

Jm

SEP 17 1993



GREAT LAKES UNITED

September 13, 1993

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Terry L. Yonker

SUBJECT: September Board Meeting Update

Enclosed are the minutes of our July 25th Board of Directors meeting in Chicago and the agenda for our September 24-26 Board meeting in Buffalo. The meeting will be held at the Best Western Inn--Downtown, 510 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, New York (Telephone: 716-886-8333). A map showing the location of the Best Western is attached.

I was informed that several Board members were not aware that there has been an additional personnel change within GLU. I thought that everyone had been notified. Karen Murphy has decided to leave GLU and join a local consulting firm to further her career goals. It is my understanding that she has been considering this move for some time. However, her resignation comes at an inopportune time for the organization, considering our current reduced staff level. A decision has been made by the Finance and Executive Committees that Karen's position will not be filled before the end of FY 1993.

Mary (Memo) Oshei has been hired as a temporary employee to work on our fall fund raising campaign. She will be working through the end of December. A decision will be made later as to whether this position will be carried into the next fiscal year.

See you on September 24th.

septbmt.093

**BOARD OF DIRECTORS MEETING
SEPTEMBER 24-26, 1993
BUFFALO, NEW YORK**

AGENDA

FRIDAY, SEPTEMBER 24

8:00pm Briefing on the GLU Fundraising Project
9:30 Recess

SATURDAY, SEPTEMBER 25

8:30am Breakfast
8:45 Strategic Planning

Jeffery's Report on the Office/Staff Review
Continued Development of the Plan

12:00 Lunch (Catered)
12:45 Board of Directors Business Meeting

Announcements/Communications
Minutes--July Board Meeting
President's Report
Executive Director's Report
Treasurers' Reports

2:30 Draft FY 1994 Budgets
3:30 Issues Updates

Great Lakes Initiative
Winter Navigation
Mud Creek Diversion
Other

4:00 Annual Performance Review--Executive Director
5:00 Recess

SUNDAY, SEPTEMBER 26

8:30am Breakfast
8:45 NAFTA Issues

Rally/Demonstration--October 2nd--Niagara Falls
Letter to Congress
Toronto Forum

9:30 Collective Bargaining Agreement
10:30 IJC Biennial Meeting
11:30 Adjourn

September 14, 1993

Tony Clark,
Assistant Deputy Minister,
Environment Canada,
351 St. Joseph Blvd.
Hull, Quebec.

Fax (819) 959-9452

Dear Tony,

Re: NGO Position on ARET and the Next Steps

Further to our telephone conference yesterday, the purpose of this letter is to confirm the constructive steps we discussed with you to further the implementation of a sunset chemical program in Canada.

These steps are as follows:

1. NGO members officially withdraw from ARET.
2. While withdrawing from ARET, ARET NGO members would be invited to participate in a pilot project. This pilot project, which has been outlined in a memo by Colin Isaacs and Bill Wilton dated September 10, 1993 could be called the "Virtual Elimination Pilot Project" or some such name.
3. The terms of reference, timelines, nature of participation and expected results would be negotiated over the next week or so with those NGOs interested in participating in the pilot project. Clearly, the expectation of the pilot project is an efficient, effective and productive exercise.
4. NGO funding for ARET would "roll-over" into funding for participation into the pilot project. CEN would be vested with the coordinating and networking duties. The groups directly participating in the pilot project would be eligible for research and participation funding. CEN may ask for supplemental funding after the dimensions of the pilot project are further outlined.

5. Depending on the outcome of the pilot project, NGO members could consider rejoining the ARET consultation.

.../2

We appreciate the efforts you are making to address the concerns we have raised.

Finally, we re-iterate that we can only speak for the undersigned groups.

We look forward to hearing from you at your earliest convenience about this proposal. Janine Ferretti will be contacting you tomorrow to further discuss these steps.

Yours very truly,

Janine Ferretti
per Am

Janine Ferretti
Pollution Probe

Chris Rolfe
per Am

Chris Rolfe
West Coast Environmental Law Association

Myles Kitagawa
per Am

Myles Kitagawa
Toxics Watch Society of Alberta

September 17, 1993

Tony Clarke
Assistant Deputy Minister
Environment Canada
351 St. Joseph Blvd.
Hull, Quebec

By FAX: 819-953-9452

Dear Mr. Clarke.

Position of Non-Governmental Organizations in the Accelerated
Reduction/Elimination Toxics (ARET) Consultation

The purpose of this letter is to clarify the position of non-government organization (NGOs) in the Accelerated Reduction/Elimination Toxics (ARET). As you may be aware, the NGOs have actively participated in this consultation since its inception. A year and one-half into the process, we are extremely disappointed in the progress of this consultation.

Despite our time, effort and organizational resources, the consultation has not resulted in any action to improve the quality of the environment or added greater protection for workers.

The expectations of the NGOs for the ARET consultation has always been clear. We thought it would result in a legislated program directed toward eliminating the most hazardous of substances. Instead of proceeding with this fairly simple goal, ARET has been transformed into a complex and incredibly cumbersome initiative which remains, by and large, far from complete.

NGOs have many concerns regarding the ARET consultation. This letter will not list all the issues of concern by NGOs on ARET. It will catalogue only a few of these issues.

The Elimination versus Reduction Issue

From the very earlier stages of ARET, NGOs clearly stated their understanding of the purposes of the consultation - it was to identify the most hazardous toxic substances and then develop strategies for their phase-out.

Why were the NGOs so insistent on elimination of these substances?

(a) **Government Commitments:** The goal of virtual elimination is articulated in the Green Plan and is a fundamental policy objective of the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

(b) **Failure of Pollution Control:** For the most hazardous substances, pollution control has not been sufficient to protect the environment. End-of-the-pipe controls are incomplete and only shift the problem to another medium.

(c) **Lack of Worker Protection:** The use and generation of persistent toxic substances endanger the health of workers by exposing them directly to these substances.

(d) **No Safe Levels:** When employing the precautionary approach, an underlying assumption is that there is no assimilative capacity in the environment for persistent toxic substances. Elimination is the only appropriate long-term strategy.

The controversy over what is meant by "elimination" was, in the end, surprising. The NGOs' position had always been explicit and consistent. Yet, despite 18 months of consultation and seven meetings of the Elimination Task Force, not only is ARET no further ahead on the issue, it has taken many giant steps backward. For example, with respect to the last industry proposal dated July 7, 1983 on the issue of elimination, there remains a host of unresolved issues. A non-exhaustive list includes:

(a) **Hazard Criteria versus Risk Assessment:** Industry proposed the inclusion of risk assessment as a precondition to action on candidate chemicals. NGOs had been under the assumption that the basis of ARET was to identify candidates for elimination based on the characteristics of chemicals (that is, hazards), rather than risk assessment methodologies.

(b) **Use versus Release:** The focus of industry remains on releases rather than generation and use. NGOs have been consistent in arguing for true "prevention" that attempts to reduce both generation and use of persistent toxic chemicals.

(c) **Definition of Virtual Elimination:** Industry suggests that the definition of virtual elimination is reduction to "acceptable levels." NGOs have followed the definition of the International Joint Commission which views virtual elimination as a two prong concept - turning off the tap for chemicals in use now, while remediating those chemicals already in the environment. In this context, there is no acceptable level, in the long term, for persistent toxic substances.

(d) **In-Plant and Out-of-Plant Releases:** Industry seems to define pollution as anything "entering the natural environment." NGOs refuse to draw an artificial and arbitrary line between chemicals found in the plant and out of the plant since both have the potential to harm both the environment and humans.

(e) **Purpose of Candidate List:** Industry assumes the chemical selection criteria will identify chemicals for "action." That action may include no action depending on costs, feasibility and societal demands. NGOs assumed that the candidate list would identify substances for phase-out.

