

INTERNATIONAL  
JOINT  
COMMISSION  
Canada and United States



COMMISSION  
MIXTE  
INTERNATIONALE  
Canada et États-Unis

**Transcript of the public meeting held by  
the International Joint Commission  
on the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement Review  
at Cleveland, Ohio, on November 3, 2005  
(duration: 72 minutes)**

\*

**Transcription de la réunion publique tenue par  
la Commission mixte internationale  
sur l'examen de l'Accord relatif à la qualité de  
l'eau dans les Grands Lacs  
à Cleveland (Ohio) le 3 novembre 2005  
(durée : 72 minutes)**

CHRIS RONAYNE (Chief of Staff of Cleveland Mayor Jane Campbell):

Well, good evening, everybody. I just ran back from Akron, so they bid their adieu here from Akron tonight, but it's good that you're with us in Cleveland tonight. And on behalf of Mayor Jane Campbell, I want to welcome to City Hall. This has got great acoustics in City Hall, it'll carry all the way up to the 3<sup>rd</sup> and 4<sup>th</sup>-5<sup>th</sup> floor.

But we are also welcoming of our chairmen here to the Rock and Roll City, Cleveland. We know that you have been rocking all throughout the Great Lakes, holding meetings in Bay City, Chicago, Windsor, Quebec, Toronto, Green Bay, and last night, we heard, Detroit.

So the tour is going well. There's a guy outside selling t-shirts with the Great Lakes rock and roll tour out there in Cleveland, but we understand that you're going to be on to a couple of more cities, with still a few cities to go.

Cleveland gives you a hearty welcome. And I want to welcome...a lot of our colleagues on staff are here, a lot of partners with our area organizations, and it's good to see you back tonight.

So Dennis and Herb, welcome to Cleveland, from all of the places you have been. Thanks for being here tonight. This is a special city that has a waterfront very much at its heart.

Here in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, the building we're in is a part of the Group Plan, which all of you locals know, on the Cleveland Mall, but 100 years ago, when the Boundary Waters Treaty was forged in 1909 between Canada and the U.S., we

were just getting started with Daniel Burnham's great Group Plan. The Federal Building had been built just down the street in that very same year.

Then, we were the sixth largest city in the country. And a few years, later this hall was dedicated in 1916. So we're perched atop the lakefront, looking over it, over the Cleveland Harbour, and we've been looking at it ever since this place was built.

Our stewardship over those years hasn't always been so great. Over 75 years, there were times when our waterfronts literally drove people away - Cuyahoga River burning, dead zones in the lake - it wasn't always the place to be near.

But as a lot of our locals know, we've tried to turn the corner on that and bring about a 50-year lakefront plan, which Debbie Barry, my colleague, Steve Phifer (?) from the Port, Jim Wakeley (?) from Lake Carriers Association (?), you've all been a part of this, and a lot more tonight, you know that we have a very ambitious plan to reach our lake.

But the first priority, really, with that lakefront plan is to assure its sustainability into the future, so that Cleveland remains a viable part of the Great Lakes basin.

We've worked hard also in our community to turn a once-burning river, which burned multiple times, multiple fires on the river, into a thing of the past, which really the only vestige of the burning river being a great 12-ounce beer at

Great Lakes Brewing Company. For those locals, you know the Burning River Beer of Pale Ale.

Anyways, you're now seeing that American heritage river designated in the Clinton Administration in the '90s as a place now where we're seeing lots of interesting life come back – blue herons, a bald eagle was spotted in the watershed a few months ago, and much aquatic life.

We're working with the sewer district (inaudible)...always on our CSO (?) program and abetting the CSOs along the Lake Erie shore line, which Les could tell you much more in detail about those hot spots that we're working on.

And finally, we're working in concert with other Great Lakes cities and around also the St. Lawrence Seaway in something...we have worked with Mayor Daley principally on, and the Great Lakes Cities Initiative, where Mayor Campbell, Mayor Daley, and many other mayors from 40 different cities, large, mid-sized and small around the Great Lakes have lobbied for passage of their Great Lakes Restoration Act, dealing with invasive species in the waterways, again assuring the continued cleanup of our waterways in the Great Lakes basin.

So Cleveland doesn't want to just be known as the rock capital. We like that name, but we also want to be known really as the heart of the waterbelt. Dave Beech (?) must be credited with the phrase the waterbelt. From rustbelt to waterbelt, we're still proud of our rustbelt image – Mike Lowell (?), ISG, Mattel Steel (?) – but also the notion that in the 21<sup>st</sup> century, we're part of the waterbelt.

So others are watching what we're doing here in Cleveland, we're glad to be a part of this 10-city tour. Forty million people in the Great Lakes basin are depending on our work as stewards for potable water, continued as a source, recreational enjoyment, and key industry, from fisheries to shipping.

Let's stay vigilant in those efforts. And we are really glad to be a part of the Binational Water Quality Agreement, as it's updated. That's what we think we're here to do tonight is review the progress in the Cleveland community, working in concert with other communities around the Great Lakes.

So your work is important, really, again, binational work, a century old, but really renewed in the 1970s when the first Agreement was forged and a very important time for us, again when the Great Lakes weren't so clean, when the Cuyahoga River had just really become the genesis for the Clean Water Act, and 35 years since, we've made some great progress.

We're going to keep that going and keep our part of the Agreement up, chairmen, that's why we're here tonight. Again, we welcome you to Cleveland, to Cleveland City Hall, on behalf of Mayor Jane Campbell, thanks for coming out tonight. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

DENNIS SCHORNACK (Chair, U.S. Section, International Joint Commission): Thank you, Chris, for those fine opening remarks, and please pass on our gratitude to the Mayor for the use of this facility this evening. I understand that she is engaged in a rather serious endeavour somewhere down the street...

CHRIS RONAYNE: (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: That's right. So I think that given the acoustics in here, I would recommend that when people speak, to try to please speak slowly. It's a rather echo-y chamber.

I'm going to make a few opening remarks just to kind of set the context and the frame for why we are here this evening, and then we'll move right into the public comment period.

