MS. LANGDON: Can I have
everybody's attention, please. It's after five, so
we're going to get started now. Would everybody
please sign the attendance sheet, even if you don't

wish to comment.

Good afternoon. My name is Susan Langdon, Director of Project Development for the Niagara County Industrial Development Agency, and I'll be serving as hearing officer for this public hearing. It is now 5:03 P.M.

The purpose of this hearing is to solicit comments, both written and oral, on the proposed PILOT modification for the AES Eastern Energy, L.P. project in the Town of Somerset, New York. For your review, a copy of the project application, project summary, cost/benefit analysis, and the public hearing notice have been made available in the front of the room.

Please be advised that this is not a debate or a question and answer session. We are here to record your comments, and present a transcript of these proceedings to the Niagara County Industrial Development Agency Board of

Directors for their consideration in their decision relative to this project.

This project involves modification of the Payment in Lieu of Tax Agreement as follows. Year two, PILOT payment fourteen point three million dollars; year three, PILOT payment of twelve point eight million dollars; year four, twelve point eight million dollars; and year five, twelve point eight million dollars.

As part of the proposed modification, the NCIDA Board is considering the establishment of a PILOT safety valve, which would run to the benefit of the county, town and school district. If the market conditions for the AES Somerset facility return to the 2009 levels, the PILOT amounts would also be returned to the original PILOT payment amounts.

Notice of public hearing: Notice is hereby given that a public hearing pursuant to Article 18-A of the New York General Municipal Law will be held by the Niagara County Industrial Development Agency (the "Agency") on the 1st day of February, 2011, at 5:00 P.M., local time, the at

Somerset Town Hall Boardroom, 8700 Haight Road, Barker, New York 14102, in connection with the following matter.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

AES Eastern Energy, L.P., for itself, or on behalf of an entity formed, or to be formed (the "company"), has requested the Agency's assistance with respect to a certain project (the "Project") consisting of: (A) the acquisition or retention by the Agency of fee title to, or a leasehold interest in, an approximately 1,800-acre parcel of land located at 7725 Lake Road in the Town of Somerset, Niagara County, New York (the "Land"), together with the existing nine buildings thereon (the "Existing Improvements", and together with the Land, the "Facility"). The agency has previously provided financial assistance (the "Financial Assistance") to the Company to qualifying portions of the Project, consisting of partial real property tax abatement in the form of a certain Payment-in-Lieu-of-Tax Agreement (the "Existing PILOT.")

Pursuant to the Company's request to modify the terms of the existing PILOT, the

Agency will consider acquiring or retaining title to, or a leasehold interest in, the Facility and lease the Facility back to the Company. The Company will operate the Facility during the term of the lease. At the end of the lease term, the Company will purchase the Facility from the Agency, or if the Agency holds a leasehold interest, the leasehold interest will be terminated. The Agency contemplates that it will provide financial assistance (the "Financial Assistance") to the Company for qualifying portions of the Project, consisting of a modification of the Existing PILOT between the Agency and the Company.

A representative of the Agency will be at the above-stated time and place to present a copy of the Company's amended application, and to hear and accept all written and oral comments from all persons with views in favor of, or opposed to, or otherwise relevant to the proposed changes to the existing PILOT agreement.

This public hearing is being conducted in accordance with Subdivision 2 of Section 859-a of the New York State General

| Municipal Law.

Dated January 13, 2001, Niagara County Industrial Development Agency, Samuel M. Ferraro, Executive Director.

I will open the hearing for comments. Please remember to give your name, address and organization you represent. Direct all comments to the Chair. And your comments should be made on this project only. And please limit your comments to three minutes to give everyone a chance to talk.

I have a sign-in sheet. I'm going to recognize people that signed in that they wish to talk, and if anybody else, when they're done, wishes to, please raise your hand.

James Hoffman.

JAMES HOFFMAN: I guess I pay a penalty for getting here early. James Hoffman, 8737 Lake Road, Town of Somerset.

I am no friend of PILOT, but I do support the Verizon component of this, because I think Verizon certainly is a bright star on the horizon for us.

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

21

22

23

1

There is no doubt that in these financial times -- I have a written record of this, plus some backup. There's no doubt in these financial times that we're all suffering, including even large companies like AES Somerset, LLC. would like nothing better than AES to return to their previously highly-profitable days. All of us would benefit if that were to occur. I wish AES and their employees the best in their efforts to make that happen. Revising the current PILOT will not help AES, and will further devastate our community, as the basic financial problems lie outside of Niagara County.

A Payment-in-Lieu-of-Taxes, a PILOT, is a shift in taxes from those politically connected to those less well connected and less able Further, it erodes our tax base. current proposed revision will shift well over six million dollars in taxes to Niagara County residents most -- many of whom are unemployed, underemployed, retired, or living on fixed incomes. recent unemployment figures place the Niagara Falls area at eleven percent on unemployment. These are

the people who are being required to subsidize AES, a profitable, multi-national corporation.

