

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 Detroit, Michigan, on November 2, 2005
(duration: 88 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 Detroit (Michigan) le 2 novembre 2005
(durée : 88 minutes)**

(DISCLAIMER – very poor audio quality, especially for some speakers who spoke somewhat away from the microphone)

DENNIS SCHORNACK (Chair, U.S. Section, International Joint Commission): ...Canadian co-chair and a native of Windsor, Ontario, just across the river here. You could actually see Windsor if they didn't have the curtains down (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: But then they can't see the (inaudible)...before we begin, I wanted to express our gratitude to the Detroit Regional Chamber of Commerce for hosting this here today. These are outstanding facilities. It is my first time in this room (inaudible)...Herb, it's your first time as well (inaudible)...and it provides a very nice venue for this meeting.

I have some brief remarks that I am going to make to try to set a frame for these comments that we will receive today from the public with respect to the potential review and revision of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, and then we'll go immediately to public comment by way of the mics (inaudible)...way in the back.

But we're here today because the governments of the United States and Canada asked the International Joint Commission to find out what you think the governments should consider as they begin their review of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement in the coming spring.

In fact, they are going to commence that (inaudible)...beginning March of 2006 (inaudible)...18 months. So that would constitute a very serious review of this Agreement.

In 1972, as you'll recall, the Great Lakes were suffering from heavy loads or loadings of conventional pollutants, and the governments signed this arguably visionary agreement that focused on reducing pollution from municipal and industrial sources, and in particular on controlling the input of phosphorus.

The governments recognized that it would be necessary to adapt to new challenges, so they built into this Agreement, I guess, the 1972 version of adaptive management, and that was a requirement to periodically, every six years, go back and review the Agreement and make any revisions as necessary to meet more contemporary challenges to water quality in the Great Lakes.

So that first review was conducted in 1978 and it did (inaudible)...at that time to a whole new Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, one that we're largely operating under today. That '78 Agreement took what is known as an ecosystem approach that focused again on persistent toxic substances. And the ecosystem approach, the Agreement defines that to be the restoration of chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the waters of the Great Lakes basin ecosystem.

A protocol to the Agreement was added in 1987 to address degraded conditions in particular hot spots, some 43 of them around the Great Lakes known

as Areas of Concern, and to focus on reducing critical pollutants on a lake-wide basis (inaudible) beneficial uses for all of the waters in the communities (?).

Under the Agreement, Canada and the United States have set common objectives for a variety of pollutants and 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 many important results. For example, 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, a principle of zero discharge. Both countries abiding by this Agreement have made major advances in understanding the dynamics of this very complex ecosystem.

The Agreement does provide a framework for binational goals and cooperative efforts to restore and protect the Great Lakes, but the governments have not made any changes to this Agreement since the 1987 Protocol, which was nearly 20 years ago.

There has been widespread recognition that parts of the Agreement, such as some of the numeric objectives, are out of date. At the same time, there are several contemporary issues that require binational cooperation, either under this Agreement or through a separate (inaudible)...two governments, such as

preventing the introduction of aquatic invasive species, reducing the 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 Great Lakes restoration activities in each country. These include, on the U.S. side, the Great Lakes Regional Collaborative, and the forthcoming renewal of the Canada-Ontario Agreement on the Canadian side. This makes this forthcoming review of the common goals in the Water Quality Agreement a very timely and important endeavour.

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 so the governments get a sense of your priorities.

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

As indicated in the slideshow behind me here and in our printed materials, there are several ways to provide comment to us. We are going to have (inaudible)...microphones, you may submit written comments to the IJC of any

kind, and up until (inaudible)...November 30th...and we're going to have a live Web dialogue that will be held on November 29th through December 2nd. So I invite you to join us there, and you can get to that dialogue by way of the IJC Web site, which is www.ijc.org. It's not gov or (inaudible)...

So when consultations end, the IJC will write a report synthesizing the views that it has (inaudible)...and we'll also send a hard copy of any written materials that you have submitted, as well as transcripts of these meetings to both governments. And we are recording this meeting today, and there will be a written transcript eventually produced.

So as for our meeting today, we will call you in the order that we received your request to speak. And I note that outside, there are these registration forms (inaudible)...and I would invite anybody (inaudible)...so that we know who you are and so that we can keep a record of all those (inaudible)...and there is a little box that says (inaudible)...