We're here because the governments of the United States and Canada asked the IJC to find out what you think the governments should consider as they begin their review of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. We're told that that review will be some time in March or early spring of 2006.

In 1972, when the Great Lakes were suffering from heavy loads of conventional pollutants, the governments signed this visionary agreement that focused largely on reducing pollution from municipal and industrial sources, and in particular in controlling the input of phosphorus.

The governments recognized that it would be necessary to adapt to new challenges, so they built into the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement a cycle of periodic review, a six-year cycle to be specific.

So in 1978, they signed a new Agreement based on that first review, and that agreement took what has been called an ecosystem approach and focused on persistent toxic substances. And by an ecosystem approach, we mean looking at the chemical, physical, and biological aspects of the Great Lakes.

A protocol was also added in 1987 to address degraded conditions in Great Lakes Areas of Concern and to reduce critical pollutants on a lake-wide basis.

Under the Agreement, Canada and the United States have set common objectives for a variety of pollutants and they have agreed to implement a range of research, monitoring, and pollution control activities.

Efforts in both countries have resulted in dramatic reductions in discharges of nutrients and toxic pollutants, particularly from municipal and industrial sources.

The Agreement has resulted in binational initiatives that have brought about important results. For instance, Canadians and Americans have set the same limits on total phosphorus loads for each lake, and they have agreed that approaches to address persistent toxic substances will be guided by a philosophy of zero discharge. Both countries have made major advances in understanding the dynamics of this complex ecosystem as well.

And the Agreement provides a framework for binational goals and cooperative efforts to restore and protect the Great Lakes, but the governments have not made any changes in this agreement since 1987, and that's nearly two decades now, and there's a general feeling that perhaps the Agreement has become out of date.

At the same time, there are several issues that require binational cooperation, either under a revised Agreement or through separate agreements between the two countries, such as preventing the introduction of non-native

aquatic invasive species, reducing impacts of land use activities, and conducting research programs that will enable us to understand large-scale ecosystem changes.

Currently, domestic policy initiatives are underway that will frame the Great Lakes restoration efforts in each country. These include the Great Lakes Regional Collaborative in the United States and the forthcoming renewal of the Canada-Ontario Agreement in Canada.

This makes the forthcoming review of this agreement very timely and very important.

The two governments are now getting ready to review the Agreement. And in preparation for that, they have asked us to hold these meetings to find out your views on how well the Agreement has worked and what, if anything, needs to be changed.

The governments and the IJC believe that it is very important for the Great Lakes community to be heard at this stage of the process so that the governments can get a sense of your priorities.

The two governments have said that there will be additional opportunities as this review progresses for public input once they begin their review. They also have said they will consult with First Nations and Tribes on a government-to-government basis.

So as indicated on the slideshow over to my left and in our printed materials, there are several ways to provide input. There is tonight's meeting, and



we expect you to deliver verbal comments. You can submit written comments at any time between now and November 30<sup>th</sup>. And on November 29<sup>th</sup> through December 2<sup>nd</sup>, we're going to have an interactive Web dialogue that we invite all of you to participate in.

When the consultations end, the IJC will write a report synthesizing all of the views it has heard and we'll also send all of the documents that we have received, along with transcripts of these proceedings, to the governments.

As for our meeting today, I will call you in the order that I received your request to speak. And I have already mentioned that at the back of the room, there are some registration forms and there is a box on those forms that indicate your desire to speak.

We're relying also on a tape recording to produce a transcript, so please make sure that you speak into the microphone, and again, given these acoustics, speak slowly.

So I'd ask you at this time...I'm going to call our first speaker. But I also want to recognize somebody in the audience...Todd Shelton, where are you? Right here. Todd Shelton, from Senator Voinovich's office, has come to attend this meeting on the Senator's behalf, and we hope that you take our best wishes back to him for us. So thank you.

I am now going to sit down and call our first speaker. So I am hoping that this won't be too echo-y, but I have my first speaker...it looks like a James Little or (inaudible)...I can't quite read the writing here. Oh, I'm sorry, James White.

And he will be followed by Randy Cunningham, so Randy, you can...you're on deck.

JAMES WHITE: Good evening, Mr. Chairman and Mr. Chairman. I'm Jim White. I'm sorry about my handwriting.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Actually, it's my fault...

JAMES WHITE: I get a lot of that, it's not you. I am the Executive Director of the Cuyahoga River Remedial Action Plan and I am also the river navigator for the Cuyahoga American Heritage River Program. So welcome to ground zero of the Clean Water movement for the United States.

Thank you for allowing us a chance to comment on the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. This public comment process, I know, can be very demanding, and we appreciate your dedication to the effort.

For nearly the past year, it's been my honour and pleasure as a director of the Cuyahoga RAP to participate actively in the work of the Great Lakes Regional Collaborative process, and the final report, as you know, will be presented in December.

The development of this plan, as an overarching guiding document for the United States in their restoration and long-term stability of the Great Lakes, is an important achievement, and I am glad to see it acknowledged in the Water Quality Agreement report.

There are a few key elements in the GLRC that should receive fresh attention, I believe. One is emphasizing systems integration. The GLRC plan

frequently promotes the need to improve coordination between the 140 federal agencies and programs that deal with the Great Lakes. Having and sustaining well-organized local sponsors as a vehicle to coalesce these resources is important to achieve this goal.

The GLRC plan repeatedly emphasizes restoring and preserving the essential features of natural stream functionality as a key to ecosystem stability. The plan emphasizes systems-based approaches to stream restoration. Wetlands, repairing corridor, forest canopy, permeability management, are all tools that need coordinated support between federal, state, and local organizations.

RAPs, as you know, play an essential role in promoting these goals at the local level. And in order to sustain Great Lakes recovery, watershed stewardship must become part of our community culture in the Great Lakes. And this is a key message that RAPs can and should deliver, and we hope that this role for RAPs is more clearly enunciated as a value in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

The second issue is sustaining RAP organizations for restoring AOCs. I'm going to give you a written copy of these before we leave so you don't have to worry too much about notes, and they're typed, so you don't have to worry about my handwriting.

RAPs, as part of their restoration priorities, are addressing many of the issues raised in the annexes to the Agreement. Indeed, many of the annex goals require viable and functioning RAP organizations to organize and sponsor and lead restoration efforts.