Further, the current pilot has not achieved the tax certainty promised because of the failure of AES to live up to agreements signed by them. There's no assurance that future agreements will fare any better. Something else besides a PILOT should be tried. It is not working. This is the third attempt, and we have had no tax certainty, we've had tax uncertainty.

There's been spin in news articles recently. Barker Central School District and Dr. Roger Klatt have released a statement, and they've thrown some light on what's going on here. I do not view that as supportive of this PILOT, but it does give us some numbers to work with. And some of the key numbers that are always absent in something like this is what does it do to my wallet. What does the -- what would this PILOT do for the average taxpayer. That number is nowhere to be seen; never will be.

The Supreme Court of the State of New York, Appellate Division Fourth Judicial

Department, ruled against NCIDA and AES in part as follows, May 10, 2010 -- now, remember, they're talking about the original PILOT. The record establishes, however, that AES respondents presented no financial statements to NCIDA from which NCIDA could determine whether financial assistance to the Somerset Generating Station was necessary. In other words, the financial case was not made in the original PILOT. And I don't know how you go around advising something -- and where are the financial details that would say, hey, those guys are really It's not there. And the Judicial in trouble? Appellate Court, four judges, ruled unanimously in May of 2010, out of Rochester, on this very subject. MS. LANGDON: Mr. Hoffman, can you sort of wrap it up? We have more speakers. JAMES HOFFMAN: Well, let me -- a couple more. Tying PILOT payments to the price of electricity, the Catch 22, with all the natural gas being discovered, and foreign demand for coal

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

recover.

That would be good for our economy, since

high, the price of electricity may never, never

our economy runs on cheap energy, but may not necessarily be good for AES, unless they adapt to the use of other fuel, perhaps even natural gas. On the other hand, the price of electricity goes up, we all pay more for electricity, but maybe less for the PILOT. But I don't know where the individual is benefiting at all on this.

I think the public has been kept, essentially, out of that, and I could identify some reasons. But I think I'll skip that.

But again, the problems AES and the rest of us face will not be solved locally. The solutions lie where the policy and the environmental decisions are made, and that's at the state level, federal government level, and at the White House.

And I'm going to make some suggestions, so hold your laughter until the end, okay; freeze the state budget, eliminate unfunded mandates, set aside the New New York State Renewal Energy Portfolio, because that's nothing but a threat to people like AES and discourages them from investing in conventional energy, lift the ban on drilling for natural gas and hydrofracking in New

York State, this alone will provide twenty thousand jobs, high-paying jobs, and perhaps it will even allow AES to have some natural gas, and perhaps put in another plant that burns cleaner.

Thank you for the opportunity to talk.

7 MS. LANGDON: Thank you.

John Syracuse.

JOHN SYRACUSE: My name is

John Syracuse. I live at 6091 Condren Road in

Newfane.

know, I've had the privilege of representing the Town of Somerset in the Niagara County Legislature. Tonight, I address you not just as a legislator for Somerset, but also as a citizen in the northeastern corner of this county. And as a citizen, and a father and husband who pays taxes on a home and a private practice, when I hear that a business that pays taxes in this county is seeking a reduction from what many might consider a fair level of taxation, I am concerned. But I am more concerned when I hear that that business might have to close

up shop and lay off a hundred or more employees because the cost of doing business has grown too high, and government is one of those primary reasons.

Now, I don't believe that either the taxes paid by AES Somerset to this county, nor to the Town of Somerset, nor to the Barker Central School District, are responsible for the company's plight. Frankly, I'm proud of this legislature's record cutting government spending and lowering taxes over the past half decade. And I'm proud, too, of the PILOT Agreement that we put in place for AES last year. That PILOT deal showed that this county government, and our friends in Somerset and Barker are committed to fostering a climate that's conducive to business growth.

But for AES, new fees originating in Albany, something called carbon footprint fees that was deemed up by Assembly Speaker, Sheldon Silver and former Governor, David Paterson, raised their cost of doing business by ten million dollars. That the Obama Administration and the former Speaker of the House helped foist such schemes on us, all

while increasing taxes and fees, only exacerbated the problem for AES.

Worse, though, is the global market for coal. As you all know, AES is a coal-burning plant. And while coal remains one of the best and most readily available sources of energy in the world, the Obama Administration and former Pelosi Congress were waging war on coal production in the U.S.

At the same time, strategic competitors of China and India were competing with American electricity-generating companies like AES to buy what coal was on the global market. And we all remember what happens when supply doesn't go up, but demand does; the price of coal surged.

AES is, indeed, our biggest taxpayer in this county. They're also, maybe even more importantly, a major employer. The new PILOT deal that has been put forth remembers both facts. AES will, even with this deal, remain our county's single largest taxpayer. Something that, frankly, we wish the other electricity-producing enterprise here in Niagara could say; but the Power Authority

isn't burdened by things like trying to turn a profit, or at least remain solvent. AES, on the other hand, is.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The current global, regulatory and economic climate would, frankly, put AES right out of business, and put their employees on to the unemployment rolls.

