

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 Green Bay, Wisconsin, on November 1, 2005  
(duration: 85 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 Green Bay (Wisconsin) le 1<sup>e</sup> novembre 2005  
(durée : 85 minutes)**

IRENE B. BROOKS (Commissioner, U.S. Section, International Joint Commission): Good evening. I guess I couldn't convince you all to come on this side so we can...all right.

JACK BLANEY (Commissioner, Canadian Section, International Joint Commission): I think you should run for election. (LAUGHS)

UNIDENTIFIED: It will make it, I think, a little easier for us to see everybody. Thank you, you're very cooperative. (LAUGHS) Thank you very much.

JACK BLANEY: The people who sit in the front always get the best grades.

IRENE BROOKS: Yeah. Well, welcome to our public meeting on the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement review (inaudible – mic problem)...to be here with you tonight. This is one of 14 meetings being held throughout the basin. We've had three already, three or four.

This is Jack Blaney, Commissioner Jack Blaney, from Vancouver. Jack is one of the Canadian commissioners. And my name is Irene Brooks; I am from Seattle, and one of the U.S. commissioners.

There are six of us altogether. One thing you should know about us is that we work from ocean to ocean. We are responsible for trying to prevent problems, and if there are problems, resolving them along the border if anything involves water levels or flows or pollution.

So the Great Lakes is one of our responsibilities, but we do go from ocean to ocean, so we do a fair amount of travelling.

But let's get to the reason why we're here tonight. We're here 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 (inaudible)... Agreement in the spring of 2006.

The governments asked us to do this because the Commission has been involved in the Agreement, with the Agreement, since its inception. In fact, the 1972 Agreement, in large part, came out of the 1970 IJC Report on the Water Quality of the Great Lakes.

I'm going to ask my colleague Jack Blaney to give a short overview of the Agreement, starting in 1972, when it was first signed.

JACK BLANEY: When I was born. (LAUGHS) Anyone who believes that, put their hand up. Not a soul.

The first Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement was in 1972, signed by President Nixon and Prime Minister Trudeau, and this was actually a very far-sighted agreement. Few countries...no two countries, by the way, had an agreement that was as sophisticated about this about environmental concerns.

The Agreement largely related to industrial and municipal, city pollution, industrial pollution put into the Great Lakes and of course sewage from the cities.

In 1978, the Agreement was reviewed and changed, and in 1978, they added a whole number of other contaminants and chemicals that were in the

Great Lakes, and they tried to develop what they call an ecosystem approach to the Great Lakes, which means, of course – and most of us now know what that means – that what happens on land and air and water and human beings and all animals, it's all connected one way or another.

And again, it was pretty far-sighted in that regard, in 1978, taking kind of an ecosystem-connected approach.

Then in 1987, again, the Agreement was reviewed and changed, and this in a very fundamental way. They added a lot of annexes to the Agreement, such as about air quality and such, because of course, what is deposited from the air into the Great Lakes has now become a fairly major source of contamination.

And then they identified 43 Areas of Concern. These were areas in the Great Lakes that were highly contaminated and toxic and basically impaired the use of the Lakes clearly, in terms of fishing and swimming and sometimes drinking.

The two governments have made a lot of improvements in those Areas of Concern, but only two have been de-listed, only two have been taken off the list., so there still is a lot of work to be done.

And I'm not quite sure where I'm supposed to end, but the Agreement is now up for review again, and a lot of things...while a lot of progress has been made, a number of things have changed in the last 20 years.

First of all, there is a lot of concern about climate change, and the governments make take a position on that, because if indeed the climate is getting

warmer, it is going to have a very dramatic effect on the Lakes and the ecosystem.

There are new pollutants, new kinds of chemicals are being discovered in the Lakes. And of course, there is a lot of urban development around the Lakes, and that has its own consequences in terms of overflow into the Lakes.

There is a whole matter...again, in terms of pollutants, well, industrial and municipal pollutants have been pretty well controlled, there still is a lot of...and stormwater kind of pollution, but there's a lot of agricultural pollution.

So these are the kinds of new things that the governments will want to take a look at when they review the Agreement. I think I've gone on far too long, and I'll turn it over to my friend. I told her I don't do these things with notes, so she has to (inaudible)...

IRENE BROOKS: I think you've covered it all. The governments are now getting ready the Agreement, as Jack pointed out, and the governments and IJC both feel that it's very important to hear from you.

So this, tonight, is a listening period for us, and your thoughts will be recorded and we will take them down and give the governments, when they started their formal review, a report that they can use to go on to look at what the priorities should be in looking at and reviewing the Agreement.

As indicated on the slide behind us and in our printed materials, which you will find on the back table, there are several ways to provide comments to us in addition to tonight.

You can join us on a live Web dialogue that will be held November 29<sup>th</sup> to December 2<sup>nd</sup>, full days, any time you wanted to join the conversation.

When the consultations end, the IJC will, as I said, synthesize a report of all of the views that we have heard. We will also send all documents we have received, along with transcripts of these meetings, to governments.

As for our meeting today, we will call you in the order that we have received your request to speak. And if you wish to speak, there are registration forms at the back of the table, and we ask that you please fill that out. And if you need one now, please raise your hand and staff will come along and give you one.

We are relying on tape recording tonight, so you should know that. We ask that you use the microphone there at the centre and that you please give us your name so we know who is speaking. And if there are no questions at this point as to procedure, we can get to the core of the matter. We want to hear what your views are.

So the first gentleman is Donald Friesen. Yes, Sir. Please, so we can all hear you.

DONALD FRIESEN: I was just wondering what they plan on doing to the city of Milwaukee that continually dumps sewage in the river? Every time it rains, any little bit of rain or a little snow melts, they just open their tunnels up and dump it in the lake.

IRENE BROOKS: Well, we will certainly take that into consideration. Is there anyone here from Milwaukee or from the Wisconsin area that would like to

Speak to that? Because we're not in a position to do that, we're here to talk about the review and hear what you have to say about that. Yes, Ma'am?

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

DONALD FRIESEN: They put it in the paper...whenever they do it, they put it in the paper and let everybody know.

UNIDENTIFIED: It has just been announced that Attorney General Peg Lautenschlager has initiated legal action, enforcement action against Milwaukee (inaudible). So they're going to go after him.

DONALD FRIESEN: I believe the last time they did legal...something legal, the fine, I think, was \$1,200. I spent more on that on gas in my boat to go fishing this summer.

IRENE BROOKS: That's an issue that we certainly...we are familiar with, but we're not involved with, and it's not the subject of tonight's meeting.

DONALD FRIESEN: Oh, I thought it was about the cleanliness of the water...

