

***United States Environmental Protection Agency
Region 5***

***1996
Community-Based Environmental Protection
Progress Report***

TABLE OF CONTENTS

SECTION	PAGE
<i>CBEP in the Region - 1996</i>	1
<i>Capacity Building and Partnerships</i>	5
<i>Actions</i>	
<i>Partnerships</i>	
<i>Education</i>	
<i>Internal Culture Change</i>	11
<i>Internal Culture Change Actions</i>	
<i>Regional Organization</i>	
<i>Barriers to CBEP</i>	
<i>Lessons Learned</i>	18
<i>Priority Place-Based Projects</i>	20
<i>The Great Lakes</i>	
<i>Lake Michigan</i>	
<i>Lake Erie</i>	
<i>Lake Superior</i>	
<i>The Upper Mississippi River</i>	
<i>Northwest Indiana Geographic Initiative</i>	
<i>Greater Chicago Initiative</i>	
<i>Southeast Michigan Initiative</i>	
<i>Gateway Initiative</i>	
<i>Northeast Ohio Initiative</i>	
<i>Tribal Lands</i>	

CBEP
In The Region
1996

Over an 18-month period in 1992 and 1993, the Region developed its environmental vision, mission, and values. Region 5's vision statement is:

A sustainable environment where air, water, and land resources are restored and protected to benefit all life.

In 1995, the Senior Leadership Team (SLT) added an operational vision to describe how the Region will achieve that goal:

Together, we can solve environmental problems with communities in common-sense ways.

These vision statements reflect the Region's commitment to environmental protection--the first reflects our desired state and the second reflects our commitment to Community-Based Environmental Protection (CBEP). Region 5's Community-Based Environmental Protection Action Plan of December 6, 1995 (FY 1996 Action Plan) outlines the steps to implement it.

The FY 1996 Action Plan identified five key actions to be undertaken by the Region to implement CBEP. These actions are:

1. Assess ongoing EPA Regional efforts.
2. Initiate dialogue internally, with States, and with others to clarify EPA's roles.
3. Align internal EPA processes.
4. Equip Regional EPA staff with new CBEP protection tools.
5. Communicate the fundamentals of environmental protection to citizens.

During 1996, many of these actions were completed, others will be ongoing, and still others need to be revisited in 1997. Overall, Region 5 has made significant progress towards incorporating CBEP into its day to day operations.

Assessing Regional Efforts: Region 5 completed an assessment of our CBEP efforts for the FY 1996 Action Plan. Because of its scope, these actions will be completed over a number of years, and much of our work will grow and adapt as we continue our work. Each Division assessed their programs which resulted in new initiatives that increased their outreach to external customers and provided opportunities for staff development in CBEP activities. As part of the assessment, we found that not all EPA employees have the opportunity to work on CBEP projects. Therefore, the Region will conduct a CBEP conference where many of our external partners will discuss the strengths and weaknesses of current Regional CBEP programs. This information sharing will recognize what works well in CBEP and how to implement CBEP throughout other Regional programs.

Dialogue To Clarify Roles: The Region began exploring the federal role with the States, Tribes, and other players. Formal discussions have been held at State Directors' Meetings and have been included in the Environmental Performance Partnerships Agreements (EnPPAs) with Minnesota, Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana, and Ohio that address CBEP and the division of responsibilities. We have found that much of what is included in these EnPPAs have been the result of informal and impromptu discussions that the Region has among its State partners and other external audiences. We will meet with the States and Tribes to explore a clearer federal role for CBEP activities. Developing joint training, round tables and other information sharing activities is potentially one of the next steps.

Aligning Internal Resources: The Region began aligning internal EPA processes to be more compatible with CBEP. The initial reorganization and operational system to facilitate a CBEP approach was inaugurated on October 1, 1995. The reorganization consisted of a Senior Leadership Team (SLT), the Office of Strategic Environmental Analysis, the program offices, and 18 geographic/thematic teams. The teams serve as one of the principle mechanisms for incorporating CBEP into EPA's new approach to environmental protection. The program offices are also responsible for outlining new opportunities for partnerships and activities and staff development.

Through the establishment of these teams and the additional efforts of the program offices, the Region increased its commitment of resources to community based efforts. The program offices and support organizations dedicate resources to these teams making them a truly multi-program regional effort. During 1996, SLT assessed the organizational structure, determined that there were conflicting messages and decided that it needed additional work and added commitment from the Region to insure its success. Twenty-six priority areas, principal places, and critical approaches were identified by SLT. Individual strategies and work plans were prepared and will be used to allocate the Region's resources and FTEs. The affirmation of the principal places and the identification of CBEP as a critical approach renew the Region's commitment to this approach in the future.

Equipping Staff: Internally, the Region conducted the First and Second Seminar series that provided information on CBEP, building partnerships, and specific methods useful in implementing CBEP. An overview of the CBEP approach was presented at the multi-media training for Tribes which simply reinforced the CBEP model that the tribes are already using. The Region's ten principal place teams are collaborating with their respective communities and the other Federal agencies in promoting and encouraging CBEP partnerships to improve environmental and public health conditions.

There are on-going efforts to equip Regional EPA staff with new CBEP protection tools. The first and second CBEP Seminar Series provided internal training to EPA staff. Also, the Region hosted a roll-out session of the geographic/thematic teams which informed EPA staff of the types of work and activities being conducted. Some programs such as Superfund and Water conducted community dialogues on how CBEP is being incorporated into Regional programs. With staff access to the Internet and Intranet, there has been an increase in Regional home pages (especially associated with the Regional teams) and an increase in linking EPA's home pages to other external home pages. This is an ideal use of the Internet in creating linkages and partnerships in achieving our Regional vision. We are currently working with a number of State, federal and non-government organizations on integrating databases and developing user friendly software.