Mr. Chairman, I'm standing here tonight as a supporter of this PILOT, and of AES and its workers. As we've seen demonstrated again and again by the actions of the Niagara County Legislature, by the actions of the Niagara County Industrial Development Agency, and by important partners like Senator Maziarz, in our county job creation is job one. So I think that job two must necessarily then be job protection. Mr. Chairman, this new PILOT is the right thing to do to protect jobs, and an attempt to undo the harm that Washington and Albany have done to one of our biggest employers. I urge my colleagues to stand up for the working men and the working women of AES Somerset, and to support this PILOT. Thank you.

Thank you.

MS. LANGDON:

Okay. James Giegerich.

JAMES GIEGERICH: Hello. My
name is Jim Giegerich. I live at 8825 Bradley Road,
Gasport, New York. I'm a Niagara County resident
and a Barker Central School taxpayer.

I strongly disapprove of this AES application for a new deviated PILOT. And I respectfully request that this application be denied by the Niagara County Industrial Development Agency, the Barker Central School District, and the Niagara County government; notwithstanding all the fine remarks that Mr. Syracuse made.

I am a free enterprise person, and I believe in free enterprise. This country was founded on free enterprise. It was not founded on government-sponsored free enterprise. This is a competitive environment, and I think that's what we really need to aspire -- go for in this country.

Here are some points I would like to make. First of all, after the court ruling that disallowed the original PILOT for many reasons, including procedural reasons, a modified PILOT was agreed to subsequently by AES, IDA, and the

concerned government entities. That agreement was negotiated and executed in good faith. Everybody came together and said let's make it work, much along the lines that Mr. Syracuse mentioned.

The deviated PILOT is not in conformance with that second PILOT. If this were to be considered, it should have been considered at that time.

The fundamental purpose of the taxpayer subsidy to AES is to create new jobs in Niagara County and the State of New York. There are no new jobs proposed by AES to justify the substantial addition to the enormous tax subsidy already provided by the taxpayers to AES in the current PILOT. It's not like we haven't already done great things for AES. We've done great things for AES, and they're asking for more. And I suppose under the procedure that's going on, that a year from now they'll come back and ask for an additional modified or deviated PILOT. When is this going to end?

There are no supporting staff reports that I've been able to obtain, or IDA

analyses or AES financial data that has been made available to the public that demonstrates that additional extraordinary taxpayer subsidies to a profitable worldwide corporation is justified as compared to the benefits in new jobs created. Not getting a substantial profit, as indicated by the AES application, is not a reasonable justification for a private enterprise in the United States of America.

Most importantly for me as a citizen -- and I've gotten materials through the mail from Dr. Klatt -- most importantly to me as a citizen is that there will be a severe adverse impact on the Barker Central Schools at the very time when there is a recognized need nationally, and in the State of New York, for improved educational programs. And when I see that it will have a six-plus million dollar impact, in addition to the other financial impact that the previous PILOT would have on the Barker Central School System, this is of great concern to me as a citizen. Education has got to be one of our highest priorities. We have to put money into education. If I had a choice between

putting money into education and putting money into subsidizing a profit-making worldwide international corporation, I would chose education, definitely.

9.

The denial of this application is only fair and responsible, considering the very high level of trust and responsibility that's been placed by the County Legislature in the IDA to fulfill its responsibility to protect the health, the safety, the welfare, and the interest of the residents and taxpayers of this county. I know it's a big balancing act, but in balance, I would prefer education expenditures of that six million dollars, and not a tax subsidy to profit-making private enterprise.

So in summary, we have here tonight a proposal by AES, a very large, a very profitable international energy corporation that's making investments all over the world, but not here in Niagara County, that wants to avoid its corporate responsibility to pay its fair share of taxes on the already documented under-assessed value of its property. State agencies have indicated that their value is worth a great deal more than they have said

its worth. And they're not even paying their fair share; according to the rate that we are paying, they're paying a much lesser rate, and then they get a PILOT, and now they're coming back for another reduction. So why is that citizen more valuable and more important than each and every one of the citizens in this county? I don't understand why there is not equity.

We want to -- they want to pay a lower tax than the rest of us property owners and the citizens of Niagara County to create greater benefit for their shareholders. They are shareholders, they have -- a private corporation, they have shareholders, and this will only mean more profit for the shareholders. Which is very, very good, that's what private enterprise is about. But why does -- why do the citizens of Niagara County have to support the shareholders getting better dividends and better returns for their investment?

And finally, in conclusion, with no corresponding public benefits or jobs identified, new jobs, in this proposal, approving this application would be nothing short of the grossest

form of unjustified corporate welfare accorded to

AES by Niagara County citizens and taxpayers, even

by reasonable subsidy means testing standards, which

all welfare candidates have to go through. When you

apply for job assistance or social services, you

have to have means testing. The means testing that

was done in this case is not there. There is no

means testing that they've submitted information

for.