IRENE BROOKS: Well, it's about advice that we would like to give to the governments, you would like to give to the governments, and we'll certainly include that in your remarks.

DONALD FRIESEN: Okay, thank you.

UNIDENTIFIED: Thank you.

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you. John Dillon. If you are affiliated with an organization, that might be helpful for us to know, too, and for everybody.

JOHN DILLON: I'm John Dillon, I'm from Green Bay, Wisconsin, but I also have a place up in Washington Island which is surrounded by the water of Lake Michigan. And I, too, am definitely concerned about what you brought up about Milwaukee.

Before 2004, they had dropped something like about 1.7 billion gallons of sewage into Lake Michigan. Just recently, they dropped 200 million gallons.

And the whole tourist industry, which is very large in Wisconsin, and a lot of manufacturing and then all of our municipalities get their water from Lake Michigan, so it's costing anybody that has water from the lake an extra fee because they have to purify that water.

And it takes more purification the more garbage that goes into it, not to say what it does to the fish and wildlife and everything else.

And I would like to see somebody answer that question, what they're going to do about it. And if the guy that is responsible is still working there, I'd like to know why. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Again, I refer you to whoever spoke before on that subject, and hopefully will shed some more light on it. We will certainly add that to the comments that you make here tonight and pass that on to the governments.

The next speaker is Jean Agnessus (?). I really apologize, I know that's now how you pronounce the name.



JEANIE AGNESSENS: Hi, my name is Jeanie Agnessens and I am with the Isaac Walton League, and I also have a lot of concerns about the Great Lakes and about keeping our waters clean.

And I am concerned about the invasive species that have entered our waterways, and I know that there's work being done on them, because the Isaac Walton League has taken that on as one of the things that they're presently working on.

We are working with a collaboration of all of the states that are around the Great Lakes trying to get legislation that's going to help handle that.

And we're also working on the issue with the stormwater out of Chicago and Milwaukee, because that is something that just does not make any sense.

So whether we have to have help from, you know, this agreement to make the laws stronger, that's what we would like to see happen, so that they cannot continue to pollute the waters on that.

We have had a series of beach closings. I want to say hi to John Dillon because he is my neighbour on Washington Island. I never get...I met him once, so it's nice to see you, John.

But I also have a place up on Washington Island, but aside from that, you know, I have children that have used the great tourist areas that we have got up in Door County and along, and we have had a lot of beach closings with not a lot of answers as to why that's happened.

And I would just like to go on record that we would really like to get to the bottom of that. And I thank you for the work that you are doing, I thank you for coming and having public input on this. I think it's very important that people are here tonight.

I myself am not fully versed on what this agreement totally is, but I like the fact that we're working together, and hopefully we can tighten this up and make it a little stronger so that we can protect it a lot better than it has been. So thank you.

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you for your comments. Dan Ford.

DAN FORD: First of all, thank you for being here tonight. This is really only the second meeting I've been to that has to do with water quality. And now I'm living on the Bay of Green Bay, and what I sense is a little bit frustrating is a lot of times in these meetings, you're asking for input and we're asking for answers, and there's nobody ever there to give us answers.

I mean, we're giving you input, just like the situation in Milwaukee, which I think is frustrating for all of us. And in fact, there was even...someone had gotten up and spoken a couple of months ago and said that they had been to Algoma and there was raw sewage on the beach in Algoma this summer.

And it's just so darn frustrating that there's never really a question and answer forum. It's always a public comment forum, but we're not getting anything back at all. It's just give us your input...well, we would like a little input back. That's all I've got to say. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: The Agreement is between the two countries. Our role is to kind of tee it up for the governments in listing what your priorities and what your thoughts are.

You will have an opportunity to hopefully have dialogue with the governments once the review starts. There will be another opportunity, the governments will go out for public consultation.

I understand your frustration and thank you for your comments. Kyle Friesen-Smith?

KYLE FREISCHMIDT: Hello, I'm Kyle Frieschmidt. I go to the Pier High School and I'm also a local angler on the Great Lakes. Something people have mentioned was the invasive species, and I'd like to know what is being done, if anything, about the zebra mussels.

I've noticed a change over the past five years with the water and how many they are. I can recall an experience going jet-skiing and falling off and being barefoot and coming up with my feet being covered in blood from them. And I want to know what, if anything, is being done.

Another thing is all of the sewage in Milwaukee. What...are we doing anything for it? I fish constantly in the summer out of Algoma, Kiwanee, and Sturgeon Bay. I know many people that make their living on it.

And if they say...they say you're only supposed to eat one fish, I think, per month if you're pregnant, and what is that going to do to people that depend on that for their livelihood if their clients read in the local paper that you're not

supposed to consume over one per week and they want to go fishing. What is being done (inaudible) anything of that?

I guess I'm not exactly what the Agreement is, but I feel that we should probably be doing a lot more than we are and that there's a lot of things that need to be addressed.

As far as the sewage thing. I know when the wind blows a certain way in the summer, when we're out there, it's all you can smell is raw sewage. So I'd like to know that something is being done with that, that's my main concern, because I do fish and eat a lot of fish out of the Bay and Lake Michigan, and I'd like to know that something is going to be done so that my kids can enjoy it the same I might enjoy it, if not better. (APPLAUSE)

JACK BLANEY: Commissioner Brooks, I might make a comment on this one so we share this a bit. Frustrations, by the way, we heard frustrations last week from people from various centres, and of course, as we all know, governments sometimes move a bit more slowly than we'd like, but they do move.

And just to give us a little bit of perspective, in the late 1960s, the Lakes were in much worse shape than they are now. And the two governments asked the International Joint Commission, which was created in 1909-1911, by the way, and they recommended to the two governments that they create something like the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement, and it was out of a recommend of the IJC that it happened.

So things do happen, and the Lakes, in many ways, have been improved, and that's because people like yourselves have made comments. Now the comments that are made tonight about the sewage and about alien invasive species, zebra mussels and whatever, all of these are recorded, we will synthesize this, and the governments will hear about it.

The mussels, by the way, were an invasive species, and it's a very good example of...an illustration of why we have to do what we can to control so that there are no further invasive species. We get about two new ones a year.

And the IJC has recommended to the governments that the IJC get a reference, that is to undertake a study to see how we can better coordinate with the two countries means by which we can control further species from not getting into our lakes. Okay, thank you.

IRENE BROOKS: We have Pete Petrowski.

PETE PETROWSKI: That's not the worst pronunciation, but it's okay. I've got three simple things.

The Great Lakes basin, the water that is there should stay in there. It should not be shipped over to the Mississippi basin, like it is doing in that Chicago ship canal.

