



**Public Hearing Williamson, NY
International Joint Commission, Canadian Section - LOSL Hearing
Proposal for Lake Ontario St. Lawrence River Regulation
July 16th, 2013**

Lana Pollack: My name is Lana Pollack. I am one of the 6 Commissioners on the IJC: there are three Americans and 3 Canadians. Each section has a Chair appointed by the Prime Minister or President respectively but we work as a unit. We take oaths of office to our respective constitutions and then again to protect the resources and uphold the Treaty without bias. We are here tonight to listen. First I'm going to ask my colleagues to introduce themselves and say a little bit more about the purpose of the evening. We will look at a quick PowerPoint on the matter. I'll go over some of the rules of the evening which is not much more than your mother taught you about good manners, and we will get started and the rest of the evening is yours. Let's start on my right and introduce yourself.

Benoît Bouchard: My name is Benoît Bouchard. I'm from Canada. I've been appointed recently as a Commissioner of the International Joint Commission. I am pleased to be with you tonight. We're here to listen and I'm sure we will get good opinions and recommendations on your part. Thank you very much.

Rich Moy: Hello, my name is Rich Moy and I am a U.S. Commissioner and I look out at this audience and I see so many people and I think it's wonderful. We're here to listen to you and hear your comments and figure out how to move forward, thank you.

Joe Comuzzi: My name is Joe Comuzzi and I am a Commissioner too from Canada, from Thunder Bay. That's on the north shore of Lake Superior. We value the water that we have on Lake Superior. My family lives about 40 miles away from the two most important diversions into the lake. In fact, the only two diversions to the lake called Coakley and Long Lake. Since 1942 that area has been contributing over 13 billion cold, drinkable litres of water to Lake Superior which eventually finds its way down to Lake Erie and Lake Ontario and Lake Michigan. We have great respect for the water and our First Nations people up there and we would expect for us to continue to supply that water and we all know how valuable and important it is today. You can visualize how valuable and important it's going to be in the next five years and we just have to learn how to be using it just a little better

than we have been doing in the past. So it is nice to be with you and I'm amazed at this crowd and please ask us to come back. This is a nice place to be.

Gordon Walker: Hello, I am Gordon Walker and I am a Canadian Commissioner, sitting beside our Chair, Joe Comuzzi. I come from Toronto, and I was a recent appointee to the International Joint Commission although I did spend a period of 3 years back twenty years ago. I remember visiting this area back then as a member of the IJC at that time.

Dereth Glance: Good evening everybody. My name is Dereth Glance and I live just down the road in Syracuse, New York. I am very happy to be right here in Wayne County this evening. I look forward to hearing your comments. I encourage everybody if you do have a moment to just step on down; there's a little more space down here. We will be showing a video behind you and we want to make sure you can see it, and we're able to see your faces as well. Thank you.

Lana Pollack: Thanks, my name is Lana Pollack. I grew up in Michigan, I still live in Michigan, and we have a home on Lake Michigan. So let me give a few more words about the background. As I referred to already, there's a Treaty between Canada and the United States signed in 1909. Purpose of the Treaty was to deal with the boundary waters that we share. We established at that time this Commission, with three Canadians and three U.S. appointees by the Heads of State. We are charged with preventing and resolving disputes on the waters that we share, and that includes all the waters along the Atlantic to the Pacific and include as well the Yukon/Alaska border.

So, getting to the point and issue at hand, in the 50's we had an application by the two governments to build a Dam and Hydro Power project on the St. Lawrence River at Cornwall and Massena. At that time the governments said "we recognized that the Treaty stipulates that the IJC have to take into account the interests of all the various stakeholders; the shipping industry, irrigation needs, all the various needs and certainly including the household needs for the use of water." They said to us "when you make the regulation plan, if you can compress the fluctuations in the natural flow of water through the Dam, please try to do that as well, as well as looking after all these other interests." So the IJC at that time came up with a Plan 1958 D and it did compress the natural fluctuations that would otherwise not have been there, so it did take the top of the highs and the bottom of the lows. At that time though, it did not consider and didn't really know, the impact that it would have on wetlands. Years go by and there is recognition that there is a loss of wetlands and a lot of erosion, and the idea is that there could be a better way. As you know, we've been talking about this a lot. We've seen previous plans, now we're here with another plan.

