

GLU Meets with EPA Chief Lee Thomas

by David Miller, Executive Director, GLU

On Thursday, August 7, 1986, delegates from Great Lakes United, NYS Conservation Council, Ecumenical Task Force, Pollution Probe, NYPIC Citizen Alliance and other Great Lakes organizations met with Environmental Protection Agency Chief Administrator Lee Thomas in his Washington, D.C. office. Mr. Thomas' commitment to the toxic waste problems facing the Niagara Frontier and the rehabilitation of the Great Lakes Ecosystem was encouraging to all those present. The citizen participants presented several agenda items and Mr. Thomas was assisted on his response by ten EPA officials representing Niagara Frontier, Great Lakes, Region II, Solid Waste, International and Enforcement divisions of the agency.

The first agenda item addressed EPA's policies on permanent solutions to hazardous waste site clean-up activities, with specific references to excavation and environmentally sound destruction technologies for the multitude of sites leaching toxic chemicals into the Niagara River and other sections of the Great Lakes Basin. Pamela Miller of Pollution Probe presented a seven-point program to Administrator Thomas, emphasizing the need for a scheduled reduction of chemical loadings into the Niagara River from these waste site sources. Miller also stressed the need for new technologies to excavate and destroy these toxic contaminants.

Mr. Thomas' response was centered around the development of an integrated



From left to right: Robert Boice, NYS Conservation Council; David Miller, Lee Thomas, EPA; Cathleen McFarlane, Niagara Environmental Coalition; Rev. Rudolf Gelley, Ecumenical Task Force; St. Margen Hoffmann, GSE, ETP; Rev. Dr. Joseph Levesque, ETP; Carolyn Crosby, NYPIC Citizen Alliance; Pam Miller, Pollution Probe.

approach to environmental problem-solving in the Niagara Frontier and Great Lakes Ecosystem. Mr. Thomas emphasized the following points:

1. EPA would work towards long-term solutions, promote new technology development and would not rule out excavation of these toxic waste sites.
2. EPA would institute specific reduction targets for chemical loadings into the

Niagara River from toxic waste sites by mid-1987. Currently, EPA and other agencies are determining the exact amounts of toxics from these sources entering the river.

3. He believes cost-effectiveness of actions to clean up toxic contamination sources in Great Lakes system should be expanded to include the total environmental and social costs to the region.

Mr. Thomas further stated that he would take a leadership role in moving toward a four-party agreement between EPA, Environmental Canada, Ontario and New York, depending on the technical advice of his staff and the timing of such action. The Ecumenical Task Force raised concerns that the four-party agreement to implement a Niagara River Action Plan may not materialize without his personal involvement.

Participants asked the Administrator what EPA's position was on the goals of the International Water Quality Agree-

ment, the Agreement's scheduled governmental review in 1987, the Great Lakes Amendment to the Clean Water Act, and the role of the public in the development of remedial action plans for toxic "hot-spots" in the basin. Mr. Robert Boice, NYS Conservation Council and Great Lakes United, emphasized the long-term consequences of toxic contamination to the region's economic base and the need for the Environmental Protection Agency to involve the public in the development of remedial action plans to accomplish the goals of our International Agreement.

Mr. Thomas stated that he was committed to the goals and objectives of the International Water Quality Agreement. The EPA will be a lead agency in its review by the federal governments of the United States and Canada, and he said that the agency will seek to maintain the integrity and principles of the Agreement. Mr.

Continued on page 7

GLU Hearings Draw Citizens, Recommendations

by John Jackson, Vice-President, GLU
and Tim Eder, Field Coordinator, GLU

Imagine... a public hearing where government agencies testify to a citizen group. Though it's unique, that is exactly what is happening as Great Lakes United conducts its citizens hearings on the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. The tour of the Great Lakes began July 10 with a boat tour of the Milwaukee harbor, a press conference and a hearing later that evening. The tour will end on October 30 in Buffalo. During that time 19 hearings will have been held from Duluth, Minnesota to Montreal, Quebec.

According to Task Force Chairman John Jackson, "the tour and hearings are going exceptionally well. The delegations are shedding light on a number of critical Great Lakes issues and we're gathering a large number of important recommendations which will go into our report to the two governments."

The number of presentations at each hearing are ranging from eight to 21, representing everyone from citizen groups, fishermen, congressmen, labor unions, government agencies and native Indian tribes to eighth graders. From 40 to 120 have been in attendance at each hearing. Jackson stressed that each hearing was very different but that a number of themes have occurred. Some of the major issues include:

- The lack of attention and action to control toxic fallout and atmospheric sources of toxics.
- The lack of a strategy or technology to deal with in-place pollutants or to protect the ecosystem during dredging and disposal of contaminated dredge spoils.
- The impact of toxics on human

health. Tremendous concern has been expressed over the finding that residents of this region carry a higher body burden of toxic chemicals and that data on human health impacts of toxics is incomplete and incompatible with other epidemiologic information.

The overwhelming conclusions of the delegations thus far with respect to the Agreement are:

- The Agreement and its goal of eliminating the discharge of persistent toxic substances is essential and must be maintained, but;
- Implementation of the Agreement to date has largely failed to control toxics. The jurisdictions, the IJC or some new body must be much more aggressive in enforcing the commitments of the Agreement. As David Bigley from Save the River told the panel at the hearing in Kingston, "It's as though we're on a toxic treadmill, talking about cleaning up toxics but still permitting them to be discharged."
- GLU's citizens' hearings have pointed out the failure on the part of the IJC and the government jurisdictions to be accountable to the public or to recognize the essential role of the public. Speakers have overwhelmingly expressed gratitude to GLU for giving them the opportunity to review the Agreement.

Comments on the question of renegotiation have been divided. Some speakers have expressed the fear that renegotiation could result in a weakening of the Agreement, while others have said a new agreement is essential.

Some of the most distressing presenta-

Continued on page 2

From the President

by Frederick L. Brown, Ph.D., M.U.C.C.

Great Lakes United has requested public involvement in basin jurisdiction's development of ecosystem toxics policy. We've been heard and the response has been both positive and negative. Wisconsin, Michigan and New York have invited our participation; others have flatly denied our request or failed to respond.

This is not a meaningless request. We believe that public input is critical to the development and implementation of policy required by the Great Lakes Charter and the newer Toxics Agreement. Politically, geographically and chronologically these policies will be very far-reaching.

The Great Lakes cannot continue to be the sink for basin wastes and the connecting waters—St. Mary's River, St. Clair River, Detroit River, Niagara River and the St. Lawrence River—cannot continue to be viewed as conduits to carry out wastes beyond our shores.

In each jurisdiction where we need to participate when invited. We must recognize the possibility that, in the rush to address basin-wide water quality standards, uniformity may be given priority over quality. We must not let this happen.

I believe our goal must be basin standards at least as rigorous as the most

rigorous currently operative among the basin jurisdictions. Whenever we're asked, I believe we must say (and repeat as often as necessary to assure being heard),

"Great Lakes water quality shall go no lower and shall be improved from this date forward. Further, standards shall be subject to constant scrutiny and constant revision to the point that discharge of toxics is eliminated."

If governments make it absolutely necessary for users and dischargers of toxics to meet the above goal, that necessary will span the technology and economics required to achieve the goal. But the user and discharger must know what is expected of them and that there is no alternative. Therefore, enforcement must follow the standard.

Unfortunately the timeline for achievement is a long one. The first steps have been taken. Second steps, policy, are being considered. Implementation must follow. Let's trust that our views be heard in policy development and standard setting. Let's go for the BEST of the BEST.

GLU President Frederick L. Brown serves as a delegate for Michigan United Conservation Clubs.



Washington Update:

Transition from 99th to 100th Congress

by Jane Elder, Midwest Representative, Sierra Club

It never fails. For close to two years Congress wrestles with controversial legislation and, in the final few weeks, jams through as much as possible with nary a contemplative moment to spare.