Communicating With The Public: The Region has been very successful with communicating the fundamentals of environmental protection to citizens through the principal place teams and the programs' project partnerships and grants. Next, we will determine if there is an umbrella type mechanism that can be developed for communicating with the communities, other agencies, States and Tribes.

Conclusion: The Region has gone beyond the actions identified for 1996 and described in the subsequent sections. The regional teams continue to advance the CBEP approach by working in the places with the people on environmental problems. The media programs have expanded their traditional work to include more outreach to the communities and projects in which they are involved. The commitments to work with the States on CBEP through the EnPPAs is promising, and, because we are the lead region on outreach to Eastern European nations, our commitment expands beyond the boundaries of the Region to those countries as well.

Table: Region 5's FTE Commitment to CBEP for FY 1996

	Total FTE*	% Working in CBEP**
Office of Regional Administrator	16	44%
Air and Radiation Division	148	25%
Resource Management Division	176	25%
Superfund Division	280	25%
Waste, Pesticides, and Toxics Division	174	20%
Water Division	220	54%
Great Lakes National Program Office	40	100%
Office of International Activities	5	100%
Office of Public Affairs	36	95%
Office of Regional Counsel	133	97%
Office of Strategic Environmental Analysis	24	54%
Total	1252	43%

* FTE numbers may or may not include support staff and regional team managers and should be considered approximate numbers.

** Percentage reflects the number of staff working in CBEP activities.

CAPACITY BUILDING AND PARTNERSHIPS

Actions

The Regional 1996 actions for capacity building and partnerships were to:

1. Expand and formalize the CBEP approach with States, Tribes, and other partners (Partnerships);
2. Create new partnerships and alliances while continuing with existing efforts (Partnerships);
3. Develop knowledge and skills of Regional staff and partners that will improve our ability to implement the goal of environmental protection and safeguarding human health (Education); and
4. Develop CBEP tools and training (Education).

Partnerships

Partnerships are an essential component of the Region's work for achieving the vision of a sustainable environment in which air, water, and land resources are restored and protected to benefit all life. Region 5 actively worked at establishing effective partnerships with States, Tribes, local governments, other Federal Agencies, communities, and environmental groups in which each partner could maximize their efforts by joining with others to achieve environmental results. These partnerships include the formal agreements of Environmental Performance Partnerships Agreements with States (EnPPAs), Tribal Environmental Agreements (TEAs), grants to communities, and informal collaboration with individual communities and organizations.

In the *Strategic Directions for the Midwest Environment, 1995-1999*, the Region and the States jointly agreed that CBEP was one of the major priorities for implementation. The importance of CBEP was reaffirmed with its inclusion in the State EnPPAs. The language and application of CBEP vary between States; for example, Ohio focused its CBEP efforts in terms of their watershed program and activities; Minnesota identified programmatic areas in which CBEP activities will occur; and Illinois incorporated it as an underlying implementation approach for its program commitments. The Region

completed and signed EnPPAs with the States of Illinois, Minnesota, Indiana, Ohio, and Wisconsin in 1996.

The Region is proud of its strong relationship with the area's 33 Indian Tribes. The commitment to work jointly on environmental issues and capacity building is represented in the Tribal Environmental Agreements and the Divisional Blueprints. During 1996, TEAs identifying the priorities determined during the planning sessions were signed by all Minnesota Tribes, ten Wisconsin Tribes, and four Michigan Tribes.

Other partnerships formalized during 1996 include the Water Division's Wellhead Protection Program; the Air and Radiation Division's (ARD) Ozone Action Strategy for urban non-attainment areas in Region 5, and individual projects within the Green Lights Project; the Superfund Office's SuperSAT team work at southeast Chicago that is employing a multi-site comprehensive assessment with strong community involvement; and Waste, Pesticide, and Toxic Division's (WPTD) new Memorandum of Agreement with the US Department of Agriculture to review and strategize current and potential work activities in the rural and agricultural areas of the Midwest.

The Region has long realized that the Agency cannot meet its statutory mission without international cooperation to address stratospheric ozone depletion, global warming, maintenance of global biodiversity, and sharing of ideas on new foreign technologies and even management techniques piloted elsewhere. The Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) continues to identify problems and seek solutions in partnership with Canada. Exotic species such as zebra mussels, protection of biodiversity, and toxic problems continue to be of mutual interest. The Region has expended resources for capacity-building programs in the Baltics on the development of regionally compatible environmental monitoring programs and environmental data managements systems, as per the Lithuanian, Estonian and Latvian FY 96 Funding work plans. The Region also has working partnerships in Russia, Ukraine, Hungary, and Poland on environmental assessment projects and training.

The Region continued to improve its organization in 1996. The Regional Teams and Team Managers were part of the 1995 reorganization with resources and funds committed to those activities. During the 1996, the Regional Team Manager positions were upgraded, and staffing patterns and resources for the teams were strengthened. During the summer of 1996, the SLT undertook the identification of its priorities. The Region's work and resources would then be allocated based on the priorities. The original geographical Regional teams were identified as the ten principal places where the resources the Region protects are so important, or the environmental stresses are so great that the Region must concentrate its efforts to make sure that these resources are restored and the quality of life improved (to be described in the FY97 Regional Performance Plan). These Regional teams serve as one of the principle mechanism for the incorporation of the CBEP approach. Their very structure fosters formal and

informal partnerships with States, Tribes, local communities, and businesses for the development of priorities and environmental activities. The SLT also identified ten critical approaches to be used to find solutions and address environmental problems. CBEP is one of the critical approaches, thus ensuring support and implementation within the programs and by all staff.