So with that, a general overview (inaudible)...Herb Gray (inaudible) opening remarks (inaudible)...

HERB GRAY (Chair, Canadian Section, International Joint Commission):
Well, I want to join with Chairman Schornack in welcoming you here, for responding (inaudible)...series of consultation meetings (inaudible)...all along the Great Lakes (inaudible)... governments early next year (inaudible)...we look forward to hearing your comments (inaudible)...let the dialogue begin (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Okay, and with that, we'll call our first speaker (inaudible)...Ken Weir (?), to be followed by (inaudible)...I have a number that says (inaudible)...if you're not ready, I can move on to another speaker (inaudible)...George Cooper followed...

UNIDENTIFIED: Let the record show that Tim New (?) was not ready for the first (inaudible)...I have brief comments which I will submit to you in writing (inaudible)...Council of Great Lakes (inaudible)...

First off, Chairman Gray and Chairman Schornack, thank you very much for the (inaudible) your organization has undertaken to organize this series of public inputs to the review.

It's extremely to all of us, it's extremely important to hear (inaudible)...possible, and we are particularly pleased that you are doing so, and we look forward to (inaudible)...members of the organization I represent (inaudible)...

In summary, we believe a revised Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement could and should be supportive of the sustainable development of the Great Lakes region while guiding basin policy and management of the waters of the Great Lakes. (inaudible)...summary (inaudible)...

First off, the current Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement has worked well, at least to produce cooperation between the two countries. It has permitted them to establish common goals (inaudible)...identified in the Great Lakes Water

Quality Agreement (inaudible)...lopsided (inaudible)...Chairman Schornack explained (inaudible)...

A second point, the possible revision of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement is an opportunity first to shape policy towards regional economic and social viability, along with environmental issues.

It's an opportunity to recognize human and human beings as a part of the ecosystem. The economic benefit produced by industry is a critical component of the health of the ecosystem and the region must be a viable place to do business. Including industry's perspective will ensure sustainable development (inaudible).

It's an opportunity to focus on the ecosystem as a whole, the chemical, physical, and biological integrity all being pursued equally, and it's an opportunity to develop an agreement framework and language capable of dealing with the current and future threats and pressures of the ecosystem.

My third point, we believe that industry must be an important part of the review process following this public comment period. Industry needs to be a continuing participant in the process if the Water Quality Agreement is revised. Industry looks forward to a process that will move the region forward.

The (inaudible) should include a well-managed environment, a healthy economy, it should support communities that are good places to live, work, and (inaudible)...

We do have some questions on specifics of the process for managing the revision and developing the substance of that revision. How will the process be

(inaudible) ? In what way will stakeholders be involved from this point on?

What will be the extent of the revision effort: marking up and tweaking existing language or are we going to start with a clean slate and build a new Agreement from the ground up?

Those are the basic questions that we don't know the answers to, and our input (inaudible)...

In summary, the governments should take this opportunity to (inaudible) or revise the Water Quality Agreement into an overall regional water management policy with a sustainability and economic development framework.

The Water Quality Agreement must be an enabler of national (?) policy advancement in both countries for sustainable development, with the management of the Great Lakes and the St. Lawrence waters as the focus, and it should include environmental protection, economic development, and societal well-being.

Industry stands ready to help you, the Commission, and we really look forward to this important (inaudible)...thank you for (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you, Curtis (?). You did pose some questions, and I think Chair Gray would like to (inaudible)...

HERB GRAY: (inaudible)...at this point, all we know about (inaudible)...final version of this plan (inaudible)...opportunity for stakeholder input while the process is underway. Now (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: Actually, Mr. Chair (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: (inaudible)...just to be clear, the last point that Chair Gray made there is that the actual review itself is done by the governments. We are here assisting them by gathering public comment, and the Commission itself will render its own advice to governments some time early next year (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: I also (inaudible) Chairman Gray's response to be that the governments also have an intent to (inaudible)...other inputs (inaudible)...

HERB GRAY: (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you. So I guess I should ask Tim (inaudible) if he's ready or should I move on...

UNIDENTIFIED: Absolutely.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: You are now ready. We are pleased to welcome you (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: Mr. Schornack, Chairman, I want to start off by thanking the IJC for what you're putting together here. I can tell you that I mentioned to a colleague, earlier today I was coming down to this meeting (inaudible)...3:00, and there was a bit of a disparaging remark expressed about the fact that it was 3:00 instead of at 7:00, when people were off work.