As the 99th draws to a close, environmentalists are closely watching Superfund, Clean Water, FIFRA (the pesticide bill), several wilderness proposals, acid rain legislation, and more.

Key bills affecting the Great Lakes include:

Superfund Superfund cleared its toughest hurdle in late July when, after months of discussion, House and Senate conferees agreed on a language for the Superfund regulatory program. Weaker than the House bill, the conference bill does require cleanup to begin at 375 dumps (as opposed to 600 in the House language), and cleanup standards must meet all other existing health and environmental standards, although some limited waivers are possible. Significant gains were made in the area of Community Right-to-Know, with reporting required for everyday releases of toxics into the environment.

In contrast, citizen suits took a beating. Citizens cannot sue under Superfund to stop imminent and substantial endangerment. Thus, if you live next to a Superfund site and want to sue the polluter to prevent your well from being contaminated rather than wait for EPA to get started on a cleanup, you are out of luck. This conference bill still needs to be approved by both houses.

Now that we appear to have a Superfund, how are we going to pay for it? This remaining question is the one that may endanger passage of the program in the 99th. The House and Senate have widely divergent approaches to funding the \$9 billion program. A separate conference committee must work out the funding program, which will likely combine several funding methods, including taxing oil and chemical feedstocks, a general profit tax, and possible "water-end" taxes. This fundamental companion legislation must pass for Superfund to have any meaning. Congressional leaders are optimistic, but don't count this chicken until it has hatched.

Clean Water This legislation has been languishing in conference committee for months. Major House/Senate disagreements over allocations for sewer construction grants have barely been discussed, let alone resolved.

If the Clean Water Act dies from neglect this year, we will have to start all over again next year, fighting again to get a strong Great Lakes action and other progressive language. All this progress down the drain! Perish the thought. Instead, call your representative and urge action on the Clean Water conference.

Acid Rain Action is moving in both houses on an acid rain control program, but the question is whether it will be enough. In the House, John Dingell's Energy and Commerce Committee was scheduled to mark-up H.R. 4567 when they came back to work in September. Delays and weakening amendments al-

ready threaten to gut the car and truck standards to reduce NO_x, to push back deadlines, and to drop the nationwide cost-sharing program. H.R. 4567 in its current form would reduce SO₂ and NO_x emissions by 9 million tons over the next 10 years, and is supported by the National Clean Air Coalition.

The Senate is taking a different approach. Hearings have been held on S. 2023, a 12.5-million-ton reduction bill, and Senator Proxmire is expected to introduce another Senate bill this fall.

None of these bills addresses toxic airborne deposition. So, regardless of the outcome of acid rain in the 99th Congress, expect to see toxics and other "non acid" air issues debated in the 100th Congress. FIFRA The pesticides "consensus" bill still has to make it through floor action in both houses. FIFRA (The Federal Insecticide, Fungicide and Rodenticide Act) regulates testing, licensing and safety practices for manufacture and handling of pesticides.

Wilderness Michigan wilderness passed the House in September of 1985, but still awaits a Senate hearing. Two Great Lakes islands and two Great Lakes natural shoreline areas are among the areas under consideration for wilderness designation. Expect Michigan Wilderness back in the 100th if there is no resolution this year.

Water Resources Congress has not authorized a new water projects bill since 1977, and it appears that perhaps this year, they will. Sections in the bill affecting the Great Lakes include a new lock at Sault



Ste. Marie, a study on consumptive uses of Great Lakes water, diversion language, as well as language on seaway tolls and commodities marketing. There's always another proposal to build a dam or straighten a river, so expect more water project proposals in the 100th.

Shoreline Erosion Congressman Dennis Eckart has introduced a bill to establish a Federal guaranteed loan program to "protect" real property contiguous to the Great Lakes. H.R. 5453 bears watching.

And next year? Suffice it to say that whatever doesn't get finished in the 99th will be back on the plate in the 100th. In addition to the re-run, expect to see some new action on TOSCA (The Toxic Substances Control Act), groundwater, air toxics, the usual battles over appropriations and budgets and more.

GLU HEARINGS

Continued from page 1

tions have come from native Indian tribes. At the Sault Ste. Marie hearing, Chief Earl Commanda of the Serpent River tribe graphically described how the Canadian Army "cleaned up" a sulphuric acid factory by bombing it. The Chief passed around a photo album showing how bombing spread the acid throughout the surrounding area, in the heart of their community on the north shore of Lake Huron. They can get no government assistance to clean the problem up.

An accompanying article describes the

frustrations of the Mohawks at the St. Regis reserve in New York and Ontario in their plight to protect their fish, wildlife and their own health from toxics coming from area industries. Their story was told at the hearing in Cornwall.

The hearings are meeting or exceeding our objectives:

- They're stimulating awareness and review of the Agreement. By the time the tour is complete, virtually every major environmental interest group in the basin will have submitted comments.
- The hearings are clarifying the major

water quality issues and the shortcomings in the management scheme. Jackson said he's confident that, because of the number of tremendous recommendations we're receiving, the report will indeed be a blueprint for better clean-up, management and protection of the ecosystem.

- Finally, and perhaps most exciting, is the incredible number of groups and individuals GLU is establishing contact with throughout the basin. The potential for mobilizing this network means great things for the future of the lakes.

Great Lakes United

24 Agassiz Circle
Buffalo, NY 14214
(716) 886-0142

Board of Directors OFFICERS

Frederick L. Brown, Ph.D., President
Midland, Michigan
John Jackson, Vice-President
Kitchener, Ontario
John Hickley, Secretary
Cornwall, New York
Joshua Wanech, U.S. Treasurer
Troyes City, Michigan
Jules Langer, Canadian Treasurer
Toronto, Ontario
Robert A. Bales, Past President
Shawtown, New York

REGIONAL DIRECTORS

Scott Stewart
Region I, Superior
John H. Stender
Region II, Huron
Joe Finkbeiner
Region III, Michigan
Amos Bankston
Region IV, Erie
Stanh Miller
Region V, Ontario
Richard Spencer
Region VI, St. Lawrence

DIRECTORS-AT-LARGE

Cathy Alpaugh
Dr. Katherine Davies
Robert Ginsburg, Ph.D.
David Green
Richard Kubiak, Ph.D.
Tom Miller
Karl Milyard
Mark Peterson
Ron Scudlark, Ph.D.
Carol Semelars

STAFF

Daniel Miller
Executive Director
Tim Eley
Field Coordinator
LuAnn Dierschmidt
Office Manager
Jennifer E. N. Ott
Editor/Lake Erie Coordinator
Michelle Downey
Administrative Assistant



GLU photo

The Duluth hearing panel, left to right: Minnesota Representative Willard Manger, Sault Ste. Marie Mayor John Jackson, Ron Scudlark, Wisconsin Representative Robert Isach.

This publication was made possible through a grant from The George Gund Foundation. Additional funding was provided by The Hubbs Foundation.



The Turtle: Mohawk Symbol Under Attack

by Mary Frances Hoover

Until the American Revolution, the Mohawk Nation occupied millions of acres of fertile soil, fed by the clean waters of the Mohawk, Hudson and St. Lawrence Rivers in eastern New York. They did not "own" their lands, but instead acted as guardians of the earth. Force and deceit on the part of some Americans and their leaders left fewer than 14,600 acres in the hands of New York Mohawks. In spite of tremendous efforts by the Mohawk people to maintain their way of life, their lands continue to be threatened by the newest American revolution, the industrial chemical revolution.

The St. Regis Mohawk Reservation (Akwesasne) is an American Indian community located on the border of northern New York and Canada, near Messena. The people of Akwesasne have always viewed their land as the center of their political, economic and socio-religious philosophy. The turtle represents the very foundation of the earth for Mohawks. It plays a central role in their explanation of how the earth was formed and how human beings came to live on it. To the Mohawks living along the St. Lawrence River in northeastern New York and in the provinces of Quebec and Ontario, the turtle has now become a significant monitor of the toxic contamination of their lands by adjacent industries.