(f) **Exclusion of Metals:** Industry suggests that heavy metals be excluded from the proposed strategy. NGOs have always proposed the elimination of inputs of all persistent toxic substances caused by human activities.

(g) **Single Chemicals versus Classes:** An underlying assumption all the way through the debate was that the goal was elimination of "substances" despite the constant argument of NGOs of the necessity to examine classes of substances.

In our view, by backtracking on such issues, it is clear that industry is not serious about the ARET consultation. In our view, with the nature and direction of proposals put forth by industry, it is apparent that they intended to frustrate the

process. They know or ought to have known that such a proposal would have provoked NGOs to rethink their status in the consultation.

Lack of Leadership of Environment Canada

Perhaps one of the most perplexing aspects of the ARET Consultation is the role of Environment Canada. Their view that they are only a "stakeholder" in the process created a lost opportunity for the department to take more of a leadership role in the consultation. The lack of a strong leadership role by the department created a policy vacuum for the discussion on the issues related to persistent toxic substances.

One of the few exceptions was the proposal on the definition of elimination proposed by Francois Guilment at the May meeting in Vancouver. Although NGOs had significant problems with the proposal, it was a positive and constructive contribution that really focused consultation and delineated the issues at hand.

Labour Concerns

Regarding labour concerns, the NGOs see the phasing out of specific substances as one option within a range of pollution prevention strategies as opposed to the traditional reliance on end-of-the-pipe controls. ARET failed to address both a general pollution prevention system (since it was aimed only at a limited number of specific substances) and to focus on pollution prevention at the expense of emission controls.

The focus on discharge releases also meant that workplace pollution and worker protection were never addressed in ARET, contrary to our position paper of February 1992 and despite repeated attempts to put workplace issues on the ARET agenda.

Nor was there any attempt to address worker displacement issues (alternative work, retraining, and compensation) in the light of the ambitious aims of reduction and elimination, though the final proposals to emanate from the other caucuses were so feeble that the employment impacts would have been minimal.

NGOs Position on ARET

In light of the comments expressed above, the NGOs listed below have decided to withdraw participation in the ARET consultation. No doubt many will be disappointed with this stance. However, no one can be more disappointed than the NGOs. Their sincere intention was to accelerate preventative action on those chemicals that are considered the most hazardous to the Canadian environment. Our investment in time and resources has failed to result in this basic objective. It seems that ARET will have not "accelerated" indicating that voluntary initiatives are no more rapid or efficacious than a regulatory approach.

SENT BY:

; 9-20-93 ; 10:26 ;

John Jackson→716 886 0303

:# 7

SENT BY: GEN

; 8-17-83 ; 17:08 ;

61358372864

John Jackson # 54 5

ARET, as far as it did progress, was not a waste of time. It brought forth fundamental and crucial issues of environmental policy. Various activities resulted in constructive reports. It is unfortunate that all the stakeholders did not have the courage to further new approaches that have been embraced with success elsewhere in the world. It is not surprising Canada will follow, rather than lead, other countries in their quest for a sustainable nation.

Next Steps

While the NCS members are leaving ARET, some NGO members would still welcome an invitation to participate in other consultations pertaining to the furtherance of a sunset chemical regime.

Yours very truly,

David Bennett
Canadian Labour Congress

John Jackson
Great Lakes United

Paul Muldoon
Pollution Probe

Myles Kitigawa
Toxics Watch Society of Alberta

Chris Rolfe
West Coast Environmental Law Association

Great Lakes United



STATEMENT OF TERRY L. YONKER
TO
THE INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION
ON
THE FINAL DRAFT REPORT
OF
THE LAKE LEVELS REFERENCE STUDY BOARD
SEPTEMBER 11, 1993

My name is Terry L. Yonker, Executive Director of Great Lakes United. Great Lakes United is an international coalition of 150 environmental, conservation, business, labor, and native people's organizations representing one and a half million people in Canada and the United States. Great Lakes United is dedicated to the protection and restoration of the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin ecosystem.

In January of 1993, the Board of Directors of Great Lakes United adopted a resolution reaffirming the organization's opposition to the construction of major additional water level control structures. The resolution also reaffirmed GLU's support for land use management measures as the most acceptable and effective methods to alleviate adverse impacts from fluctuating water levels in the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River ecosystem.

an international coalition to conserve and protect the Great Lakes/St. Lawrence River ecosystem

Great Lakes United supports the decision of the Levels Reference Study Board to recommend against the adoption of five-lake and three-lake regulation measures that would dampen fluctuations in Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River levels and flows. The cost of such measures, both in construction and operation costs and environmental degradation, are too high to be offset by modest, temporary reductions in erosion and flooding of shore owner's property in the middle lakes. The downstream damage to the shoreline and wetlands of the St. Lawrence River that would have to be mitigated (up to \$4 billion) is totally unacceptable. One of the key principles used in this study to evaluate various measures was the one which called for even distribution of impacts and benefits throughout the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin. The attitude expressed by shore owners in the middle lakes appears to be a lack of concern about the serious downstream effects of regulation measures on the Canadian section of the St. Lawrence River.

Great Lakes United also supports the decision of the Levels Reference Study Board to recommend the adoption of land use and shoreline management measures that would prevent future damages due to flooding and erosion, including: the purchase of at risk land, setback requirements, shoreline alteration requirements, real estate disclosures, and a flood hazard insurance program that discourages development at the shore.

40 million people live in the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin. By comparison, slightly over 100,000 riparians own property on the shores of the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River representing less than 1% of the Basin population. The current market value of those properties does not exceed \$200,000 seventy-five percent of the time. Less than 50% of shoreline residents live there year-round. Less than 5% of shoreline residents experience erosion or flood damage to their actual dwellings. Most damage is limited to developed yards and beaches. This information is taken directly from the riparian survey conducted as part of the Level Reference Study.

Consider the following argument. If approximately 5,000 property owners are experiencing even modest damage to their dwellings from flooding and erosion caused by fluctuating water levels, and if approximately \$5 billion is expended to implement the three-lake regulation measure, and if the market value of shoreline property is less than \$200,000 in 75% of the affected properties, then it would not be outrageous to suggest that the \$5 billion be spent to buy out properties at risk and alleviate the problem altogether. \$5 billion spent to buy 5,000 at risk properties would amount to \$1 million per property. At current market value, money would be left over.

Consider the damage to the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin Ecosystem that would result from the construction and operation of control measures under the tree-lake regulation plan advocated by riparian groups. Water quality would be degraded. In the wetland sites studied, nearly 30% of wetlands would be destroyed. The wetlands would either be deprived of the benefits of natural fluctuations in lake levels or they would be inundated and drowned out during the growing season. Suitable fish spawning areas and wildlife habitat in many affected wetlands would cease to exist. The fisheries of Lake Michigan and Lake Ontario are already on the verge of collapse. Nearly one third of the threatened or endangered birds in the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin Ecosystem are totally dependent upon wetlands for breeding success. The construction of sea walls and other shore protection structures further degrades habitat for threatened and endangered shorebirds and other shoreline plant and animal species.

What about the interests of the other 40 million Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin residents who are not riparians but depend totally on a healthy and sustainable Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin Ecosystem for their very existence. If the health of the Ecosystem is degraded, it will become less able to sustain the existing large population in the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin. Diversions, consumptive uses, and pollution have already impacted the Ecosystem. Further abuse in the form of lake level regulation will de-stabilize the Ecosystem even more. Enough is enough.

