

Memorandum**To: Executive Committee Members****From: Karen****Date: December 23, 1992****RE: Grant abstract for Laidlaw AOC proposal**

On the following pages I will outline two scenarios for an Area of Concern grant to be sent to the Laidlaw Foundation. Laidlaw's deadline is January 4 so I will need your thoughts by December 31. Because our offices are closed from December 24 to January 4, you can either fax me your comments c/o David Murphy at the following number (303)322-9774 or you can call me after December 31 at home at (716)884-6750 or mail your comments to my house at 359 Lafayette Ave., Buffalo, New York 14213.

Over the past few months the Board has had several discussions about the need to deal with the problems with the remedial action plans and address the larger issue of how we are going to achieve cleanup and restoration in the areas of concern. One of the basic themes of these discussions is that we need to bring citizens in the Areas of Concern together again.

The two proposals outlined below reflect two viewpoints on bringing people together and on addressing RAPs and restoration of the areas of concern.

PROPOSAL #1

The focus of this proposal is on the implementation of remedial action plans. The goals of the proposal are:

1. To assess progress to implement the citizens' agenda for RAPs developed at our 1990 workshop (RAP Revival).
2. Identify specific programs needed to protect and restore the Areas of Concern.
3. Build citizens' consensus and strategy for obtaining these programs.

Goals #1: Assess Progress

Program Activity: Great Lakes United would identify 3 Areas of Concern that were representative of all AOCs and evaluate progress to clean up these areas. This evaluation would look at five parameters: achievement of zero discharge,

cleanup of contaminated sites, cleanup of contaminated sediments, land use and other measures taken to prevent recontamination, and the role of the RAP in promoting progress or defining a direction. This assessment should also take a hard look at the institutional roles of the states, provinces, federal governments and the IJC in cleaning up the Areas of Concern and in overseeing the development of remedial action plans.

The purpose of this type of assessment is not to define the problems in the areas of concern, but to look at existing programs and their relationship to the RAP and to the guiding principles of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement. This assessment then becomes a concrete statement of the programmatic impediments to cleaning up and restoring the areas of concern.

This assessment would be written up and distributed to all workshop participants in advance. The assessment would also be presented at the IJC Biennial meeting.

Goal #2: Identify programs needed to restore areas of concern

Program Activity: After reviewing the assessment GLU would develop detailed draft citizens' agenda. The agenda will focus on the five areas reviewed in the assessment. At the 1990 workshop we drafted a citizens' agenda. The distinction with this second agenda is that it would have to be much more specific. For example, under achieving zero discharge in the areas of concern we might want to recommend that uniform toxics use reduction programs be developed in all the states and provinces modelled after the New Jersey and Massachusetts programs. The agenda would have to provide an outline of the specific components of such a program.

Goal #3: Strategizing and coalition building around agenda

Program Activity: GLU has a RAP Task Force. The Task Force would meet prior to the workshop to do three activities: review the assessment, critique the agenda, and develop an agenda for the workshop.

Hold a citizens workshop on restoration programs in the AOCs. We would bring in 2 citizen representatives from each of the Areas of Concern. The first day would focus on achieving agreement about the citizens' agenda; the second day would focus on developing a strategy for ensuring that programmatic elements are implemented.

Key targets in the strategy include the IJC Biennial Meeting, the State of the Lakes Conference in 1993, IJC Commissioner appointments, and new EPA administrator and Environment Minister.

PROPOSAL #2

The purpose of this proposal is somewhat the same as the previous one except that we would focus on one specific item that impacts AOC restoration -- toxic use reduction and zero discharge. The purpose of this proposal is to assess implementation of these two GLWQA principles in the areas of concern and how the RAPS impact or do not impact upon reductions. The three goals for this program are:

1. To assess progress to implement zero discharge and toxic use reduction in the areas of concern.
2. Identify specific programs needed to achieve these two principles.
3. Build citizens' consensus and strategy for obtaining programmes.

Goal #1: Assess progress

Program Activity: GLU would look at three areas of concern that are representative of all areas of concern to identify whether progress is being made to eliminate the use of persistent toxic substances and reduce the use of other toxic chemicals. We would also have to review the effectiveness of existing regulatory programmes to achieve zero discharge and toxics use reduction.

Goal #2: Identify specific programs needed

Program Activity: After reviewing the assessment GLU would develop detailed draft citizens' agenda. At the 1990 workshop we drafted a citizens' agenda. The distinction with this agenda is that it would have to be much more specific.

In this agenda we need to outline specific steps that need to be taken, both regulatory and legislative.

In addition, we should identify and develop some key pilot programs that could be instituted in specific areas of concern. These pilots should probably focus on developing green technologies and green industries in the Basin and could be a logical tie to the Labor and Environment Task Force.

Goal #3: Coalition building and strategizing

Programme Activity: GLU has a RAP Task Force. The Task Force would meet prior to the workshop to do three activities: review the assessment, critique the agenda, and develop an agenda for the workshop.

GLU would sponsor a citizens' workshop on achieving zero discharge and toxic use reduction in the areas of concern. The workshop would have two focuses. First, to provide citizens with a clear agenda about what is needed to achieve zero discharge in the areas of concern. Secondly, to prioritize and develop an internal strategy about how we will obtain these programs. For example, let's say that out of this workshop citizens decided that the top priority was to wage a legislative fight to obtain toxic use reduction laws in Ontario, Ohio, and New York (probably a bad example). The second day would focus on developing the skeleton of a strategy for achieving this and establishing an ongoing structure for implementing that strategy.

As you can tell, the purpose of the assessment is really to highlight the fact that RAPs cannot be implemented fully because they are not legally binding and the regulatory programs are not in place to ensure that they are implemented. I also think it is important that we think about innovative non-regulatory programs that could be used as pilots and models.

I would really appreciate any thoughts that people have. In addition, at the last Board Meeting it was decided that the Executive Committee would review and approve grant proposals or at least abstracts of grant proposals. I believe that in concept the Board has wanted another citizens' AOC conference. I need to

know whether either of these proposals reflects what people want and what they think is needed.

BUDGET

Staff		
(1 full time person/6 months)		\$14,000
Food and Lodging		
86 participants x \$85 Stella Niagara		\$ 7,310
6 staff/facilitators		510
Travel		
86 participants x \$200		17,200
6 staff/facilitators		600
Supplies		150
Copying		
Invitations/Workshop packets		
(92 x 100 pages x .06\$)		550
Mailing		
Invitations/Workshop packets		
(92 x 2 x \$2.00)		380
Printing		
Agenda		
(500 copies printed)		?
Phone		
Regular calls		
(\$100/month)		600
Conference Calls		
(2 calls at \$400)		800
Task Force Meeting		
Lodging (10 x \$85)		850
Travel (10 x \$200)		2,000
TOTAL		\$44,950