As early as 1903, industry began using the bountiful resources of the St. Lawrence River when the Aluminum Company of America (ALCOA) established a factory a few miles west of Akwesasne. Less than 30 years later, a biological survey noted serious pollution problems. In spite of this, the St. Lawrence Seaway was constructed in 1954; this led to the decline of many species of fish, the destruction of marshlands and the extensive dumping of toxic chemicals into the river and atmosphere.

In 1959, Reynolds Metals established an aluminum plant one mile southwest of Akwesasne. Before 1968, the facility emitted fluorides into the atmosphere at a rate of 300 pounds per hour. In 1973, pollution control devices reduced this level to 75 pounds per hour. A study conducted by Cornell University veterinarians Dr. Lennart Krook and Dr. George Maylin concluded that these emissions were detrimental to the health of dairy cattle on the reservation. Mohawk farmers suffered severe economic losses due to fluorosis (brittling and breakage of teeth and bones), poor reproductive functions and decreased life expectancy in their cattle.

Dontar Paper is also located near Akwesasne on the north shore of the St. Lawrence River. In Canada, Dontar reportedly emits an average of 380 pounds of hydrogen sulfide and sulfur-containing compounds into the atmosphere each day. Another local industrial giant is General Motors, which constructed an aluminum-casting facility in 1959 less than 1,000 yards from several homes at Akwesasne. According to the Council on Economic Priorities, GM is estimated to be the country's second largest polluter. Since the 1950s, several areas on the GM property have been used as waste-disposal sites for PCB contaminated sludges and other industrial wastes. For over 30 years, many of these toxic substances have not been controlled or monitored.

During the last five years, the Mohawk people have focused their attention on the environmental contaminants leaching from the General Motors Central Foundry into the St. Lawrence River. In December 1981, the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation reported "widespread contamination of the groundwater" on the GM property by PCBs and heavy metals. At least 45 Mohawk families rely on water that is

taken from within a half mile of the GM plant. In October of 1983, General Motors was fined \$507,000 by the Environmental Protection Agency (EPA) for unlawful use and disposal of PCBs. To date, no remediation has begun to clean up the contamination, and toxics continue to escape daily into the river, atmosphere and food supply.

In June of 1985, Mohawk midwife Kats Cook and Cornell researcher Lin Nelson asked Ward Stone, state wildlife pathologist, to find out if toxic contaminants, particularly PCBs, were moving through the food chain at Akwesasne. Stone began his work by examining a 14-year-old snapping turtle collected at Akwesasne. Douglas Smoke, a Mohawk environmental health

There are no set standards for PCB, PCDD and TCDD levels in turtles, but a level at or above 3 ppm of PCBs in poultry fat and 10 ppt of dioxin in fish is considered to be unsafe for human consumption. Based on this data, Stone concluded that PCBs and other chlorinated compounds were moving through the food chain.

Stone also studied other area wildlife and found them to be contaminated. Masked shrews, for example, collected at Akwesasne during the summer of 1985, had PCB levels (on a lipid basis) ranging from 30 ppm to an amazing 11,522 ppm in their carcasses. These levels are hundreds to thousands of times higher than levels found in a masked shrew collected

Polychlorinated dibenzofurans were implicated in the suppression of the immune system of humans, making them more susceptible to many diseases. Abnormalities in liver enzymes were also noted. Thirty-seven babies born to PCB-poisoned Taiwanese women suffered from hyperpigmentation, facial swelling, abnormal calcification of the skull, low birth weight and overall growth retardation. Eight of the infants died from pneumonia, bronchitis or general weakness. The occurrence of abortions, stillbirths and undersized infants was attributed to transplacental movement of PCBs and dibenzofurans.

Mohawk people have always been proponents of a philosophy that requires leaders to consider the potential effects a



Courtesy of John Kulashnikov, Tuller

technician, captured it within 300 feet of the GM landfill and 150 feet of the St. Lawrence River. The turtle is considered to be an excellent monitor of local environments. Turtles, like humans, are omnivorous, and eat both meat and vegetation. They are relatively sedentary and long-lived; any toxics found in their tissues are usually considered to be locally acquired. Unlike other wildlife, turtles appear more tolerant of large concentrations of toxic chemicals such as PCBs.

Tissue analysis from the first snapping turtle from Akwesasne yielded startling results. PCBs were found at a level of 835 parts per million (ppm) in the fat tissue (wet weight basis); this level was 7 to 28 times higher than levels found in turtles further upriver. The concentration of highly toxic dioxins and dibenzofurans, both microcontaminants of PCBs, was even more alarming. The turtle had 300 parts per trillion (ppt) tetrachlorinated dibenzop-dioxin (TCDD), the same dioxin found in Agent Orange, in her fat. The level of polychlorinated dibenzofurans (PCDF) was an equally alarming 3,000 ppt.

in Columbia County (3.8 ppm lipid basis). Even meadow voles, whose diet consists primarily of vegetation, were found to have high levels of PCBs, ranging from 1.5 ppm to 9.8 ppm (lipid basis). According to Stone, PCBs are not usually detectable in meadow voles from other areas.

No one knows how long it will take for toxic chemicals, at levels to which Mohawks might be exposed, to cause serious health problems. What happens when a segment of the population—such as the Mohawks of Akwesasne—must continue to rely upon contaminated fish, game and vegetation to supply a large proportion of their diet? Most of the information regarding the effects of PCBs and dibenzofurans on human health is based on accidental poisonings. In Japan in 1968 and in Taiwan in 1979 thousands of people ingested contaminated rice oil, which contained concentrations of PCBs as high as 3,000 ppm. Many acute toxic effects were documented.

In Taiwan, 12 out of 24 deaths resulted from liver diseases and cancers. Following both incidents, many people suffered from chloracne, a severely disfiguring skin ac-

decision will have on their seventh generation of descendants. The time is upon us for leaders in government, industry, education and religion worldwide to adopt this philosophy and think first about the welfare of the earth and the unborn human beings, heirs to this planet.

The seriousness of the problem should indicate that dumping of deadly chemicals into the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence River should cease and clean-up should begin immediately. This, however, is not happening. Industry must attempt to find some way to compensate the people of Akwesasne for the contamination of their lands, waters, fish and wildlife. Federal and state governments will have to locate clean fishing and hunting grounds for the people to use. Industry, along with government officials and policy makers worldwide, must also heed the warnings that contaminated wildlife are sending before it is too late. As the Mohawks would say, when the turtle dies, the world will also die.

Mary Frances Hoover spent the past summer at a wildlife pathology system at the NYS Department of Environmental Conservation.



Ohio Environmental Council begins Campaign for Clean Water

by Stephen Sedam, Ohio Environmental Council

The Ohio Environmental Council (OEC) has begun a new statewide effort, the Ohio Campaign for Clean Water, to promote stronger measures for protecting Ohio's water resources.

"The historic reluctance of government to protect public health from unsafe water will not improve until citizens of this state demand it. That is what the Ohio Campaign for Clean Water is all about," said Stephen Sedam, OEC executive director.

The Council began the Campaign by meeting with concerned citizens and representatives of environmental, health, conservation, and other groups from September 15-22 in Akron, Athens, Cincinnati, Columbus, Cleveland, Dayton, and Toledo. Initially, the OEC will focus on Lake Erie water quality issues and groundwater protection.

Threats to Public Nod

In announcing the Campaign, the Council noted examples where Ohio has failed to protect the public from unsafe water.

Although cancerous fish have been found in the Cuyahoga, Black, and Ash-tabula rivers, Ohio remains without an ongoing program of testing fish for toxic contamination and warning the public. Portions of the Ash-tabula, Black, Cuyahoga, and Maumee rivers and their harbors are designated Areas of Concern by the International Joint Commission; yet only one Ohio EPA employee is assigned to develop Remedial Action Plans for restoring water quality in these areas.