Education

The Regional CBEP Workgroup continued its work in promoting internal education with the Second Seminar Series. The Seminar Series featured speakers, both internal and external, who provided information and methods useful for incorporating CBEP into the Region's activities. The seminars were not mandatory, but attracted a sufficient number of CBEP believers who will be able to translate the information into their project activities. The seminar series were videotaped for individual viewing. The series topics included ISO14000; Regional Planning presented by Regional planners from Milwaukee, Chicago, and NW Indiana; EPA Software; Environmental Indicators; Project XL; Comparative Risk and Quality of Life Values; President's Council on Sustainable Development; and EPA Databases Demonstrations. Members of the workgroup also provided upon requests CBEP presentations to internal and external audiences.

Also, the Regional program offices assumed a major role in the development of educational activities for internal and external use.

Superfund Division

- ▶ First Responders training under Title III, Community Right to Know, to communities and Tribes.
- ▶ Superfund 101 Course, an overview of the Superfund process and the environmental issues associated with a Superfund site targeted for local municipalities and citizens.
- ▶ Community Advisory Groups Introduction, outreach to communities near Superfund sites. The Region has conducted the interviews at eight Superfund sites and is ready to work with the communities to organize a group who will then receive technical assistance from the program and an independent facilitator.

Waste, Pesticides, and Toxic Division

- ▶ Toxic Release Inventory (TRI) Workshops, for community education on the TRI data base - what is it, how to access it, and how to use it. The workshops were held in every state of the Region.
- ▶ Environmental Justice (EJ)/Pollution Prevention (P2) Grants, grants were for the support communities efforts to develop and implement P2 projects. The grants

were awarded to assist communities in Milwaukee, Chicago, and Minneapolis-St. Paul.

- ▶ Community Awareness on the Health Affects of methyl parathion, education sessions held for residents of Lorain County, Ohio and Detroit, Michigan so they would understand the need for the removal activities.
- ▶ Section 10-18 Rule on Real Estate Disclosure for Lead-Based Paint workshops, for citizens and real estate agents on the new lead-based paint requirements and the health risks posed by lead-based paints.
- ▶ Lead Grants, grants for lead cleanups and education of lead problems awarded to citizens and community groups.

Water Division

- ▶ Workshop - Getting in Step: A Pathway to Effective Outreach in Your Watershed, for learning and sharing ideas on nonpoint source information and education. It was developed and presented jointly with Illinois Environmental Protection Agency (IEPA) and Northeastern Illinois Planning Commission (NIPC).
- ▶ Three-day Conference - Nonpoint Source Pollution Information/Education Programs, for learning and sharing ideas on nonpoint source information and education. It was sponsored by IEPA, NIPC, and the Region.
- ▶ Three Videos (Great Lakes Teens, Stewards for Today, Partners for Tomorrow; Northwest Indiana: Partnerships for Change; and Protecting Your Groundwater Supply - Putting the Pieces Together) that were developed to stimulate ideas and provide practical ways for target audiences to increase environmental awareness, form new partnerships, and take action in their communities. The videos were jointly developed and produced with Office of Public Affairs (OPA) and GLNPO.
- ▶ Wellhead Protection Workshop, conducted for representatives of 24 Tribes. As a result of the workshop, four Tribes are in the advanced stages of wellhead protection program development and 12 Tribes are in development state.
- ▶ Advanced Identification Process (ADID), a final product is usually a mapped inventory and data base, which is made available to community planners, developers, landowners, conservationists, regulators, researches, and the general public who use the information in planning wetlands related projects and insuring protection.

Great Lakes National Program Office

- ▶ Great Lakes Atlas, a valuable educational tool popular with schools, private institutions, and the public. Revised by GLNPO and Environment Canada, the Atlas provides fundamental environmental and socioeconomic information on the Great Lakes. The Atlas, as well as other educational materials, are available on Internet via the Great Lakes Information Network (GLIN).

- ▶ Great Lakes Program, workshops for teachers conducted at a number of cities prior to the "Great Minds, Great Lakes Program" on the Lake Guardian. The Research Vessel Lake Guardian, in addition to its use as a Great Lakes monitoring vessel, is a floating classroom.
- ▶ GLNPO's Internet home page, expanded and enhanced this year received more than 65,000 "hits" in October, suggesting increase public awareness of Great Lakes issues. GLNPO has placed a high priority on making our information available to the public through the use of Earth 1.
- ▶ Five draft State of the Lakes Ecosystem Conference (SOLEC) papers, background papers on nearshore current conditions and issues. Working with Environment Canada and other agencies, the papers were produced and presented at the second SOLEC Conference. The papers are: *Nearshore Aquatics*, *Coastal Wetlands*, *Land by the Lakes*, *Information and Information Management*, and *Land Use*. The final papers will be published and widely distributed to the public in July 1997 after extensive review.

Office of International Activities

- ▶ Wastewater Capacity Workshop (Moscow, Russia), a workshop on lessons learned from wastewater demonstration projects.
- ▶ Two Year Comparative Risk Assessment Project (Poland), training sessions for municipalities and communities on working through the comparative risk assessment process.
- ▶ Fundamentals of Risk Assessment (Hungary), training sessions on risk assessment.
- ▶ Fundamentals of Environmental Assessments and Impacts course work (Baltic nations and Ukraine), training session for fundamentals of developing a national environmental assessment, monitoring and evaluation program, and an emergency response training conducted jointly with US Air Force.

Office of Regional Counsel

- ▶ Community Involvement in the Enforcement Process Workshop, designed to involve EPA staff in a dialog with external partners on community involvement and the enforcement component of the programs.

Gateway Initiative

- ▶ Citizens Environmental Academy, a seven-week seminar series on environmental legislation, environment issues, and the public participation process for community citizens.