But this person went on to tell me about all of the things that the IJC has been doing to make it possible for people to participate in this review: the Web

site where you can submit comments (inaudible)...dialogue (inaudible)...there's a number of other (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...anyway, I think it was terrific, all of the ways that you're making it possible for people to participate in this. And it goes to kind of the heart of what I want to convey to you, and that is the important role that the IJC plays in elevating the importance of not just the Agreement, but the Great Lakes themselves.

I have been around for a little while; coming here today makes me understand and appreciate how old I am. I think the first meeting that I attended as a professional (inaudible)...was an IJC meeting maybe back in 1983 (inaudible)...from then, coming to IJC meetings, I've seen the importance of them over many years.

In 1986, I worked for Great Lakes United, and we conducted a program not dissimilar to what you are doing right here. You organized a series of 19 public meetings in the review of the Water Quality Agreement, the last time it was (inaudible)...myself and our colleagues from the board of Great Lakes United (inaudible)...testimony from citizens all across the region.

And as a result of that project, me and five (?) representatives from conservation organizations were invited to participate as observers in the last amendments to the Agreement, and one of the greatest thrills of my career was participating in those (inaudible)...State Department and (inaudible)...

And over those many years, I've come to appreciate just how important the Agreement was and the prominence of the IJC and its role in Great Lakes protection and restoration, and how that's changed.

It's (inaudible)...but I think we all know and understand that it's changed, and the level of recognition and prominence and attracting attention that the IJC and its Great Lakes program gets now is less than it was 15 years ago, and I think it's highly appropriate for you all to ask why and for us to offer our perspectives on why that is.

I have some thoughts about that, but I just want to tell you that the IJC was extremely well-respected and was very visible. And you're still very well respected by the quality of your work and the people of your team. And I just have to tell you that I'm very thrilled and excited to know about the hiring of the new regional director, Karen (inaudible)...great things in the future.

And this is a critical time for that. Within the past, I'd like to just tell you some of the important things that the IJC did (inaudible)...the publications that the Water Quality Board and the Science Advisory Board released in the past were the most thorough and well documented and cited compendiums of information reporting on the status of the health of the Great Lakes and the progress the governments are making or were making.

They were looked forward to by people like us. I referred to those on a regular basis as I did my work on the Great Lakes (inaudible)...I relied on them for being a factual, objective source of information.

I could open up the Water Quality Board report and find out where the biggest and most importance sources of pollution were, which governments needed more attention than others in terms of the job that they were doing to clean up the Great Lakes, and the progress that you were making to eliminate the use of phosphorus.

It was a wonderful collection of information that was extremely useful. And you know, it's not completely gone away, but there is nothing else like those reports now and that information is sorely missed.

Why has it changed? What's different now? A number of people blame it on the 1987 Protocol. I think that's too simplistic. I think that shifting the accountability for progress under the Agreement to the governments or making it clear that that's where the accountability for Agreement implementation rested, as the 1987 Protocol did, was entirely to be expected.

I think that there was some confusion about whose job it was to actually implement the Agreement, and the '87 Protocol made it clear that it was the responsibility of the governments.

Some say that that gave the governments the opportunity to pull back away from the IJC. I don't necessarily buy into that. But that might be a factor.

I think another factor...some say that the fact that the IJC meetings had 1,000 or more people at the biennial (inaudible)...drove some people away. I think that...that's my opening. That was a reflection of how much and how much

public focus there was on the Water Quality Agreement and the issues that were raised back then. I think that's a good thing.

But at any rate, I think probably a more important reason was that the public had been focused, the media and the public had been focused on water quality for a couple of decades, and people have a short attention span, the media have a short attention span (inaudible)...wanted the problems to be solved.

There has been a tremendous amount of progress (inaudible)...and people wanted to move on to other things, so there's somewhat of a natural evolution there.

But this is, to some extent, moot because we should be looking forward, but I think it is appropriate that you do ask why this change has occurred, recognize some of those reasons, because we do want to improve on the past. We want to recognize and fix whatever problems and mistakes might have transpired over the last 15 years.

So I think some of those questions are entirely appropriate and I hope that your review will reflect some of those reasons and be honest about why that's changed.

