Board of Supervisors be and is hereby authorized to execute all necessary Agreements, certifications or reimbursement requests for Federal Aid and/or Marchiselli Aid on behalf of the County of Delaware with the New York State Department of Transportation in connection with the advancement or approval of the Project and providing for the administration of the Project and the Municipality's first instance funding of project costs and permanent funding of the local share of Federal-aid and State-aid eligible Project costs and all Project costs within appropriations therefor that are not so eligible; and

**IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED**, that a certified copy of this resolution be filed with the New York State Commissioner of Transportation by attaching it to any necessary Agreement in connection with the project; and

**IT IS FURTHER RESOLVED**, this Resolution shall take effect immediately.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Rowe and adopted by the following vote: Ayes 4129, Noes 0, Absent 677 (Molé, Maddalone).

Chairman Eisel waived Board Rule 10 to permit the introduction without objection of the following not-prefiled resolutions.

Chairman Eisel offered the following resolution and moved its adoption:

**RESOLUTION NO. 66**

**TITLE: IN MEMORY OF ALBERT PAUL VAMOSY SR.**

**WHEREAS**, Albert Paul Vamosy Sr., passed away on April 3, 2009, having served as the Supervisor of the Town of Harpersfield from 1976 to 1977; and

**WHEREAS**, he was recognized for his hard work, dedication and community service

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED** that the Delaware County Board of Supervisors extend their sincere sympathy to his family and recognizes with gratitude his years of service and contributions to Delaware County.

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Utter and Mr. Hynes.

Chairman Eisel stated that Mr. Vamosy was a good man with quite a sense of humor. He was a farmer for years, had a good sense of community and will be missed by his family, friends and the community at large.

Mr. Utter noted that he and his wife were personal friends of Mr. Vamosy and his wife. The family is a fine family and very well known in the Stamford/Harpersfield area. The farm is being carried on by Mr. Vamosy's son who is one of the County's emergency services coordinators.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

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

**RESOLUTION NO. 67**

**TITLE: RESOLUTION OF THE COMMITTEE ON ADMINISTRATION/VETERANS AFFAIRS AND THE COMMITTEE ON NATURAL RESOURCES SUPPORTING REINTRODUCTION OF FEDERAL SENATE BILL S-1722, THE FEDERAL MILK MARKETING IMPROVEMENT ACT**

**WHEREAS**, our Nation's vast farming industry contributes to our nation's health and prosperity every day of the year and the dairy farming industry is the backbone of Delaware County; and

**WHEREAS**, it is estimated that dairy farmers are currently being paid about 95 cents per gallon of milk, while it costs them \$1.50 to produce that same gallon and the rising costs of

production along with the extreme drop in price per hundred weight of milk has many dairy farmers in Delaware County concerned about providing for their families now and in the future; and

**WHEREAS**, United States Senators Arlen Specter and Bill Casey are leading an effort to reintroduce The Farmers Milk Marketing Improvement Act of 2007 (S.1722) which is “an act to amend the Agricultural Adjustment Act to require the Secretary of Agriculture to determine the price of milk used for manufactured purposes, which shall be classified as Class II milk, by using the national average cost of production and for other purposes”; and

**WHEREAS**, this bill was designed to correct the disparity in payment versus cost and the reintroduction of this bill would mean a raise in the price per hundredweight from a current approximate price of just under \$12 to an approximate price of \$22.46

**NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED**, that the Delaware County Board of Supervisors supports the reintroduction of S.1722, the “Federal Milk Marketing Improvement Act of 2007” and requests our representatives in the United States Congress and Senate to pass this bill to correct the many inequities the dairy farming industry is facing in Delaware County Board and nation wide; and

**BE IT FURTHER RESOLVED**, that certified copies of this Resolution be forward to President Barack Obama, Senator Arlen Specter, Senator Robert P. Casey, Jr., Congressman Michael Arcuri, Senator Charles Schumer, Senator Kirsten Gillibrand, New York Senator John J. Bonacic, State Assemblyman Peter D. Lopez, State Assemblyman Clifford W. Crouch, New York State Commissioner of Agriculture and Markets Patrick Hooker, New York State Association of Counties and Progressive Agriculture Organization (Pro-Ag).

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Rowe and Mrs. Capouya.

Chairman Eisel commented that he understands the plight of the farmer is tough. He hoped that the federal government will consider reintroduction of this Bill and advised that other counties are sending in a similar resolution.

The resolution was unanimously adopted.

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

#### **RESOLUTION NO. 68**

#### **TITLE: PAYMENT OF AUDIT**

**WHEREAS**, bills and claims submitted and duly audited by the Clerk of the Board’s office in the amount of \$991,618.66 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	\$640,256.55
OET	\$33,565.42
Countryside	\$360.00
Highway Audits, as Follows:	
Road	\$119,041.79
Machinery	\$60,959.67
Capital Road & Bridge	\$43,824.01
Capital Solid Waste	\$39,980.00
Solid Waste/Landfill	\$53,631.22

The resolution was seconded by Mr. Marshfield and adopted by the following vote: Ayes 4129, Noes 0, Absent 677 (Molé, Maddalone).

Chairman Eisel made the following re-appointments to the Countryside Care Center Committee:

Thomas Hynes, Supervisor Town of Roxbury  
Wayne Marshfield, Supervisor Town of Hamden  
Thomas Briggs, Director Office for the Aging  
William Moon, Commissioner Department of Social Services  
Christa Schafer, Town of Roxbury

Chairman Eisel said that there will be a kick off committee luncheon meeting on May 13<sup>th</sup> at the Countryside Care Center. A time for the meeting has not yet been determined.

Chairman Eisel advised that the towns will be receiving ballots for the Coalition of Watershed Towns. The following people are currently serving:

John Meredith, Town of Walton Supervisor - Vice Chairman  
Peter Bracci, Town of Delhi - Regular  
William Layton, Town of Tompkins Supervisor - Regular  
Craig DuMond, Town of Masonville Supervisor - Alternate

There are two alternate slots available that can be filled by any elected official who may be inclined to serve. He suggested the Supervisors bring the ballot to their Town Boards in the hope of gaining the interest of town councilmen and woman.

Mr. Utter commented that he served on the Coalition of Watershed Towns and this is the

only agency that has the clout to speak for the people in the watershed.

Upon a motion, the meeting was adjourned at 2:45 p.m.