Any removal from the basin should be under the control of the International Joint Commission; that way, we can keep some of the politicians out of it.

And water leaving the Great Lakes system via the locks for ocean ships should be put back to the volume it was 10 to 15 years ago, because there is much more water coming out. And if you look at your shorelines, you've got long shorelines that used to be under water and now it's sand and rock.

And the people up in Door County are getting a great deal there because they're getting extra land for nothing. I can't blame them for that. That's all.

IRENE BROOKS: Tired of getting up. Ronald Vanderloo. I hope I pronounced that one right. Ronald Vanderloo? Okay, (inaudible) the bottom then. Rebecca Kakis. Okay, where is the mic?

REBECCA CATERS: My name is Rebecca Caters. I am the Executive Director of Clean Water Action Council of Northeast Wisconsin. We're a Green Bay-based organization, just for this (inaudible) to this state.

We have been active for 20 years now in our area, primarily on pollution issues, but we have also worked on some wildlife habitat and other related issues as well.

We very much support the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement and believe that it is a truly visionary document. We urge you to keep it intact at the very least or strengthen it, but in no way should it be modified to remove any of the existing provisions or weakened in any way.

We need strong leadership, we need that strong guidance between our countries to show the world that we intend to protect these Great Lakes and restore their condition. So that's the overview we would like to present.

We would also, though, like to see the two governments really meet the spirit of the Agreement and demonstrate to the public that it's serious...that both Canada and the United States are serious about implementing the Agreement.

We do want restoration, we do want ecological recovery in the Great Lakes, and yet we're seeing both countries dragging their feet on many of the provisions that are described in the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. So we'd like to see the spirit of the Agreement met.

And specifically, we'd like to see the International Joint Commission be very proactive in identifying emerging threats to the Great Lakes. Don't let us see any more PCB contaminations occurring around the Great Lakes. Let's try to identify these problems before they occur so we can prevent them or catch them early enough to where we can stop them before they get too widespread.

And several examples would be new toxic chemicals. You know, there are thousands of chemicals introduced in our society that are not being tracked very well for what their true effects could be.

And right now, under current legislation at least in the United States, a chemical is innocent until proven guilty. That's completely backwards to how the chemicals should be regulated.

We should be assuming chemicals are guilty and preventing their release until we fully understand their effect. We should be testing for the full range of possible effects - immune system, reproductive, cancer, all of the possible health effects - before they are allowed in any discharges to the system.

And yet we're still seeing new chemicals come on the horizon. Right now we're battling a new fight against polybrominated fire retardants, or PBDE (?). Apparently, in Lake Michigan in particular, the levels of these chemicals are rising rapidly and may not have peaked yet, because we still have a lot of consumer products in this country that are saturated with this group of chemicals.

This shouldn't be happening. We should have learned this lesson 20 and 30 years ago with the better-known things like PCBs, and yet it's happening again because we're not being proactive and preventative.

So we need to be looking into the future and checking our technologies to make sure that we're not stepping into a problem. And with that, I'd like to call attention to two potential problems on the horizon.

One is nanochemistry. Nanotechnology is becoming very big and it's creating a lot of nanoparticles, ultra-tiny particles that may actually change the chemical effect of some commonly-used substances.

I was talking with a Ph.D. who is looking into this right now and she is very concerned about this and saying that, you know, this could be a big deal in the future.

But once these nanoparticles are out there, they're virtually impossible to control because they are so small. And yet it's a technology that is already in use, there are already many chemicals out there being used in very tiny concentrations, tiny structures.



Another would be genetic modifications, genetic pollutions. And biotechnology is a big, growing field, there's a lot of excitement about it, but it poses a certain risk to the Great Lakes and I think this needs to be watched very carefully.

But then there are the more standard risks like climate change, changing water levels, demands for water withdrawals, new or increasing nutrient imports, new alien species, or newly-endangered species.

Here in Green Bay, we have seen a very tragic loss of about four species of terns just in the last 10 or 15 years that used to nest right in the lower bay here, beautiful birds that were fish-eaters.

And studies had shown in the 80s that they were having health problems due to toxic contamination, primarily what's left over in the sediments from past pollution.

They're gone now. We used to have hundreds of them, hundreds of pairs nesting in the lower bay, just north of the city, and they're almost all gone now, except those that are passing through from other areas.

We need to prevent that kind of tragedy and identify it early enough that we can address it. We also need to reinforce and reemphasize the Agreement's call for zero discharge of toxic substances or the virtual elimination of toxic problems in the Great Lakes.

We have seen a real backing away from that. And in fact, just recently, we learned of a permit issued to one of our local paper mills that allows a 10,000

pound increase in their discharge of phosphorus and an increase in their mercury releases.

And it's being permitted. This is a clear degradation. We're moving in the wrong direction with some of these permits and we need to stop that.

We also are not seeing urgency in getting the Fox River cleaned up. One of the reasons our group formed 20 years ago is because of the Fox River contamination. And we have been to dozens if not hundreds of meetings on the Fox River cleanup, and yet the process is just dragging along, dragging.

And now, this Thursday, if anybody is interested, 7:00 at the Brown County Library, is a big public meeting on the Fox River cleanup. And they gave us less than a week's notice, so the public input process is suffering.

UNIDENTIFIED: (inaudible)...

REBECCA CATERS: Is it the Holiday Inn? Oops. Okay, good, 7:00 at the Holiday Inn. I have not gotten any real notice on this, so that's word of mouth.

That's very poor publicity of a major event in our area, and we've seen that happen chronically on the Fox River issue as well as others. The public is not being informed of key opportunities to have input on processes. We'd like to see a major reemphasis on public participation and public notice and actual support and pressure to get these sites cleaned up.

The word is that this meeting on Thursday is going to announce a modification of the Fox River cleanup plan that we fought for so hard for so

many years, and we finally got a record of decision 2-3 years ago, and now they're saying that we're going to get it modified.

We need action on this. We need a sense of urgency from the IJC, from the U.S. federal government, from the government in Canada, pushing for these sites to be cleaned up.

We hired a toxicologist a couple of years ago who said there are 40,000 people along Fox River and Green Bay who are eating, continuing to eat unsafe quantities of fish.

This is a major health risk, a threat to our communities, and yet we're not seeing adequate action. We need leadership from the IJC on this.

We also need full funding and true enforcement. We're seeing too many of the recommendations in the Agreement, even though they are very well intended, if they're not funded and if there isn't an enforcement mechanism behind them, they will simply be something written in a book. We're just not seeing action.