In addition to training and workshops, the Region developed education and outreach

tools such as computer software and computer Home pages. The Software for Environmental Awareness Section (OPA) and Purdue University produced two new programs for 1996. They are *Pollution Prevention (P2)* and *Residential Energy Efficiency*. The *Pollution Prevention* program is an introduction to P2, outlining the relevant environmental legislation and addressing P2 in industry, agriculture, energy, government, and consumer sectors. The *Residential Energy Efficiency* program shows effective ways to reduce home energy consumption. Also, the *Municipal solid Waste Factbook and Landfill Inventory* program was updated. This partnership has produced over 40 software programs (ranging from comparative risk assessment and environmental assessment resource guide to private water systems education system) that are targeted for citizens, community leaders and officials, and environmental system operators.

The Superfund Division has worked with several local planning commissions utilizing the software programs - Landview and Cameo. These programs mapped the Agency's environmental data and imported data from other information systems to create a multi layer and comprehensive picture of local areas. The Superfund Division's outreach to local planning commissions helped them work with these programs and understand the information presented. These type of outreach efforts enables communities and counties, etc., to understand and see the number of environmental stressors and resources in their area.

All of the Divisions/Programs and Offices, and many of the Regional Teams have Home Pages which can be accessed by internal and external users and provide information on their activities, related topics, and Agency contacts.

INTERNAL CULTURE CHANGE

Internal Cultural Change Actions

The CBEP approach to identifying and resolving environmental problems has become a fundamental principle in the organization and operation of Region 5. In fact, many elements of the Region's reorganization were established to specifically foster and implement CBEP. As part of the reorganization, actions for facilitating cultural change were identified. They are:

1. Continue to improve and modify the Region's organization in a manner that optimizes the CBEP approach while addressing its priorities and goals,
2. Increase programs/offices commitments' to CBEP, and
3. Develop new opportunities for staff with CBEP.

Regional Organization

In 1995, the Region first implemented its reorganization plan. It consisted of a Senior Leadership Team (SLT), Program offices, Office of Strategic Environmental Analysis, and 18 geographic/thematic teams. As the reorganization was implemented, it became clear to the SLT that modifications were needed to identify operating principles and remove barriers to the Regional teams and program initiatives. The Region reaffirmed its commitment to the current organization by prioritizing work.

Because of the large number of challenges in Region 5, it is necessary to focus attention on the most serious problems and the most threatened places, using the most effective approaches. If the Region does not focus its resources, it will find that only minimal progress on a broad range of problems is made. SLT considered information from a range of sources and decided for FY97 to focus on six major environmental priorities and ten principal places by using ten critical approaches to find solutions. The ten critical approaches, which include CBEP, will empower employees to make progress toward solving the priority environmental problems, especially in the principal places, even more effective in the future than in the past.

A key to the success of this organization is the Region's ability to take full advantage of the changes made during the reorganization and provide a clear direction for everyone

in the Region as to where the Region is going and how it plans to get there. This system and road map are compiled in a dynamic document, Agenda for Action, prepared in August 1996. The road map shows the connections between the priorities, teams, the programs, and the approaches. In conjunction with the road map, the Region determine the best course by allocating of funds, resources, and support to the priorities, teams, and programs.

Divisions/Programs Internal Cultural Change

Air and Radiation Division

- ▶ 148 total FTEs, 25% working on CBEP activities.
- ▶ Support Regional Teams, sponsoring regional teams and providing core team members (10%FTE).
- ▶ Priority Area - Attaining the Air Quality Standard for Ozone, and core members to all the Regional teams.
- ▶ Air Quality Standard for Ozone team is dedicated to community outreach and providing information and support of cooperative programs with local partners in seven different places in order to achieve the ozone and particulate matter standards.
- ▶ Radiation and Indoor Air Section, conducts extensive outreach as a result of the of the Green Lights, Energy Stars, and Tools for Schools programs and Indoor Air activities.
- ▶ Beneficial Landscaping Team, co-sponsored with Chicago Botanical Gardens a workshop on beneficial landscaping for individuals and organizations.

Resource Management Division

- ▶ 176 total FTEs, 25% working on CBEP activities.
- ▶ Supports the Regional teams, sponsoring regional teams.
- ▶ Outstationing, three positions as tribal liaisons.
- ▶ Regional Tribal activities, sponsors Region's tribal activities.
- ▶ Primary goal of Tribal Initiative is to build capacity of the Tribes, provide technical support, and ensure their rights are protect.

Superfund Division

- ▶ 280 total FTEs, 25% working on CBEP activities.
- ▶ Support of Regional teams, sponsoring regional teams and providing core team members (10% FTE each).
- ▶ 3 full FTE for Brownfields Regional team, who work to promote and increase the understanding and capability of the States and external partners on Brownfield redevelopment; also has project leads for three Brownfield pilots - Detroit,

Indianapolis, and West Central Chicago - that provide funding and technical assistance to communities and local municipalities to explore brownfield development.

- ▶ Dedicated FTEs for Community Involvement Coordinators (CIC) in OPA, who work on Superfund sites.
- ▶ Development of Public Involvement process, CIC and Superfund staff are planning early and enhanced community outreach at Superfund sites.
- ▶ Lorain County, Ohio Removal Project, Superfund team removal cleanup activities included education and outreach to the ethnic community and services that included temporary relocation and facilitation with other agencies.
- ▶ SuperSAT Team, to develop a comprehensive plan for Superfund sites in southeast Chicago with a strong community outreach component.
- ▶ CBEP training, training for Regional staff and communities and state agencies.
- ▶ IPAs in Detroit and Chicago, and staffing of two field offices in Grosse Isle, Michigan and Westlake, Ohio.