We will submit written comments, the National Wildlife Federation will have more to say about a couple of the aspects and questions that you're posing. One of the things that I don't want to comment too much on here today is the content and subject matter that we believe ought to be addressed in the next iteration of the Agreement.

In fact, I want to make it clear that the National Wildlife Federation is not ready to say that the Agreement should be amended or changed. I think, to be honest, I think you probably will hear that from us, but I think that it's probably more appropriate to withhold judgement until the review has taken place, until we see the information, hear what information is uncovered by this process and then make recommendations on exactly what direction we should take.

I do believe that there are some opportunities presented by changes to the Agreement that (inaudible)...and we, as an organization, have opposed changing the Agreement in the past. The last time this question was presented, in 1999 and 2000, we were strongly opposed to changing the Agreement.

We're not strongly opposed to it today, and I think there are many good arguments that can be made we could use this opportunity to re-invigorate and re-elevate the prominence of the IJC and its role in the region and the Agreement as an important part of the institutional fabric that we have to protect and restore the Great Lakes.

So I'm going to withhold my comments on the content and just offer a couple of other notes, if you will, on the role of the IJC and its role (inaudible)...the importance of that to the Great Lakes.

The IJC can and should be a forum for the public and for binational participation, binational dialogue between our two countries, and that's probably the most important role that I see the IJC playing, and of course, you all recognize that as well.

You bring an opportunity for people from both sides of the border to come together to express their concerns and to receive information, to be educated, to be the recipients of science and research and factual information that only you are able to produce and compile in an objective, factual way.

That's the second point that I want to stress about the importance of the role of the IJC, and that is that you are an honest...you can and should be an honest broker of the truth. And this is not to say that you have not been that, I just want to stress the importance of that.

The IJC, as I mentioned, is an incredibly important source of quality information, and you are also and have been, and I think could be even more so in the future, a facilitator of resolving challenges based on sound information.

Dennis, you and I spoke recently about the problems with the erosion at the bottom of the St. Clair River, and we talked about a role for you and the regional office to (inaudible)...different government agencies to figure out (inaudible)...

I think that's an ideal role for the IJC to play. I think you attribute some science to that, but you also provide a forum, it's a shared resource (inaudible)...you know the players and bring them together and figure out the best way to go forward and who is going to pay for it.

I've mentioned the importance of credibility in terms of sound, scientific-based research and the importance of that, educating the public. The final point I

want to make is perhaps the most important, and that is that the IJC makes it possible for accountability to happen in the Great Lakes region.

And you do this in a number of ways. Your reports and your proclamations and your statements are a form of you assessing the progress and providing recommendations and reports to the governments and holding them accountable by doing that.

But you also make it possible for other participants in this process, in a participatory democracy, people like the media, people like citizens groups, people like individuals, the general public, to hold their elected and appointed officials accountable for the promises that they make to our citizens in the form of the Agreement and our expectations of how we want (inaudible)...to protect and restore.

Now, the final point I want to make about the importance of the IJC's role is that I don't think it's possible to fulfil these functions without a strong regional presence here in the Great Lakes region.

I think the importance of that regional office and having quality staff is fundamental to you being able to do your job, and I just want to reinforce the importance of that, a strong, well-funded and staffed regional office.

I guess the final point I just want to leave you with is that this is happening at an incredible, opportune moment in the history of the Great Lakes region. We're facing some very important regional challenges and opportunities.

The Annex, the framework for managing water use that both you and I participated closely, Dennis, in shaping and getting forward, has ushered a new era of water use management, an issue that we haven't focused on as a region for far too long.

The question of how you restore the Great Lakes, the attention being placed on repairing some of the damage and mistakes that we have made in the past, a tremendous amount of focus and attention by the public and elected officials how we're going to do that, who is going to pay for it, again an opportunity and important role for the IJC to play.

How you do that and the role the IJC...I'm going to withhold our comments on. Invasive species, you're certainly well aware of the (inaudible) of that issue, and I know that there is some important role for the IJC to play in (inaudible)...indicating government progress on (inaudible)...

All this adds up to an opportunity for the IJC to re-assert its leadership and to re-invigorate its role as an institution that helps protect and restore this valuable resource. So I applaud you again for providing these forums and encourage you to continue to participate and keep us informed (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you very much, Tim, for those well-considered remarks, and we look forward to receiving (inaudible)...you reminded me that I have been remiss in introducing our new director of the Regional Office (inaudible)...stand and be recognized. Karen...what, is this your second week on the job?