A major uncontrolled source of pollution to Lake Erie is phosphorus from agricultural sources in Ohio. However, no funds have been allocated to implement the phosphorus reduction strategy developed by Ohio EPA which, among other things, targets critical watersheds for accelerated use of no-till farming.

Over 90 percent of the wells tested since 1981 in the Village of Marengo show drinking water contaminated by septic tank waste. Proper maintenance and inspection standards could have avoided this

unsafe situation. The last Ohio Department of Health annual survey, conducted in 1974, showed 30 percent of private water wells in Ohio to be contaminated by bacteria.

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources can account for only one-third of the 2.4 billion gallons of oil production brine waste generated in the state every year. Brine contains high levels of chloride, trace amounts of metals, and toxic substances such as benzene.

Groundwater Protection Strategy Released

As a cornerstone of the Ohio Campaign for Clean Water, the OEC has released a comprehensive statewide groundwater protection strategy entitled *Buried Treasure at Risk*.

The Council's strategy was written over an eight month period by a task force of 20 hydrogeologists, toxicologists, drinking water chemists, attorneys, public health scientists, and representatives of health, environmental and consumer organizations.

The OEC strategy was released in time for interested citizens and organizations to prepare for a series of public hearings the State of Ohio is conducting in early October on the official state groundwater protection strategy.

Buried Treasure at Risk describes 23 known or potential contamination sources found in Ohio, Ohio geology and areas vulnerable to groundwater contamination, the type and availability of useful groundwater data in Ohio, steps needed to prevent groundwater contamination, proposals for funding the programs recommended, and provisions needed to improve citizen participation and enforcement.

Copies of an executive summary of *Buried Treasure at Risk* can be obtained from the Ohio Environmental Council, 155 N. High Street, Suite 300, Columbus, OH 43215-1094.

Stephen Sedam has been executive director of the Ohio Environmental Council for the past ten years and serves on GLU's Water Quality Task Force.

Strawberry Island Update

On July 30, 1986, Gov. Mario Cuomo signed a home-rule request transferring ownership of Strawberry Island from the Town of Tawasville to New York State. This transfer was a key move in the island's preservation effort, because a state agency would have the necessary funding to save it. Strawberry Island, which is in the upper Niagara River, has been decimated over the years by erosion, brought on by merciless commercial dredging of the land.

Great Lakes United's Strawberry Island Task Force, chaired by Dave Miller, successfully brought about this latest accomplishment. Some of the many people and organizations represented on the Task Force were: Ronald Gardner of UAW Local 774, James August of Strawberry Island

Preservation Group, John Bunz of New York State Conservation Council, Charlie Rechlin of the Erie County Sportsman's Federation, Doug Hurtubise of New York Wildlife Association, Don Shennaker and Otto Reinhardt of the George Washington Fishing and Camping Club, and over 6,000 names on petitions.

Thanks to the efforts of Congressman Henry J. Nowak, the Army Corps of Engineers will begin a detailed study of Strawberry Island beginning in October. The enormous concern for this small but significant fish and wildlife resource shows the genuine feelings of western New Yorkers for their environment.

James J. Gardner, Chair
Strawberry Island Preservation Group



On Strawberry Island, left to right: Otto Reinhardt, George Washington Club, Jim Gardner, Congressman Henry Nowak, David Miller, GLU, Assemblyman Robin Schumacher, Jim August, S. I. Preservation Group.

New Publication

Directory of Ohio Water Management Associations and Organizations is available free from Water Resources Center, The Ohio State University, 1791 Neil Avenue, Columbus, OH 43210.

Ohio Coastal Resource Management Project

Many conflicting interests compete for Ohio's shoreline and its resources. These resources are limited, however, and the shore is already almost fully developed. The Ohio Coastal Resource Management Project (OCRMP) has been formed by a group of citizens to complete Ohio's coastal management effort along Erie's north coast. Its goal is the development of a comprehensive program for the management of coastal resources by state and local governments.

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) worked for several years to develop a coastal program following federal requirements, but this program was not approved or implemented. OCRMP has been working closely with the ODNR to develop a proposal for a special task force on Coastal Resource Management. The task force would be charged with the development of policies for coastal resource management and recommendations for the implementation of such policies.

The task force, composed of 15 members primarily from the coastal area, would utilize the information and findings of previous efforts. A series of public meetings and hearings would ensure an open forum for development of an Ohio coastal program, with recommendations for:

- resource protection, including wetlands; potable water; wildlife habitat; aesthetic, cultural, and historic resources;
- coastal development, including shorefront access, ports and harbors, energy;
- coastal recreation and tourism; and
- government policies and a management plan.

An OCRMP slide show is available, as well as speakers, for presentations to groups. For further information, contact OCRMP, P.O. Box 3160, Kent, OH 44240.

A New York Lake Perspective on Critical Great Lakes Issues

by New York State Assemblymen John B. Sheffer (R) and William B. Hoyt (D)

Although there are numerous natural assets in New York State and throughout the Great Lakes Basin, our enormous fresh water resources must surely rank at the top of that list.

With less than one percent of the earth's water in usable, drinkable form, the advantage of having one-fifth of that world supply in our own backyard can hardly be overrated. The economic, environmental and governmental implications of this resource must necessarily be considered and pursued by all those in charge of public policy decisions at all levels of government.

The Great Lakes Basin has been hit disastressfully hard by the loss of business, industry and jobs to the South and other areas of the country. Although the lakes themselves cannot rebuild the economy of our region, they can act as a catalyst to accomplish that purpose in coordination with innovative and effective governmental policies.

Although New York State, and Western New York in particular, has a huge stake in the quality and integrity of the Great Lakes, we have not historically been as active a participant in many basin-wide efforts, including the Council of Great Lakes Governors, that many of us would desire. For several reasons, it is of great importance to remedy that situation.

page 4

Including the St. Lawrence, New York State has the second longest Great Lakes coastline of any state. Agriculture and tourism are New York's number one and two businesses, respectively, and other water-intensive industries employ many thousands of our residents. New York has the largest population and, therefore, the largest Congressional delegation of any Great Lakes state.

The extraordinary stake which the State of New York has in Great Lakes issues is further exemplified by the fact that Lake Erie is by far the shallowest of the Great Lakes and Lake Ontario is the smallest. When one also considers that Erie and Ontario are the most downstream of the lakes, it becomes clear that decisions on issues such as water diversion can have as big and bigger an impact upon New York than any area of the basin.

Both from the perspective of New York State and the entire Great Lakes Basin, it is essential that New York participate in every way practical in the spectrum of organizations and efforts currently pursuing critical Great Lakes issues. Although the matter of the Governor's Council has been particularly discouraging, there are a number of important ways in which New York is in fact making a significant role in current Great Lakes efforts.

As a signatory to the Great Lakes

Charter established in 1985, New York is participating, on an administrative level, with many of the committees and programs which are part of the on-going agreements and goals outlined in the Charter. In addition, Governor Cuomo has recently appointed a coordinator of Great Lakes issues and has signed the Toxic Substance Control Agreement concluded last May on Mackinac Island. Legislative efforts, pursued on a fully bipartisan basis, have included follow-up proposals to strengthen the impact of the Charter within our own borders, funding of a new Great Lakes Center at State University of New York at Buffalo, establishment of a Great Lakes Consortium including several State University campuses, and the convening of a conference of state and provincial legislators in Albany last May. New York State has been further honored by the location of the headquarters of Great Lakes United in the City of Buffalo.

Many historic and practical reasons have acted to divide the Great Lakes States on certain issues and efforts. The critical point, however, is that the stakes are too high to allow such divisions to prevent the united front and cooperative effort required to protect the continued vitality of this enormous resource.