And finally, we need better public education efforts. There's a lot of misinformation or a lack of information. Fish consumption advisories are still not well publicized because governments seem too concerned about discouraging tourists and not concerned enough about protecting people and protecting public health.

These are just a few of the things that we could raise as issues. There's a whole range of them. Right off shore here, we have a contaminated disposal

island that is basically built like a sieve. The sides leak, it's sitting there uncapped (?), it's been uncapped for ten years, it's full of PCBs and mercury, and it's just sitting out there.

The County proposes and the Corps proposes to simply pile more sediment on top and call it capped. That is not proper sediment management. We need a renewed course for true protective controls on these structures. Thank you.  
(APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you for your comments. Bob Sloe?

BOB SLOE (Chairman, Blue Water Shoreline Residents Association):  
Bob Sloe, from London, Ontario, Canada. Glad to be with you tonight. We left at 7:00 am this morning just to be here. We're on Lake Huron, and we have the same problems you have on Lake Michigan.

I was born on Lake Erie. Back in the 50s and 60s, I taught swimming, if you can call it that, through the algae, and some days we would walk 50 feet out into Lake Erie without getting wet because of the extensive algae mats.

So there have been improvements in the Great Lakes. But it took billions of dollars by both state and federal governments, provincial and federal governments, in Canada and the U.S.A. to do that.

I am here tonight representing 50 or so shoreline associations. I am in charge, chairman, of an environment committee for BSRA, Blue Water Shoreline Residents Association, and we have 50 or some odd cottages, if you want,

associations, but we prefer the lakeshore because 30 or 40 per cent of our people are there year-round living on Lake Huron.

And we have noted a great degradation of our beaches, mainly due to E.coli. We sampled 12 beaches and four ravines in the last number of years, 3-4 years now, and we found the ravines have 20 times the number of E.coli than our beaches.

And the ravines, we call it the big flush, particularly when it's raining. You have rain, you have agricultural runoff, and you have E.coli coming into those ravines and then polluting our beaches.

And we have the same problems you have, we are closing our beaches earlier, we are closing our beaches longer, and we are closing more of our beaches.

Now some people would say the problem isn't any worse than it is 20 years ago, and I say bullshit. Excuse the language. I am a biologist. The kinds of E.coli that we are getting are much different from the kinds of E.coli that you had 20 years ago.

And I point to Walkerton, where we had seven people who died because of a certain E.coli strain and we had hundreds of people who were sick, some that are permanently injured because of contamination getting into their drinking water.

We have the same kinds of organisms getting into our beach water, and we are exposing our children and our grandchildren to these types of organisms. Now we only test for E.coli. That's an indicator organism.

How many other organisms are there in the beach water that we can't test for because we just don't have the money for, you can only guess. But there are many pathogens out there that are much worse than old 157H7, the E.coli that killed people in Walkerton.

So the IJC has mentioned this in their report for the last year, their biennial report, they're concerned with these forms of E.coli, but I'd like to see some action taken by the governments on both sides to limit, if you can believe, the spreading of liquid manure, solid manure, and human waste.

In Ontario, we spread human waste on fields, and then the rains come and then we have our fields that are tile (?), for God's sake, and the E.coli, it's the big flush, it gets out there within minutes, within hours, and there it is in our beaches, there it is in our ravines.

So I can't for the life of me think why the United States and Canada, Ontario, Michigan, Wisconsin, allows people to spread liquid manure. In Ontario alone, we have billions of gallons of liquid waste, hundreds of thousands of tonnes of manure, plus human waste, that we spread on the fields every year.

And we wonder why E.coli is getting into our beaches, into our water? Are we stupid or what? There are ways of dealing with this.

And I have gone to the Environment Minister in Ontario and I've explained plants that we can build that can take this stuff and turn it into nutrients. We can turn it into electricity. We can take it through anaerobic digesters. This is common practice in European countries, and yet in Canada, in Ontario, we're too stupid to do that.

It's so easy to spread it around and just let it go, let it flow out into the streams, out into the beaches. So I think we need a real shake-up from the IJC, like we had back in the 60s and we had billions of dollars spent and we had a real effect on the Great Lakes.

And that's what we need again, a commitment on the part of the governments of both Canada and the United States to do something to fix this problem, because the Great Lakes are our greatest value.

We depend so much on tourism for the Great Lakes, for simple pleasure. It's such a valuable resource, it's a shame to see it being degraded as it is. Thank you very much. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you, excellent comments. Thank you very much. I'm glad you got up at 7:00. Next we have Kate Barrett.

KATE BARRETT (Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources): Hello, my name is Kate Barrett and I come from the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources.

We thank the International Joint Commission for conducting these public comment sessions in Wisconsin and for providing Wisconsin citizens this opportunity to comment on the Water Quality Agreement.

Wisconsin has a long history of supporting restoration efforts in the Great Lakes. In recognition of its importance, the State recently established an Office of the Great Lakes to provide support to the Governor as Chair of the Council of Great Lakes Governors and to those programs that work to protect this valuable resource.

The Water Quality Agreement has been a successful binational vehicle for United States and provincial management strategies around focused issues. The Agreement has had positive results in areas such as the development of Remedial Action Plans and Lakewide Management Plans, which, as directed under Annex 2, provide for a systematic and comprehensive ecosystem approach to restoring and protecting beneficial uses in Areas of Concern and in open-lake waters.

Identification of and strong statements regarding the need to control persistent toxic substances and dealing with contaminated sediments are other examples of issues identified in the Water Quality Agreement that subsequently led to programs that were directed at addressing these sources of contaminants in the Great Lakes.

We need to continue this legacy of advocating broader and futuristic types of issues that governments find hard to address.



Therefore, the Wisconsin Department of Natural Resources supports the review of the Water Quality Agreement as an audit of its effectiveness in addressing the overall binational goals contained in the Agreement and its annexes and whether or not it has enough of a preventative aspect on emerging issues.

The review should specifically address issues such as the need to characterize and quantify the emissions of airborne toxic substances that can affect the Great Lakes.

Calling for a federal requirement for the development of emission inventories to support the assessment and abatement of atmospheric deposition into the Lakes will strengthen the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement and facilitate the Great Lakes states' efforts in implementing atmospheric deposition assessment and control programs.

The review should also ask the following questions: does the Agreement adequately address new and emerging contaminants such as pharmaceuticals and personal care products? Would adding them guarantee that they receive the type of attention that persistent substances have received to date and prevent them from becoming a problem?

Are the toxicological assumptions and analyses that were used to develop specific objectives still valid? And is changing the Agreement the right place to address any weaknesses or is there a better forum?