We do not know exactly what the future holds for the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin Ecosystem. It is the opinion of many scientists who are knowledgeable about the climate of the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin Ecosystem, myself included, that global warming will reduce water levels by up to a meter or more in the next 50 years. While the precise impact of increased global temperature on precipitation is speculative, the impact of increased global temperature on evaporation can be predicted with greater certainty. Lower lake levels will likely result from greater evaporation, not less precipitation. Data I have seen from every sampling station on earth show consistently an exponential increase in the levels of carbon dioxide and other green house gases in the atmosphere. Some may debate the nature of the impact of these increased levels of greenhouse gases, but there will most certainly be an impact. That impact will likely be a decrease in Great Lakes water levels, decline in water quality, a decrease in shore ice to protect shorelines from winter storm flooding and erosion events, and a drastic decrease in water flow through the connecting channels and out the St. Lawrence River.

All of the previously stated negative impacts of new lake level regulation together with the uncertainty over the impact of climatic changes on the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin Ecosystem, all help make the argument against water level regulation--especially the three-lake measure being supported by a few shoreline owners.

Draft
Great Lakes United
Decision-Making Procedures

Great Lakes United is an international coalition of diverse individuals and groups advocating for a healthy ecosystem for the Great Lakes basin and St. Lawrence River. Great Lakes fulfills its charge to its membership by : promotinig and coordinating citizen action; intititating environmental education programs; and developing effective policy initiatives.

Great Lakes United will make decisions by modified consensus. The organization will strive for consensus in all instances of decision-making, and will make decisions by voting only when consensus cannot be reached and the decision cannot be deferred.

Consensus is a group-centred way of making decisions, wherein we build a collective sense, then a conclusion, on the matter at hand. An issue is identified, the meeting builds an understanding of the different concerns and the options available, and a mutually acceptable solution or plan of action is developed, by synthesizing the alternatives into something that belongs to the entire group.

Great Lakes United will rely on consensus building tools to assist in their decision-making, including :

- "Go-arounds", wherein, usually early in the discussion, all members of the group speak to the issue, and offer their comments. This serves to get all the issues "on the table" and ensures that all members of the group are heard from.
- "Straw Votes", wherein, usually after the discussion has been in process and a number of views have been expressed, members of the group are asked to indicate a preference for one option or another, without making a commitment to a particular position. This allows the group to see what direction a discussion is heading at that moment, and provides quick information about how the group is weighting towards one option or the other.
- Delegation/Deferral, wherein a discussion is delegated to a smaller group for more discussion (usually consisting of those with differing views, if there is disagreement) and for the development of a recommendation to the whole group. This allows all members of the group to give the matter further thought, and to receive more information, and it allows those with dissenting views to explore them more fully and come to a mutually acceptable conclusion.

When consensus cannot be reached and a majority of the group has concluded that the decision cannot be deferred, to allow further discussion, seventy percent of non-abstaining votes will be required to carry a decision.

In all instances of decision-making, either when a decision has been reached by consensus or when a vote has been used to reach conclusion, dissenting views will be recorded in the record of the discussion and decision.

Meeting Procedures for Great Lakes United Meetings

- meetings will be chaired by the chair, by the vice-chair in the absence of the chair, or by a person designated by the chair and accepted by the group
- items will be on the agenda for decision, information, or discussion without need for immediate decision. The chair should clarify what the purpose of the item is
- items for decision should begin with background information, and a recommendation
- discussion should relate to the item or recommendation on the floor
- new items, arising in the course of a discussion, should be deferred until discussion on the current item has concluded
- complicated items should normally be referred to committees or broken down into component parts
- items not directly related to the item being discussed are out of order
- a speakers list will be kept
- the Chair may amend the speakers list in order to recognize first-time speakers
- the speakers list may be interrupted by a point of procedure, clarification or information
 - a point of procedure is a procedural suggestion on how to deal with the discussion
 - it should be ruled on immediately or after one or two speakers specifically relating to the point of procedure
 - a point of clarification is a short and strictly factual point relating directly to the current discussion
 - a point of information is also a short and strictly factual point relating directly to the current discussion, but may be of a more background nature
- the decision, when taken, should be reiterated by the chair or recorder, to ensure it is clearly understood by the group, and accurately recorded
- dissenting opinions or objections should be noted in the meeting record
- meeting participants should keep in mind principles of common courtesy

Helpful Discipline In Discussions

- if you agree with a previous speaker, acknowledge that you agree, rather than restating the point
- suggestions and minor information which does not bear on the discussion should be passed on privately or outside the session
- every effort to stick to the specific issue should be made by all
- information about decisions or a discussion that has been missed at the current or previous meetings should be requested outside the session

"Consensus is not a process that gives each delegate a veto on each decision. Consensus should only be blocked on a substantial and fundamental point of disagreement. Normally, when one or two people are the only ones to disagree with a decision they should ask the meeting to note their objection and let the meeting proceed. When someone blocks consensus, the onus is normally on them to come up with a new proposal they think would be widely acceptable. They should not use this time to simply reiterate the disagreement or prolong the discussion." (Canadian Peace Alliance meeting procedures manual)

GEORGIAN BAY '94 MARINE HERITAGE FESTIVAL INC.
ENVIRONMENTAL IMPACT STUDY - TERMS OF REFERENCE

1. BACKGROUND

The Georgian Bay '94 Marine Heritage Festival is a co-ordinating theme for marine heritage events along the Georgian Bay shoreline over a 16 week period from June to September 1994. The Festival will involve some 45 Georgian Bay communities and include hundreds of marine heritage events and activities including song and dance festivals, the internationally known Atlantic Challenge, historic boat building, cultural/heritage displays, environmental-educational events, tall ships and other types of activities for the entire family. The events will stimulate local tourism and promote Georgian Bay as a key tourist destination.

The objectives of the Festival are as follows:

- The promotion of co-operative planning and promotion of Georgian Bay involving all levels of government, the private sector, tourism associations, chambers of commerce, community groups, volunteers and interested individuals.
- The promotion of marine heritage for Georgian Bay as a tourism-stimulating activity which builds positively on our cultural, natural and environmental assets.
- The promotion of heritage, as linked with the past, the present and the future enhancement of these vast resources.
- The development of Georgian Bay as a tourism destination which is changing, exciting and always worth visiting; this Festival will respect the Code of Ethics and Guidelines For Sustainable Tourism, as published by the National Round Table on the Environment and the Economy and the Tourism Industry Association of Canada.
- The creation of employment and positive economic development over the next five to ten years.

- 2 -

Because of an expected increase in human, boat and automobile traffic during the summer of 1994, the Festival Management Committee is planning to conduct an environmental impact study. Results and recommendations from the study would be integrated into the Festival Marketing Plan.

2. PURPOSE OF STUDY

To assess the environmental impacts of the Festival as a whole, and with selected specific events the impacts they will have on Georgian Bay.

3. EXPECTATIONS OF THE MANAGEMENT COMMITTEE

- To review and inventory municipal waterfront infrastructures of the key harbour/port communities surrounding Georgian Bay, particularly in the areas of:

- > Marina slips
- > Parking
- > Pump out facilities
- > Signage and safety features
- > E.P. areas
- > Angling
- > Marine amenities, i.e. laundry, showers

- To review the latest literature on environmental impacts including:

- > Ministry of Natural Resources
- > Severn Sound R.A.P. Report
- > Code of Sustainable Tourism (Parks Canada)
- > Georgian Bay Boating Studies
- > Niagara Escarpment Commission
- > Conservation Authorities
- > Crombie Commission Results

- To inventory the list of summer events currently being carried out across Georgian Bay and prioritize, from an environmental perspective, those events that are most desirable and those events that are least desirable.

.../3

- 3 -

To analyze the impacts of events on regional eco-systems taking into account:

- > especially sensitive areas (i.e. unique habitat and ecological communities, regionally or locally rare species);
- > important wetlands, water courses and shoreline environment;
- > geomorphological impacts;
- > perception of the natural environment;
- > development of environmental awareness through educational and interpretive opportunities

4. RECOMMENDATIONS

The consultant will develop initial recommendations based on this project. These will be discussed in a workshop with representation from municipal, county, provincial and Festival Management Committee officers. The consultant will then draft a final set of recommendations to serve as the basis of an action plan.