KAREN VIGNOSTAD (Director, Great Lakes Regional Office, International Joint Commission): Third.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Third week (inaudible)...so Karen has joined us (inaudible)...pleased to have her. And you also, Tim, I think, raised a couple of things that since we don't have a huge list of people speaking (inaudible)...

I noted that you focused on the role of the International Joint Commission (inaudible)...and I think (inaudible)...co-chair (inaudible)...Commission itself (inaudible)...advice to governments (inaudible)...Agreement.

It's kind of hard for us to talk about re-shaping our role (inaudible)...more credible, I think, coming from an external organization.

UNIDENTIFIED: Well, I guess I just acknowledged that your role to assess and to experience and to enjoy, or lack thereof, in the last few years, is an important part of this review process. And I know that you'd be welcome to comments on your success as well as criticisms (inaudible)...ways to improve.

Ultimately, it is up to the two governments to assign the IJC its role and there are, as you have well...appropriate limits on what your role is. I guess the point that I want to leave you with is that the IJC does have an important role (inaudible)...in the review (inaudible)...establish the importance (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: All right, our next speaker, our next person (inaudible)...followed by (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: Hi, I'm going to stay seated (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: (inaudible)...

LYNN KASCHERRY: Thank you. My name is Lynn Kascherry (?) and I have lived for over 25 years in Gary, Indiana (inaudible)...symposium, so I decided to take advantage of this meeting this afternoon, and I thank you for the opportunity to do so.

I sort of feel like Tim kind of gave a big part of my comments, and reiterating his history, we've both been in a lot of the same places over the last 20 years.

My first IJC meeting was in...not as early as his, but in 1987 in Toledo, when the Agreement was celebrated, the review of the Agreement was celebrated. And I can't help but point out that for something that's supposed to be reviewed every six years, that was 18 years ago, so I think we can start there, you know, just the timeliness of keeping up with what's going on, because a lot has happened over the last 18 years.

I was also at the IJC meeting in Hamilton in 1989 (inaudible)...to that meeting. That's a very notable meeting, for people who are not familiar with the history of the IJC, because that was an opportunity for citizens from all over the Great Lakes to speak directly to the commissioners and it was a real high point in the Commission's history, I think, which continued through the subsequent meetings in Travers City and then in Windsor.

And I think that I was also at the meeting that was recently in Kingston, and I think the differences in the meetings between then and now are (inaudible)...and I think that we have to find a way, as Tim was saying, to get the

IJC to bring it back to the role where it can do the kind of education of the Great Lakes community that's really required, because if the IJC doesn't do it, it's probably not going to happen.

The Environmental Protection Agency in the U.S. does some of that, but as far as a binational perspective, which is really critical (inaudible)...I think that it has to be (inaudible)...

I also want to say that I am proud to be from Indiana, where one of the most distinguished commissioners of the IJC of the recent past, Gordon, Durrill (inaudible)...

And if we're looking for a model of an IJC commissioner, I think that Mr. Durrill is an excellent model, who came into this area, I think, not extremely familiar with the Great Lakes and evolved into a very pro-active and concerned commissioner who made a great contribution.

And I think that he is somebody that I'd like to mention when you talk about what the IJC should be considering, they should be looking to the real successes of the past.

I wanted to say that I was also at the...I also helped organize the meeting that Great Lakes United did in (inaudible)...and I hope that we will be having more (inaudible) meetings like this in the next year or two, also in conjunction with (inaudible)...those Great Lakes activists (inaudible)...

One thing that I think is very important to note – and it's a negative, but I think it's instructive, and it has to (inaudible)...for the future – and that's that

while I have tremendous respect for the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, I think it has been a key document in pushing policy, I think (inaudible)...history of the policy in both the U.S. and Canada, certainly in the U.S., of what came out of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, and certainly the binational talks and strategies, is one of the most active and important policies that was a result of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement and the work of the IJC.

And I think that if that's going to continue, we have to (inaudible)...pro-active role by the IJC in pushing the governments to maintain those (inaudible)... You know, the negative is that however...I mean, when the Annex was reviewed and the points were put in that said zero discharge and virtual elimination of toxic chemicals in the Great Lakes and took an ecosystem approach, those were really historic and important mandates.