The GLRC supports strengthening sustainable federal funding to the states and to the local RAPs to ensure continuity of Great Lakes recovery efforts. The Water Quality Agreement should acknowledge the Great Lakes Regional Collaborative recommendations and re-emphasize the importance of AOCs and functional RAPs as key elements for leading recovery efforts.

Three, I want to talk about a couple of international issues. One, there are many...well, first, there are many impairments in the Great Lakes that cannot be restored without a consistent and energetic level of effort at the federal level, both in the U.S. and Canada.

One of these is impairments to fish consumption, which is largely driven by deposition of mercury from coal combustion or sources that are not local to the individual RAPs.

The Water Quality Agreement should clearly strengthen this expectation for more rapid and coordinated efforts for reduction of persistent pollutants from air deposition.

The second item is the impact of aquatic invasive species. This impact is widespread and highly disruptive to efforts to restore natural ecosystem functions. Pathways of invasion require a multinational approach for detection and prevention.

And the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration makes specific recommendations for improving management for controlling AIS, and they should be embraced, I think, in the additions to the Water Quality Agreement.

A final note about the unique nature of Lake Erie. It requires perhaps more specific attention. As you know, Lake Erie is the shallowest and most biologically productive and also the most fragile of the Great Lakes.

It's a source of drinking water for over 10 million people, which is approximately 35 per cent of the Great Lakes population...the U.S. population. The Lake Erie and St. Clair systems are also home to 11 AOCs in the U.S. and Canada.

And these unique circumstances strongly suggest that the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement should direct special attention and resources to protecting Lake Erie as the vital and fragile lake that it is.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on these issues, and I appreciate your dedication to the effort.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: I have been asked to ask people if they can hear well the speakers at this microphone. Somebody from the back there just...you can't, you're shaking your head now. Now we're going to try to work with this a little bit...

UNIDENTIFIED: Testing 1-2-3...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Well, this microphone actually seems to work better, so I am...

UNIDENTIFIED: It did.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: So I am willing to turn this one over to you if you promise to give it back to me. Okay, well...I don't...

RANDY CUNNINGHAM: Instead of (inaudible)...detailed proposals...

UNIDENTIFIED: Sorry (inaudible)...much better (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: I think it is.

UNIDENTIFIED: Sorry.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Sorry, I didn't mean...I meant to introduce you, Randy Cunningham, so here is you...

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...turn this one off, though.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Turn that one off, please.

UNIDENTIFIED: Where is that...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: She knows, Debbie knows. You can stand here or there (inaudible)...

RANDY CUNNINGHAM: All right. I just think that there should be several considerations that should go into the deliberations of this agreement, and one of them was not so prominent back in 1978 or in 1987, and that is that there needs to be an organized effort to research and make policy suggestions on dealing with global warming and climate change and how they will impact the Great Lakes.

I think that any time we talk about any environmental issue and we don't talk about that, we're ignoring the 800 pound gorilla in the room.

The second thing the organization should address are efforts to open up state and public lands to natural good gas, mining, and logging. I am speaking specifically of the State Bill 193 currently in the State Senate.

There's a lot of State parks, reserves, preserves, along Lake Erie, and we have to go and think about what the effect of opening these up to exploitation are going to be to runoff, to the possibility of pollution, to the removal of forest cover, and other factors that could impact on the water quality of the Great Lakes.

So those are two areas of consideration that we should keep in mind.  
Thank you.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you very much, Randy. I didn't really give any notice to the next person who is coming up, and I believe it is Ms. Chase or Mr. Chase from the Ohio Coastal Resource Management Project, and then on deck Ed Howser. I'm sorry, what is your first name?

EDITH CHASE (Ohio Coastal Resource Management Project): Edith.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Edith Chase.

EDITH CHASE: Thank you. I'm Edith Chase, representing the Ohio Coastal Resource Management Project, a non-profit citizens organization that has worked for over 20 years for sustainable use of Ohio's most valuable natural resource, Lake Erie.

And we commend the International Joint Commission for all of your work on public consultation and on holding 14 public hearings on updating the Agreement, including coming to Cleveland. And I have two pages of written remarks which I will not...which I will hit the highlights of.

The updated Agreement must focus on the whole Great Lakes basin and ecosystem health, which includes humans, and provisions are needed for a

watershed approach, special ways to protect human health, and the precautionary principle, virtual elimination, and zero discharge.

A process must be developed to address emerging issues, and there are quite a long list of those. Review of the roles of federal, state, provincial, and local governments could broaden public understanding of these complicated issues and the actions needed to restore, preserve, and protect our Great Lakes.

For the watershed approach, I'd like to see more explicit requirements incorporated into the updated Agreement, for the development and implementation of watershed management plans.

And these plans must require clear identification of major ecological issues to be addressed in the watershed, the measures to be taken to alleviate the issues, and a proposed schedule of any implementation actions.

On human health, I recommend that the commissioners take the lead in identifying specific steps for the government to take to protect human health, beginning with changing the prove-harm system of regulation of chemicals. And I have an attachment on that, on its deficiencies and the consequences thereof.

Our ability to detect parts per trillion of toxic chemicals has not yet been accompanied by actions to reduce exposure to humans, including the fetus, and these damages include damages to the human central nervous system, reducing IQ, childhood cancers, lymphomas, breast and prostate cancers, diabetes, asthma, and other environmental-related diseases.



Endocrine-disrupting chemicals act like drugs but are not regulated as such, and we need...for example, the Food and Drug Administration requires extensive testing to demonstrate safety and effectiveness, and even so, as we are well aware, side effects discovered later show the need for more post-market monitoring.

On emerging issues, we need a process, maybe more often than just meeting once every six years. And I would recommend that priority be given to the following emerging issues: climate change, alien invasive species, and land use changes.

And more specifically, the International Arctic Climate Impact Assessment confirms the previous scientific work that shows what we can expect in the Great Lakes region and around the planet.

And as one scientist recently said, the scientific debate is over, but the political debate is still in process. And Dr. Thomas Schindler (?), at the June IJC meeting, also had comments to add on that issue.