And therefore, it's my feeling as a citizen that this application should not be approved. The previously approved PILOT is sufficient. And if it's not sufficient, then maybe they need to get a different business manager to operate at a higher level of profit than they are right now. Thank you very much.

MS. LANGDON:

Thank you.

Next, Daniel Engert.

DANIEL ENGERT: Good afternoon. Daniel Engert, 1167 Quaker Road, Barker, New York. And my comments are not written, they're notes, so I won't be as eloquent as the previous three, but I'll take a shot.

1	I think I want to start by
2	addressing, from a Town Board perspective, the
3	benefits of the PILOT. It's been alluded that
4	PILOTs are bad in general terms. I would disagree,
5	and I would just remind those here that there are
6	significant values to PILOT, particularly in the
7	commercial realm, and particularly with a six
8	hundred seventy-five megawatt coal plant. They
9	present an extreme challenge to the taxing
10	jurisdiction, particularly the town that is required
11	to set the assessed value on that. We saw that
12	difficulty endured for many years as the town
13	diligently tried to appropriately assess the value
14	of that plant. During that long term, there was
15	significant fluctuation. It's hard for an
16	assessment model to incorporate, and that was
17	challenging. Countless experts, appraisers,
18	lawyers, with a lot of real costs attached to them,
19	tried to set fair values to the plant. In the end,
20	almost all of the time, there was opening for
21	challenges, and it just created a never-ending cycle
22	of litigation and challenges to that attempt.
23	And so in this case, PILOTs

represent certainty. They represent anticipated revenue. And when we talk about certainty, and the buzz words have been out here a couple of times, I would remind everyone that -- particularly, the certainty that we talked about last year with the original PILOT, was certainty that was brought to the taxing jurisdictions because of anticipation of revenue that was coming in. That exists with the new PILOT proposal.

We heard this certainty echoed from not only the town, we heard this desire for certainty echoed by the school and the county as well. It made for preparing an efficient budget much more easy on the taxing jurisdictions.

So I guess my point is that there are instances where I believe that PILOTs are a very good thing, and particularly, they are something that we desire to achieve in Somerset, particularly from a Board perspective.

I think it's also important to remember that a year ago when we were here talking about the, I guess it would be the second PILOT, there was a number of positives that were echoed by

the three taxing jurisdictions. And I would submit that those sentiments exist today. I remember hearing the cooperative effort that the three taxing jurisdictions were provided an opportunity to meet and to drive the process.

There was -- that effort was also afforded to the taxing jurisdictions in this go-around. We had numerous meetings where we discussed, not only the basis of the request for relief, but we also examined the market, we examined any information that we had at our fingertips to make an assessment as to what was the appropriate course of action. The ending of litigation existed a year ago. That remains to be the case today. I would even submit that, you know, in this case we have prevented future litigation by our achieving of a PILOT.

I remember the short-term and the measured relief that was so important and so vital when it related to this PILOT, and the taxing jurisdictions strived to maintain that in this go-around as well. The initial application called for an eight-year extension. The taxing

jurisdictions said no, it's too long, it's too far out. We worked hard to keep it short-termed and measured. We remain consistent today.

And I feel as though, you know, many of those same qualities that existed a year ago are still in existence today. And I would also add that while there has been a reduction in revenue, we've also gained an added component to holding AES to a standard that when the energy market will come back, which we are very hopeful -- none of us roots harder for that plant than the Town of Somerset and the Barker Central School District -- that they will be in a position to be able to contribute and maintain their fair share of taxing payments to the two jurisdictions.

So in the end, you know, while this -- there's difficult times abound for many in our community, including residents and businesses, we felt strongly that our elected representatives, and again, I'm speaking from the Town perspective, the people conveyed to us repeatedly their desire for us to do everything possible to work through this, to work hard and negotiate, not to litigate,

and to protect all of their interests.

AES revenue, as I stated earlier, is a critical, critical component to, not only the town and the school, but it's also a critical component to the county's resources. Legislator Syracuse already commented to the fact that they are, and remain, the largest taxpayer in our county. And so their health and their profitability, and their good fortune, are directly tied to our town, and so therefore, they are very important to our residents.

I have no crystal ball. But I know that in support of this PILOT I can look anyone in the eye and say that we did all that we could do at this time. And we are hopeful and optimistic for our future, that includes a viable and profitable AES Somerset. And for those reasons, I support this PILOT. I support AES and its employees, many of which live and work in Somerset and in this county.

And in closing, I would like to, again, express thanks, as I did at the last go-around, to Chairman Sloma, the Niagara County Industrial Development Agency, who has allowed for

the steering of the taxing jurisdictions in this 1 regard, Mark Gabriel, who I believe is here, the 2 attorney who's provided countless pep talks and phone conversations with me to keep me up to speed on what particular elements mean and their 5 ramifications, and I appreciate that, my colleagues on the Town Board; Councilman Alt, Councilwoman Jansen, and Wayner, and Supervisor Meyers, Chairman 8 Ross, Legislator Syracuse of the legislature, Dr. 9 10 Klatt and Scott Hoot, the business administrator, 11 for all their efforts put forth in this very 12 difficult endeavor.