5. ACTION PLAN

The consultant will develop an action plan for the implementation of the recommendations. He will provide descriptions of the work to be undertaken, with estimates of the costs and time required for capital and organizational projects. Tasks will be prioritized and an overall implementation schedule and budget estimate prepared.

6. PUBLIC PARTICIPATION

Community input will be an important part of this study. The public, for study purposes, will represent:

- Severn Sound Remedial Action Plan Task Force
- Georgian Bay Association
- Parks Canada
- Municipal officials
- Boating Associations
- Local Festival '94 Committee

- 4 -

The general public and other interested organizations will have opportunities for input through either public meetings, written submissions and/or formal surveys.

7. **MATERIAL SUPPLIED**

It is the responsibility of the consultant to obtain copies of all relevant material including studies.

The consultant will search for all relevant agencies' studies to determine what environmental impact information is published.

8. **CONDUCT OF THE WORK**

The consultant shall acknowledge all sources of information used in the Final Report.

The consultant shall fully substantiate any information in the Final Report.

All material produced or assembled by the consultant in carrying out the work shall be the property of the Georgian Bay '94 Festival Management Committee.

9. **BUDGET**

To include all related costs to the project including time, travel, data entry, publication, etc.

10. **CONTENT OF PROPOSAL**

Scope of Proposal - Bidders for this contract shall submit a proposal of not more than five pages indicating the principal staff involved, how the project will be undertaken, the methodology used by the firm, related experience, the firm's philosophy of the environment and a preliminary budget, not to exceed \$ _____.

11. _____ copies of proposal be delivered to _____ by 12 noon, _____, 1993.

Great Lakes United



September 20, 1993

Dear Great Lakes Member of Congress:

Congress is currently considering the Department of Transportation appropriations bill which includes funding for United States Coast Guard icebreaking operations in the Great Lakes. Great Lakes United requests that the Congress eliminate further funding for the modernization of the Coast Guard Cutter Mackinaw and eliminate operational funding for the icebreaker beyond the 1994 Fiscal Year. We further recommend that the aging vessel be decommissioned as recommended by the Coast Guard.

Great Lakes United is an international coalition of over 150 conservation, environmental, sports, labor, business, and native people's groups that represent over a million and a half people in the United States and Canada. Great Lakes United and its member organizations are dedicated to the protection and restoration of the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin ecosystem. The organization formed over ten years ago when proposals for year around shipping, proposals for new water diversions, and the increased risk of toxic chemical contamination of the food chain threatened (and continue to threaten) the very health of that ecosystem. The operation of the Cutter Mackinaw materially contributes to the destruction of wetlands and wildlife habitat within connecting channels by enabling commercial bulk carriers to operate on the Great Lakes during periods of maximum ice thickness and maximum risk of under-ice petroleum and chemical spills.

The Cutter Mackinaw is revered and is the recognized flagship of the United States Coast Guard fleet in the Great Lakes. But sentimentality over the possible loss of this beautiful vessel should not overshadow the importance of the other responsibilities of the Coast Guard that do not involve icebreaking, such as, search and rescue, coastal protection, law enforcement, environmental protection, aids to navigation, shipping safety, and ballast water regulation. Many of these activities are seriously under-funded while winter shipping continues to be subsidized through the unnecessary and destructive ice breaking operations carried out under pressure from shipping interests.

an international coalition to conserve and protect the Great Lakes/St. Lawrence River ecosystem

The Mackinaw is simply not needed. The Lake Carriers Association claims that without the Mackinaw, navigation between March 21st and January 15th could not be maintained. The truth of the matter is that the reduced level of shipping, the reduced calls for ice breaking, and the potential damage to the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin ecosystem from ice breaking activities, do not justify the continued operation of the Mackinaw beyond December or before ice out in the Spring. Shipping within this period has been adamantly opposed by Great Lakes United. Bay Class vessels such as the Kat Mai Bay and buoy tenders such as the Acacia are fully capable of breaking ice in emergency conditions and at the margins of the shipping season. The Mackinaw is not needed for search and rescue as any of the other vessels mentioned could be called upon to supplement the use of search and rescue aircraft if that were ever necessary. The experience of the last decade shows that Mackinaw is rarely, if ever, called into service as a search and rescue vessel.

Great Lakes United strongly supports the United States Coast Guard in its role as the protector of our coasts. We also support the activities of the Coast Guard that protect the health of the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River ecosystem. We do not support the continued operation of the Cutter Mackinaw as an icebreaker.

Thank you for your consideration of our position on this issue. Should you need additional information about our concerns over winter navigation in the Great Lakes, please do not hesitate to contact me at the address and telephone number listed below.

Sincerely,

Terry L. Yonker
Executive Director



GREAT LAKES UNITED

September 13, 1993

Carol Browner
Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, SW
Washington, DC 20460

RE: Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative

Dear Administrator Browner:

Enclosed please find comments submitted by Great Lakes United to EPA Region V regarding the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative. By the enclosed letter, Great Lakes United also endorses the comments on the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative submitted by the National Wildlife Federation. Great Lakes United participated in and contributed to the preparation of the NWF document.

Great Lakes United recommends that the Environmental Protection Agency move forward quickly to approve and implement the Initiative. We have little time to waste and have every incentive we could possibly want to move forward with the elimination of persistent toxic chemicals from the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River Basin ecosystem.

The most vocal opponents of the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative are heavily represented among the manufacturers who release the largest amounts of toxic chemicals to the air, water and sewage treatment plants in the Basin. Based on EPA and

An international organization dedicated to conserving and protecting the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River
State University College at Buffalo, Cassety Hall • 1300 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14222
(716) 886-0142

Canadian Address: P.O. Box 548 Station A • Windsor, Ontario N9A 6M6

Browner, Page 2

Citizens Fund data on 1990 total releases of toxic chemicals, the following represent the top five worst dischargers within the US portion of the Basin: the 3M Corporation, Eastman Kodak, Upjohn, General Electric, and Bristol-Myers Squibb Company.

We agree that non-point sources contribute significantly to the toxic loading of the Great Lakes; but the point sources that would be controlled under the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative currently contribute as much or more to the toxic stew and cannot be dismissed as an insignificant part of the overall problem. The arguments of the worst polluters don't hold up.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Initiative.

Sincerely,

Terry L. Yonker
Executive Director



GREAT LAKES UNITED

September 10, 1993

Wendy Schumacher
Water Quality Branch (WQS-16J)
U.S. EPA, Region V
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, IL 60604

RE: Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative

Dear Ms. Schumacher:

Great Lakes United has reviewed the proposed Great Lakes Water Quality Guidance (GLI) that was published in the Federal Register on April 16, 1993. Following that review, and after consultation with the National Wildlife Federation, we have decided to endorse the comments that have been submitted on behalf of Great Lakes United and several other major environmental organizations by the Federation.

Great Lakes United is an international coalition of 150 environmental, conservation, labor, business, and native people's groups representing over a million and a half people in Canada and the United States. The mission of Great Lakes United is to protect and restore the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River ecosystem. Great Lakes United has routinely monitored and reported on the progress of the parties in meeting their commitments under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

It is our concern over compliance with the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement that prompts us to add the following additional comments to those submitted on our behalf by the National Wildlife Federation.

- o The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA) should not be changed or amended as recommended by EPA. Full compliance with the provisions of the Critical Programs Act and the current GLWQA must be demonstrated before consideration can be given to amending the agreement.

