

**GREAT LAKES UNITED**

MEMO

TO: Karen/Bruce/Dick/Sarah
FROM: Mary Ginnebaugh
DATE: July 1, 1992
RE: Michigan Statewide Public Advisory Council

Among the many things that did not get discussed at the June Board Retreat was GLU's involvement in the Statewide Public Advisory Council of Michigan.

I have been sent another letter of inquiry soliciting Council members for seven of Michigan's AOCs. These include Torch Lake on Lake Superior; Manistique River, Kalamazoo River, and White Lake on Lake Michigan; Clinton River and Raisin River on Lake Erie; and St. Clair River as one of the connecting channels.

I have been advocating that GLU - especially the Windsor Office - become more involved in the Binational RAPS and FACS because they are experiencing the greatest difficulty in the whole RAP process. Three of the binational RAPS are geographically close to both GLU offices and, given our binational membership as an organization, gives us a perfect opportunity to strengthen the public involvement to ensure the process continues. (See memos dated May 27th and June 17th.)

To serve as a representative to the Council, you must be a Michigan resident. There are several members of the Board that are Michigan residents that could be representatives on this Council. I could also be a representative, and would ask to represent the St. Clair River AOC, because of its binational status. Appointments to the Council are made by Michigan's Dept. of Natural Resources. Given my relationship with the DNR, which has become strained due to criticism of the Detroit EPAC; I may not be viewed as a welcomed member - especially representing the St. Clair River.

All nominations must be submitted by July 30, 1992. I believe Karen was involved in the early work of establishing this council but could not be involved as an actual member, for obvious reasons. We have time to give this some consideration and develop a GLU strategy. Please let me know what you think regarding this issue.

An international organization dedicated to conserving and protecting the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River
State University College at Buffalo, Cassety Hall • 1300 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14222
(716) 886-0142
Canadian Address: P.O. Box 548 Station A • Windsor, Ontario N9A 6M6

**GREAT LAKES UNITED**

MEMO

TO: Dick Kubiak

FROM: Mary Ginnebaugh

DATE: June 17, 1992

RE: Binational Public Advisory Councils for RAPs / AOCs

As stated in my memo to you regarding issues I considered important for GLU, I strongly felt that GLU should take an active role in the five binational AOCs, particularly those geographically close to Buffalo and Windsor. The reasoning behind this active participation would be to help strengthen the public involvement within the RAP process in order to build the partnerships necessary for remediation.

In reviewing the status of each binational RAP, it is apparent that there is considerable friction between the various governmental agencies that are directing the RAP process. I think this difficulty partly stems from the complexity of the jurisdictions (Federal, Provincial, State and local) involved. The bottom line, however, is that the "public" is caught in the cross fire. Frustration and anger are being expressed by everyone because the progress on the binational RAPs is slow and controversial.

In 1991, the Michigan DNR funded four demonstration projects to enhance public involvement in Michigan's AOC Program. This Demonstration Grant for the four projects totaled \$20,000 and was administered by SEMCOG, the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments. According to the Michigan Areas of Concern News, the projects that were selected for 1991 have the potential for duplication and implementation by other AOCs. The News also indicated a second round of demonstration grants would be offered to nonprofit organizations seeking funding for projects to encourage public involvement in the RAP process.

While I realize \$5,000 is not a great deal of money, I do think GLU should prepare and submit a proposal to address the public involvement in the binational RAPs as a whole, and concentrate on either the Detroit River or St. Clair River AOC.

I will stay informed on when the next round of grants are being offered, including requirements and application dates.

An International organization dedicated to conserving and protecting the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River
State University College at Buffalo, Cassety Hall • 1300 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14222
(716) 886-0142

Canadian Address: P.O. Box 548 Station A • Windsor, Ontario N9A 6M6



GREAT LAKES UNITED

MEMO

TO: Dick Kubiak

FROM: Mary Ginnebaugh *Mary*

DATE: May 27, 1992

RE: Issues to consider for GLU Board Retreat and Ways the Windsor Office can be more visible in Ontario

(1) Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative

This is a federally mandated, eight state effort to develop region-wide water quality standards. Michigan's governor Engler, state administrators in Ohio and Wisconsin plus a well organized coalition of polluters are joining together to stop this initiative. This group is claiming the initiative does not have the scientific support to warrant a change in any of the water quality standards and the economic impact to the region would be exorbitant, should the initiative be instituted.