On alien invasive species, there is an urgent need to first set biological standards for ballast water, and second, to pass comprehensive federal legislation to address all of the pathways by which alien invasive species can enter the Lakes. And the IJC's 12<sup>th</sup> Biennial Report had a little chapter on that, very well done.

Land use changes were first addressed by the IJC's PLUARG group in the 1970s, Pollution from Land Use Activities Reference Group. And recent rapid

increases in urbanization and impervious surfaces has had direct consequences on water resources, water quality, the amount of flooding, erosion, that is all experienced downstream.

And I'd particularly like to emphasize the importance of assessing and disseminating information on the cumulative effects of all of these problems and the management actions needed. The local decision makers need to understand the consequences of their decisions and have a tool kit of measures to address them.

I'd like also to see the Commission commence review of the roles of the various governments, the institutional arrangements and Great Lakes governance. The state, provincial, regional, and local governments could serve perhaps on a binational advisory council that includes stakeholders and citizens.

We'd have to worry about the serenity issues, but in any case, stable funding would enable the Commission to make progress on all of the above critical problems, including research, data, and information management dissemination.

And these recommendations would benefit both the economy and the environment, with benefits to my grandchildren and all of ours. Thank you very much.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you, Edith. Those were very well considered remarks and well delivered, I might add. Is Ed Howser here? Ed, care to step up?

ED HOWSER (Chair, Friends of Whiskey Island): Thank you for allowing me to speak tonight. My name is Ed Howser. I am a citizen of Cleveland and also the chair of the Friends of Whiskey Island. And I didn't have too much time to prepare any written comments, but I'll turn something in after I review it in more detail.

I'll keep this short and sweet. Of course, Edith and Jim White are tough acts to follow; they know about this probably more than anybody in the area here. But once again, the things that must be concentrated on are the contaminated sediments, the invasive species, waterway development, fish consumption, and all of the major categories that we're looking at.

But more on a local level here, in Ohio, we have something that was just approved last year, the Balanced Growth Initiative, that is balancing development with nature and the environment, there's a few pilot projects out there now, and that's the kind of thing we need to be looking at, how to really balance development and the environment.

Just recently here, the City of Cleveland approved the Lakefront Plan, a very extensive plan covering eight miles of lakefront and some of the river properties.

And as one of the Friends of Whiskey Island, we just got a beautiful park here, right at the mouth of American heritage river, the Cuyahoga, and our great Lake Erie. But the problem is it's the only in downtown Cleveland, but you can't

swim there. You cannot. You can, but I would not recommend it. I have boats down there and I certainly hope my boat doesn't flip when I'm there.

A lot of the CSOs flow out into the Cuyahoga River and the river flows into the harbour, which is contained there. So it's very contaminated, the sediments are contaminated also.

So as we proceed with this lakefront plan here in Cleveland, we need to really address the balance growth of this project. How is the bricks and mortar balancing with the natural shoreline?

So with that, I just want to say please do this to the highest standards. I'll review this in more detail, but it's absolutely necessary that this agreement gets signed and that it's held to the highest standards for both governments. Thank you.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you very much, Ed. That, believe it or not, is all of the forms that I have from people indicating the desire to speak. So now, Herb and I could do the Herb and Dennis show up here, but I am sure others might...this is your opportunity to tell us and for us to convey to the governments your thoughts and views on this very important agreement.

And I note there are perhaps some others in the audience that might wish to come forward, and you need not necessarily fill out the form, we can catch you later. But I'll hold the microphone open for a while...Herb, did you want to make some comments?

HERB GRAY (Chair, Canadian Section, International Joint Commission):

Well, I just wanted to urge you to follow up on Dennis' invitation. We found in our other meetings around the basin that in addition to those who fill out forms indicating they want to speak right at the beginning of the meeting, other people often listen and say, hmm, do I want add something to that comment or maybe take issue to some extent.

So if any of you in the audience would like to get up, you don't need a formal brief or notes. If you'd like to come forward and express views on anything that has not been said so far, or that has been said, you're all welcome.

And I see a gentleman who looks like he may be interested...would you prove our point?

DENNIS SCHORNACK: We're trying to make it a painless process, so...and your name, Sir?

LESTER STUMPY: Lester Stumpy. Maybe it's just to invite all of the rest of the people here who's got things to say to come up and say things. Really, we can start calling off by name, how about that? Thank you for coming to Cleveland. We do appreciate that.

You know, because I haven't prepared remarks, I will just say a couple of things that I have kind of roaming around in my mind. I have been probably doing water pollution control work in Cleveland since 1972, the day before the Clean Water Act was passed. More...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Slowly.

LESTER STUMPY: Slower, okay. So one of the comments that I want to make is about the relationship between the RAP process and the LAMP process. I think they're both good programs, but I have been very discouraged over the years about the lack of coordination between the LAMP process and the RAP process.

It just seems like there isn't really a defined connection. And I know that...certainly, the RAP processes, and I've talked to lots of RAPs that felt like they're not really included in the LAMP process, they don't necessarily know how they fit into it. There doesn't seem to be a really coordinated process.

So that's one comment that I would like to make. Let's see if we can't maybe do a better job of defining the relationship between the RAPs and the LAMPs.

And I think, as well, RAPs have an intern responsibility to really involve a larger segment of the communities, including some of the smaller watershed groups that are coming along nicely, particularly in the greater Cleveland area.

I would note that...I know this isn't really the forum to talk about funding; otherwise, I'd be talking about CSO funding up here. But if it's pertinent, note that it's needed.

But I think also, the whole sustainability of how these small groups all work and are all sustained, I think, is really an issue that we really need to give some thought to.

And I don't know to what extent the Commission can help us with that, but I think right now, we have somewhat of a...we have a lot of enthusiasm, but I'm not sure we have a sustainable model of how to keep all of the local interests going.

I feel like so many people are spending so much time competing for such limited funding that I'm not sure that there's a great efficiency there.

The second point that I want to make really quickly is that I think we haven't done a good job over the years in terms of really defining the benefits of clean water.