Waste, Pesticides, and Toxics Division

- ▶ 174 total FTEs, 25% working on CBEP activities.
- ▶ Support of Regional teams, sponsoring regional teams and providing core team members (10% FTE each).
- ▶ Inter-Agency Workgroup with US Dept. of Agriculture, workgroup created by MOU with State Agriculture Agencies to develop outreach and communication to the rural and agricultural communities.
- ▶ Memorandum of Cooperation (MOC) between the Region, IDEM and five refineries in northwest Indiana, to develop solutions to the groundwater problem of oil products. During the August 1996 Anniversary Celebration, two refineries were able to withdraw from the MOC because the groundwater beneath their facilities was clean.
- ▶ Special projects- Silver Shovel and Winton Hills/Cincinnati, CBEP projects with strong emphasis on community involvement.

Water Division

- ▶ 220 total FTEs, 54% working on CBEP activities.
- ▶ Support of Regional teams, sponsoring regional teams and providing core team members (10% FTE each).
- ▶ Education and Outreach Management Team (EOMT), created team to focus the Division's efforts on education and outreach and to ensure a cross-division integrated approach. EOMT developed a Strategic Action Plan designed to improve public trust and credibility; to increase accessibility to Water Division information, to expand environmental awareness of others so they have the knowledge/information to make environmental decisions; and to enhance

- education outreach provided by Water Division programs, geographic initiatives, and Regional Teams.
- ▶ Watershed Team, responsible for developing a watershed strategy that integrates the watershed approach into the culture of the Region and to promote inclusion of the watershed approach into the States' programs. The team has initiated training for the Division staff on various aspects of watershed management and is a resource for the Upper Mississippi River Regional team.
 - ▶ Wellhead Protection Program, a CBEP program that will derive environmental benefits through increased public awareness, economic stability, and a healthier/safer water supply.
 - ▶ Outstationing, 3 positions and 3 additional positions under review.
 - ▶ Piscasaw Creek Pilot Watershed Management Project, designed to give staff hands on experience in diverse aspects of watershed management from building partnerships through field mentoring and public participation to implementation.

Great Lakes National Program Office

- ▶ 40 total FTEs; 100% Community-based activities.
- ▶ Support of Regional teams, sponsoring regional teams and providing core team members (10% FTE each).
- ▶ State of the Lakes Ecosystem Conference (SOLEC), 1996 State of the Lakes Ecosystem Conference was held in Windsor, Ontario from November 6-8. Sponsored by USEPA GLNPO and Environment Canada, this conference brought 500 people from federal, state/provincial, and local governments and Tribes, as well as non-governmental, university, and environmental organizations and institutions together around the topic of the state of nearshore ecosystems of the Great Lakes. The purposes were to provide Great Lakes residents with information about shoreline ecological resources, to report on the condition of those resources, and to encourage stewardship activities to protect them. USEPA GLNPO and Environment Canada were asked by conference participants to host a third SOLEC conference in 1998 which will focus on Great Lakes indicators.
- ▶ Mining Ideas: Turning a Grant Assistance Program into a Knowledge Base, GLNPO awarded \$900,000 to supplement existing grant budgets for ecosystem protection and restoration projects throughout the basin, bringing the total over the last five years to approximately \$9.5 million. Sixty-five percent of grant dollars were awarded to local and non-governmental organizations and Tribes to protect and restore local ecological resources. Project activities are varied and include efforts such as developing a freshwater habitat classification system for the Great Lakes, constructing "walkovers" to protect fragile eastern Lake Ontario dune ecosystems from recreational foot traffic, removing thousands of cubic yards of wood debris from the mouth of the St. Louis River, developing the Mighty Acorns educational youth program to bring city youths, their parents, and

teachers into the field to restore tallgrass prairie and oak ecosystems of the Chicago area, and supporting the Menominee Tribe's sustainable forestry program.

- ▶ Contaminated Sediments, the use of GLNPO's specially-outfitted sediment assessment tool, the Research Vessel Mudpuppy, states and GLNPO staff are determining the nature and extent of sediment contamination by conducting a total of 29 surveys which covered 15 AOCs and two international connecting channels. All of these projects are oriented to providing scientifically sound information upon which to formulate cleanup projects. Additional grants have been given to help states evaluate remediation alternatives. Grant assistance of approximately \$1 million was provided in 1996.
- ▶ Chicago Wilderness, GLNPO is formally participating in a major initiative in the southern Lake Michigan area called "Chicago Wilderness". With 33 other partners, including Chicago's Field Museum of Natural History, Brookfield Zoo, Illinois Department of Natural Resources, The Nature Conservancy, and Indiana Dunes National Lakeshore, GLNPO is developing a biodiversity strategy, funding a region-wide atlas, and restoring large ecologically important tracts. Work is intended to progress through the early part of the next century, with restoration taking place on over 200 sites.
- ▶ Binational Strategy for Virtual Elimination of Toxic Chemicals, a goal-setting effort involved significant stakeholder involvement, including government, industry, and environmental groups. The BNS is expected to be signed in 1997.
- ▶ Computer Laboratory, numerous instructional workshops were conducted in the Great Lakes Computer Laboratory in 1996 to acquaint various communities with information readily available to them via the World Wide Web.
- ▶ Pollution Prevention, GLNPO has assisted numerous communities in the Great Lakes by providing grant assistance for pollution prevention projects. Grant assistance of approximately \$ 300k was provided in 1995. Grant assistance dollars from 1996 will be awarded in this year.

Office of International Activities

- ▶ 5 total FTEs, 100% working in CBEP activities.
- ▶ Develops and coordinates the environmental outreach activities, training and workshops for our international partners.