Developing a Remedial Action Plan: The Green Bay Experience

by Rebecca Leighton, Green Bay Toxics Project

Green Bay and the lower Fox River are the focus of an intensive planning process. By early next year, a Remedial Action Plan (RAP) will be drafted by the Wisconsin DNR, designed to restore these polluted waters to full beneficial uses by the year 2000. As part of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, the U.S. and Canada have agreed to develop such plans for 42 Areas of Concern, and Green Bay is one of the first.

The bay is one of the three most productive freshwater estuaries in the Great Lakes, but it also receives its waters from the heavily industrialized Fox River. The world's largest concentration of paper mills can be found here, with the resulting heavy flow of effluents to the water. Historical and continuing discharges have caused a high level of contamination, with thousands of chemicals such as PCBs, chlorinated organics and heavy metals being found in the water, sediments and

wildlife.

Though the problems are serious, the DNR has had trouble in the past generating local support for stringent controls and clean-up of toxic sediment "hot spots" in the river. Many people in the community of Green Bay have accepted the contamination as an unfortunate but necessary trade-off, if jobs and industry are to be maintained. Also, big improvements have been made over the last 10 years in water quality, as conventional pollutants like phosphorus and BOD decreased by 85-90%. Visually, the water is much clearer. Fish have returned in large numbers and looters are out in droves. But the invisible toxics are still there. They'll be much more expensive and difficult to remove, yet ironically the public support for this important work will be harder to generate, since the problem can't be seen.

This industrial attitude and public

perception problem makes the new RAP planning process very interesting. The DNR has been challenged to bring together a diverse group of people to agree on how millions of dollars will be spent for cleaning up the bay and river. It has chosen to get as many people involved as possible.

Lynn Persson, the DNR's planner, has her hands full coordinating five separate committees (each with several subcommittees) which have been meeting since February and March, 1986. Four are technical advisory committees (TACs): Toxic Substances Management TAC, Biotra and Habitat Management TAC, Eutrophication and Nutrients Management TAC, and Institutional TAC. The fifth committee is an overall Citizens Advisory Committee (CAC) with 27 community members.

Over 80 people are involved in these committees, with many experts traveling long distances to participate. Of course, this creates serious communication problems between committees, and delays, but it also generates a lot of media and community attention because of the size of the effort. It will add considerable weight to the final plan. Fast planning efforts have been ignored, but the local feeling is that this will be the "plan to end all plans." CAC members intend to continue meeting during the implementation, since everyone agrees that this final step will be the most difficult.

The plan will also need fine-tuning as new research results become available and government institutions change.

Initially it appeared that the CAC was too top-heavy with local agency, government and commission leaders, and that regular members of the public were under-represented and possibly intimidated by the politically powerful. Though this could be a problem from an environmentalist's standpoint, it may end up as an advantage. If these leaders become convinced of the need for a clean-up, the implementation will be both smoother and swifter.

There is a serious problem, however, with meetings held only during the weekday for the convenience of industry and government representatives. Some labor leaders and fishing club leaders who work during the day have been unable to attend because of this.

The seven months of meetings have been a necessary and important education

for everyone involved in the CAC. The technical experts have made regular reports explaining the significance of the issues, and are making a clear impression on local leaders. The ecosystem approach of the plan, with all its interrelationships, has been a complicated concept to grasp.

There is some concern that agency experts on the TACs may not be as free as they should be to express their opinions because of agency policies they must adhere to. Also, the plan will be measured against the current requirements of law, as expressed in the Clean Water Act, the Water Quality Agreement, the Governor's Toxics Agreement and state law. This will strengthen some recommendations and possibly weaken others.

An obstacle in the planning process is the lack of technical data from the river and bay system. Though extensive research has been done already, the experts are uncomfortable with drawing firm conclusions and making recommendations. Their inclination is to simply ask for more research. Five to ten years could go by with little or no actual progress. Economic analysis will also be difficult, because new techniques and processes may be required. The agency staff hours just aren't available for thorough analysis and documentation of all the recommendations. Forging for this type of research will be very expensive.

Outside the meetings, efforts are being made to educate the public about the water quality problems and the plan. The Lake Michigan Federation, as a public interest group, is giving slide presentations and talks to local civic, church and labor organizations. Newsletters are being circulated. The Brown County Conservation Alliance is sponsoring photography, art and poetry contests about the bay. The DNR has an education specialist working with the schools.

A concerted effort will be needed to get the public out to the final hearings next spring. It's entirely possible that certain aspects of the plan will not represent the public will, so a strong showing of concern could be important.

It's a monumental effort to get so many people working together and communicating, but the resulting plan will be an important tool for the clean up of the Fox River and Green Bay. It's worth it.

Rebecca Leighton is the Director of the Green Bay Toxics Project, which is coordinated by the Lake Michigan Federation in Chicago.



Lake Michigan Shoreline

GLU photo

Globescope II

Environmentalists will be joined by leaders in business, government, and civic affairs from the United States, Canada, and around the world to discuss critical long-term trends in global environment, development, resources and population at Globescope II: An International Forum. A main goal of the conference is to expand local issues into a global perspective and promote more holistic solutions to environmental problems.

Workshops and addresses will cover a wide variety of issues, including acid rain, hazardous waste, water supply, nuclear policy, fisheries, and environmental ethics. The forum is sponsored by the Lincoln Filene Center for Citizenship and Public Affairs and the Global Tomorrow Coalition, and will be held October 24-26 at Tufts University.

For a brochure or additional information, please call Michelle Zader or Nancy Anderson at (617) 381-3451, or write: Globescope II, Lincoln Filene Center, Tufts University, Medford, MA 02155.

Michigan Groundwater Conference

Michigan State University's Institute of Water Research is co-sponsoring a conference, Rural Groundwater Contamination: Assessment of Needs, Strategies for Action, which is to be held October 20-22 at the University. For information, write: 1700 E. Gull Lake Drive, Kellogg Biological Station, Hickory Corners, MI 49060. For a fee, housing and meals will be available; the registration fee is \$60.

Fish Preparation and Consumption Guide Available

A new guide for preparing fish to reduce potential exposure to contamination has been released by the Michigan Department of Public Health. Also included in the guide is an amended Public Health Fish Consumption Advisory updating the advisory printed in the 1986 Fish List Digest. The guide is available from the Department's Center for Environmental Health Sciences, 3500 N. Logan, Lansing, MI 48909, or by calling (517) 335-8350.

People Who Make a Difference

A recently published book by John J. Berger, *Restoring the Earth, How Americans Are Working to Restore Our Damaged Environment* (Alfred A. Knopf), profiles individual environmentalists who clean up whole rivers and lakes, repair wetlands, replant prairies or forests and redesign towns and suburbs. The author argues that restoration of land and water must take place, along with conservation of our resources, if our environment is to be protected. Berger, who has written on environmental issues for years, also contends that such restoration should not be equated with economic loss since, for example, some industries are saved from forced closings when environmental problems are solved. Readers are reminded that results of actions taken now will be seen as a legacy by future generations, and that they have a right to an intact and healthy inheritance.

Superfund Information Service

EPA has set up a Superfund technical information service, through which the public may make suggestions and ask questions about EPA Superfund activities. The toll-free number is (800) 424-9346. It is open from 9:00 to 4:30, Monday to Friday; messages may be left at other times.

Spill Hotline

Anyone who sees a release or spill of oil or hazardous waste materials anywhere nationwide can report it by calling the National Response Center Hotline at (800) 424-8802. Companies that produce or transport oil or hazardous wastes are required to call the hotline to report an accidental spill.

Underground Storage Tanks

EPA is moving to protect people and the environment from leaking underground tanks that store petroleum products and other hazardous substances. EPA estimates that there are approximately one million such tanks in the United States. The agency is awarding grants to assist states in locating underground storage tanks and developing procedures to stop, clean up and prevent leaks.