I'm right now involved in a survey with some of the other people here, including the Cuyahoga RAP, trying to help, trying to understand from the leadership of the greater Cleveland area about why clean water is or is not important.

And I'm just really aware of the difficulties of really drawing out, and maybe it's selling too, our civic leaders and our business leaders on issues of the value of clean water, both short term and long term.

And I just sense that we, you know, we need some help in this area. Maybe this is an area that deserves more research or maybe it's an area that...it's a sales job, but I think maybe it's clearer goals and clearer guidelines. I'm not sure, but I just don't think we're doing a great job of selling benefits.

And I'm just going to leave you with those two remarks, and thank you for the opportunity to speak.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you for taking the opportunity to speak. Yes, Sir, would you like to come forward?

HERB GRAY: Could we ask the staff to make sure they get the name and organization, if any, and address of those that didn't sign in at the beginning but like the last gentleman, have come forward? And there's another one coming forward, and we welcome him and thank him for his response to Chairman Schornack's invitation.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Okay, and you are?

JOHN ISOUGH: John Isough (?), past commander of the Greater Cleveland Boating Association. I just want to say the boaters are always in favour of water quality.

The Greater Cleveland Boating Association led a fight that culminated in 1988 getting phosphates banned in the 35 counties that border the Lake Erie water basin.

And also, I'm presently vice-commodore of Interlake Yachting Association, which is five states and two countries that all border the lakes, and we all want clean water. Thank you.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you very much. I'm going to keep the mic open for a little while here and see if others wish to come forward. Yes, Ma'am? Thank you for having the courage to step up. We really don't bite. Please introduce yourself.



NANCY LYON-STADLER: Sure. My name is Nancy Lyon-Stadler. I am a relatively new resident of Cleveland. And I'd like to talk on kind of a bigger scale.

I don't know all of the specifics and the intricacies of this agreement, but what I've seen especially in recent years is a real weakening in the preservation of our environment and our planet.

I think we're making short-term popular decisions that are going to hurt us in the long term, so I hope that that trend isn't continued with this agreement. I would prefer to see things swing the other way, be a little bit tougher to meet the standards.

Maybe, you know, we need to spend a little bit more money upfront to clean things up and to get things fixed, but then...I think you need to look at what the long range cost is.

And you can't just look at the cost of the equipment on scrubbers or whatever else that you're going to do to clean things up, but you need to look at the long-term costs. Thank you.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you very much for that thought. Others wishing to come forward, please. I could do the old going once, going twice...John, do you have a form, is that what you're carrying forward here? Do you have another speaker? No? Okay.

Well, if there are no other people wishing to speak, then I would just reiterate that you do have the opportunity to submit written comments to the Commission.

Again, the governments, we have been told, will be commencing this review about in next March. They have told us it will be a serious review. They have indicated they plan to spend in the order of 18 months going through the review.

Now that is a long time, but it also is clear evidence, I think, of their commitment to doing a serious review and perhaps suggesting some significant revisions to this agreement that has served us so well for so long.

Herb, would you like to make any comments?

HERB GRAY: Well, I just wanted to underscore what Dennis has said. In case I didn't read all of you when you came in, you may wonder who is that guy sitting there next to Chairman Dennis Schornack.

We should make clear that the IJC is a unique international organization created by a treaty signed in 1909, it started operating in 1911. We're not an agency of either government, we work at arm's length for the best interests of the people not just around the Great Lakes, but in all of the water basins on the boundary from one ocean to the other and in the north.

And we have a unique government structure. There are two chairs working simultaneously. There is good reason for that. One is that we have offices in Ottawa and Washington and the Great Lakes office in Windsor,

Ontario, and it helps to have people based in each headquarters in Washington and Ottawa for administrative purposes. Also, we work very closely with government departments in Ottawa and Washington and also with Congressmen and Members of Parliament.

So to have somebody like Dennis take the lead in Washington and myself, Herb Gray, to take the lead in Ottawa, also liaising with provincial governments, Dennis with state governments, has proven to be an effective model in working in the best interests of the populations of both countries in preventing and resolving what would otherwise be disputes about transboundary waters, which make up about 40 per cent of the boundary from one ocean to the other, and we also deal with related air pollution matters.

And we have a number of scientific boards reporting to us, as perhaps Dennis has mentioned. It has come up in some of the briefs, the Scientific Advisory Board, the Water Quality Board, the Council of Great Lakes Research Managers, the International Air Quality Board, and the Health Professionals Task Force, and they are also preparing their recommendations to us on how to update, reform, or revise the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

And we will, as has been said, be joining with you once we finish this consultation and make a report and preparing our own recommendations as a commission.

And I also want to reiterate that we have some conventional and novel ways for you to communicate if something strikes you on your way home this evening and you say, gee, I should have come up to the microphone.

Don't worry about that, you can reach us by e-mail, by toll-free telephone, by fax, by old-fashioned U.S. or Canada Post mail, and also the interactive Web dialogue, where people around the Great Lakes can communicate back and forth through the Internet in a unique dialogue for, what, four days, I guess. So feel free to take advantage of that.

Now I've stirred up somebody here. Come up here and tell us what you'd like...

JOHN MCGOVERN: (inaudible)...

HERB GRAY: No, no, but...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: You're going to have to at least speak into the microphone.

JOHN MCGOVERN: Okay. Is this for the recording purposes of this?

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Yes, and so I can hear you.

JOHN MCGOVERN: Can you hear me now? (LAUGHS)

HERB GRAY: (inaudible)...do that?

JOHN MCGOVERN: Magic. All right...wow, that's loud. Okay. I'm a little nervous now. Okay, yeah, I just wanted to ask a question. And you didn't say that questions were allowed here, you just said statements, so I'm going to ask a question. Is that okay? All right.

My question is this. So this plan by the IJC, how does it relate to the \$20 million plan that's been drafted by Congress to restore and protect the Great Lakes? Is there a relationship between the two? Someone was talking about coordination earlier. Ohio, I'm going to hand this to you now.

HERB GRAY: Right before Dennis answers your question, we have a question: who are you?

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Yes, please identify yourself.

JOHN MCGOVERN: I'm a citizen of this great city, Cleveland, Ohio.