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And with that, I will rest.

MS. LANGDON: Thank you.

Would the rest of the speakers mind please coming to the front of the room. Next would be Randall Wayner.

RANDALL WAYNER: Thank you. I would like to start out by saying that I received a communication from a concerned citizen, and it was a welcome communication, but the communication said that so far the presentation, or the rationale had lacked in specifics, and went on from there. And so

I had some specifics prepared for this afternoon's hearing; a lot of numbers. And so I know that numbers can get a little bit dry, but I think it's important, but because after all, when it's all said and done, that is what we're talking about here are payments and dollar figures, so if you'll indulge me.

I just also wanted to address the fact that we've heard a lot about -- through the history of all of these different PILOT negotiations and then again, more particularly today, about how AES is a multi-national global corporation, which they are. However, I think it's important to note, very important to note, that AES Eastern Energy is not that. AES Eastern Energy, or AEE, is comprised of four locations, all in New York State; Cayuga, Greenidge, Westover, and of course, Somerset.

Greenidge, I'll just say that -or note that three of the four units that are
currently there have been shut down. And there is
application to PFC right now to shut down unit
number four.

Westover; seven of the eight

original units are shut down, and in March of this year, it looks like number eight will be shut down as well.

So let's take a look at AES AEE income. In 2005, net income, ninety-one million dollars; 2006, a hundred and twenty-seven; 2008, one thirty-one; 2009, thirty-four. And I've got it broken down by quarters, and I won't read all the quarterly numbers, but suffice to say that there's a definite trend going this way. This isn't one, you know, one of these, it's a definite trend downward.

And so it would be extremely easy to assume that last year, 2010, was not a very good year for AEE either. But rather than assume, let's look at the numbers, and I have the numbers for the Somerset plant all by itself. 2007, net income, forty-one point eight million; 2008, thirty-eight point two; 2009, a five point six million dollar loss; 2010, H1 of the first six months, one point 0-four million dollar loss; H2 projected, one point five million dollar loss; and a projected loss in 2011 of four point nine seven million dollars.

We've heard about root causes.

The root cause of this negative trend is the high price of coal and the decreasing revenue from selling the electricity that they produce.

Let's take a look at the coal prices. And I'm almost done with numbers. But let's take a look at the coal prices. 2005, thirty-one dollars twenty-two cents per ton; 2006, thirty-four twenty six; I'm going to skip a couple of years, but then it goes to 2009, forty-four seventy-two; and in July of 2010, sixty-seven dollars; and now we're in the seventies. That's a forty-three percent rise from 2005 to 2009; a fifty percent rise from December of 2009 to July 2010.

The other component, of course, is the price paid for the product they produce, electricity. 2005, eighty-five to ninety dollars per megawatt hour; 2009 forty to forty-five. That's half of what they were getting in 2005. So these are numbers that are readily available.

But what do the experts think? I mean, what do independent sources think and say, and what are they looking at regarding AEE? In 2010, Standard & Poor's downgraded their rating from BB

1 stable to BB negative. August 2010, Moody downgraded its rating from BA1 to BA2. And then 3 January 31, 2011, Moody downgrades to B3 from BA2. 4 And the reason they give, and I'm just going to read 5 this; the downgrade reflects a dramatic deterioration in AEE's prospects and performance 6 7 that is primarily the result of compressed dark 8 spreads, that's that margin between the price of 9 power and the cost of coal, and it's reflected on 10 the company's severely-strained liquidity position. 11 And it goes on at some length, which I won't read 12 three pages of this thing. But in addition, the 13 cost of coal has risen significantly more. Okay. 14 Also, I found a downgrade from 15 Fitch. And Fitch downgraded from BB+ to CCC. 16 But I think the reasons why these 17 downgrades happened are more important. And I've

But I think the reasons why these downgrades happened are more important. And I've got four of them here: Lower than expected power prices and significantly eroded operating margins expected to persist in the near term for the Western New York power region where AEE is located; lower than anticipated capacity factors at AES -- AEE's five coal-fired plants projected to remain at

18

19

20

21

22

23

fifty-five to seventy percent annually for the next five years. This is not a short-term thing we're looking at here, this is -- they're talking about five years.

I'll skip a couple for the sake of brevity. I have this in outline form, which I will give to you.

One very, very important one goes back to one of the first points I made; no significant financial support expected from AEE's alternate sponsor, AES Corporation. Okay.