Unfortunately, they did not protect us, because if we look today and see what's going on today, you see that the Great Lakes, in the last 18 years, have not been protected from brominated fire retardants, which are now being found throughout the Great Lakes in sediments and in fish (inaudible)...BFRs, which is going to become ubiquitous in the next 15 years. And we should have learned our lesson from PCBs, but apparently we didn't.

Also, now we're seeing TFOA (inaudible)...fluorinated chemicals which are entering the Great Lakes as well. And I think that we have to have an agreement that leads the way for the parties to deal with these chemicals of emerging concern.

Had we had a strong...had we been able to see the future on this, and we could have (?) 18 years ago, we had the experience of PCBs in the Great Lakes, we had the experience of (inaudible)...in Michigan, and yet here we are with this ubiquitous new toxin in the Great Lakes of the BFRs.

And I think that we have to approach that from learning from our mistakes and trying to understand, when we review the Agreement, what are we going to do to prevent that kind of thing so that when we come back 20 years from now, we won't be saying, you know, why weren't we able to deal with (inaudible)...

I think that the Agreement is at a critical juncture, frankly. I can't speak to the Canadian government, but as Tim alluded – and I'll be more specific – the U.S. government has just taken a disappointing, giant step backwards in restoring and protecting the Lakes with the recent announcement that funding to (inaudible)...Great Lakes Collaborative, to make that actually occur, and all programs are all hard work, will probably be severely constrained, this if any new funding will be available at all.

It's a disappointment to the thousands of people literally who participated in this project. And I think that it's going to be vital that the Agreement, when review is finished, can be used as an instrument and as a document that can push this work forward, because we can see that there are many factors pushing against it.

This is a time when, as I just said, highly contaminated sediments continue to affect the water quality, and we have yet, all of these years, not figured out a

way to get rid of these contaminated sediments, but we continue to put them in landfills.

So whether they're in the water landfills or on land landfills, they're still storage facilities, and we will not be able to say we restored the Great Lakes until we don't leave a legacy for our children.

My daughter, who is 20, could well come back in 20 years and, if she's living in the Great Lakes, still be dealing with the issues of these contaminated sediments, so I think that the IJC has to have addressed that. The governments have been trying, but there's still a great deal to be done.

Tim alluded to the invasive species, and I talked about the new contaminants that are in fish and humans, so I think that...so I won't repeat that. But I want to say that...

(TAPE CHANGES SIDES)

(inaudible)...but I think that the Water Quality Agreement should
(inaudible)...

The point is that those are still critical values that you don't
(inaudible)...when you look at U.S. policy, you don't see (inaudible)...and those were (?) very driving concepts that pushed a lot, including industry – who resisted at first, and I think came to see that in many respects, it was possible to move closer to that, with benefits to their industrial processes in terms of (inaudible)...

So I would like to see the IJC, as it moves forward, vigorously work to assure the implementation of the goals of the Agreement and proceed with full transparent mechanisms (inaudible) accountability.

I have to echo what Tim said because (inaudible)...too many times, although you can probably never repeat it enough, but we must have better accountability.

And I think it's unfortunate that the IJC meetings don't have (inaudible)...because I think the commissioners and the agency people need to know that the public is behind them, especially when the decisions that they are being asked to make are difficult decisions, as many of these decisions are.

I think we must maintain the emphasis on ecosystem integrity. I would respectfully disagree with Mr. Cooper about putting the Agreement into an economic framework. I think that...an economic development framework.

I think that it has always been squarely in an ecosystem framework and a human health framework and I think that it must remain there, because there are many other venues in which to discuss economic development aspects. But (inaudible)...Agreement has been one of the premier (?) barriers to assure human health and the ecosystem of the Great Lakes.

And he also raised the issue of sustainable development, which I think is very important. And I want to point out that the definition is different depending on whose views (inaudible)...sometimes.

Well, I would like to push for the IJC to integrate the concept of sustainable development into the Agreement from the perspective of greater emphasis on utilizing the opportunities and the advances that are occurring in a field called green chemistry, which actually is one of the (inaudible) the U.S. EPA has been somewhat pro-active on that. They have a Web site (inaudible)...

But we need to build (inaudible)...for that in both the U.S. and Canada as a route toward sustainable development, as a route to working with industry to facilitate their ability to make changes that are required, in a way that's healthy to their bottom line and their environment as well, and also (inaudible)...concept of substitution (inaudible)...for toxic chemicals.