EPA notified companies that after May 8, 1986, "bare steel" or underground storage tanks that were not protected from rust or corrosion could no longer be installed. Owners who store petroleum products or other hazardous substances were required to notify state agencies of tank capacity, construction material, contents, time in service and location. By early 1987, EPA plans to propose a complete set of underground storage tank regulations. For more information, contact Tim Taccone at (212) 364-1829.



Superior's Notes

by Alden E. Lind

Now, take Lake Superior—Pleasi! Or at least part of it. If a poll of basin residents were conducted, lake levels would emerge as the current number one problem. Recent slight declines from record levels have done little to comfort in view of serious shoreline erosion and the summer-long red water of western Lake Superior, the latter attributed partly to high water, partly to voluminous run-off. At my family's resort on the North Shore, a grumpy, tenacious barker, arching toward the skies from its inverted grip on a cliff—its home for more than 50 years of memory—was torn loose, victim like so many others.

Lake levels are not our only problem. A just-released EPA funded study (\$400,000 worth) examined possible responses to our worst hazardous waste site, the oil refining at the Arrowhead Refinery. About 4,600 cubic yards of a "highly acidic, metal-laden sludge" was dumped into a 2-acre lagoon on about 10 acres of shallow peat bog. Analysis yielded 14 volatile organic compounds, 17 polycyclic aromatic hydrocarbons, 4 phthalates, cadmium, copper, lead and zinc, some in sufficient quantity to constitute a significant cancer risk through direct exposure, groundwater contamination, or other exposure.

The \$400,000 produced little. After three volumes of report seven final "findings" are listed: Having conducted only two rounds of sampling they were unable to eliminate inconsistencies in data, to account for seasonal variations, to determine the depth of contamination, etc. There is, then, no meaningful data base on which to fashion a meaningful remedy, but the consultants state the deficiencies "should not have an effect on analysis of remedial action alternatives."¹

Ah, yes—Dioxin too. Duluth is building a super-calandared papermill and nearby Cloquet has a Bortnick mill, the latter already shown to have produced dioxin, the former a possible source of dioxin contamination. The National Dioxin Study has found evidence that the production of bleached kraft pulp also produces dioxin and the paper industry, through its National Council of the Paper Industry for Air and Stream Improvement, Inc. (NCASI), seems prepared to accept considerable responsibility. A recent visit by its director of research to Duluth was

refreshing for his willingness to talk about research and remedial programs, contrasting notably with the tobacco industry, the asbestos industry, the acid deposition producers, etc.

And, an old nemesis, Reserve Mining and its asbestos-laden taconite tailings, is not yet behind us. LTV Corp., purchaser of Republic Steel's 50% of Reserve, recently filed Chapter 11 bankruptcy. The other partner, Armco, held holding the bag, sought similar protection for First Taconite, Reserve's corporate identity. Employees, past and present, are left with uncertain futures, probably no medical insurance, uncertain retirement benefits. And, we are left with a tailings disposal facility whose long-term maintenance there is now some question. How will the filtration plant, built to remove fibers from water which would otherwise have threatened to overflow unfilled and dam-threatening, be operated? How will airborne transport of fibers from untreated surfaces be restricted? Or, will monitoring even be done?

The litany of western Lake Superior's problems has only begun. The old Superior landfill is being breached by Lake Superior, possibly liberating all manner of pollutants including wastes from Superior's refinery. Ashland, Wisconsin, has a serious sewage by-product problem threatening to degrade a marina now under construction. Torch Lake, on the Keweenaw Peninsula, is still the apparent source of a high incidence of fish tumors. Atmospheric deposition brings us "acid" as well as PCBs, mercury, and a host of other interesting visitors. Canadian paper plants and gold mining operations, at Hemlo, remain high on the list of suspects though more definitive data from our Canadian friends would be welcome.

I must say, with regard to acid precipitation we have made a bit of progress. Both Wisconsin and Minnesota have moved. In Minnesota, our two acid deposition laws and new regulations have now produced an 11 lb/acre wet surface deposition limit and a mandatory no-back-of emissions from Minnesota's two largest sources, Northern States Power's Allan King plant and Minnesota Power's Clay Boswell plant. Our long-term strategy of forcing the federal government and other states to

move on this matter by first cleaning up our own sources is well on track.

Acid deposition provides a nice transition to a brief discussion of institutional forms. Reducing and eventually eliminating acid rain will require a vigorous national policy. While states can do a bit, establishing a "level playing field" means that the federal government must establish a national policy. I am very leery of notions such as the "bubble concept" which presumably would allocate, then permit trading in, pollution rights.

But, we need to create more authoritative regional agencies. Then, we must develop a structure within which less-than-national interregional issues can be discussed with at least the possibility of preliminary resolution pending a veto of the federal government.

The Reagan administration slew the most significant regional agency we possessed, the Great Lakes Basin Commission, and seems determined to slay even our basin research programs. While the GLBC's lack of formal powers was a fact of life, it succeeded in elevating consciousness of the integrity of the basin and in setting some touchstones for state and

federal agency decisions.

But, even if the GLBC were recreated, our water diversion threat makes clear the need for additional interregional structures. We must say "no" to interbasin transfers until it is possible for us to have some say about the uses to which our water will be put and the standards applied in allocating it. How, in good conscience, can we accede to a transfer to western states where "prior appropriation" based water laws encourage its waste? How can we permit transfer when a pricing system will create inequity and the current system will entail our helping pay for the loss of our economic base and our people? And, finally, how can we permit this to become a matter for complex political logrolling where many legislators will introduce totally extraneous side-payment issues? Serious consideration must be given the creation of a new institution within which interregional bi-lateral agreements can take form.

Alden Lind is a board member of Save Lake Superior, a chapter director of the Lake Water League and president of the Minnesota Council of Parks.



Lacks at Sand St. Morte

GLU photo

CELRF RELEASES CROSS-BORDER LITIGATION STUDY

by David Scriven

For the past two years, the Canadian Environmental Law Research Foundation has been studying the problems and prospects for persons and organizations to cross the border and participate in environmental legal proceedings of another basin jurisdiction. This study has now been published as a book entitled *Cross-Border Litigation - Legal Action in the Great Lakes Ecosystem*.

The book, which was written by Paul McIsaac with David Scriven and Jim Olson, is intended to be both a resource manual on environmental rights and remedies within the Great Lakes basin as well as a law-reform document advocating the removal of barriers to cross-border litigation. It examines and summarizes all the environmental laws of the U.S. and Canadian federal governments, eight states and two provinces. Through this review, it found that in the vast majority of instances there are no barriers for residents in one jurisdiction to sue for pollution injury or participate in the environmental decision-making processes (such as assessment, permitting or standard-setting procedures) of another jurisdiction.

To overcome the barriers that do exist, the book advocates that every Great Lakes jurisdiction adopt the "Ecosystem Rights Act." The Act establishes the basin as a single juridical unit and creates a citizen suit law which gives any person within the ecosystem the right to sue or participate in environmental proceedings anywhere in the basin to defend the interests of the ecosystem as a whole. The Act essentially is a code of environmental rights for all in the basin.

As a follow-up to this study, CELRF is now undertaking a study examining the discrepancies and inconsistencies within environmental standard-setting processes of the Great Lakes basin jurisdictions, with a focus on the need for management of toxics on an ecosystem basis. A report is presently expected in the spring of 1987.

To order a copy of the cross-border litigation study, contact: The Canadian Environmental Law Research Foundation; 243 Queen Street, 46th Floor, Toronto, Ontario M5V 1Z4, (416) 977-2410.

David Scriven is a research associate with the Canadian Environmental Law Research Foundation.

Great Lakes Channels Study

Almost 200 scientists, engineers and managers, including 22 universities and 22 U.S. and Canadian Government groups and agencies, have recently launched their second year of the Upper Great Lakes Connecting Channels Study.