Let me sort one thing out, we've heard a lot about it and I think you deserve to understand the process. In 2008 I think, there were previous hearings by Commission, different people

but the same Commission. In 2008 a lot of objections to the Plan, not much support from any quarter in that Plan and the Commissioners decided not to go forward with the Plan that they had at the time. Instead they said "let's go back and ask the state of New York, the province of Quebec and the province of Ontario, United States and Canadian governments if each would bring forth a small team of people, we'll sit down and see if we can find something that might work better." And that is what has been going on and that's where this plan 2014 comes from. We've heard during the last several days that we have been here, that there were secret meetings and closed door meetings. Half of that is true and half of it is not true. There were closed door meetings with representatives of bodies that I have mentioned. So people were nominated by their respective governments, sat around and they talked and they came up with this Plan that we will review tonight and that you will comment on. The Commissioners were not in that room; that is not our Plan. It's the Plan we're bringing to you so we can hear from you and we can consider whether we like the Plan, what part of the Plan we like, we don't like it at all, we like some of it. So, there was no secret about what was going on. The doors were closed and if you want to know who the people that were at that table developing this Plan which is not official, it is a proposal then you can look at our website. And that is the process and that is where we are at. The cake's not baked. We're here to listen to you.

So let's play the PowerPoint. Make yourself comfortable.

(PRESENTATION IN PROGRESS)

Lana Pollack: Thank you for your attention to that we're going to start now with the comments. I'm going to lay out a few rules that are pretty much common sense and common courtesy. There are more than 40 people signed up. In order to get through it before people lose their concentration and attention span here, I'm going to ask people to limit their comments to three minutes. We want to get through everybody and anybody running more than three minutes is taking time away from somebody down the road, so please don't, even if you are an elected official or representing one. If you've heard your points made many times, you can summarize it; we will hear your points made. We've been listening and listening. We've listened to hundreds of people already. Many of the points can get reinforced, that's fine, but often they can be shortened, but sometimes we are hearing some new points, some new perspective, new ideas and new suggestions for win-win situations. So we look forward to it.

The last two other comments: one is that if you don't wish to speak tonight, or you are speaking briefly tonight and have a lot of developed statements, just give it to us in writing

anytime before 30th August. Just submit it in writing. It counts just as much if it's in writing.

And finally, we are happy to hear your enthusiasm for anyone who has spoken. So at the conclusion of somebody who comments, and you like them and you want to applaud, that's wonderful. If you do not like them, please: no booing, no hissing, no grumbling out loud, none whatsoever. It's rude, it doesn't help make a good impression on us the point that you are trying to make, and if it gets out of hand, or anybody is too rude, I will adjourn the meeting briefly to calm things down and that just takes time away from the hearings. With one exception in the last three days, people have just been wonderful. Like it or don't like what they say. People have been wonderful. And I'm sure that's what we'll have tonight.

So let's start with Assemblyman Bob Oaks please. I am going to call a couple of names and ask you to come down like who's on deck. So come down and sit close so we can move through this. The next two are Joan Grela from Senator Nozzolio's office and Jim Hoffman, Chair of the Board Supervisors, Wayne County.

Bob Oaks: Thank you very much and welcome to Wayne County. I represent the district that includes all of Wayne County, Cayuga County that touches Lake Ontario and through Oswego County to the City of Oswego so a significant amount of shore line. I appreciate all the Commissioners being here this year.

I raised concerns last year about the Bv7Plan. Any changes to that Plan, as I understand it, contained in this Plan are minimal and still leave south shore communities of Lake Ontario at risk. I'm mostly concerned about the negative impacts of high water on community infrastructure whether that is mostly water treatment facilities that might be at low level, public parks and public access facilities, private home owners and business owners.