Finally, the review process should ensure that there are ample opportunities for a full and meaningful engagement of the public. The Department would be happy to assist in any way, and we are committed to protecting and restoring the Great Lakes. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you for your comments and thank you for your offer. Mr. Vanderloo, your name has surfaced again. Do you want me to put your underneath or would you like to speak now? Ronald Vanderloo?

RONALD VANDERLOO: My name is Ronald Vanderloo. We've had some very good speakers today. One of the things that I think we should emphasize is better water levels, try to maintain better water levels and especially on Lake Michigan. There is too much water running out of it and it can be controlled.

When I received...when I got the meeting notices, something bothered me. With two provinces, they had seven meetings, and with seven states, we have one meeting in each state.

I thought for Wisconsin, because of Superior, we should have had a meeting up there, one here and probably one in the Milwaukee area, to be fair. I don't think that expecting people to come here from those distances in the middle of the week was very practical. Thank you.

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you for your comments. The two governments have given us a very small budget to hold these hearings. They requested that we hold six, and we found a way to hold 14, mostly through the efforts of the various

cities and cooperation with local governments. So we felt that was a good way to get the word out.

We would love to...I'm sure Jack and I would like to travel for the next six months all over the Great Lakes basin for these meetings, but I think we've done as good a job as we could with the budget that has been given to us.

Again, we are receiving information, views by e-mail, snail mail, phone – there's an 800 number you can call – it costs nothing to give your views, and any and all views will be passed on to the governments. Again, if you have a computer, or if you don't, you can go to a local library and join the Web dialogue.

I think we have been very imaginative in our efforts to get the word out and to have your views heard by governments, and we will do everything that we can to make sure that that happens.

And tonight is an opportunity for you to do that, and I commend all of you. When we first came into this room tonight, we saw all these chairs and couldn't imagine them all being filled up, and we salute you for coming out and giving us your opinions. The next speaker is Kevin Yan. I believe that's his name. I really apologize, it's very difficult to read some of the handwriting.

KEVIN YAN (Great Lakes Commission): I'll keep this very brief. Good evening, Commissioner. I represent...I work for the Great Lakes Commission, and I work for the Great Lakes states in terms of compiling the most comprehensive air toxics...

(TAPE SWITCHES SIDES)

...speakers, but I think one of the most important things for the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement is the information that needs to make the decision.

Within the Great Lakes basin, some of the states have different requirements in terms of collecting emissions inventories. We need...actually have to have comprehensive, comparable data standards in terms of data collection methodologies. That is one of the key aspects for setting the baseline to make more recommendations and improving the water quality for the basin.

I'll keep that short, and I think that's...we'll probably be submitting written comments for the different states' agencies, along with the Great Lakes Commission as well, so thanks.

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you. We look forward to receiving them. Next we have Greg Mund.

GREG MUND: (inaudible)...trip over something. My name is Greg Mund and I'm a resident of Montague, Michigan, in White Lake area – White Lake is an Area of Concern, and I'm the secretary for the White Lake PAC (?).

And a few comments. One, the way the Annex 2 was written, it was a very concise, very credible document, well thought out. The funding has not taken place. It's been 22...excuse me, let me do my math right...18 years since the first RAPs were produced, and where there was funding, adequate funding to garner an Area of Concern Public Advisory Council, there are results on the

ground as far as cleanups, because the people, the public that were there had the resources there to move forward and in effect leverage state and federal funds.

If there's anything in regards to (inaudible)...more important focused items, IJC could go back to both governments and ask to provide the adequate funding for those local resources.

I would echo the comments earlier in regards to concerns with genetically-engineered, genetically-modified organisms, and along with that the impact of the antibiotics in regards to our biological systems.

Those issues are innocent until proven guilty, and I don't agree with the process when it's based totally on economics for corporations to produce an element or an item that they make money off of and the public has never really seen...in terms of agricultural production, I'm not sure farmers have ever really seen a reduction in their net costs because they're paying a premium for those modified organisms and genetically-engineered crops, and we don't know the true impact of what's going to happen within the biological systems.

There's been reports where BT (?) builds up into agricultural soils that are traditionally non-forest-based soils for at least the last 60 or 80 years...that's not seen (inaudible)...biological result from genetically-modified corn, where BT has been used and raised over and over.

And then, in the offsite drift impacts, when it comes to (inaudible). There's just a lot of unknowns in that and I think we need to put some funding priority on research, and not industry-funded and based research, government-

funded, based research so that our universities can go out or independent researchers can go out and do a thorough job with that.

The final comment I'd like to make is in regards to...in the 1970s, in '72, it took rivers to become on fire for our society to recognize the problem with our environment, and yet even then, in the last 30-some plus years, we've never really gone to the point of putting an economic value on those ecosystem services, the ecological values that we get from our environment.

Yet the first thing a company does when it comes into town is brag about how much economic development, economic value that they're going to bring into that community. We recognize that as a society, it's easily conceivable, it's in our thought process, we can understand that.

When it comes to ecosystem services, most people don't have a clue, other than they have a passion for it. They can understand an inherent value, but when it comes to the decision-making process, that's not at the doorstep, it's left outside the process.

And I think as a society, we need to start putting that back in or put it in that concept. That's how we operate, that's our mode of operation. I think we would start changing things in regards to coal-fired power plants and some of the things that the United States have done here in the last year in terms of the air quality emissions, tools and regulations. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you and thank you for your contribution on the ground work. We appreciate that, unsung heroes. Lawrence Craven.

LARRY CRAVEN: Yes, my name is Larry Craven, and my comments are sort of prompted by the young man who was up here talking about invasive species. I think the answer you gave from the chair was there will be a study or there was a study in progress.

It seems to me that many organizations interested in helping the environment along feel that nothing can be done unless they initiate their own study.

There has been enough studies on this by many excellent organizations, such as the Union for Concerned Scientists. The last thing I want to hear is another study. I want some action.

Just take, for instance, the Fox River. It's been dragging for over 22 years and it's going to probably drag for another ten years. But this organization shouldn't be caught up in things like this.

If you're tight on a budget, look to see what resources are out there that you can reuse instead of thinking that only your own study is going to be of value. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: I couldn't agree with you more. I would point out that the IJC does not have a budget, and we do recommend and give our advice to governments. In Areas of Concern, it's the main source of funding, both federal governments. Next is Sophie Dorsano.

SOPHIE DORSANO (Endometriosis Association of Eastern Milwaukee):

I'm pretty sure this is my first public hearing, so I am very grateful that there is such a thing, and I also thank you for being here and letting us comment.