HERB GRAY: You don't want to (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: And your name?

JOHN MCGOVERN: Oh, my name is John McGovern, I'm a student at the Levin (?) College of Urban Affairs and I am a citizen. Thank you.

HERB GRAY: You know, we want to be able to send you material.

JOHN MCGOVERN: Oh, you have got my info over there, yeah.

HERB GRAY: Oh, okay, that's great. Okay, Dennis, would you like to...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: I'll take a shot at your question. The process that you are referring to, the Great Lakes Collaboration, is associated with a group that was put together in response to an executive order by President Bush this past June, I believe it was.

And it was in response to a General Accounting Office finding that there were some 140 plus programs working in the Great Lakes on the U.S. side, some

13 or so different federal departments and agencies, and that there was very little coordination.

In fact, Senator Voinovich held a hearing that I was privileged to testify at in which he termed this an orchestra without a conductor...

HERB GRAY: Who is the conductor, he asked.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: He did, he asked who is the conductor? And the Task Force that was formed by the President's executive order had a couple of very specific missions.

They were first to catalog and inventory all of the federal programs and resources currently being expended in the Great Lakes, and secondly, to look at how what is currently being spent and currently being done might better be coordinated so that one might extract greater benefits for the resources being spent.

Parallel to that task force process was an initiative put together by the governors of the eight Great Lakes states and the mayors, and that is called the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration.

They divided up into some eight different committees - I think some of the people I recognize in the audience, Jim Wakeley from the Lake Carriers Association, for example, served on the Invasive Species Task Force - and they examined eight different priorities that were looked at, that were prepared and submitted to Congress by the governors.

They also, in their work, assembled some recommendations, and to those recommendations they attached a dollar figure. The sum total of that dollar figure for the recommendations of the governors and mayors' collaboration was some \$20 billion.

That has then been forwarded to the Task Force, and on December 12 of this year in Chicago, there will be what is called summit number two, in which those recommendations and the Task Force's recommendations will be addressed.

Now I know I'm making a long story of this, but given the lack of people willing or eager to come up and testify, I will continue just briefly.

In the U.S. – and I can only speak for the U.S. on this matter – the government has taken these two processes, the Task Force along with its associated Collaboration – and they have taken them sequentially.

The work done by the Task Force to identify the programs, the agencies, and the resources currently being expended in the Great Lakes will inform the government as it enters into negotiations with the government of Canada on the potential revision of this agreement.

So things that came out of that task force work and out of the Regional Collaboration will inform this review and potentially lead to some revisions or recommended revisions, at least on the U.S. side.

At the same time – and I'd like to ask Herb perhaps to comment on this – there is the impending renegotiation or re-authorization of the Canada-Ontario Agreement.

HERB GRAY: Well, you know, from looking at the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, although it's the agreement between the two national governments of Canada and the U.S., there is reference in it to collaboration with the U.S. states and the relevant Canadian province.

The province of Ontario covers all of the Great Lakes and the international section of the St. Lawrence, but there is an interest in the province of Quebec because the outlet of the St. Lawrence goes through that province.

So in order to get Ontario involved in carrying out Canada's obligations under the Agreement, since the Agreement was signed, there have been successive iterations of what's called the Canada-Ontario Agreement.

And this latest iteration will be coming up for renewal in 1997 (sic). So in a way, it's the existing match for what President Bush has asked the American agencies, state and federal, to do.

Now our funding process is on a different time cycle than the American. In our most recent budget – and I say our even though I'm an arm's length head of an international organization along with Dennis – the budget (inaudible) at \$85 million Canadian to begin implementing a plan to fight alien invasive species not just in the Great Lakes, but across the country.

Ten million has been allocated specifically so far to continue the fight against the sea lamprey, led by the Great Lakes Fisheries Commission. And I think that there is 40 million in there for what's known as the renewal of the Canada Great Lakes Program.



So I'm not saying that is enough, but there is some new money in there in the last budget. And I'd be very surprised if once the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration is finished and the U.S. federal government and the Administration, not to mention Congress, sign on to some or all of the recommendations, there will be further action by the Canadian federal government and the two provinces, particularly Ontario.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you, Herb. Long answers to a short question, huh?

JOHN MCGOVERN: Yeah. My question has two parts. Is it okay if I ask the second part of it (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: I would...let me say this, that the purpose of tonight's meeting is not to query the commissioners. It is to advise us on your views on the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement so that we may pass those views on to the governments.

JOHN MCGOVERN: That's what I meant. I meant I had a question followed by a statement.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Would you like to make your statement?

JOHN MCGOVERN: If you don't mind.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Certainly, come forward.

HERB GRAY: (inaudible) forward, come up.

JOHN MCGOVERN: It's really, you know, this is the only time I can get in front of a microphone, so I thought I'd take advantage of it.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Have at it.

JOHN MCGOVERN: Okay, folks, here's the issue I'm going to talk about here. I think what we're seeing here is, you know, how do we fix the Great Lakes. What I'm seeing is how do we fix Cleveland, Ohio. We're in a city that's severely economically depressed, and if you haven't noticed that, you're probably kidding yourselves. So how can we do this?

I've got this amazing paper here by a gentleman from the Michigan Land Use Institute, his name is Andy Guy. He wrote this paper on what's called the restoration economy, which means leveraging this \$20 billion in investment instead of just sinking it all, using it to actually create some technologies or innovations that can be exported along the world.

The CIA has predicted that there will be a global water crisis by 2015, so even if they're 30 years off, that's within my lifetime and maybe most people's here – I'm going to give you the benefit of the doubt.

So what I am proposing here is that anything that's invested into this program be looked at not just as a way to repair the ecology or renew the ecology, but looked as potential for catalyst for economic development, for technologies like...I'm sure you've all heard of what are called living machines, that take in sewer waste and actually turn it into usable energy or, you know, are able to refine it, for fish habitat or something like that.

I mean, we need to look outside the box here, this is a once-in-a-lifetime opportunity, or at least once in my lifetime, maybe, for my children it would be their lifetime, which would be two, so that would be twice, two lifes.