An international organization dedicated to conserving and protecting the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River
State University College at Buffalo, Cassety Hall • 1300 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14222
(716) 886-0142

Canadian Address: P.O. Box 548 Station A • Windsor, Ontario N9A 6M6

- o The GLI does not actually lead to the elimination of any persistent toxic substances in the Great Lakes. Greater emphasis needs to be placed on pollution prevention and the virtual elimination of persistent toxic substances through sunseting and zero discharge as called for in the GLWQA.
- o The cost estimates for compliance with GLI need to be updated following review of the Michigan DNR analysis and critical re-evaluation of the DRI study. Industry estimates of cost to comply with GLI appear to be partly based on costs that they would incur in meeting existing water quality standards in progressive states such as Michigan where standards may already meet or exceed those in GLI.
- o The antidegradation components of GLI are of particular concern. The "prudent and feasible alternative" legal test needs to be applied whenever a degradation in water quality is proposed. The question should be whether the discharger has considered "prudent and feasible" alternatives to the proposed discharge.
- o Intake credits of any kind violate the spirit and the letter of the GLWQA and should be eliminated from consideration in GLI.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Guidance.

Sincerely,

Terry L. Yonker
Executive Director



GREAT LAKES UNITED

September 13, 1993

Carol Browner
Administrator
U.S. Environmental Protection Agency
401 M Street, SW
Washington, DC 20460

RE: Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative

Dear Administrator Browner:

Enclosed please find comments submitted by Great Lakes United to EPA Region V regarding the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative. By the enclosed letter, Great Lakes United also endorses the comments on the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative submitted by the National Wildlife Federation. Great Lakes United participated in and contributed to the preparation of the NWF document.

Great Lakes United recommends that the Environmental Protection Agency move forward quickly to approve and implement the Initiative. We have little time to waste and have every incentive we could possibly want to move forward with the elimination of persistent toxic chemicals from the Great Lakes-- St. Lawrence River Basin ecosystem.

The most vocal opponents of the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative are heavily represented among the manufacturers who release the largest amounts of toxic chemicals to the air, water and sewage treatment plants in the Basin. Based on EPA and

An international organization dedicated to conserving and protecting the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River
State University College at Buffalo, Cassety Hall • 1300 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14222
(716) 886-0142

Canadian Address: P.O. Box 548 Station A • Windsor, Ontario N9A 6M6

Browner, Page 2

Citizens Fund data on 1990 total releases of toxic chemicals, the following represent the top five worst dischargers within the US portion of the Basin: the 3M Corporation, Eastman Kodak, Upjohn, General Electric, and Bristol-Myers Squibb Company.

We agree that non-point sources contribute significantly to the toxic loading of the Great Lakes; but the point sources that would be controlled under the Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative currently contribute as much or more to the toxic stew and cannot be dismissed as an insignificant part of the overall problem. The arguments of the worst polluters don't hold up.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Initiative.

Sincerely,

Terry L. Yonker
Executive Director



GREAT LAKES UNITED

September 10, 1993

Wendy Schumacher
Water Quality Branch (WQS-16J)
U.S. EPA, Region V
77 West Jackson Boulevard
Chicago, IL 60604

RE: Great Lakes Water Quality Initiative

Dear Ms. Schumacher:

Great Lakes United has reviewed the proposed Great Lakes Water Quality Guidance (GLI) that was published in the Federal Register on April 16, 1993. Following that review, and after consultation with the National Wildlife Federation, we have decided to endorse the comments that have been submitted on behalf of Great Lakes United and several other major environmental organizations by the Federation.

Great Lakes United is an international coalition of 150 environmental, conservation, labor, business, and native people's groups representing over a million and a half people in Canada and the United States. The mission of Great Lakes United is to protect and restore the Great Lakes--St. Lawrence River ecosystem. Great Lakes United has routinely monitored and reported on the progress of the parties in meeting their commitments under the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement.

It is our concern over compliance with the Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement that prompts us to add the following additional comments to those submitted on our behalf by the National Wildlife Federation.

- o The Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement (GLWQA) should not be changed or amended as recommended by EPA. Full compliance with the provisions of the Critical Programs Act and the current GLWQA must be demonstrated before consideration can be given to amending the agreement.

An international organization dedicated to conserving and protecting the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River
State University College at Buffalo, Cassety Hall • 1300 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14222
(716) 886-0142

Canadian Address: P.O. Box 548 Station A • Windsor, Ontario N9A 6M6

- o The GLI does not actually lead to the elimination of any persistent toxic substances in the Great Lakes. Greater emphasis needs to be placed on pollution prevention and the virtual elimination of persistent toxic substances through sunseting and zero discharge as called for in the GLWQA.
- o The cost estimates for compliance with GLI need to be updated following review of the Michigan DNR analysis and critical re-evaluation of the DRI study. Industry estimates of cost to comply with GLI appear to be partly based on costs that they would incur in meeting existing water quality standards in progressive states such as Michigan where standards may already meet or exceed those in GLI.
- o The antidegradation components of GLI are of particular concern. The "prudent and feasible alternative" legal test needs to be applied whenever a degradation in water quality is proposed. The question should be whether the discharger has considered "prudent and feasible" alternatives to the proposed discharge.
- o Intake credits of any kind violate the spirit and the letter of the GLWQA and should be eliminated from consideration in GLI.

Thank you for the opportunity to comment on the Guidance.

Sincerely,

Terry L. Yonker
Executive Director



504

AUG 30 1993



GREAT LAKES UNITED

August 24, 1993

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Terry L. ^{Yonker}Yonker

SUBJECT: September 24-26 Board Meeting

The Great Lakes United Board of Directors will meet Friday evening September 24, 1993 through Sunday noon, September 26, 1993, at the Best Western Inn--Downtown, 510 Delaware Avenue, Buffalo, New York (Telephone 716-886-8333). The room rate is \$69 per person, which includes breakfast on Saturday and Sunday, lunch on Saturday, meeting breaks, and meeting room accommodations. We have reserved a block of rooms at the Best Western, but you must call the hotel to make your own room reservations by September 13th. A fee of \$20.00 per person will be charged for those who attend the meeting, but do not stay at the hotel. Staff has indicated a willingness to house a few Board members, but we do not know at this point how many can be accommodated. **Please notify Michelle at the GLU office by September 13th about your plans to attend the meeting, your accommodation plans, and your travel plans. She must notify the hotel by September 13th.**

Enclosed in this mailing are the following:

- o August 25 Memorandum entitled, Revised FY1993 Budgets and Contingency Plan
- o Time Line--PERT Chart for Action Items through 1993
- o Fundraising Campaign for Fiscal Year 1993
- o 6-8 Month Action Plan from the July 1993 retreat

Other meeting materials, agenda, and minutes of the July 23-25 Board meeting will follow.

septbmt.083

An international organization dedicated to conserving and protecting the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River
State University College at Buffalo, Cassety Hall • 1300 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14222
(716) 886-0142
Canadian Address: P.O. Box 548 Station A • Windsor, Ontario N9A 6M6



GREAT LAKES UNITED

August 22, 1993

M E M O R A N D U M

TO: Board of Directors

FROM: Terry L. Yonker

SUBJECT: Revised FY1993 Budgets and Contingency Plan

Attached are revised budgets for both GLU Canada and GLU United States. The revised budgets include explanatory footnotes. The Executive Committee and Finance Committee reviewed the revised budgets by conference call, and, to the best of my knowledge, the recommended changes are reflected in the revised documents and footnotes.

The Executive Committee and Finance Committee also asked for additional recommendations, a contingency plan, should revenue fall short of projections. Revenue shortfalls, if any, would primarily be the result of a shortfall in either the US or Canadian budget line, entitled, Additional Possible Income. Please review the footnotes that explain both of those income lines.

While every effort will be made to raise the dollars included in the Additional Possible Income lines, the Executive Committee and Finance Committee felt the lines should be identified separately and addressed as yet uncommitted and possibly speculative.