I represent the Endometriosis Association of Eastern Milwaukee, Wisconsin. We're an international association. And I represent 89 million women and girls who are affected by that diseases and 5.5 million women and girls in the United States and Canada.

For those who don't know, it's a chronic and often debilitating disease and it can last a whole lifetime. It requires a lot of care and attention to...management of the disease, not just with the medical resources that are available, but it's almost imperative that each woman that who is affected, regardless of the severity, that she pursue every way possible to improve her quality of life.

So diet is a pretty big deal. And you see a lot of women with endometriosis also affected by toxins, they're sensitive chemically, and the reason is that endometriosis isn't just a hormonal disease, it's also an immune system disease, so you'll see a lot of crossover between a woman presenting symptoms of endometriosis and also presenting with auto-immune disorders such as allergies, asthma, lots of different allergic diseases. I can let you know more about that later if you have any questions.



But the reason why we are concerned with about the water quality of the Great Lakes is of course because it is a food source and because of the quality of life in general.

My job is to make sense of all of the information that we get, that comes to us from science and from other environmental health organizations, make sense of the information and try to help our association members understand what it means.

So when we hear about polychlorinated biphenyls, when we heard about brominated flame retardants, we hear about mercury, dioxin, and their link to endometriosis itself as well as other chronic illnesses of the immune system, it can be overwhelming.

I am overwhelmed, actually, myself, as I've just been in this job for a year and a half and there's a lot of information out there. And I'm also even overwhelmed just being here tonight and listening to all of the different information that's being exchanged here.

So I want to say that on behalf of the Association members, we encourage the IJC to continue to strengthen the Agreement, and especially looking at the science, understanding the science, and being serious about really understanding the effects of the quality of the water, quality of the Lakes on human health.

There is so much that I say about this, so I will just end with this image that I had. It's a scary image in my head and it doesn't go away. I don't know

how many people saw “I, Robot”, the movie. It’s based on Isaac Asimov’s book “I, Robot”.

Well, if you haven’t seen it, there’s a scene in there where Will Smith, who is playing the lead character, is supposed to go to the Great Lakes – this all takes place in the future, but not-too-far future – is supposed to go to the Great Lakes for something, it’s all part of the plot.

But what’s scary about it is when he gets to the Great Lakes, there’s nothing there, it’s all sand, it’s desert. I think that’s probably the worst-case scenario that people can imagine, and I sure hope that that never happens.

I also hope that groups like the IJC and everyone else that is working on environmental health will continue to create better scenarios, healthier scenarios for everybody, not just health-affected people with chronic illness, but everybody. And I just want to thank you again for this opportunity. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you, Sophie. You are an excellent spokesperson. Thank you for sharing all that information with us. Mike – I’ve got to put my glasses on for this one – McComb.

MIKE MCCOMB (Ashfield-Colbourne Lakefront Association): Thank you. Thank you for your time and attention. I came with Bob, I got up an hour because I live even closer to Toronto than he does. (LAUGHS)

We share similar roles. We’re both non-paid volunteers with cottage associations on the Ontario side of Lake Huron. The outfit that I represent is

called the Ashfield-Colbourne Lakefront Association, made up of about 22 little cottage groups.

We've been doing stream testing for the last five years, and if I can explain, the Ontario recreational water quality standard is 100 CFU per 100 millilitres. As we test 12 streams over the last five years, we do it about 18 times a year, the numbers we're reaching on average are 20 times the standard.

So what we're dumping into Lake Huron on a daily basis is 20 times. Our record last year hit was 59,000, 590 times, which reaches deadly levels, but that was beaten this summer by a Ph.D. scientist with our Ministry of the Environment who found 1.6 million.

Now it absolutely surprises me that in the Water Quality Agreement here, there's a list of a couple hundred chemicals that are dangerous, sewage and manure is not in there, nowhere.

So I think it's time that the IJC become less politically correct and begin to identify where the true damage is coming from. The county we have our cottages in has 60,000 people and one million livestock, most of which are contained – I think, in the U.S. term – it's CAFOs, confined agriculture feeding operations; we call them factory farms.

It strikes me, as we carry through this...and again, I'll go back and remind you of Walkerton, this small town that's 45 miles north of my cottage, a pastoral, lovely little town. I used to drive a truck into there when I was in university.

2,500 people, seven people died, 2,700 people became ill, 1,000 of whom have permanent illness, over 200 will be on dialysis for the rest of their life. This was based on one small manure spill and an incredible lack of responsibility by the local water department.

Numerous people have talked tonight about there's a lack of funding. Well, funding only follows...the only requirement for funding is if you didn't do the right thing upfront. If you passed the laws that are required to stop the spills, stop the dumping, stop the pollution, and stop the poisoning, you'll never have to do the funding later.

It strikes me...and I will not be bold enough to speak on the American side, but on the Canadian side, when I look at the people who have the authority to solve these problems, we have overlapping responsibilities.

We have Fisheries, Ministry of the Environment, Health, Tourism, it just goes on and on. The only problem is there's no overlapping responsibility. No one does anything. They have meetings, they pass intent, and then the lobby groups come in and wide it all out and we're back to where we started. Thank you very much. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you very much. Derek Shearer.

DEREK SHEARER (Water Policy Director, Clean Wisconsin): Hi, my name is Derek Shearer. I am the Water Policy Director for Clean Wisconsin, a state-wide, member-driven organization.

I'd like to echo many of the thoughts spoken here tonight, especially those from our folks from Canada regarding sewage and bovine sewage.

We would like to see the Agreement strengthened. We are concerned that mercury levels in our fish are rising, that E.coli levels on our beaches are rising, and that sewage is flowing too freely into our Lakes.

Clean Wisconsin is challenging the wastewater permit given to Wisconsin Energy in Oak Creek, Wisconsin, because the permit gives lip service to the mercury standards in the Water Quality Agreement, but allows the solution to pollution to be dilution.

We are working to limit bovine sewage and car droppings that are a huge problem here and region-wide, with soft path solutions to stormwater problems. We're also looking not only at the well-publicized Milwaukee sewage overflows, but at the sewage coming into the Lakes from Ashland, Duluth, and elsewhere throughout the Great Lakes, and in Wisconsin.

We think there are opportunities for the IJC to limit pollution entering the Great Lakes through strengthening the Agreement and embarking on an educational campaign that focuses on health issues, takes on the threat to recreation and tourism today to lead to cleaner water and a healthier future for the Lakes and its people. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: I've come to the end of the pile of papers here. However, if there is anyone else who wishes to speak, we would be more than

happy to hear you. I think I saw the gentleman on the right, my right. Would you tell us your name and your affiliation, if you are affiliated with an organization?