But regardless, I think that this issue needs to be addressed, the issue of economic development, not just restoring the environment, you know, especially for these rustbelt cities that have been so hard hit.

You know, if you look back in time, we were building the steel here for the rest of the country, and now we've been left behind by our federal government, I would say.

So that's what I want to say. I want to thank you for the time. And you probably couldn't hear a word I said because of these terrible acoustics. Next time you're in town, I would recommend you come to the Levin College. We have an excellent forum facility with non-hard surface, echo-y walls such as these. It's a beautiful place, but gosh darnit, you can't hear a damn thing. Thank you so much. Sorry for swearing, yes, okay.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you.

JOHN MCGOVERN: I've got a copy of the paper if you'd like, if (inaudible)...

HERB GRAY: (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: (inaudible)...college. You might wish to leave a copy of your comments with our staff.

HERB GRAY: Don't forget us.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Don't forget us. Okay, yes, Sir? So if you'd state your name...

TOM RAYBURN: Sorry, I don't want to sound like an idiot. My name is Tom Rayburn (?). I used to work with a number of regional groups, worked on a lot of the aspects that were implemented because of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, Annex 9 for the joint plan, Annex 4, a lot of the habitat work.

I guess what I would really like to see – and this is just a broad generality – coming out of the next Water Quality Agreement is a more tangible, commanding control document that dedicates funds, that dedicates short-term, long-term goals, that dedicates both governments and the states and the provinces to mutually work together toward directing those funds and efforts in a unified manner.

We have not only 140 different agencies or programs in 13 different departments, we have numerous non-governmental, non-profit agencies working sometimes together, sometimes not.

We have RAP programs very dedicated to the work they're doing, but there's not even a line item in the presidential budget. And we worked to try to get, you know, money each year for RAP planning, not just the remediation that we see under the Great Lakes Legacy Act, but the actual planning to get us to that point, and we don't have that because it's not even in the budget.

So I would like to see something a little bit more hard-core, a little bit more directive, and that takes the energy that the original Great Lakes Water

Quality Agreement did and moves everything forward. So just in general. Thanks.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you very much, Tom. Yes, Ma'am? If you could just start by identifying yourself, that would get us rolling:

LINDA SEKURA: Hi, I'm Linda Sekura (?), and this gentleman reminded me about the Remedial Action Plans and Areas of Concern.

And it's good to try to reduce pollution or try to remediate problems that have already occurred, but what we need to do is also protect and do pre-emptive measurements to protect our watersheds ahead of time.

There's a lot of development going on right now in many of the tributaries that feed into Lake Erie, and it's not that big of a watershed. And there is development going on where we're losing our channel marshes, and these are your breeding grounds for fish.

So I think there needs to be some not just funding for the RAPs, but funding to...first of all, regulations to keep development away from sensitive watersheds and habitats and to...well, just, thank you.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Okay, thank you very much. I mean, this is your chance to get on the record on this matter, so...anybody else wishing to speak? Herb?

HERB GRAY: No, I just wanted to reiterate what Dennis has said. We haven't come here to tell you what's to be done or even what we're doing.

We have been asked specifically by the governments to have this series of meeting to get your views and bring them together so that when the governments begin their review next year, they'll have the benefit not just of their officials, but of members of the public like yourselves.

So I just wanted to reiterate that point. And now we're happy to answer your questions, but as I say, we're not here to preach to you and so on. We have things you can look at, you can look at our Web site, our 12<sup>th</sup> Biennial Report on the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, our report in 2003 on the status of something that's come up here, the Areas of Concern and the RAPs.

So we're not silent ordinarily, but we have a rather unusual task at the request of the two governments to hear your views and those of people all around the Lakes.

It's funny, when we were travelling here by van from Detroit, I felt like we were one of the early rock groups, winding our way around the country on the first Great Lakes Water Quality tour. Now whether the Cleveland Rock and Roll Museum will give us a site for some of the memorabilia of this tour, I don't know, we'll see what happens.

But in the meantime, to share in this important tour, as we wander away around the basin, please make use of this opportunity, even if it's just a sentence or two like some of your colleagues. Feel free to come up to the microphone.

We don't have to stay here until 9:00, but we've put aside two hours. So if you think that you're breaking in on our flights to have a sandwich or something,

you're not, we're scheduled to be here. We don't have to stay here, but if you want to come up, please do.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you, Herb.

HERB GRAY: (inaudible)...come back.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: You can also return to the microphone, obviously.

TOM RAYBURN: Sorry, Tom Rayburn again. I forgot...one tangible that I thought I'd like to see in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement is an actual collection of baseline data throughout the entire basin consistent on the U.S. and Canadian side.

We've got, you know, such efforts funded by NOAA Coastal Services Center, the Great Lakes Observing System, that's collecting open water and coastal data, we've got GLACSEO, Great Lakes and Central States Ecological Observatory funded by National Science Foundation – that's primarily an academic endeavour but it's more driven toward inland – we've got the Great Lakes Coastal Wetland Consortium, you know, identifying indicators binationally on a consistent manner, we've got the state heritage programs on the U.S. side that collect data, but on the Canadian side, they're collecting it in a different manner.

We don't have a consistent inventory either of natural features or man-made features, urban indicators, aquatic or inland, that can really drive a lot of the

science and drive a lot of the intelligent thought toward long-term cleanup, long-term economic growth.

I think if we can mend (?) those two and get them into a very tight scale, I think that can go a long way. I'm done.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Okay, thank you. Yes, Sir? Please identify yourself.

PAUL BUREK: Sure, Paul Burek (?). I would like to bring up the issue of exporting water. I'm not sure if that's dealt with in the Agreement, but I know that there were attempts on both sides of the border to export water from the natural watershed.

And besides tampering with nature by doing so and unbalancing the natural status, the other aspect, I think, is the economic impact. That's one of our resources here, is the water, and if we allow the export of that water, we'll be taking our fundamental resource away from the cities in the watershed.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you very much. Anybody else? Yes, Ma'am?

MARNIE ARSOME (Audubon Ohio): Hi.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Please identify yourself.

MARNIE ARSOME: Hi, I'm Marnie Arsome (?). I am here representing Audubon Ohio. And like Ed, I didn't have time to sort of put together formal statements, but I did just want to acknowledge that Audubon Ohio is interested in this issue.