Office of Public Affairs

- ▶ 36 total FTEs, 95% working in CBEP activities.
- ▶ Support of Regional teams, sponsoring regional teams and providing core team members (10% FTE each).
- ▶ Public Outreach Expertise and Support, provides expertise and services to the teams and programs that includes new releases, media events, communication

strategy development, public meetings, work with citizen advisory groups, editorial boards, environmental software development, graphic arts, video production, Internet web page development, fact sheet and brochure development, and environment education.

Office of Regional Counsel

- ▶ 133 total FTEs, 97% working in CBEP activities.
- ▶ Supports of Regional teams, sponsoring regional teams and providing core team members (10% FTE each).
- ▶ Staffing to other partnerships and workgroups - CBEP workgroup, Ashtabula River Partnership, and Winton Hills/Cincinnati.
- ▶ Development of a Community Involvement in Enforcement Workshop.

Office of Strategic Environmental Analysis

- ▶ 24 total FTEs, 25% working in CBEP activities.
- ▶ Support of Regional teams, sponsors regional priorities and teams.
- ▶ Sponsors CBEP workgroup and Critical Habitat workgroup
- ▶ Team Leader for Project XL-Communities projects.
- ▶ Representative of National Sustainable Development Challenge Grant workgroup.
- ▶ Staffs the international projects for comparative risk in Poland and risk assessment in Hungary.
- ▶ Sponsors Urban Sprawl Initiative.
- ▶ Ecorisk Management Training, training for trainers.

Barriers to CBEP

Various barriers to CBEP were identified in the Regional 1995 CBEP Action Plan. These were budgetary restrictions, pending State and Tribal buy-in, and lack of staff experience in using the community-based approach. Budgetary restrictions still continue as a major barrier. While the signing of five State EnPPAs and the TEAs indicates that we have reached a major milestone, the Region, the States, and the Tribes need to continue the progress on defining specific CBEP activities and resource needs. Resources and training are still needed for the development of staff along with a clarification of the Federal role in CBEP.

Messages from Headquarters and OECA on environmental results and enforcement emphasis are being interpreted as obstacles to the CBEP approach. It is recognized that environmental results are the ultimate objectives of the Agency; however, the emphasis on immediate and direct environmental results may not always be possible

when working with communities and organizations who will require time and investment before results are accomplished. The premise of CBEP is that greater environmental results will occur from working with the communities to identify, prioritize and develop solutions to environmental problems. The methods needed for a CBEP approach do not readily lend themselves to the indicators and result requirements now being imposed by the national programs. Community capacity building environmental measures are a very new concept and are extremely difficult to develop at this early stage in the process.

The message from OECA is also interpreted as competing and/or opposing the CBEP approach. Command and control was to change to partnering, yet OECA insists on numbers and enforcement actions to demonstrate that environmental success is being achieved. The interpretation of the messages may be what is at fault, and the Agency may need only change the words to convey a clearer message..

The requirements of the Government Performance and Results Act (GPRA) may make it more difficult to implement CBEP. The methods and techniques of CBEP do not align well with those of GPRA. A reconciliation between the requirements of GPRA and the CBEP approach and measures of success is needed.

The funding process and requirements from national program offices continues to make the application of the CBEP approach more difficult. If CBEP activities are not able to make a direct link to the program definitions, it is difficult to secure funding. There is no specific grant for funding communities capacity building, forcing staff to identify potential sources of money and to develop creative justifications for the funding.

LESSONS LEARNED

CBEP is still a relatively new way of doing business for the Agency. While some of the staff may have been working within a CBEP model for a number of years, it is only in the last year that the Agency has made it one of our guiding policies in conducting our work. Accordingly, we have learned much over the last year. This final section will highlight the strengths and weaknesses of the CBEP approach.

Strengths

- ▶ Stronger Partnerships: By having multi-program internal teams, EPA is better able to show partners that there is a long-term commitment on our part to work with them. Because of this, EPA is able to form more robust partnerships with State agencies, other Federal agencies, non-governmental organizations and others.
- ▶ Better Problem Definition: Because of the stronger partnerships and the sharing of expertise, there is a greater chance that the environmental problems can be better identified. That means that the agencies can better focus their limited resources on solving particular problems in particular places.
- ▶ More Efficient Resource Distribution: With better problem definition comes a better understanding of what resources are needed to solve the problem. EPA has a tremendous amount of discretionary grant dollars that can now be better targeted to particular groups or universities to help solve local problems. We can better define the results we are looking for and create environmental indicators to show the progress we are making.
- ▶ Increased Public Involvement: With partnerships comes a natural need to create better dialogues to help solve problems. Local knowledge is key to CBEP and the teams and their partners have formed long-term dialogues with all key stakeholders to keep the agency grounded in working on environmental problems.
- ▶ Leveraging Resources: With the expanded internal and external approach to our work, both the Regional programs and those programs of the external partners are open to much more resource sharing. This is a way to extend the life of a program or to fund local groups that can achieve local results. CBEP is an ideal

way to "prime the pump" to leverage more resources for environmental programs

- ▶ Addressing Related Environmental Issues: Being involved with other partners means that there is much more expertise around the table to solve problems. It also means that other agendas can come to fore and EPA can get involved in related environmental issues that are not under our direct legislative authority. The CBEP approach allows us to get involved in land use issues, sustainable development and other local issues without necessarily overstepping our authority.