I've had the opportunity to look through the publication, which I appreciate that the IJC put together, and would agree in there I noticed that you talked about in the last couple of years there has been a loss of ice cover and increased storm activity and that is influencing how water levels and flows impact coastal communities and of course other interests. But rather than adapt a new Plan of sustained higher highs and sustained lower lows, to respond to those changes, I would believe that Plan 2014, 1) underestimates the impact of financial loss to the South Shore and would actually assure greater land erosion and greater damage to personal homes and businesses and property and greater damage to the public infrastructure.

I've represented what I described before; about 50 miles of the South Shore. If this Plan is to go into force then I think we will experience damage to public and personal property at some time in the future due to a storm or storms that assuredly are going to hit. I have lived all my life not on the water but near enough to it. They are going to hit sometime

during a time when we have sustained high water levels. That's my main concern. We have had peaks and valleys before, it's the sustain time and the concern is who will pay? The federal government? The state government? Could it be some other of the other interests? I know there's a chart on here. It doesn't have pluses and minuses but minuses and inferred pluses. Will they pay or is it going to be left to the communities, our homeowners and business owners, who are stuck with a bill? I think that bill could devastate both local tax bases and local economies.

I represent the area in the Assembly for 21 years. I grew up within a few miles of the Lake. I worked when I was a teen at one of the local parks on the Lake and I recognize, as you said, that any plan that we put in; a present one, a new one, we can't precisely control the lake levels. But I don't think that's a reason to create a new Plan that gives up on trying to control it. I contend that over the last fifty years the data suggest that we could continue on that course and not chart a new uncertain course. The environment, the ecosystem, the Lake has been impacted by many things. Some intended, others not. Stacking program was started in the 60's. It changed some of the ecosystem and the food chain in the Lake. Several invasive species have been introduced that obviously we do not like and they've had a negative impact. I believe if 2014 is implemented it'll have its own set of consequences, some of it intended and welcomed but some perhaps intended not welcomed to south shore and others not intended and extremely detrimental. So I appreciate the adaptive management plan concept. My fear is that the adaptiveness will take place after the devastation to the south shore and then we will say "oops", we've had the loss of property and to such an extent, let's change and go back. I think for those home owners, property owners; we should not change the Plan until we have something that is more equal to all interests. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Joan Grela: Good Evening. I am here this evening representing Senator Michael Nozzolio and first of all, would like to thank the Commissioners, Chairman Pollack and other Commissioners for coming and listening to the concerns of the residents who live in this area. I have a letter I would like to read from Senator Nozzolio.

"As the New York State Senator representing Wayne and Cayuga Counties, I wish to voice my very serious concerns with the IJC proposed 2014 proposal. The plan that you propose will in fact have a devastating impact on local property and business owners in this region and create hurricane level flooding and wide spread destruction. The only difference is that this damage can be prevented. The sustained high levels of water called for in the proposed plan will result in drastically increased erosion damage to the shore line. It will create problems in our local water and sewage treatment plants and damage our local roads and highways.

The policy changes suggested during periods of high water could also submerge the main business and recreation districts in low lying communities like the village of Sodus Point and other towns and villages along the Lake Ontario shoreline. The IJC study is strongly biased against the residents and business along the southern shore of Lake Ontario and includes no provisions to mitigate the negative impact the new water regulations will have on these communities. Your plan does not anticipate or provide any funding to address the tens of millions of dollars in anticipated damages to the areas the Lake Ontario shoreline nor the damage that would result to public infrastructure in the region.

I urge the IJC to scrap your current plan and start again using the information and personal testimony from the individuals and businesses who live and work in the areas most affected by your plan. This was a bad plan when it was first proposed and it is a bad plan now. Thank you for allowing me the opportunity to voice my strident opposition to your proposal.

(Applause)

Lana Pollack: Jim Hoffman, Wayne County, followed by Robert Kelch from the town of Ontario followed by Laurie Crane out of Huron.

Jim Hoffman: Good evening, my name is Jim Hoffman. I am the Supervisor right here in Williamson and I agree it's a wonderful place. For the sake of time I've handed you a document I've prepared for tonight. I'll just hit some of the high points. I do realize that at some of your other hearings, so I don't want to elaborate of some of the things you already heard.