We have important bird areas throughout the Great Lakes basin, Lake Erie is a very important migration corridor, and we have lost a lot of our wetlands and habitat for those species that depend on it.

But specifically for the Agreement, I feel it's very important that there's an emphasis on achieving end goals. Watershed planning and materials should use policies, for example, that encourage adoption by the parties as a possible means to ensure that responsible agencies...that agencies are responsible for that progress.

Flexibility for such planning and milestones would be important for being able to achieve end goals and objectives in the manner most fitting for their own jurisdictions. But goals and objectives with time frames should be set by the parties with facilitation of the development of those goals and objectives by the IJC, and it should be evaluated.

I think the public must also have a strong role in the development and assessment of the Agreement's effectiveness. Perhaps having some citizen observers in the Agreement review process, I think there have been some precedents set for this.

But additionally, just have a true ecosystem approach. The scope covered by the Agreement should include the Great Lakes and perhaps the St. Lawrence basin.

That's all I'd like to say, just that Audubon is very interested in Great Lakes protection. We do have a campaign here to conserve our important birding

areas in some of the Lake Erie tributaries as well as advocating for policy and a comprehensive campaign dealing with the restoration project, the Great Lakes Water Basin Resources Compact, which does address the diversion issue.

And it might be beneficial in future meetings – I think this is one of the last ones – for...you know, we're working on getting citizens here that might not have any background on anything that's going on in the Great Lakes, having information on other Great Lakes initiatives that are going on available so that people do have an idea of how everything fits together. Coordination, I think, is going to be key. Thanks.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you very much. You mentioned a true ecosystem approach, and from what we have heard in a number of our meetings so far, this agreement commits to restoration of the chemical, physical, and biological properties of the Lakes.

But one of the criticisms that we've heard in some of our other meetings is that the Agreement tends to be a bit lopsided at this point, that it focused perhaps, well, it focused very sharply on chemical constituents, particularly on municipal and industrial outputs, and perhaps at some...not to the detriment necessarily, but to the point where we didn't address biological concerns like invasive species or bacterial contamination of beaches, CSOs, and so forth, and also the physical changes that have occurred in the Great Lakes, those were perhaps not addressed as directly as they might be.

A couple of other speakers have mentioned the role of the IJC. The current role that we have is a two-part role. We assess periodically the progress of the two governments in meeting or keeping the promises that they made when they signed this agreement back in 1972. We do that periodically through biennial reports.

We're also here to assist the two governments in the implementation of the Agreement. And arguably, tonight, we are in the assistive role.

Others have suggested additional roles or stronger roles for the IJC. And as you think about, and if you are planning to submit written comments to the Commission, you might consider those roles and how they might be changed, strengthened or altered in ways that might make this agreement more effective.

Herb, would you like to make any closing comments...I...well, there's another gentleman that would like to speak. Please identify yourself.

MARTY GELFAN (Office of Congressman Dennis Kucinich): Hi, my name is Marty Gelfan (?), I'm with Congressman Dennis Kucinich's office, and I appreciate the opportunity to speak on his behalf; he is in Washington today and can't make the meeting.

But we also appreciate the International Joint Commission coming to Cleveland, because Cleveland is such an important part of the Great Lakes and is such an important port in the Great Lakes, and we very much appreciate the opportunity to be part of this process.

And that's what this is, it's a process. The IJC didn't form and the Water Quality Agreement didn't happen overnight, it was a process, because both the United States and Canada realized the need to protect the Great Lakes, and that need is ever as important today as it was back in the early '70s and the '60s and prior to that, when these needs were first coming onto the radar screen.

We may not have exactly the same problems as we had then. Then, we had our burning river nearby and Lake Erie was declared all but dead. Much has happened positive since that time as a result of the International Joint Commission and the Water Quality Agreement, but much still needs to be done and new things arise that need to be addressed.

What are...you know, what will happen if we allow our water to be transported to other places? And that's a very serious issue for our ecosystem here in northeast Ohio and the Great Lakes region. What will happen if we allow drilling to occur that would have some serious ecological consequences? And on behalf of the Congressman, I can say that we would not like to see those things happen.

On the other hand, there are other issues that we know about that we support. Much of the commerce that happens on the Great Lakes...we know that we need some replaced bulk heads on the Cuyahoga River.

They're at risk, and we need to make sure that the bulk heads get replaced so that we can continue to have active commerce in the Cuyahoga River and that it's done in a way that is mutually supportable so that we have commerce and

we're able to protect the Great Lakes, Lake Erie, the Cuyahoga River as much as possible for the ecosystems that exist.

So these are just an example of a few of the things that are on the radar screen that may or may not have been on the radar screen in the '60s and the early '70s, but need to be incorporated into the scope of the Agreement, or at least in the discussions that lead to an agreement.

And so I appreciate the opportunity. I am working with the Congressman and our legislative assistant on environmental issues, Vic Etherton (?), in determining if we're going to make some additional written comments, but I very much appreciate the opportunity to be part of this oral session and part of this oral history of people of the Cleveland area along the Great Lakes coming together to discuss the very important issue of our Lake Erie ecosystem and economic system.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you very much for those remarks. I'll ask one more time if anybody else wishes to come forward. And if not, I'm going to ask Herb to make some closing remarks, and then we shall adjourn for the evening.

HERB GRAY: Well, we thank you all for coming, we thank you for participating,, we thank you for listening. Please use the other opportunities already stated to bring us your ideas and concerns.

This will help us help the governments to renew the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement or rewrite it or replace in a way that truly protects what

Champlain, when he came here a couple of hundred years ago, called the sweet water seas.

Now obviously, we can't replicate – nor I don't think we should – what things were like before great cities like Cleveland were created, but as one of the speakers pointed out, there have to be ways of linking sustainable development, protecting, preserving, restoring the environment with economic development. They are not in contradiction, there are ideas for doing that, and meetings like this and others will help prove that very important point.

So thank you for coming. We appreciate your involvement in this important process. Thank you and good night. (APPLAUSE)

\*\*\*\*\*