A 1991 IJC report by Jeff Foran, entitled The Control of Discharges of Toxic Pollutants into the Great Lakes and their Tributaries: Development of Benchmarks, evaluates the myriad of procedures that the Great Lakes States and Ontario use to regulate the discharge of toxic substances from point sources. This publication not only is helpful in assessing any achievement in virtual elimination of persistent toxins, but it fully demonstrates the lack of uniform water quality standards within the jurisdictions of the Great Lakes basin.

Because of the unique position GLU holds as a basin-wide environmental organization, I strongly think GLU should actively be involved in supporting the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative.

In determining GLU's involvement, some questions should be asked:

- What other region-based environmental groups are publicly involved in the GLWQI? (This might have been something that was discussed in the Great Lakes Environmental Leaders Meeting, held in March.)

- Could GLU be an active proponent of including Ontario (and for that matter the IJC) in the GLWQI? (The initiative is only concerned with the U.S. water quality standards and as a bi-national organization, we should be sensitive to this.)

An international organization dedicated to conserving and protecting the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River
State University College at Buffalo, Cassety Hall • 1300 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14222

(716) 886-0142

Canadian Address: P.O. Box 548 Station A • Windsor, Ontario N9A 6M6

(2) Binational Public Advisory Councils

Among the 43 Areas of Concern, there are five that are binational: St. Marys River, St. Clair River, Detroit River, Niagara River and St. Lawrence River. These binational AOCs involve two Federal governments, Provincial and State agencies plus an extraordinary effort by the "public" to work together. In developing the Stage I RAPs for several of these AOCs, there have been strong differences between Provincial and State government agencies in the sources of pollution, problem definition and use impairments. These differences have resulted in a slow down of activity within the RAP process and incredible frustration expressed by the "public" in accomplishing the goals of cleaning up these areas.

To date, the St. Lawrence and Niagara AOC have two PACs (one Canadian and one US) which is not only redundant but counter productive in fostering a cooperative relationship between the two countries. Because of the frustration expressed by the BPAC members of the Detroit River and St. Clair RAPs, they too are threatening to split into two separate PACs.

I strongly believe GLU should be more actively involved in the five Binational Public Advisory Councils. Geographically, three of these AOCs are located near the GLU offices, and meetings could be attended without a great deal of hassle. GLU would become more visible to the Canadian side by actively participating in the binational RAPs. Successes (and failures) from one BPAC could be shared with other BPACs - as an educational thing.

(3) Municipal/Industrial Strategy for Abatement

The MISA program in Ontario was intended to establish tough new standards for municipal and industrial dischargers into the Ontario waters. The program has been in existence for nearly four years, and very little progress has been made toward reducing the persistent toxic pollutants into the Great Lakes. I believe the only effluent parameters that are routinely monitored by municipalities are suspended particulates, phosphorus and BOD.

The problems associated with the MISA program are no doubt very complex, but I think GLU should make some commitment to push the Ontario government into proceeding with the program as soon as possible. The whole effort of virtual elimination of persistent toxic substances needs to be the focus of GLU with the MISA program.

(4) Canada - Ontario Agreement

There is a strong movement to renegotiate COA not only to attain the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement's objectives, but also include a mechanism for public participation for greater accountability in efforts to clean up the Great Lakes basin.

Because COA deals with programs connected with municipal/industrial waste treatment, persistent toxic substances and RAPS, I think GLU should be actively involved in the activities of COA, in an effort to bring COA to the Ontario public.

(5) Increasing Organizational Membership

There needs to be a greater effort in introducing GLU to the many small, grass-roots organizations (and municipalities, for that matter) in the basin and soliciting them to join GLU, thus being represented in our common goal to protect and preserve the Great Lakes.

There are several environmental organization directories that can be used to make contact with environmental groups by letter of inquiry about GLU and their interest in joining. To illustrate my point, I reviewed a Michigan Environmental Resources Network listing and compared it with the list of Michigan organizations that were GLU members from the 1992 annual report. Only 17 of 269 organizations listed were GLU members. That is only 6% of the Michigan organizations. I think GLU should be able to raise that number to at least 10% this year and to 15% by next year if actively pursued.

GUNDON



a little S.L. Humor!

Have a good holiday —

Alvany