The worst case scenario is that none of the \$17,500 US or \$22,000 CD is raised. \$12,500 of the total represents funds that may not be raised as projected in the fund raising campaign proposed by staff (attached for your information). If we cannot raise the funds as projected, it will be because we did not try or that support for GLU is much more shallow than we thought. While there is no absolute assurance that we will receive the \$20,000 pollution prevention planning grant from Great Lakes Protection Fund, we have been encouraged by the Fund Director to apply for the money. The question would seem to be, will we receive the full grant? The remaining dollars under question relate to

An international organization dedicated to conserving and protecting the Great Lakes and St. Lawrence River
State University College at Buffalo, Cassety Hall • 1300 Elmwood Avenue, Buffalo, New York 14222
(716) 886-0142

Canadian Address: P.O. Box 548 Station A • Windsor, Ontario N9A 6M6

possible lack of support for GLU's efforts to coordinate NGO activities at the IJC Biennial Meeting. We intend to solicit financial support from participating organizations and individuals to help us defray expenses. Recognizing the fact that operating dollars are tight for everyone right now, it is still important to ask for supporting dollars and a strong commitment by all those who plan to provide input at the IJC Biennial Meeting. GLU will be spending close to \$15,000 in salaries and expenses for the IJC Biennial Meeting that were not originally budgeted. However, our Board of Directors considered our involvement in the meeting important enough to include it as one of the action items in our 6-8 month Action Plan developed at the Strategic Planning Retreat.

If all else fails, I would recommend the following options as a contingency plan:

1. Unless the Board of Directors institutes a layoff policy that is satisfactory to the members as being more fair than the procedure that was used in the Kershner case, I will not recommend any further layoffs unless directed to do so by the Board. While it is possible that some acceptable procedure will be developed as a part of a collective bargaining agreement with UAW Local 55, it remains to be seen whether that agreement will be consummated before the end of 1993.
2. Barring layoffs, I would cut all remaining staff travel for 1993 (except for travel supported by grants) and make drastic cuts in other expenses such as telephone and general fund postage expense (pre-approved conference calls, time limits on long distance calls, fax rather than call, no overnight mailings, limited mailings of Action Alerts and Annual Meeting resolutions, etc.)
3. Defer printing of analytical reports and other documents that are scheduled to be printed in FY 1993. These include a report on pesticides use in the Great Lakes, a report on the potential for diversion of Great Lakes water for out-of-basin municipalities, copies of the Guide to Pollution Prevention in AOC's, and an updated membership brochure, etc.
4. Ask for voluntary unpaid staff leave during a two week holiday period at the end of December when Buffalo State College offices are closed and inaccessible. Compensatory time and annual leave are normally used during this period or the staff person works on the honor system at home.
5. Request recommendations from staff for further reductions in administrative and salary expense.
6. Emergency appeal to GLU coalition members.
7. Defer December expenses to FY 1994.

I hope that we will need to exercise none of the above options.

contplan.083

GREAT LAKES UNITED

REVISED FISCAL YEAR 1993 U.S. BUDGET

Expenses

Salaries	129,958	(1)	
Kershner Settlement	2,228		
Co-Payment Fund	2,000	(2)	
Benefits (20.2)	26,251	(3)	160,437
Audit	2,300		
Accounting Contract	13,000		
Legal	5,000		20,300
Office Space	6,250		6,250
Strategic Plan Consultant Contract	7,500	(4)	7,500
Computer	2,000		
Copy Machine	4,500		
Postage Meter	1,300		
Equipment Repair and Maintenance	2,500		10,300
Telephone	9,500	(5)	
Postage	11,200		
Office Supplies	3,300		
Book Purchase	100		
Computer Supplies	1,500		
Printing	9,100		
Insurance	600		
Memberships	2,300		37,600
Travel Staff	10,000		
Travel President	1,000		
Travel Board	5,000		16,000
Fundraising Expense	2,000	(6)	2,000
Contingency	1,500	(2)	1,500
TOTAL	261,887		

Income

Gund Foundation	30,000		Committed
Gund Foundation (LEA)	1,200		Committed
Joyce Foundation	65,000		Committed
Mott Foundation	13,333		Committed
Great Lakes Protection Fund	30,000		Committed
Mott Foundation (1993-94/pro 1993)	27,500	(7)	Committed
Joyce Foundation (1993-94/pro 1993)	32,250	(8)	Committed
Environment Canada (ARETS)	2,000		
Receivables	10,400	(9)	
Donations	2,133	(10)	
Organizational Memberships	8,103	(10)	
Individual Memberships	2,885	(10)	
Fundraising Campaign	7,500	(11)	
Interest Income	3,000		
IJC Biennial & NAFTA Sub Grants	10,000	(12)	
Additional Possible Income	17,500	(13)	
TOTAL	262,804		

FOOTNOTES

- (1) The salary line assumes that the Associate Executive Director (Buffalo) position will not be filled before 1/1/94. The line also includes a temporary employee to manage the fundraising campaign for 16 weeks from 9/5/93 to 12/25/93 at a cost of \$5,000.
- (2) The co-payment fund and the contingency fund are funds budgeted in reserve in the event of an employee's hospitalization (GLU would pay \$400 of the \$500 detectable) or other unforeseen emergency.
- (3) The benefit line is reduced because of the decision not to fill the AED (Buffalo) position until 1/1/94. Additional FICA is included in the line for the temporary fundraiser.
- (4) The strategic plan consultant contract line includes one half of the contract of \$15,000 US (\$19,000 CD) to be paid in 1993. The remaining \$7,500 will be paid in 1994.
- (5) The increase in telephone expense reflects a doubling of conference call expense.
- (6) Fundraising expenses are those associated with implementing the fundraising plan, including telephone, postage, and printing (not including the temporary employee expense listed under salaries).
- (7) The prorated share of the 18 month Mott Foundation grant includes \$20,000 for the 6 month period 7/1/93 to 12/31/93 and \$7,500 for strategic planning expenses such as salaries, retreat costs, travel, etc.
- (8) The prorated share of the 12 month Joyce Foundation grant includes \$25,000 for the 5 month period 8/1/93 to 12/31/93 and \$7,500 for the first one half of the strategic plan consultant contract.
- (9) Receivables include \$6,000 from the Great Lakes Protection Fund representing the final payment on the Pollution Prevention Project, \$3,000 from Environment Canada for the RAP PAC News, and \$1,400 from the Great Lakes Protection Fund to close out the Ludwig research.
- (10) The donation, organizational, and individual membership lines reflect funds received through 7/31/93.
- (11) The fundraising campaign is estimated to raise \$20,000 total. The US share should amount to approximately 3/4 of the total or \$15,000. However, the Executive Committee and Finance Committee feel that only 1/2 of the \$20,000 can be raised and that it is likely none or very little will be raised in Canada to support the Canadian budget.
- (12) This line represents \$9,000 from an Ontario MOE grant and a followup grant from the Laidlaw Foundation to support our NAFTA campaign. Another \$1,000 will come from a Sierra Club special projects grant (an equal amount also for the Canadian budget) to support the IJC Biennial Meeting effort.
- (13) This line includes uncommitted dollars and the remainder of the funds we expect to raise in the fundraising campaign. \$10,000 should come from a pollution prevention planning grant to be submitted to the Great Lakes Protection Fund and \$7,500 represent the additional fundraising proceeds.