Okay, the first point that I would like to make, and again I represent the county and the town, is I don't know if everyone's aware that four of the five counties with the highest property taxes in the entire county are four of the five lakeshore counties impacted. As a percentage of home value, Orleans County is number 1 in the United States for property taxes. Niagara County is number 2, Wayne County is number 3 and Monroe County is number 5. Plan 2014 will guarantee that the race will go on for who has the highest property taxes in the country. It just so happens that 4 of those towns are right here impacted by Plan 2014. I hope that you would keep that in consideration in your decision making. Plan 2014 will increase the tax burden for Wayne County residents. Decreased valuation of waterfront property shifts the burden to other taxpayers in Wayne County who cannot afford it. The 5 lakeshore towns of the 15 towns in Wayne County are 43% of the property valuation in Wayne County. 17% of that is waterfront property. Sodus Point: 54% of the assessed value is real property on waterfront. I'd also like to highlight that the impacts of Plan 2014, I think will be worse than other counties because on the map you will see we have 35.6 miles of waterfront property on the Lake but you can double it with the

embayments. Sodus Bay alone has 21 miles of waterfront property which is not, I don't think, acknowledged in the Plan.

And a couple other points that I would like to make would be... I don't see any environmental review. In New York State there's a thing called a "seeker"; it's anytime you do anything with wetlands, it's an extreme detailed process which is justified, that you evaluate the environmental impact. I don't see anything like that in this Plan that I am aware of. In my opinion I think there's an issue of due process when you're interfering with property being taken from people and I think this could be a discussion I'm sure. I think the new Plan... the Plan that's in existence has done a lot of good. That doesn't seem to be acknowledged. I remember before the Plan was in effect how Durand Eastman Park the beach was eroding gone.

I would like to suggest there's a better process for the future for these types of plans. I would encourage you to consider having all the stakeholders in the Working Group, closed or whatever it may be, I don't know, but as a part of that process have stakeholders that are south shore property owners or someone who represents them. My guess is we'd be a lot further along in this process if you heard some of the stuff that folks don't want to hear. I think that would make for a better plan and I'm sure the folks that would like to be a part of it.

And my last comment would be from your own schedule of impact, it seems to me, I don't know if there is anyone here from Hydro Power, but Hydro power gets I calculated four times the benefit than the environment. I'd like to hear from hydro power. I wonder if they'd be willing to subsidize some of the shoreline loss that would be incurred by the south shore line. I just realized that thanks to your good publication.

In closing I would just like to suggest, and ask, and I'm sure you that you will, weigh heavily the comments of the other elected officials and the citizens out here who pay my salary and all our salaries. These are the same citizens that their tax money support a lot of grants; millions and millions of dollars to come up with Plans that I don't think represents their interests.

In closing, Wayne County is all for improving the environment. A lot of these folks are environmentalists. I would submit that the Plan is non-balanced in terms of impact, in terms of the damage; it looks like all the damage is on the 5 south shore counties and everybody else seems to benefit, especially hydro power, and I'm always happy to hear when the environment does benefit so... with that I respectfully submit my comments. Once again thanks for choosing Williamson, Wayne County.

(Applause)

Lana Pollack: We're going to hear from Robert Kelch and then Laurie Crane and then Steve Leroy from the town of Sodus.

Robert Kelch: Chairman Pollack and members of the International Joint Commission, thank you for the opportunity to speak this evening on such an important issue. And thank you for hosting the technical panel discussions held earlier today. They were well done and very informative. I am here representing the residents and town of Ontario, New York which is a lakeshore community in Wayne County; we're the next town west of here.

My purpose this evening is to convince you the best course of action regarding the water level of Lake Ontario is to leave them as they currently are under plan 1958 DD. Since establishment of the current levels in the 1950's much commercial, residential and municipal development along the lakeshore. It was done based on the belief that to the best of human ability the lake would remain as promised in plan 1858 DD. We have two issues. I'll just summarize them because I left the full text there.