We have to really maintain (inaudible)...rather than sliding very easily back to the (inaudible)...approach.

So finally, I just want to say that I also will be submitting written comments and I think that...I think that Tim's observation that it's important to wait to see what the review, you know, looks like when it comes out...I take very seriously the invitation to come into the process now and I think that it's very important...

I mean, it's a little distressing in some ways to have the governments (inaudible)...doing this and I not being able to see what it's going to be like until it's done, and I'm hoping that it'll be a very (inaudible) process as we proceed.

I wanted to say that I think that it's critical that we maintain water quality as the focus of the Water Quality Agreement. There are a lot of other issues on

the table. In addition to invasive species, in Michigan, they're bottling water from the Great Lakes (inaudible)...you know, shoreline, various restoration issues.

Those are critical issues, but again, I believe there are other venues where those can be addressed, and that if we don't focus on water quality in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, we will diffuse the ability of the governments to actually address the issue.

I thank you again for the opportunity and I do commend the IJC on multiple opportunities for people to comment and participate. I think that's a really important step for the IJC. Thank you.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you for (inaudible)...remarks (inaudible)...

(AUDIO QUALITY WORSENS NOTICEABLY FROM THIS POINT IN RECORDING – MANY SPEAKERS TOO INAUDIBLE FOR COHERENT TRANSCRIPT)

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: (inaudible)...

HERB GRAY: (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: (inaudible)...take your best shot now. You are, Sir?

ART RICHARDSON: Art Richardson (?) (inaudible)...water quality (inaudible)...Michigan. I'm also Chair of the (inaudible) River Public Advisory

Council, which is the organization charged with overseeing the activities (inaudible)...concern (inaudible)...Areas of Concern (inaudible)...Water Quality Agreement.

I do intend to (inaudible)...comments (inaudible)...so I'm going to keep my remarks (inaudible)...I'm just going to (inaudible)...points.

First of all, I (inaudible)...shock (inaudible)...scope of the review of the Water Quality Agreement must (inaudible)...invasive species as an issue, and any revised Agreement (inaudible)...much longer language addressing the invasive species problem.

(inaudible) county (inaudible)...located north of here (inaudible)...two Lake St. Clair summit meetings (inaudible)...all other environmental problems pale in comparison to the (inaudible)...brought by invasive species in Lake St. Clair, and I suspect that's true for other portions of the Great Lakes (inaudible)...as well. The zebra mussel (inaudible)...discovered in Lake St. Clair (inaudible)...

I believe that any revised Agreement should address the invasive species issue in at least two ways. One, it should provide for (inaudible)...common standards by the United States and Canada (inaudible)...best practices and other measures to (inaudible)...invasive species (inaudible)...

Secondly, it should provide a timetable for (inaudible)...government (inaudible)...and I believe this problem (inaudible)...

The other point I want to make (inaudible)...little bit longer on this one (inaudible)...public advisory council. The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement is always described as a bilateral agreement, certainly as (inaudible)...

But if it is to be truly effective, it must be in reality (inaudible)...certainly in reality (inaudible)...

We have eight beneficial use impairments in the (inaudible)...River Area of Concern. Six of those can be directly tied to (inaudible)...poor management practices (inaudible)...watershed, particularly on the American side. The responsibility for (inaudible)...decision-making almost entirely (inaudible)...level.

Local governments have to be brought into the umbrella of the Agreement. That may be (inaudible)...legal (inaudible)...legal independence (inaudible)...local government on the American side (inaudible)...

But let's be real. If we don't include the local governments as full partners under this Agreement one way or another, we will never really get a handle on many of the most important environmental problems that we're faced with in the basin as a whole.

One way to embrace the local government level as full partners under the Agreement, I believe, is through the public advisory...the RAP process, the Public Advisory Councils that have been established in connection with the RAP process.

In my watershed, we do have local government participation in the RAP (inaudible)...and we try to arrive at decision-making, implementing remedial

measures under the Agreement by consensus and agreement amongst local governments (inaudible)...environmental agencies at the state and federal levels.

So I would urge the review of the Agreement focus also very strongly on strengthening the RAP-PAC process. Governments should commit to provide adequate support for those local coalitions which (inaudible)...Areas of Concern.