GREAT LAKES UNITED

REVISED FISCAL YEAR 1993 CANADIAN BUDGET

Expense

Contractual Services	30,000	(1)	30,000
Accounting	5,000		
Bank Charges	250		
Legal	750		6,000
Office Space	3,000		
Copying	2,000	(2)	
Postage	2,000	(2)	
Printing	1,500	(2)	
Telephone	5,500	(2)	
Office Supplies/Equipment	1,000		15,000
Travel Board	3,500		
Travel Vice President	500		
Travel Associate Executive Director	3,500		
Travel Executive Director	500		8,000
TOTAL	<u>59,000</u>		

Income

Laidlaw Foundation	10,000	(3)	Committed
Gund Foundation (LEA)	4,500	(4)	Committed
Donations	740	(5)	
Organizational Members	1,900	(5)	
Individual Members	560	(5)	
Interest Income	500		
IJC Biennial Income	7,000	(6)	
Pollution Settlement	14,000	(7)	
Additional Possible Income	<u>22,000</u>	(8)	
TOTAL	<u>61,200</u>		

FOOTNOTES

- (1) The original budget for the Associate Executive Director (Windsor) was \$24,000 Canadian. When the AED was hired, she was placed on contract and is being paid \$2,000 per month US as a US citizen working in Canada. As the exchange rate ranged upward the contract expense also increased in Canadian dollars to approximately \$30,000.
- (2) These lines have been increased to reflect additional costs associated with the coordination of NGO activities at the IJC Biennial Meeting.
- (3) This grant is being restructured to support an assessment of pollution prevention plans contained in Canadian RAP's.
- (4) This line is the portion of the Gund Foundation grant to support Lake Erie Alliance organizing activities in Ontario and production of the LEA newsletter.
- (5) These lines represent donations, organizational, and individual memberships received through 7/31/93.
- (6) This line includes registrations of \$1,250 from 250 participants in GLU organized NGO activities at the IJC Biennial Meeting, plus small grants from Sierra Club, Greenpeace, and Canada Trust.
- (7) This line represents a contribution of \$14,000 (\$11,500 US) arranged by Allen, Lippes, and Shonn as the result of a pollution settlement in Western New York. The money will be used to support an assessment of pollution prevention plans contained in US RAP's to complement a similar project funded by Laidlaw in Canada. See Footnote (3) above.
- (8) This line includes uncommitted dollars (\$12,000), the Canadian portion of the anticipated proceeds of the fundraising campaign (\$5,000), and additional support from organizations who are participating in the IJC Biennial Meeting (\$5,000). The uncommitted dollars represent the Canadian share of \$12,000 (10,000 US) from a pollution prevention planning grant to be submitted to the Great Lakes Protection Fund in August.

PERT CHART--1993 YEAR END ACTION ITEMS

ACTION ITEM	SEP	OCT	NOV	DEC
Newsletter 2 & 3	===== @@@@@@@			
Newsletter 4		===== @@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@	===== @@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@	===== @@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@
Bulletin of PP 6-9	===== ++++++			
Bulletin of PP 10-12		===== +++++	===== +++++	===== +++++
Guide to PP in AOC GLI Review & Comment	===== OOOOO			
IJC Biennial	XXXXXXXXXXXX ----- OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>	XXXXXXXXXXXX ----- OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO >>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>>		
NAFTA Letter to Congress	----- +++++			
NAFTA Forum in Toronto Assessment of PP in AOCs		+++++	XXXXXXXXXXXX	XXXXXXXXXXXX
GLPF PP Project Proposal	----- +++++			
Implementation			----- +++++	----- +++++
Fundraising Campaign Board Training	----- ***** OOOOOOO			
Implementation	----- ***** OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO @@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@	----- ***** OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO @@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@	----- ***** OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO @@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@	----- ***** OOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOOO @@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@@
Strategic Plan Consultant Contract Board Preparation Followup	--- -----			-----
Personnel PD Revisions Personnel Policy Rev Labor Contract Rev	-----		-----	-----
Grant Reports Jones Final Joyce Interim GLPF Interim Gund (LEA) Interim Gund (GLU) Final GLPF Final	- - - ----- XXXXXX			--- ===== -- ++
1994 Grant Proposals Laidlaw Minigrant Gund Public Welfare PP	----- OOOOO ----- =====		----- +++++	
Issues Winter Navigation Lake Levels Diversion Report NPRI & COA Followup	- -----	----- ----- -----		-----

KEY -- Terry Yonker xx Mary Ginnebaugh oo Sean Enright
 ++ Tony Luppino == Reginald Gilbert ** Mary "Memo" Oshei
 >> Michelle Downey @@ All Staff

FUNDRAISING CAMPAIGN FOR FISCAL YEAR 1993

Program revenue less expenses

I - Individual Memberships \$5300

A) Membership Phone-a-thon \$3000

This drive would compile a variety of lists which staff has generated.

Lists	Individuals
Information request	200
Former GLU members	430
Non-GLU AGM attendees	50
Staff generated lists	50
Other	100
TOTAL	830

If 50% of the calls placed actually contact individuals and 50% (not uncommon numbers given lists that are not cold) of those contacted are willing to join the organization this effort could generate \$4120. The phone calling would probably cost over \$500. Being conservative we have estimated a return on this project of \$3000.

B) Membership renewals \$1980

There are 142 individual members whos membership is due by the end of the year. Assuming a 70% return on those memberships there would be an additional \$1980 from individual memberships

C) Board individual members drive \$400

The idea for this drive is to augment the phone-a-thon in which there are a variety of fairly substantial lists used, for which scripts can be tailored for volunteers. This drive would entail each board member compiling a short list of people who have contacted them recently for Great Lakes information or advice. Then for each to do their own mini phone-a-thon in their local area. The hope is that each board member will be able to bring in 1-2 new individual members, and we are conservatively estimating no more than a \$400 return on this effort. It could well be many times that amount.

II - Holiday Appeal \$400

A November appeal via either a letter or a holiday card. Mailing to 1000 people assuming a conservative 2% return and an average \$20 gift.

III - Major Donor Campaign**\$8000**

This requires each board and staff member to generate a list of three individuals and also give their profiles. These must be people who have the potential and the propensity to give substantial amounts of money. There would be associated training of a portion of the board members to aid in the process. Each donor meeting will require a board member as well as a staff member (usually Terry) as support. We set an arbitrary goal for this campaign that was based on initially approaching 96 people.

10 @ \$100	\$1000
10 @ \$250	\$2500
5 @ \$500	\$2500
2 @ \$1000	\$2000
TOTAL	\$8000

IV - Organizational Members Drive**\$8600**

Each board and staff member would be charged with finding three new organizational members to Great Lakes United. We feel that this effort could bring in 66 new organizational members for a return of \$6600. There are also 20 organizational members with memberships due by the end of the year. We are assuming a 100% return on those memberships for an additional \$2000.

V - The Great Lakes United Bookstore**\$0**

This fundraiser has enough of an outlay and will have a small enough turn around to begin with that we assuming it will be a wash by the end of the year. We hope to have a flyer in the October newsletter to gain sales for holiday gift-giving, but we do not assume we will have large enough sales to be much in the black (if at all) just yet. This project lays an important foundation for raising general fund revenues in the long term.