The first one has to do with shoreline erosion. There are 155 privately owned parcels on the lakeshore in the town of Ontario. Their assessed value is \$44M. Those 155 parcels generate \$186,000 annually in taxes. If that were to be diminished then we would be faced with either reducing services or raising taxes and we really don't like either of those choices.

The second issue has to do with waste water treatment, the town of Ontario does have a very effective waste water treatment plant and as the system works water flows downhill along with a lot of other stuff. It all eventually gets to a low point in the town which is very close to the level of the lake. That treatment plant was built based on Plan 58 DD, in terms of how high the highs would be. We've never had an issue with that. Our concern are if those highs get higher that waste water treatment plant which processes 500,000 gallons of waste water a day, could be swamped. Now the treatment plant itself is built on very high ground, so go to the under treatment you pump it uphill. But if that gets flooded you also pump a lot of lake water uphill, the plant would be overwhelmed and that stuff would go someplace maybe a creek to Lake Ontario, that's not so good.

The other issue regarding that is that 1400 homes in town are hooked to waste water, so they would be uninhabitable because the system wouldn't work. 2000 school children would have no sanitary facilities at their school and the majority of the industry in town would close because it's a requirement of the town that all commercial development be hooked to the waste water treatment; it simply is better than having leech fields everywhere. The Boundary Waters Treaty is a promise made between two great nations and it should remain honored. I therefore respectfully request Plan be set aside and the

current Plan stay in place. The system has worked well for the past several decades. Why fix something that at least in my opinion is not broken, I would suggest simply leaving it alone. Thank you very much for the opportunity to speak with you this evening.

Lana Pollack: Thank you, Supervisor. *(Applause)* Laurie Crane, Huron Supervisor followed by Steve Leroy of Sodus and Chris Tertinek.

Laurie Crane: Thank you. I came into office in 2008 right in the middle of B+. I am tired, I am frustrated and I am downright appalled that we have to be here again tonight to defend and protect our shoreline, our embayments and Lake Ontario. We have agencies, like New York State DEC coastal erosion and the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers. They should be protecting our shorelines. These agencies should be standing up to the lobbyists saying that this plan is not good for New York State. Montreal stood up for their shoreline and refused to allow for further damage from B+. So now we are here with Plan 2014 taking all the damage on our shoreline. We have huge numbers of laws protecting the coastlines. They might as well be thrown out the window if this Plan is adopted.

In our last meetings on Bv7, it was stated that the south shore has benefitted from having a 4 foot range for 50 years as is indicated on your average annual benefit. But nowhere in there does it state that millions of dollars per year benefit that the Lake St. Lawrence area has gotten when w, the people built that lake. Nowhere in the graph does it show the benefit of the St. Lawrence River area, when the river was rerouted, rapids removed, which plainly made the river more user friendly and increased their tourism and economy.

Please do not think that we on the south shore and the town of Huron are not in favor of improving and protecting our environment because we truly are. The town of Huron code enforcement officer is the administrator for coastal erosion in our town. We have a septic law that we have in place for six years where we inspect our septic systems on a five year plan, on transfer of property, and any complaints that we might receive. We feel that this plan does not show improvement to the environment due to its assumptions and out-dated data. The town of Huron does not have municipal water. If you know the Lake Ontario shoreline at all, you know that having periods of higher water levels will destroy our barrier bars. Flood our bays and the properties on our bays. The plan and study does not include the destruction of properties in our embayments or on municipal infrastructure. The data for the damage that this plan will cause is inconclusive. We have septic systems on our three islands along with our lakeshore and our barrier bars that have been built and installed according to Plan 1958 DD. You already know that having longer time periods of high water that Sodus Point will get flooded. It's not a question of if, but when. And the same goes for destroying the barrier bars.