I think also I wanted (inaudible)...Agreement should look at the definitions we have (inaudible)...beneficial use impairments and see how they relate to existing environmental standards (inaudible)...and also the (inaudible)...geographical boundaries of Areas of Concern.

We have (inaudible)...coming into our Area of Concern from outside of the Area of Concern (inaudible)...current (inaudible)...Agreement.

So with that, I will close, and I want the other speakers in thanking you for providing this opportunity (inaudible)...public (inaudible)...whole process (inaudible)...so thanks very much.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you very much for speaking (inaudible)...obviously (inaudible)...Water Quality Agreement (inaudible)...Commission itself (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: (inaudible)...

HERB GRAY: (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

HERB GRAY: (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: One more question. So, can the IJC serve as a body that (inaudible)...what happens if both governments then (inaudible)...or one government (inaudible)...and one government doesn't (inaudible)...

HERB GRAY: (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: One more time. Is there anybody else that (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: Actually, it's Metro Detroit's vegetarian (?) group, and I happen (inaudible)... Now I share, with most everybody here, I share their concerns about water quality issues, invasive species and that kind of thing, but I am here specifically to (inaudible)...some of the factory farming that's going on in the watershed (inaudible)...Michigan in particular (inaudible)...shadow of the Great Lakes.

As I understand it, there is approximately (inaudible) factory farms in Michigan alone (inaudible)...water quality. And most of the public isn't really aware of what devastating effects there are on the water quality from factory farms.

Environmental Protection Agency themselves have come out and identified agriculture in itself being the number one cause of overall environmental water quality degradation, and approximately 70 per cent of that is

attributable to animal agriculture in and of itself. Factory farms are also known as (inaudible)...

The amounts of pollutants that are released to our watershed from factory farms is greater than all of the stormwater sewers, all of the sanitary sewers, and actually from pollutants from the air combined, so it is a huge, huge problem that we're facing (inaudible)...

Some of these factory farms are releasing as much nutrients and pollutants as a small city would be releasing, because animals produce so much more waste than human populations do, so it has a direct effect on the water quality throughout the Great Lakes region.

So what we would hope to see is eventually the elimination of factory farms, but in the meantime, perhaps a lot greater enforcement...not enforcement, but make them be required to meet the same kinds of standards the cities do for municipal waste (inaudible)...into our environment.

So those are the comments that I had (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: Well, approximately 90 per cent of all of the soy beans that are grown, about 80 per cent of all of the corn, and about 70 per cent of all of the grains that are grown in the United States are not being grown for human consumption, they're being grown for animals consumption. And they're being sprayed with pesticides to control weeds (inaudible)...

So the vast majority of all of this grains going for feed for animals as opposed to humans. I am certainly an advocate of organic farming, and I buy exclusively, as much as I possibly can, in the way of organic produce because I know it's much more nutritious, it has a lot more vitamins and minerals (inaudible)...available to you. And it's certainly (inaudible)...

DENNIS SCHORNACK: (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...if you could jot down the phone number on (inaudible)...I apologize, that number is 866-813-0642. That's 866-813-0642.

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: Yeah, you have to dial 1 before.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thanks (inaudible)...

UNIDENTIFIED: Chair Gray and Chair Schornack, just (inaudible)...Grand Falls (inaudible)...thank you for holding the forums in Bay City last night and (inaudible)...comment on this important process. This is just the beginning of a very important process (inaudible)...as a member of the Water Quality Board (inaudible)...recommendations that we forwarded (inaudible)...inclusive process (inaudible)...participation (inaudible)...opportunity for everybody to attend those online forums, something that (inaudible)...30 years ago, when the Agreement was drafted in 1972.

We certainly (inaudible)...new opportunities (inaudible)...one example of the (inaudible)...as you know, a time of great public involvement, some have called this the summer of the Great Lakes because (inaudible)...governors and

premiers (inaudible)...water withdrawals (inaudible)...collaboration on the U.S. side to try and develop an action plan for the Great Lakes.

But it's those processes hopefully (inaudible)...positive conclusion in the future and this process will step forward in prominence (inaudible)...and I certainly hope that the people who are here today will stay engaged (inaudible)...thank you very much.

DENNIS SCHORNACK: Thank you for those comments, Ken, and thank you to (inaudible)...I am going to (inaudible)...thank you all for coming (inaudible)... (APPLAUSE)