So what does all this say? All of this, coupled with the face-to-face meetings that we've had with AES or AEE says that the biggest taxpayer in Niagara County, and certainly in this town's history, is experiencing documented financial stress, that if not lightened, would force one of at least three negative end results. One, protective layup, which is another word for shutting a plant down; two, default on their PILOT payments, which would place them back on the tax roll at a much diminished rate than before; or three, the return to hundreds of thousands of dollars in expense for

	-
1	assessment consultant fees and inevitable cost in
2	legal battles that would be sure to follow.
3	In conclusion, in light of these
4	negatives, and after a thorough look at the
5	financial condition of the town, I am prepared to
6	stand here today and ask that this amendment be
7	adopted, that this measured amount of relief be
8	granted to AES. I would also say that it's
9	important to note that fund balances will be
10	affected. And I would respectfully ask the IDA and
11	AES to say that I'm here, standing here today, at
12	this point in time for this negotiation. The well
13	will be drier should this come around again, which I
14	trust that it won't.
15	So thank you for your time.
16	MS. LANGDON: Thank you. I
17	have some names here. Would anybody else who wishes
18	to speak, please raise their hand.
19	JAMES HOFFMAN: Can I jump
20	in?
21	MS. LANGDON: Just let me
22	get everybody first.
23	JAMES HOFFMAN: Okay.

1 MS. LANGDON:

Anyone else?

TOM SZULIST:

Tom Szulist,

6730 Lake Road, Appleton.

I'm a relatively new resident to the area. I worked on Wall Street for many years, and I guess what is most bothersome is that where do we weigh out the corporate responsibility to communities versus the greed aspect of just running a business? And the greed is what really made me change my career. I'm tired of seeing the greed for the sake of shareholders.

At the same time we're talking about all these problems, AES announced a five hundred million dollar stock buyback on December 31 of last year. Here they are, going -- taking their money, and whether the stock goes up a point or two, they're buying the stock back and then negotiating to take away from our community here.

But they made a commitment. And if I make a commitment, I have to stay in my commitment, no matter how tough it gets. I don't understand why a corporation -- because they say we have big, deep pockets, and they throw this fear

out, they're going to lay people off.

Well, we go through tough times.

And during those tough times, if we make a commitment -- if I have a tax bill, I don't go to the IRS and say well, the money's gone, we've got to renegotiate, I don't have it, tough times. I'm just tired of the greed.

Five hundred million dollar stock buyback; if this corporation is hurting so much, then why are they buying back their stock at that amount of money? Why aren't they investing in other ways to change the operation over here. There's plenty of ideas that you could do.

I put solar power up on my property, because I look at that stack, and you're polluting the air because you can, because regulations say you can. But this is a planet that's owned by all of us. We have to breathe that air. And if the legislation let's you do it, you're allowed to do it. But why don't we come up with a creative way?

I see that AES is also working with a commercial-size battery grid storage system,

green technology. Bring that here if you have a site here, and supplement your business if your business isn't working, diversify. But don't go taking it from the community. Taking it from the children, that are the future, that are forced to breathe this air from the planet, and because you're a corporate entity you get to say we can do it because we have regulation in our favor.

Enough's enough. Corporate responsibility for society. Let's start taking care of our people. It's not just the bottom line; it's not just the corporate stock options; it's not the profits; it's not buying back stock; it's greed and fear. The only reason the stockmarket is here is because of greed. Everybody wants to make money. It's the only reason you buy a stock. It's the only reason you sell it, it's either controlled greed or fear.

And corporate America is great.

They hire a bunch of attorneys to say, okay, it'll cost us this much if we can deduct and go in and get six million dollars from this entity, let's do it.

It might only cost us a million dollars, we'll have

1	to put a campaign together, we'll time it right,
2	we'll do this, we'll do that, you know, they're just
3	looking at the numbers. It's ridiculous.
4	You made a commitment. If I make
5	commitments, I've got to stand by them. I can't go
6	renegotiate my contract that I give. When I give my
7	word, I do it. How come big corporations come in,
8	give their word, and say oh, times are tough, we've
9	got to come back, we've got to change it? A
10	commitment's a commitment, stick to it.
11	MS. LANGDON: Anyone else
12	that hasn't spoken yet?
13	Mr. Hoffman, did you have
14	something else, something new that you haven't
15	mentioned already?
16	JAMES HOFFMAN: I think so.
17	MS. LANGDON: Okay.
18	JAMES HOFFMAN: It appears
19	many of us agree on a lot in this situation, and
20	that is, the environment is bad. And I know this
21	isn't a question/answer period, so I guess we'll
22	throw some questions out here and not get any
23	answers.

But I insist that we cannot solve
AES's problems in Niagara County. That's like
putting a Band-Aid where a tourniquet is required.
But what have our elected and appointed officials
done to change the environment, to change the
environment?

And I heard about a ten -- a ten million dollar carbon footprint tax. How come we let that happen? I don't know if anybody's here for Mr. Maziarz, but he's the third -- the third guy -- third-most important individual in the Senate. And it would seem to me that if we began working with him, he could get us some clout where it counted. I don't think the solution lies in taxing people in Niagara County. It's much bigger than that.

MS. LANGDON: Thank you.

Anyone else? Sir?

JAMES GIEGERICH: One other point -- Jim Giegerich. The good information that was presented by Randy Wayner is information that sounds very reasonable and very good, but that information was not provided to the community. The information that we got tonight what was we got.