MATTHEW KOHL: My name is Matthew Kohl. I guess I came here tonight more listening than anything else, but I...the Brown County Conservation Alliance and the Bear Creek Preservation Foundation.

And it strikes me, listening to the things that people are saying, that although most people seem to be say, oh, the Agreement is somewhat successful, at least in many ways, it is not succeeded...it is hopefully succeeding.

I can't think of any rivers that have caught on fire in my lifetime. I have actually canoed on the upper Cuyahoga, which was the one that caught on fire and was quite lovely.

But tern species going extinct, continuing problems, unknowns into the future, and it makes me feel I should speak for the people who can't be here or have something else going on, or one of those other things.

And I would say succeeding, not succeeded. More work in the same vein, pushing in the same direction, more work on specifics that are coming along and being more obvious now...invasive, continuing to be more positive.

I heard your comment about the study and I understand. There's always another question in science. I do think that in many cases, there is more information to be found out, particularly biotechnology. Nanotechnology may or may not be scary depending on how firmly citizens and government decide to

keep an eye on those issues and understand those issues, and our future may be hazy in those remarks...in those areas.

Again, I hope we are succeeding. I know we are not succeeded yet. And I think it a fair statement that most people who couldn't come tonight would say something of the sort. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you for your comments. I think taking a look at the Agreement now, it's been 20 years, a lot has happened, we do have a lot of data, there's new technology, it's timely...not only timely for the Agreement, but with what's going on, at least in the United States, with the Council of Great Lakes Governors hopefully reaching some conclusion with Annex 2001 on diversions, on the diversion issue, and President Bush's Legacy Act and the federal government on the U.S. side's collaboration, which somebody talked about, a collective effort.

One of the reasons for that effort is to bring all federal agencies to the table and to figure out what roles each will play and where they overlap. So I think it's an exciting time for the Great Lakes, there's a lot going on, and I think it's going to take cooperation from everyone to make it really happen.

And I haven't forgotten you, if you would like to speak.

DONALD FRIESEN: Well, I sort of put the blame on Milwaukee for some of the problems we've got, and the problems are there, and the blame remains where it should be.

But I'd like to know how many people concerned with government or local offices or any of the organizations that oversee the cleanup and everything that we have or should be having, how many are here tonight?

The other thing would be is we have a deal going on in Wisconsin and Green Bay especially on the water, on the runoff water, and people are being taxed on impervious surfaces that they have because the runoff going in, it's got to be cleaned up.

Yet we have filling up of all of the wetlands, they're building on it. There's a shining example right off of 41 if you go north, you can take a look at it, what they're doing on the lake site, or the bay site, and they're doing it in a lot of other places, too.

But I'd like to know how many people were invited or didn't show up?

IRENE BROOKS: Everyone was invited, and I'm really pleased at how many did show up, so I am very encouraged. And we have...staff has reported that we've had e-mails on our Web site, on the computer that comes to the office, so people are paying attention.

I notice a hand up in the back. Would you like to speak, gentleman?

CARL LITTRELL: I think it's great that we've got so much public input and people have the opportunity to speak on the issues.

IRENE BROOKS: Could we know who you are, your name, please?

CARL LITTRELL: I'm Carl Littrell, I'm from Ann Arbor, Michigan. Just before I left Ann Arbor, one of the following services I subscribe to noted



that the EPA has proposed that pharmaceuticals be designated what's called a universal waste, that is a category within RICRA (?) that handles common waste like lead acid batteries, antifreeze, fluorescent light bulbs, etc.

Given the strong suspicion of endocrine disruptors in the Great Lakes basin and certain other things, has the IJC taken a position on this proposed listing of waste pharmaceuticals as a universal waste in the RICRA scheme of things?

IRENE BROOKS: You're asking if we have taken a position?

CARL LITTRELL: Yes, and will you be commenting within the prescribed comment period to the EPA on it?

IRENE BROOKS: Jim, I have to call on you, it's something that you will have to answer. This is Jim Chandler, our counsel.

JIM CHANDLER (Legal Advisor, U.S. Section, International Joint Commission): Is the question whether the Commission will be commenting on EPA proposals?

CARL LITTRELL: Yes.

JIM CHANDLER: The Commission's practice is not to get involved in specific domestic processes in either country, the reason being if they get involved in one, then they won't be able to stop, where do you stop and where do you draw the line.

And they tend to, over the years, comment in a more general forum such as a biennial report or a special report to governments. That has been the practice to date.

JACK BLANEY: But in our last biennial report, we did recommend to the two governments that they attend to new chemicals that are being introduced into the Lakes, and we've made that recommendation to them.

And then, secondly, your comments tonight will be recorded and passed on to the governments.

CARL LITTRELL: Well, that's well and good, but you know, as a lot of people have expressed tonight, we would like to see a forward-looking and proactive role for the IJC.

And being that, you know, these things are coming up and the ability to collect data from analysis of hazardous waste, streams, you know, from the waste pharmaceutical business will, I believe, be curtailed if indeed waste pharmaceuticals are declared a universal waste under the RICRA scheme of things, we will be losing sort of a database which would be mined to determine whether some of the things that we suspect with endocrine disruptors and other things are truly so.

And so, you know, I was just wondering if indeed there would be any specific comment from the IJC on this proposed reclassification?

IRENE BROOKS: I think you got the answer from Jim Chandler.

CARL LITTRELL: All right, thank you very much.

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you. There's a young woman at the back of the room.

CHRISTINE FOSSEN RATTIS: Hi, my name is Christine Fossenrattis. I am a member on the board of directors of the Clean Water Action Council, I am a member of the Isaac Walton League, and I am also a biology/environmental science teacher at East Pier High School (?). So I feel that I am here not only representing our community, but also our youth.

I will not take any more time to reiterate all of these extremely important points recognizing that the Agreement is necessary and has done a good job, but certainly needs to be move forward, and we cannot take any steps backward.

The few points that I would really like to point out...and one in particular that concerns me is that in 1978, according to your brochure, it states that the Agreement called for the virtual elimination of the input of persistent toxic substances following a zero discharge philosophy, and I don't see that.

Zero discharge is not happening. And with that, if it was called for, the enforcement is not taking place. And that's my big concern, is that even though we may call or the government may ask for these things...

I know somebody mentioned that there is inconsistent data collection that needs to be taking place. I think it's really important that we don't allow our government agencies...that they do not allow companies and corporations and industries to legally basically dump these pollutants in our environment.

And in regards to our youth, I know that they are fearful that they will be the first generation to go backwards as far as having a life better than that of their parents. I know that they fear that in a year and a half, their drinking water will be coming out of Lake Michigan.