Weaknesses

- ▶ Senior Level Support: For CBEP to be effective, it will need the continued support and patience of senior management in the Region and Headquarters and program support in terms of resources. Regional staff need to know that it is "okay to fail" provided that valuable lessons can be learned and transferred to others in the Agency. We need to develop tracking and internal information systems in the Region which can assist regional staff to implement CBEP without "reinventing the wheel."
- ▶ New Models of Public Involvement are Needed: Better ways of communication with external customers are essential, such as not only to inform but also to assist and involve stakeholders in the visioning of goals, priorities and issues. As such, education and outreach is not only a core process in the Region, but a critical function, reflected in the FY97 critical approaches and in the way we operate on a day to day basis.
- ▶ Travel Resources: The staff needs to be more accessible to the communities whether it be as an outstationed position or increased visits to the area. Also, staff need the time to be accessible such as spending phone time and product development.
- ▶ Understanding Communities: CBEP must be one of the first considerations of all our planning, activities, and actions. Planning of activities and agenda need to include communities from the start. Too many times, EPA approaches communities with set objectives which can set up misunderstanding and sometimes distrust. We must recognize that we don't know what they are thinking, what they need, and what they want. We need a regional mechanism to facilitate these interactions early on so we can quickly start our work.
- ▶ Program Coordination: All program activities and visits to same locations should be coordinated. Some programs visits can destroy the work of another group.

PRIORITY PLACE-BASED PROJECTS (REGION 5'S PRINCIPAL PLACES)

The Great Lakes

The Great Lakes

Environmental Problem Statement

The Great Lakes are the largest system of fresh surface water, containing 18 percent of the world's supply. The Great Lakes ecosystem contains many diverse elements, including major centers of population, agricultural land, forests, dunes, wetlands, and globally rare plant and animal species. The Great Lakes have suffered over the decades from point and nonpoint sources of pollution, habitat loss and destruction, and threats to biodiversity. In recent years, the Great Lakes have seen major environmental improvements, but they still are affected by a wide range of continuing stressors, particularly toxins that bioaccumulate in the food chain, making numerous fish advisories necessary. Habitat loss and destruction and loss of biodiversity are major problems as well.

Program Sponsor and Resources

Support for this priority place is provided by The Great Lakes National Program Office in partnership with Regions 2, 3, and 5. The Office has a budget to protect and restore the Great Lakes ecosystem. In addition, seven Region 5 principal-place teams (Lake Superior, Lake Michigan, Lake Erie, Northwest Indiana, Greater Chicago, Southeast Michigan, and Northeast Ohio) work to protect geographic areas within the basin. Staff in region 3 focus on protection of Lake Erie in Pennsylvania. Region 2 staff focus on implementation of the Niagara River Toxics Management Plan and the Lake Ontario Lakewide Management Plan.

Stakeholders

Partners include the International Joint Commission, Great Lakes Fisheries Commission, Great Lakes Commission, Environment Canada and other Canadian agencies and organizations, other federal agencies such as U.S. Fish and Wildlife Service and U.S. Geological Service, more than 40 Tribes, the water quality and natural resource agencies of all eight Great Lake states, non-governmental organizations such

as National Wildlife Federation, Council of Great Lakes Industries, and The Nature Conservancy, foundations such as Mott and Great Lakes Protection Fund, universities such as the University of Michigan, community organizations such as the Grand Traverse Bay Conservancy, as well as numerous local government organizations.

Goal

To protect and restore the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Great lakes basin ecosystem.

Subgoals

- Reduce and eliminate loadings of toxic substances, with and emphasis on persistent bioaccumulative substances using pollution prevention as a primary tool. Clean up contaminated sediments.
- Protect human health; protect and restore habitat; and maintain healthy and stable populations of fish and other aquatic life, wildlife, and plants in the Great Lakes ecosystem.
- Support other priorities, such as community-based environmental protection, partnerships, enhanced public communication, and measuring and managing for environmental results.

More specific goals are articulated in the 25-year old Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement between the governments of the United States and Canada. This international agreement strongly advocates local community involvement in problem solving through the Remedial Action Plan process.

Obstacles

To accomplish the goal requires working together with another country and a variety of federal, state, and local entities, all with different missions and goals. The challenge is to meet issues head on and formulate joint solutions that protect the environment.

Successes

- ▶ 1996 State of the Lakes Ecosystem Conference focused on nearshore ecosystems. Attended by 500 people from a cross-section of Great Lakes organizations, the conference is expected to result in actions to protect the shoreline at a local level.
- ▶ Grant dollars from at least one funding source, GLNPO's Habitat grants, served as seed money for 87 projects across the basin over a period of four years (1992-1995). Sixty-four percent of the grant money went to Tribes and local organizations.

Contact

Gary Gulezian, Acting Director
Great Lakes National Program Office
(312)886-4040

Lake Michigan

Environmental Problem Statement

Lake Michigan, by volume, is the second largest Great Lake and the only one located totally within the United States. The Lake's drainage basin covers more than 45,000 square miles and drains parts of four states: Wisconsin, Illinois, Indiana and Michigan. While the northern part remains sparsely populated, the southern basin is home to about 8 million people and is the most urbanized area in the Great Lakes system. The International Joint Commission has designated 10 Areas of Concern where use of rivers, bays or lakes is limited by pollution. At the same time the Lake has unique conditions that support plant and animal species found nowhere else in the world, including sand dunes, coastal marshes, tallgrass prairies, savannas, forests and fens.

The Lake Michigan Lakewide Management Plan is called for under the United States/Canadian Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement as well as the 1990 Great Lakes Critical Programs Act to focus on reducing the discharges of pollutants to the waters of the Lake's ecosystem. Habitat loss and shifts in species composition are also important factors contributing to the degradation of the quality of the ecosystem. Despite reductions during the last 20 years, data indicate toxic pollutants still exert negative impacts on the components of the Lake Michigan ecosystem.

Program Sponsor and Resources

The Lake Michigan Team is sponsored by the Great Lakes National Program Office, Acting Director Gary Gulezian. This office has provided administrative support, Internet design and hook-ups, financial support and staff expertise for fact sheet printing and travel funds for the Team Manager.

Financial support was through Coastal Environmental Management funds that went to state grants as well as team proposals. Discussions of priorities for the use of the funds were part of the committee structure and the performance partnership agreement discussions.