How are we going to read that? It's almost like, how can we come to a public hearing, be given something at this point to read, and understand what this proposal is, and not even have the information that Randy Wayner did in terms of the background on this? How are we going to be responsible citizens if AES and IDA do not give us the information upon which to make a reasonable basis for our judgment? We just don't have it. They don't provide it.

And at the last public hearing there were over three hundred citizens that signed a petition that was notarized, and we gave it to the IDA the next day. And at the public hearing, at their particular meeting, that made a decision, they never even referenced the petition from the citizens.

So I think there's a certain disdain by the IDA for citizen participation. I'm thankful that there is a public hearing. By law, you have to do that. Only ten days; that's not very much, thirty days would be better. But how can we be responsible as citizens if we don't get information from IDA and/or the financial

	39
1	information that was well-presented by Mr. Wayner to
2	help us make a decision to come to you with any
3	constructive ideas?
4	I just wanted to make note of
5	that, and perhaps Mr. Sloma could take that into
6	consideration when he works with his Board.
7	MS. LANGDON: Thank you,
8	sir. Anyone else?
9	NORMAN JANSEN: I have no
10	notes, nothing prepared. Norman Jansen, 1872
11	Johnson Creek Road, Barker. I listened to this
12	gentleman, I listened to Randy, Dan, everybody.
13	Competition is where this country was born. And
14	corporations do not pay tax, you and me, consumers,
15	pay tax. That's all.
16	And if you can't sell your
17	product, no matter what it is, at a competitive
18	rate, you close the doors and go home. That's all I
19	have to say.
20	MS. LANGDON: Thank you,
21	sir. Anyone else?
22	JOHN SYRACUSE: John Syracuse,
23	6091 Condren Road. Without getting into, or turning

1	this into a debate, but I really feel like there has
2	to be a correction made with that last statement.
3	There are corporate taxes being paid; there's
4	payroll taxes, there's licensure taxes. So I just
5	don't think that you can make respectfully, make
6	a statement that says corporations don't pay taxes.
7	They certainly do. They certainly do. They pay it
8	on their employees. So I just can't let that slide.
9	Thank you.
10	NORMAN JANSEN: May I rebut?
11	MS. LANGDON: It's not a
12	debate, sir.
13	NORMAN JANSEN: Okay.
14	ALEXANDER MANSON: I'm on the
15	list. I'd like to speak.
16	MS. LANGDON: Go ahead.
17	ALEXANDER MANSON: It appears
18	that Manson, Al; Alexander Manson, 111 Grasmere
19	Road, Lockport.
20	Some of the points that I was
21	going to make have already been made. This AES is
22	a worldwide corporation with twenty-seven thousand
23	employees. And they do have a stock buyback

program. And the stock buyback program is, as somebody noted, five hundred million shares, and the selling price as of a couple days ago was twelve dollars thirty-seven cents. That means that it'll cost AES six billion eighteen million dollars to buy back the stock. One of the prime reasons they buy back stock is to enhance the value of the options, the millions of options, held by upper management.

1

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

And instead of -- a lot of these corporations that are headquartered in the United States, they like to call themselves world corporations, even though they're protected by United States Military and they -- only the fact that they are protected by our whole legal structure, military structure, are they allowed to make this money in other countries. They don't want to pay any taxes. They keep their money overseas, and then they bring it back to the U.S. after so many years and ask for tax forgiveness, or to pay a tiny percentage of a tax, on the grounds that they're going to bring it back and invest in new capital formations. They don't do that. They buy back stock, or they issue dividends. And this is,

anyway, EAS wants a second PILOT. And I don't think

that IDA has the legal authority to do this kind of

22

23

a deal at all. I'm an attorney. I was chief law assistant to the Appellate Division Fourth

Department for seventeen years, and I don't see any conceivable justification for the IDA getting involved in a PILOT where we're not talking about new construction, or revised -- a substantial amount of money paid to revise existing facilities in order to enhance job growth. None of that exists here.

They first started to, actually, it's my understanding, change the assessed value. It went up to the Appellate Division Fourth Department, and they said IDA has no authority to deal with the assessed value of property, their authority is to deal with payments-in-lieu-of-taxes and new formation, and dealing with help in the tax structure. But the assessed value of the property is solely done by an agency, usually, of the town. Well, the Appellate Division said they didn't have that authority.

So they came back. And so they come up with this cockamamie PILOT that I think is totally unauthorized by the statutory authority setting up IDA.

I did the first IDA project in Erie County when I represented Pearce & Pearce Co., Inc. about forty years ago. And they built a totally new plant on this industrial property that Pearce & Pearce had that was -- and they hired new employees and new construction. But that was the function of IDA, not this. I don't know what this is.

They have no business, they have no expertise in dealing with people. And to have a PILOT where it jumps up or down upon the cost of electricity is crazy. Now, if the coal prices suddenly plummet, do we benefit by that? No. No.