And what are they drinking? I know that the students that are here are probably shaking in their boots right now after this, knowing that in a year and a half, they're going to be drinking, what, sewage water and E.coli and whatever else is in our waterways.

So I think it's really important that if we do call for this zero discharge, that we follow it up with adequate enforcement of those regulations. Thank you for sneaking me in. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you. Anyone else? Yes, Sir.

TOM DILSART: Hi, my name is Tom Dilsart. I live in Alway (?), on the Fox River. I have a lot of concerns. We were at Lake Mead last year. They said that the water level of Lake Mead had gone down 80 feet, and Lake Mead has a frontage of over 1,000 miles, it's a pretty big lake.

What if the Great Lakes go down four feet? How is that going to change our environment?

I am concerned about the future for my children, the same thing that happened to my Dad. He died of asbestos poisoning – what am I going to die from and what are my kids going to die from?

I'm concerned about things like that. I'm concerned about my Dad's brother; he's dying right now, same thing. How many people here are going to be dying from unknown contaminants? That's all. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you. Did I see a hand go up in the back, at the rear of the room? Yes?

LINDA GRAY: My name is Linda Gray and I am from Chano (?), Wisconsin. And I think one of the most important things that needs to be done is to bring awareness to the public and to bring awareness to our youth.

And in that endeavour, I have the fortunate experience to be able to do a documentary on Gaylord Nelson, and one thing that he said that stood out and that I remember, and he said, you know, 30 years ago, when all of the laws and everything was passed in the United States, people could see the pollution, the effects of it, the river, all of the black smoke.

But today, all of the chemicals and everything, you don't see a lot of the fish, the dead fish floating around and everything, it's all hidden. And people have a tendency to think that everything's all right, it's not as bad as it is.

And also, the economy, with the way that the economy is going now and everything, people aren't going to focus a lot on the environmental issues. And even in this country, within the past few years, we've been seeing those laws that Gaylord Nelson fought so hard for – water quality and air quality – being bashed.

And when he...as his last few years and everything, he became a little disheartened because everything that he worked for for the past 30 years is being attacked.

Now the one thing that I have seen from everybody...and as far as awareness, and I can speak for myself, I am probably the most unaware person in this room. I have a lot to learn. Everyone in this room probably knows a lot more than I do.

But for that very reason, I am starting a program to teach kids how to go out and document environmental issues, and one of them is on the Great Lakes. And they'll be going out to Colorado, they'll be documenting on the Missouri River basin, and they'll be documenting the Ogallala reservoir, which its water is being depleted faster than it's being replenished.

And that, we have...the Midwest has the breadbasket today basically because of the Ogallala aquifer.

Now one of the issues with the Great Lakes could be other states'...water receding or being used from the Great Lakes. And if that does happen, then what's going to be the future of the Great Lakes?

And that movie that this lady was talking about, in a desert, may not really be an impossibility, when you have everything that's involved with it and when you have the climate change.

No one really knows the extent the Missouri River today is experiencing difficulties because of the climate change. People are actually having problems with drinking water and not even getting enough drinking water.

And so they have had these problems in the past. They are the forerunners of what can happen to the Great Lakes as well. And so these issues really need to be taken into consideration and there needs to be more proactive action taking place.

And our government doesn't need to be giving sweet words without actions. Because when you use sweet words without actions, in the end, it turns around and it packs you, and then you have trouble throughout both continents.

And what they need is real action. And that's not saying that nobody hasn't done anything, but what I'm saying is people really need to have awareness and there really is not a lot of awareness.

I could go out on the street and I could bet you that I could go out on the street and ask, and a lot of people will not know what's going on. And when that happens, that means nothing will really be done. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you very much. Anyone else? Yes, Sir.

BILL CROSS: My name is Bill Cross. I am from Green Bay. I came for my granddaughter.

The word legacy was used a little bit earlier tonight. My concern is our generation may leave a legacy for our children and our grandchildren, an environment that we wouldn't to live in, and we do it for our own gain.

And I think if we think seriously about it, we would not choose to bill our children and bill our grandchildren in their overuse of our environment today. And I certainly don't want to see that happen with the Great Lakes, not with the air, not with the land. So we all need to speak out. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you. Anyone else? Yes, Sir.

DAN FARRAH (Walleyes for Tomorrow): First of all, I'd like to say thanks for coming and having this public meeting. It's good for everybody to come out and express their views so that everybody knows the depth of concern that everybody has with these topics.

My name is Dan Farrah, I am a local doctor of chiropractic. I also run the Walleyes for Tomorrow organization here in town for about the past 13 years. And my comments are going to be simple and I'm going to keep them concise.

Fifty some odd years ago, Bay Beach, which is a beach right outside the mouth of the river here in the local waters of Green Bay, connected to Lake Michigan and the Great Lakes system, was closed due to pollution.

It was the first public beach closed in the United States history due to pollution concerns and as of yet has not been reopened. We're going on a second generation, 50 some odd years where my generation has been shortchanged.

I'm only 43 years old, I've never been able to use the public waterways in our area to the effect that we have. We have some beautiful waterways in the area; unfortunately, the contaminants that have been placed there by external sources have made it inaccessible for people to use.



With the proliferation of the watercraft and things, people are continuing to use them and you are seeing health diseases, endometriosis is another one. I blew out an eardrum as a water skier back in the 80s, and while I was in the emergency room, the physician said that they had over 60 cases of hepatitis reported from people casually using the water in the early 80s.

Granted, it has cleaned up somewhat. I still have some concerns about the amount of pollution permits being extended to big corporations and allowing toxins to be placed into our waterways.

In addition to that, what a lot of people don't know is that the chemicals that they use to treat the water to make it safe to drink are also human carcinogens in higher doses, and a cumulative effect takes place over time with the body, and those things can become harmful as well.

So I guess my point is this has been going on for over 50 some years, it's time to quit talking about, you know, studies and just fess up and pay the piper.

The chemicals have been placed there, they weren't coming from nature; it's time we clean them up and get things out of there and strengthen this agreement and proliferate it for the next generation so they don't have to suffer like my generation has. Thank you. (APPLAUSE)

IRENE BROOKS: Thank you. Anybody else? Going once...now's your chance. If you think of something to say in the middle of the night, you can e-mail us, you could write to us, you can even call us. You can call Jack. (LAUGHS) You can call the 800 number, we'd be happy to hear from you.

You can also check the Web site to see comments, general comments that have been gathered throughout all of these meetings.

We thank you for coming. It was truly a delight to see you all here. Thank you and have a good night. (APPLAUSE)

\*\*\*\*\*