When these septic systems in Sodus Point's municipal sewer are breached all the sewage will contaminate and pollute the bays and Lake Ontario. Will the Nature Conservancy going

to pay to fix the contamination of the bays and the Lake? Is New York State DEC going to fund cleaning up of e-coli in our waters and pay to replace the revetment that was paid for by the taxpayers funds? This plan talks about increasing the pike population. What it doesn't do is look at the consequences to the other species of fish due to the fact that the pike is at the top the food chain in Lake Ontario. Jim Howe talked on Sunday night in Lockport about the benefits of low water and how this will bring \$9M in. We know that we have blue/green algae in the lake and bays. The other lakes that flow into our lake have blue/green algae. Now add low water to higher water temperatures to all the blue/green algae and we will have an explosion of toxins in our water. Not only will our water be contaminated, we will have potable water supply issues, public beaches will be closed, no fishing even if there is enough water to get the boat in. The economic results in New York State counties and towns will be devastating. Where will the money come from to correct these issues and how many years or generations will it take to correct? New York State and Canada have spent millions of dollars to try to come up with a Plan to improve the environment.

This Plan is not environmentally friendly. It's flawed. The people are saying no. The tax payers of New York State cannot afford Plan 2014. We cannot afford the destruction that this plan will cause and we cannot afford to keep spending tax dollars to fund these studies. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

Steve Leroy: I would like to thank the members of the IJC for holding this meeting tonight. My name is Steve Leroy and I am the Supervisor of the Town of Sodus. Prior to my first election in 2005, I spent 27 years as a full time licensed coast guard charter boat captain. During that time, I logged over 32,000 hours on the open waters of Lake Ontario and its embayments. I am also a registered New York State guide. I've hunted, fished and photographed as far north as 60th parallel and West Edmonton. I recently purchased a forty acre bird sanctuary in Jefferson County. As long as I continue to own and pay taxes on this pristine habitat, the rookery will remain a safe haven for herons, ospreys, rails, wood ducks and a wide variety of other birds and wildlife including muskrats.

I currently serve on the D.E.C Region 8 Fish and Wild Life Advisory Board and I am on the Board of Directories for the Wayne County Soil and Water Conservation District. I don't draw my opinions from a book or the teachings of a college professor. My practical experience over a lifetime outdoors, certainly qualifies me to speak on the dynamics of Lake Ontario in the surrounding terrain. I am a conservationist and a sensible environmentalist. However, I am also a realist. I have become increasingly annoyed when considering the rationale behind this new plan as with its predecessors. For the past 60 years, Lake Ontario and its embayment have evolved on the current water 58 DD and the

wild life living within its parameters has adapted. I don't challenge the 58 DD modified the natural way when maintaining a natural habitat for wild life.... I get it. However, our environment is ever changing naturally and the dreaded cattails could very well have encroached on our meadow marsh with or without man's intervention.

According to the IJC, the 2 main beneficiaries of this Plan are the muskrat and the Northern Pike, neither of which are even close to being endangered. In fact, most species are extremely prolific and broadly inhabit the entire Northern Hemisphere. Supporters of the Plan claim that we need to increase the meadow marsh to maintain healthy muskrat population. I find it ironic that the IJC would consider making a better home for the muskrat while the New York State DEC has imposed no number that can be limited to being killed in the open trapping season. The true fact is that muskrats also do very well in ponds, streams, lakes, drainage dishes, and cattail swamps. I've seen it myself.

The range extends throughout three-quarters of the North American continent, throughout Europe and Asia. On the New York State DEC's own website, it says that muskrats occupy a wide variety of aquatic habitats including ponds, lakes, marshes and streams. They prefer marshland but are found to occupy wetlands and waterways that are heavily vegetated particularly with cattails. Most marsh dwellers eat aquatic plants such as cattails almost exclusively. Northern Pike are grown on similar range across the northern and are equally adaptable. Pikes are voracious feeders and they are at the top of the fresh water food chain. It is an absolute fact that pike will attack and eat almost anything smaller than they are. They are like a fresh water barracuda. Perch, blue gills, bass, ducklings and turtles are all on the pike's regular menu. I caught a pike one time in Canada that had a red squirrel in its belly. In lakes where pikes have decimated the forage base, they become cannibalistic. I have seen this myself. There is no question that if a primary motive in implementing Plan 2014 is to promote a greater number of pikes, many other species will surely be threatened. An effort to benefit one species will be detrimental to others. Factor in the human element and the potential for catastrophic losses, and this Plan simply makes no sense. We have a well balanced fishery right now that includes plenty of pike. Leave it alone.