And there are so many other factors that go into the net worth of a company and the operational cash they generate. The IDA has no experience in this area. And they say that the taxes are the highest in comparable plants upstate. Where's the evidence of that? Nothing. They just -- Sloma just throws that out there and says this is it.

And if electrical rates fall, it's my understanding, although I've seen no proposal,

reduces the int of the electricity. s that don't concern the expertise or eles that go
electricity. es that don't to expertise or eles that go these wild,
s that don't o expertise or oles that go these wild,
o expertise or les that go these wild,
these wild,
these wild,
these wild,
the transfer of the
e to keep the
lown? I don't
i, I guess NYSEG
owned by a
doing a very
Thank you.
You see I have
y I work.
Mr. Meyers
Oh, I'm sorry.

Richard Meyers, 8408 Lake Road, Barker, New York.

I could respond to the legal, environmental theories, everything that's been tossed out here, but what I'd like to respond to is more of Randy Wayner's and Dan Engert's comments.

We, as elected officials, including Superintendant Klatt, he's not an elected official, but we, as elected officials and Superintendant Klatt, have come together to do what we believe is best for the Town of Somerset, for the Barker School District, and for the County of Niagara. And the way we did that was we thoroughly reviewed, we thoroughly discussed, and we thoroughly decided on what the best route was for the people of Somerset.

And how did we do that? We did that by looking at the numbers. We did that by looking at all the different effects that what can happen over at that plant will have on the people of Somerset and the school district of Barker. We saw everything from very doom and gloom, to okay, we can ride this out for the next couple of years.

But what we had to do was make a

decision. So what we ended up doing was taking all the facts, sitting down together, and coming to a decision on what we felt was the best thing for the people of Somerset and for the County of Niagara and for the Barker School District. We did that together, and then presented it to the Niagara County IDA.

The reason why we did that is because we believe that this plant is beneficial and crucial for the health and well-being of those entities.

Now, if we were to go ahead and -with all due respect to you, sir -- you know, go on
a tangent here, or a tangent there, or a tangent
there, we would have never come to a conclusion, and
that plant would be hurting, and we would be
propagating that hurt. But I think what we needed
to do was make a decision; make a decision that was
in the best interest of everyone involved, and we
ended up doing that.

And I ask the IDA to look at that proposal, and go ahead and pass it when it comes before your Board. Because we believe that a

healthy AES is going to be beneficial to the Town of Somerset, to the Barker Central Schools and Niagara County for many years to come. And if we have to hurt a little bit in the meantime to gain that benefit in the long run, then I believe that it is in the best interest of all the taxing jurisdictions to do that. Thank you.

MS. LANGDON:

Thank you.

Anyone else wishing to speak? Sir?

JOHN HAIGHT:

I'm John

Haight, 8453 Haight Road.

I appreciate all the Town Board is doing, and all the work they've done in the past.

Mr. Klatt; all you've done in trying to work things out. And I'm probably sure that you're doing everything right, best you can.

But I just have a question, and it looms; why is Verizon interested in building a four point five billion dollar outfit, they're interested in coming here, if AES is in such trouble? Maybe it's not the threat we think it is. I don't know. But it just makes me wonder. And it's no reflection on you guys, or not doing your job; I think you are

	49
1	doing good research here. So it's just a question.
2	MS. LANGDON: Anyone else
3	who's wishing to speak?
4	RANDALL WAYNER: Just
5	housekeeping. Randall Wayner, and that's why I'm
6	standing, it's because when I went up originally I
7	didn't give my address. It's 1434 Quaker Road in
8	Barker, so with apologies.
9	MS. LANGDON: Thank you.
10	Okay. There being no further speakers, it is now
11	6:01 P.M., I'll be closing sir?
12	ROGER KLATT: My name is
13	Roger Klatt, Superintendent, Barker Cental School.
14	I just want to say, it was difficult it is
15	difficult to support this PILOT. The ramifications
16	to the school district are six point two million
17	dollars. We do have reserves; however, they will be
18	quickly depleted. So we've got our work cut out for
19	us should this PILOT be approved, to help ensure
20	that we provide quality programs for our children.
21	That's our primary responsibility. That's my
22	primary responsibility. And also that and do so
23	at a rate that our taxpayers can afford.

1	So while we met on numerous
2	occasions to try to reach an agreement, it was very
3	difficult in the end for the school to support that,
4	based on the following. There was around what I
5	just mentioned, the letter that was referenced by
6	the speakers that specifies the impact of this
7	proposed PILOT on the school district is posted on
8	the Web site. Thank you.
9	MS. LANGDON: Thank you.
10	Dr. Klatt.
11	PARTICIPANTS: The school Web
12	site or the town Web site?
13	ROGER KLATT: WWW.barkercsd.net.
14	MS. LANGDON: Anyone else
15	wishing to speak? Okay.
16	Now it being 6:03 P.M., I will
17	close the hearing. Thank you very much for all your
18	comments.
19	
20	* * * *
21	
22	
23	