The aim of the three year study is to identify the sources, amounts and types of toxic contaminants in the channels (St. Mary's, St. Clair and Detroit Rivers, including Lake St. Clair), to assess their effect on human health and ecology and to recommend ways to eliminate, reduce or at least contain toxic and conventional pollution.

The study has set up a central data exchange system by means of compatible microcomputers and software. The development of mathematical computer models will help in understanding what happens to contaminants once they get into the channels, whether they move about and, if so, where they wind up.

Details of the second-year activities are in a document entitled "Upper Great Lakes Connecting Channels Study: Work Plan of Activities, Second Year." For a free copy, contact: Peggy Harris, Great Lakes National Program Office, U.S. EPA Region 5, 536 South Lake St., Chicago, IL 60605; (312) 353-3565.

Small Business Ombudsman

EPA offers the services of its Small Business Ombudsman Office to answer questions or complaints about EPA regulations and orders. The service is designed to help make it easier for small businesses to come into compliance with applicable environmental laws. The office also provides information about grants and loans available to small businesses. The office can be reached by calling a toll-free hotline: (800) 368-5888. To get the newsletter, "Small Business Update," write to the U.S. EPA, 401 M St., S.W. (A-149C), Washington, D.C. 20460.

New Publication

The Annals of Regional Science will publish a Special Edition entitled "Environmental Conflict Analysis," edited by Dr. Peter Nijkamp. Topics covered by contributing authors include "Interfacing System Dynamics and Multiobjective Programming for Regional Water Resources Planning," "Multiobjective Modeling of Economic-Ecological Interactions and Conflicts" and "Conflicting Objectives in Environmental Management." For information on how to obtain a copy, write: The Annals of Regional Science, Western Washington University, Bellingham, WA 98225.



Minister Bradley Releases Toxic Control Program

by Jennifer Ott, Editor/Organizer, GLU

A new pollution control program to protect Ontario's waterways was issued in a White Paper in June by Environment Minister Jim Bradley. The program, entitled "Municipal-Industrial Strategy for Abatement," or "MISA," will require monitoring and effluent limits for industrial dischargers of toxics and municipal sewage treatment plants.

Five key features to MISA are outlined in the White Paper: (1) Major polluters, including the eight industrial sectors that comprise 200 of Ontario's 300 direct dischargers, will be required to cut back; (2) The effluence of municipal sewage treatment plants will have to comply with new regulations; (3) A cap will be imposed on the absolute amount of contamination

each source may discharge; (4) each direct discharger must meet standards attainable by the best available technology (BAT); and (5) each industrial and municipal sector will be periodically re-examined to see if further reductions are appropriate.

MISA may place undue early emphasis on BAT which, in the United States, has not provided adequate protection of the aquatic resource. Additionally, the effluent of 11,700 of Ontario's 12,000 industries will not be regulated directly by MISA, but by already beleaguered municipalities that will be responsible for pollutants from upstream. Another aspect of the program which has drawn some criticism is that regulations require each industry to monitor its own effluent for a wide range

of contaminants. The self-monitoring program will be supplemented by the Ministry and will involve some spot testing, but some environmental groups have expressed concern at the extent of the Ministry's activities. The first monitoring regulations for the petroleum and organic chemical industries will not be in effect until mid-1988; by 1989, the first new effluent limit regulations will be introduced for municipal sewer discharges.

Once a comprehensive database has been built up, abatement programs will be tailored for each individual discharger. Development of this data base is critical, although the proposed data collection goals should be expanded and data collection should be initiated immediately.

It is not clear how much, if any, public participation was involved in the preparation of the White Paper. Minister Bradley is encouraged to include citizen and environmental groups in all upcoming phases of the development of MISA, including the technical committees meeting prior to the plan's implementation. It is during this part of the process that interested groups should have input into risk analysis, priority setting and other factors which are so important to the program. Only through emphasis on water quality and the elimination of toxic discharges - rather than on BAT economically achievable - will MISA have its most beneficial impact on the Great Lakes/St. Lawrence River ecosystem.

Acid Rain Partnership

In July, "Consensus Recommendations" were released by the Acid Rain Partnership (ARP), which is co-sponsored by the Ohio Environmental Council and the New Hampshire Task Force on Acid Rain. The partnership was designed to replace disagreement over this issue with constructive discussions and debates.

Volunteers were chosen from a wide variety of professions, and many had opposing views on how to deal with the questions surrounding acid rain. After an information exchange between participants from each state, negotiation between the delegates led to five main recommendations: (1) begin a national program to deal with acid deposition and related air pollutants; (2) require technology to allow for competitiveness of high sulfur coal; (3) balance control costs between the public and emitters; (4) encourage reduction of emissions through a system of incentives; and (5) include a key role for conservation in maintaining emissions standards.

"The Partnership has shown that this air pollution problem is more than statistics and figures. The recommendations keep Ohio miners at work and protect the environment for our children at the same time," said Vincent Lucido, a United Mine Workers official and ARP delegate from Beallsville, Ohio.

It is this kind of initiative that may push lawmakers to legislative action. As it stands now, the Acid Rain Control Bill (H.R. 4567) is faltering in the House, and it does not look much better for acid rain legislation in the Senate. Write your representatives!

Corps Inaction Threatens Ohio Wetlands

The U.S. Army Corps of Engineers recently refused to claim jurisdiction when a marina developer destroyed 40 acres of wetland along the Lake Erie shore in Ottawa County, Ohio.

The Ohio Department of Natural Resources (ODNR) in early September negotiated a \$100,000 settlement with the Green Cove Development Corporation for ruining the wetland by filling it for condominium and marina development.

On August 15, ODNR filed a civil action not only against the Green Cove Development Corporation but also against the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers when the Corps refused to claim jurisdiction over the wetlands under the Clean Water Act.

The Corps insisted it did not have jurisdiction to issue a Section 404 dredge and fill permit even though it accepts jurisdiction over the land surrounding the site on three sides.

Consequently, the Corps has refused to require Green Cove to obtain a permit before filling the wetlands for condos. As a result, the developer began to fill the wetland without a permit in early August 1986.

In the civil action, the ODNR sought an injunction to stop further destruction of the wetlands. However, the action resulted in tremendous political pressure being placed on the agency by developers to counter support shown by the Ohio Environmental Council and sportsmens groups.

Before the development took place, the area was managed as marsh habitat for waterfowl or water was pumped out to allow farming. The future of valuable wildlife habitat is in jeopardy in other parts of the Great Lakes if the Army Corps of Engineers continues to abdicate its responsibilities for protecting wetlands.

Water Quality Summit to be Held

The Center for the Great Lakes will host a summit meeting on the 1978 International Water Quality Agreement in Detroit, Michigan on November 17 - 19, 1986. The program will feature presentations from governmental, private interest and citizen representatives involved in the review of the agreement. Great Lakes United will be presenting its preliminary findings from its 19 citizens' hearings on the future need for a strong International Water Quality Agreement.

The Great Lakes Water Quality Summit presents an opportunity for the entire Great Lakes community - government officials and citizens alike - to review progress, confront issues, share ideas and motivate collective action toward continued and strengthened U.S. - Canadian commitment to the quality of the lakes. For further information on the summit and how to register, contact Mike Donahue, Center for the Great Lakes, 435 N. Michigan Avenue, Suite 1408, Chicago, IL 60611 (312) 645-0901.

Senate Environment Committee Endorses Wetlands Bills

A bill that would provide the Interior Department with several million dollars every year to buy swamps, marshes, and other valuable wetlands was approved by the Senate Environment and Public Works Committee on August 12. The Emergency Wetlands Resources Act, S.740, would raise money in a number of ways. For one thing, entrance fees would be charged at selected National Wildlife Refuges. Also, the price of duck stamps (which waterfowl hunters must buy) would be raised over the next several years from \$7.50 to \$15.00.

Before the Emergency Wetlands Resources Act can be voted on by the entire Senate, it also must clear the Senate Energy and Natural Resources Committee. At this time, unfortunately, that committee has no plans to take action on the bill.