If the IJC was considering this Plan in saving endangered species, they'd have my attention. Conversely, it would be a travesty to threaten our communities with this kind of damage, put people out of their homes, shut down businesses and decimate economies to give the muskrat a happier place to live. It makes no sense. What does make sense however, after six years of reviewing the data released by the IJC, the biggest winner with Plan 2014 just like with the other proposed plans, might not be the environment at all; it's hydro power. Looking at the IJC own data the benefit of the hydro power under Plan 2014 is \$5.26 million annually ... and it's we on the south shore will pay for it.

In closing, I would like to say that Plan 2014 clearly violates the Treaty between the United States and Canada and it breaches the promise made to the people. I implore the members of the IJC not to break this Treaty and adopt the Plan, knowing full well what the consequences would be. Thank you.

(Applause)

Kim Park: Commissioners, thank you for coming and listening to our concerns tonight and thank you for coming to Wayne County. I will be brief. I know you have a very daunting task in front of you.

My colleagues have made good valid points tonight regarding the negative impacts of the plan for Wayne County and the entire southern shore. I'm not going to reiterate about the property damage, great economic loss, health concerns, our sewage that will be in the bay and the Lake, blue-green algae, loss of property, business property tax sales tax and our schools that will suffer major cuts in programs class offering sports and extra curriculum activities.

I'm here representing my Town of Wolcott as well as Wayne County. My town is at poverty level. At the county level, I watch our benefit programs such as food stamps, Medicaid, emergency assistance, heat for heating fuel constantly increase year over year. Our town and county expenditures increase, due to unfunded mandates and increasing costs. We have one bright spot and that is our water front. It's 40% of our assessed value. It carries my town. This proposed Plan will take it away and my people can't afford it. They can't afford any more. And they don't deserve it. They are good hard-working people. Our economy depends on our seasonal and water front residents. Not only property tax wise, but they patronize our stores, our restaurants and our local businesses. So many businesses depend on the waterfront for their livelihood. One bad season with this Plan, will devastate our local economy and it can't be repaired.

This Plan if put into place, will devastate our economy for everyone. I want to be very clear that the problem with this plan is not just about people who have above average incomes who live on the water front and have concerns about their own personal damage. It's about the average family in the County that can't afford to pick up the property tax slack when that waterfront home or business is worth nothing. It's about a young family's desire to have the American Dream of home ownership, a chicken in every pot and a car in the garage. Instead in Wayne County we're going to be looking at subsidized housing, section 8 food stamps and Medicaid, and that's no way to live. And I don't know how we will pay for it.

There is a better way to do this. And if any two countries can come up with a solution, it's the United States and Canada. Our long-standing friendship and relationship of mutual

respect, we can do this. This morning at the technical hearings, Dr. Frank Sciremammano made suggestions as to compromises to make to this Plan and to make it palatable to all with mutual benefit. I urge you, Commissioners, to please, please look into those suggestions and let's come up with something that's fair to everyone. And most of all, let's uphold this Treaty between our two great nations; a Treaty that does not allow for one party to be severely unfairly and unilaterally damaged. I don't want to see this happen to my people here in Wayne County and I don't want to see it happen in my own home town.

I thank you for your time and your attention.

(Applause)

Chris Tertinek: My name is Chris Tertinek and I am the Mayor of Sodus Point. Madam Chair, Commissioners, thank you for giving us the opportunity to express our thoughts and concerns. The Village of Sodus Point is a gem on the largest embayment of the south shore of Lake Ontario. The village is bordered 38% by land and 62% by shoreline. Tourism drives the economy of this village. The Lighthouse Museum alone draws 25,000 visitors a year-

Audio suddenly cuts, end of recording

End of Transcript