REVENUES SUMMARY

I - Individual membership drive	5300.00	
II - Holiday Appeal	400.00	
III - Major donor campaign	8000.00	
IV - Organizational members drive	8600.00	
V - Great Lakes United bookstore	0.00	
TOTAL	22300.00	22300.00

EXPENSES

Phone	500.00	
Printing and Postage	500.00	
Travel	1000.00	
TOTAL	2000.00	<2000.00>

GRAND TOTAL		20300.00
fundrais.083		

**GREAT LAKES UNITED
OPERATIONAL
6 TO 8 MONTH ACTION PLAN**

GOALS	BARRIERS	ACTION PLAN
STAFF		
1. Have Contract With Staff Union	1. Resolution of bargaining unit membership dispute (Mary & Karen) 2. Board confidence in board bargaining representatives	1. Bargaining on union contract to go forward in good faith When: ASAP Who: Board & staff
2. Restore Staff Levels to Spring '93	1. Money 2. Relationship between Terry & Bruce 3. Staff morale	2. Clarification of roles & any work force changes vis a vis deficit reduction measures When: ASAP Who: E.D. & staff
3. Have Operating Personnel Committee & Board Collective Bargaining Committee		3. Consultation with staff on deficit and plans for reducing deficit
4. Personnel Procedures/Staff Management Policy in Place		
5. Harmony Between Staff, Executive Director, & Board		4. Facilitated sessions with staff When: Who:
6. Short-term Plan Developed by Director, Executive & Finance Committees to Overcome Personnel & Financial Crisis	1. Inability to focus on the future 2. Lack of confidence that we can achieve goals (e.g. fundraising goals) 3. Defining problems not solutions	

GOALS	BARRIERS	ACTION PLAN
<u>BOARD/MEMBERSHIP</u>		
1. Consensus-based decisionmaking model developed	1. Confusion about roles	1. Develop options paper on consensus decisionmaking When: For initial review by the next board meeting Who: Board (Brennain)
2. Functioning labor & environment task force	2. Funding to increase Board meetings/infrequent meetings	2. Submit proposal for labor & environment task force When: ASAP Who: Staff
3. Common work agenda for task forces, board & staff	3. No resources to operate the task forces	3. Develop options paper delineating how the task forces should function When: By next board meeting Who: Board
4. Innovative restructuring of organization completed	4. No communication between Board meetings	4. 2 page letter sent out to board members updating on issues & other GLU activities When: Monthly Who: Staff
5. U.S./Canadian power in GLU balanced	5. Lack of closure at board meetings	5. Develop issue paper on co-chairs When: ? Who: Board
6. Chronic Board problems mended	6. Failure to take initiative	6. Conduct annual board orientation for new members When: ? Who: Board & staff Develop standard orientation packet When: ? Who: Staff and Pres

GOALS	BARRIERS	ACTION PLAN
	7. Gender differences	
	8. Failure to listen/lack of respect/rhetoric & grandstanding	7. Have a period of affirmation at each Board meeting Who: Board 2. Establish groundrules at beginning of each meeting 3. Board trainings
	9. History	Drop It
<u>FINANCES</u>		
1. GLU Canadian charitable status approved	1. Charitable status red tape	
2. Financial & fundraising plan developed & being implemented	2. Competition with members for funds/trouble finding fundraising niche	1. Intense major donor campaign Who: staff & board When: ASAP
3. Long-term fundraising program & staff to implement	3. Lack of creativity in fundraising	
4. Deficit eliminated/financially solvent	4. Lack of functioning fundraising committee	
5. Functioning fundraising committee	5. 12 government bodies basinwide that regulate fundraising	
6. GLU bookstore open	6. No start-up funds for the bookstore	
7. Increase GLU profile	7. Lack of momentum/initiative	
8. Board members active in fundraising		

GOALS	BARRIERS	ACTION PLAN
9. Evaluate grant funding process		
<u>MEMBERSHIP</u>		
1. Increase membership in different sectors i.e. labor, minority, agricultural	1. Failure to connect membership recruitment to specific GLU campaigns & programs, i.e. NAFTA & IJC Biennial	1. IJC Biennial: a. Identify citizens groups in Windsor/Detroit area & send mailing on the Biennial b. Followup with promotional mailing/phone calls encouraging/asking to join GLU c. Get names & addresses of attendees at Biennial & followup d. Develop petition When: Who:
2. Increase membership in GLU: a. 50 new community-based, grassroots organizational members b. 25 new member organizations	2. Lack of either staff or board member time devoted to membership	2. Identify Canadian organizations for promotional appeal When: Who: Recruit 3 new org. members Who: Each board & staff member When: Sept. 30
3. Promote membership around the IJC Biennial	3. Failure to bring GLU brochures to conferences	3. Followup NAFTA mailing with membership recruitment letter When: By Sept. 30 Who: Staff
	4. Lack of a fully funded & and fully staffed, functioning labor & environment task force	4. Revitalize board membership committee When: Who:

GOALS	BARRIERS	ACTION PLAN
		5. Bring information on GLU to all conferences and meetings When: always Who: staff & board

**ISSUES
6 TO 8 MONTH PLAN**

GOALS	BARRIERS	ACTION PLAN
<u>GENERAL</u>		
	1. Maintaining staff to work on issues	
	2. Adequate resources to further issues work	
	3. Prioritizations of international issues e.g. Biennial (zero discharge) & NAFTA	
	4. Finding "strategic levers" to maximize gains with minimum resources	
	5. Lack of board/staff follow through	
	6. Excessive number of issues	
	7. Nationalism	
<u>ZERO DISCHARGE/IJC BIENNIAL</u>		
1. Industry assault on IJC turned back/ industry shamed	1. No money to mobilize and get people to meeting	1. Fundraising When: September Who: Staff (MG)
2. Over 100 environmental representatives attend	2. Loss of activists on issues	2. Mobilization When: Sept/Oct Who: Staff (MG)
3. Public agenda strengthened	3. Timing with Canadian elections	3. Testimony Who: ? When: Biennial How: ?
GOALS	BARRIERS	ACTION PLAN

4. GLU emerges at center of powerful and successful intervention at IJC & preparing for SOLEC	4. Need to research industry pollution/policy	4. Research a. industry b. TRI c. federal gov. When: ? Who: ?
<u>NAFTA</u>		
1. NAFTA defeated	1. Time constraints	1. Followup to Chicago dialogue a. Press conf. b. Letter c. Other When: ASAP/End of August Who: staff, MR, SM
2. Enhanced labour relationships through GLU work on NAFTA	2. Defining target, i.e. letter	2. Sponsor dialogue in Canada When: End of Sept. Who:
3. Make Great Lakes a NAFTA issue	3. Funding campaigns	3. Distribution of NAFTA material How: When: End of Sept. Who: staff
4. Increase membership & GLU exposure		4. Establish Speakers Bureau How: Labor & Env. Task Force When: End of September Who: staff
		5. IJC testimony When: October 22/23 How: Labor & Env. Task Force -- Dorreen Who: staff
<u>GREAT LAKES INITIATIVE</u>		
1. EPA promulgates GLI intact	1. Competing with industry \$ and organizing	1. Lobby Who: ? When: August
GOALS	BARRIERS	ACTION PLAN

2. Phase II of GLI begun	2. GLU's limited support of issue (pollution control vs. zero discharge)	2. Mailing to mems. Who: Staff/newsletter? When: Now
	3. Lack of funds	
<u>HUMAN HEALTH</u>		
1. Program linking human health & environment (e.g. EAGLE project)	1. Complexity of issue	
	2. Lack of enthusiasm for project from board & staff	
	3. Failure to submit proposals	
	4. Time constraints	
<u>REMEDIAL ACTION PLANS</u>		
1. Implementation of RAPs	1. Lost interest	1. Grant proposal When: September Who: Staff (TY)
2. Citizen mobilization	2. No funds for implementation	2. Research How: Bulletin of PP When: ? Who: Staff (RG)
	3. Stakeholder death	3. Workshops When: ASAP Who: ?
	4. RAP review process	4. RAP Review When: ? Who: ?
		5. Lake Erie Conference When: June '94 Who: Rick Coronado
<u>CANADIAN ISSUES</u>		
1. COA renewed	1. No Canadian staff	
2. Expansion of NPRI	2. Distance from Toronto/Ottawa	

GOALS	BARRIERS	ACTION PLAN
3. Plan to include GLU in Canadian issues	3. Funding	
4. ARET		
5. Respond to elections		Federal election report When: October Who: Board (JJ, PM, JW)
6. Diversion		Diversion response When: Now Who: Board (JJ, PM, SM) How: ?
<u>OTHER ISSUES</u>		
1. Final resolution of winter navigation		
2. Chlorine ban remains	1. Lawsuit against Canadian government by northern Mayors & pulp & paper industry	
3. Shared time field coordinators with member groups		