Join Us!

United! Together we can protect and promote our common treasure—the Great Lakes Basin.

Name _____

Organization: _____

Address: _____

State/Province: _____ Zip/Postal Code: _____

Phone: () _____

- ☐ Individual Membership (\$15.00)
- ☐ Organizational Membership (\$100.00)

Information Request:

- ☐ By-Laws ☐ Member Organizations
- ☐ Resolutions ☐ Other (Please Specify) _____

Would you be interested in volunteering for Great Lakes United?

☐ Yes ☐ No

Time Available?: _____

Please return this form with checks payable to:

Great Lakes United
24 Agassiz Circle
Buffalo, New York 14214

For additional information, send request to the above address or contact:

David J. Miller, Executive Director
(716) 886-0142

Thomas Meeting

Continued from page 1

Thomas further emphasized:

1. His support of the Great Lakes Amendment to the federal Clean Water Act;
2. His support of expanded Great Lakes research programs;
3. His support of expanded EPA public participation programs and of insured public involvement in the development of remedial action plans or clean-up activities for toxic "hot-spots" in the basin.

As the meeting came to its conclusion, Mr. Thomas, while not committing himself, said he would consider meeting with US and Canadian citizens of the Niagara Frontier in Niagara Falls sometime this winter. The diversity of participants closed the meeting with a revived hope of a positive federal response to the needs of the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Ecosystem.

As the citizen representatives left the August 7 meeting, there was agreement

that the eight-month campaign to seek an audience with Administrator Thomas was well worth the effort. Follow-up to the meeting has already begun with Niagara Frontier citizens setting up monthly to bi-monthly progress report sessions with EPA field staff. Great Lakes United, through its Water Quality Hearing Project, will assist EPA in contacting interested parties for citizen advisory panels on remedial action plans in the Great Lakes.

Now that we have heard the honest, dedicated and committed words of Administrator Lee Thomas on Great Lakes water quality protection, the true litmus test will be the future direction of EPA regional and field staff's activities. If EPA programs are designed to work toward the elimination of toxic contamination to the Great Lakes-St. Lawrence River Ecosystem, then Mr. Thomas' commitment stretches beyond the offices of Washington, DC. If not, it is our role to ensure the Environmental Protection Agency is heeding to the Administrator's leadership.



THE GREAT LAKES UNITED

Passage of Bond Act Critical to Great Lakes

One of the most fundamental obligations of government to ourselves and to those who will come after us is the preservation and protection of those elemental supports upon which all life depends: our air, water and land. The environment is the one common ground we all share. We are, in the words of poet John Donne, "A piece of a single continent, a part of the main."

The Great Lakes is a critical part of that whole, with over 95 percent of the United States' fresh water contained in its basin. The 1978 Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement between the U.S. and Canada reflects this, stressing as it does an ecosystem approach to the environment.

Neglect of ecosystems such as the Great

Lakes have put unwarranted stress on resources so important to all New Yorkers. Love Canal tragically taught us how costly, in every sense of the word, abuse of our environment can be. Love Canal dramatically reminded us that if we hoped to survive we could no longer treat nature like raw material to be consumed and discarded. Love Canal is only one of many examples of hazardous waste sites leaking chemicals into the Great Lakes. We know now of the disastrous impact these sites have on our fish, wildlife and drinking water supplies, and have learned that they must be cleaned up.

Across the State from Love Canal to Long Island, New Yorkers realize that hazardous waste is a serious problem that affects the entire Family of New York. But as they have with other environmental problems of the past, New Yorkers are ready to face this problem swiftly and boldly. That is why this year I proposed and the Legislature approved a \$1.5 billion Environmental Quality Bond Act, a comprehensive proposal that will enable New York to undo the neglect and ignorance of the past and protect our priceless

environment for the future.

Under the Bond Act, which will go before the voters in November, \$1.2 billion will be used to remediate within thirteen years, hundreds of hazardous waste sites including many sites in the Great Lakes Basin. Using only current revenues available for hazardous waste remediation, it would take at least 40 years to achieve this objective. Of the \$1.2 billion, \$100 million would be initially set aside for no interest loans to municipalities to assist in the closure of non-hazardous waste municipal landfills. Under our proposal, \$1.2 billion from the Bond Act will be combined with funds from the federal Superfund and responsible parties to leverage a \$4 billion cleanup effort. A unique feature of our proposal is that debt service on the \$1.2 billion in bonds for hazardous waste remediation will be shared equally by New York State and those industries that produce or use materials that cause hazardous waste.

The Bond Act will also provide \$250 million to increase recreational opportunities across the State and to safeguard our heritage - both natural and cultural. It will

provide funds to purchase, restore and improve municipal parks and recreational facilities, which will increase public access to the magnificent shoreline of the Great Lakes. The Bond Act will assist in the development of New York's Urban Cultural Parks, municipal and not-for-profit historic preservation projects, as well as in the acquisition and preservation of our most beautiful forests and environmentally sensitive lands, including wildlife habitats.

To correct the past, to protect the future. That is the purpose of the Environmental Quality Bond Act of 1986. I am confident that the voters of New York will once again reaffirm, this November, our tradition of national leadership and bipartisan support for environmental protection.

Mario M. Cuomo

Mario M. Cuomo, Governor
State of New York

Niagara River Action Plan Released

EPA released its "Niagara River Action Plan" in May. The document outlines the activities the EPA is already carrying out, or plans to carry out, to address the problems identified in the report of the Niagara River Toxics Committee (NRTC), which was released in late 1984.

The plan outlines activities in four areas: point source control, monitoring and integrated enforcement. It contains timetables, target dates, resource commitments, where applicable, and potential toxic loading reductions, where available. Quantification of actual toxic loading reductions achieved will result from the monitoring and inspection programs now underway or planned. Most of the programs described in the plan are carried out in cooperation with the New York State Department of Environmental Conservation. The plan will be updated periodically.

Copies of the plan can be obtained from John Anderson of EPA's Niagara Falls office, (716) 285-8842.

Toxic Information Hotline

The Natural Resources Defense Council (NRDC) now has a Toxic Substances Information Line. The hotline provides information and responds to inquiries regarding the health risks associated with exposure to toxic substances. Call (800) 646-NRDC.

RCRA Delegation

EPA has approved New York's request to assume management of the final phase of the federal hazardous waste control program mandated under the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act (RCRA). The RCRA program is designed to track and control hazardous waste from its point of generation through to its ultimate disposal.

New York State will continue to regulate over 1,400 generators, 750 transporters, and 280 facilities that treat, store and dispose of hazardous waste statewide, in place of the federal government. Region 2 Administrator Christopher J. Daggett, who approved New York's request, said, "This program is vital to assure that hazardous wastes are being handled safely in New York. We are pleased that the state has shown not only the willingness, but also the capability to run it effectively."

The state will get a \$180,000 bonus grant for assuming the federal program and up to \$3.4 million to run it next year. EPA will maintain an oversight role with quarterly reviews of the state's performance. The effective date of the authorization was May 29, 1986. For more information, contact Joel Golumbek of EPA at (212) 264-7309.



GLU photo

What's Inside:

Citizens meet with EPA chief.....	1
From the President	1
GLU Water Quality Hearings.....	1
Washington Update	2
Toxics at St. Regis Mohawk Reservation	3
Campaign for Clean Water Begins in Ohio	4
Ohio Groundwater Strategy Released	4
A NY perspective on the Great Lakes	4
Developing a Remedial Action Plan	5
Lake Superior Notes	6
Legislative/Calendar	7
Gov. Cuomo on the Bond Act	8



GREAT LAKES UNITED
24 Agassiz Circle
Buffalo, NY 14214

NON-PROFIT ORG.
U.S. POSTAGE
PAID
BUFFALO, N.Y.
PERMIT NO. 1762