Besides the Regional Team Manager, who is devoted full time to the effort,

contributions of FTE from the Regional Program Offices were utilized.

Stakeholders

In addition to the internal team members from the Region 5 programs and offices, other regional teams, there is a formal structure of committees that meet regularly around the basin and work in partnership. These include other federal agencies, state environmental and natural resource agencies, tribal governments, local governments, health agencies, regional planning commissions, community and environmental groups, industry and academia.

Goals

- To protect and restore a sustainable Lake Michigan ecosystem,
- To provide a scientific base for policy and resource decisions that impact the basin,
- To format and interpret data into information useable by a wide spectrum of users, and
- To structure all activities to maximize partnerships and cooperative efforts.

Successes

- ▶ A series of ten fact sheets was published in November 1996 and formed the basis for the Lake Michigan Team's new homepage.
- ▶ A new partnership effort under way is called the Lake Michigan Fellows program. Governmental agencies, the Lake Michigan Forum and a local sponsor will host detailed briefings on Lake Michigan issues for community leaders all around the Lake,
- ▶ User friendly software that depicts Lake Michigan as a valued resource is under production and will be available for museums, visitor centers and educational institutions around the Lake ,
- ▶ Surveys of the conditions and potential for restoration work for the wetlands of southern Lake Michigan are being carried out using CEM funds,
- ▶ Surveys of the stakeholders of the southern Lake are also underway,
- ▶ Pollution Prevention efforts in the iron and steel industry and a land use conference are in active development with partners.
- ▶ The Lake Michigan Mass Balance study is continuing with field, lab, modeling, and data work being completed. Reports of key findings and recommendations for environmental management of the Great Lakes will be developed and published over the next year. Federal and state partners have contributed over \$12 million over the last few years to undertake the study.

Contact

Judy Beck
Lake Michigan Team Manager
(312) 353-9391

Lake Erie

Environmental Problem Statement

Lake Erie is the smallest in volume and the most shallow of the Great Lakes, and yet has the largest population within its watershed - over 11 million people, or 1/3 of the total Great Lakes basin population. Lake Erie is extremely important to these citizens as a major source of drinking water; an abundant source of water for agriculture and industry for sustaining one of the world's largest freshwater fisheries; as a transportation route for bulk cargo; for the recreational and tourism opportunities open to swimmers and boaters; and as a source of coastal habitat for bird and wildlife populations.

Major land use within the Lake Erie basin includes several large industrialized urban centers, as well as intensive farming. Therefore, the physical, chemical, and biological integrity of Lake Erie is threatened by pressures from both urban and agricultural sources, including agricultural runoff of pesticides and nutrients, point and non-point industrial sources of water pollution, leachate from abandoned hazardous waste sites, air deposition of toxic substances, habitat destruction, and invasion of exotic species such as the zebra mussel. Well-coordinated programs across jurisdictions, based upon common goals, are needed to reduce these pressures and ensure that Lake Erie remains a valuable natural resource for future generations.

Goals/Objectives

A Vision of accomplishments in the year 2001:

- State of Lake Erie: A sustainable and flourishing Lake Erie ecosystem.
- State of Environmental Protection Activities: Common environmental goals for Lake Erie drive productive public and private partnerships.
- State of Community-Based Involvement: Positive community involvement in protecting and restoring Lake Erie is a normal part of the lives of a majority of basin residents and users of the Lake.

Objectives:

- Control critical pollutants
- Protect and restore critical habitat
- Encourage sustainable fisheries
- Encourage sustainable recreational activities

Strategic Approach

- **Binational LaMP:** Serve as high-quality and timely consultants to the binational Lake Erie Lakewide Management Plan (LaMP) program, by bringing U.S. EPA's multi-media perspective, knowledge, and authorities to the LaMP program.

The LaMP is a binational management strategy with the overall goal of protecting and restoring the beneficial uses of Lake Erie. The LaMP effort is co-chaired by U.S. EPA and Environment Canada, and has as its partners the four Lake Erie States (New York, Ohio, Pennsylvania, and Michigan), the Province of Ontario, several other Federal agencies on the U.S. and Canadian side, and the interested public. U.S. EPA has provided funding for much of the assessment work to date on the U.S. side, including contractor support, has provided data to the LaMP process, and has supported facilitation of public involvement.

- **Local Problems:** To develop and advocate actions to protect and restore Lake Erie through a local focus, in harmony with the LaMP program, such as assistance with progress for Areas of Concern, or other geographic areas. The Team looks for both early actions, and actions that require long-term investments.

These goals, objectives, and strategic approaches were developed by the Lake Erie Team based on the following:

- Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement between the U.S. and Canada
- Concept Paper for the Lake Erie LaMP, finalized in January 1995
- Issues identified by the LaMP partner agencies
- Issues identified by stakeholders at four small public meetings in the spring of 1995

Future refinement of these goals will be based on a broader base of public input.

Resources

U.S. EPA funding for the LaMP work has come from the Coastal Environmental Management (CEM) funding sources.

Lake Erie Team staff involvement in the LaMP and local activities has come from the time allocated to team members by their home Divisions for work on Lake Erie.

Obstacles

- The Federal furloughs and funding uncertainties made scheduling and planning very difficult for the first half of the fiscal year.
- A strike of Provincial employees within Ontario slowed overall LaMP progress.
- U.S. EPA contractor support for the LaMP is dependent upon utilization of a Headquarters contract with many other higher-priority users. The Lake Erie Team was not allowed to use this contract until May 1996. This contractor support was needed in October 1995, and this delay did slow progress in developing pollutant sources and loadings information.

Successes

- ▶ The LaMP has moved forward in its assessment phase of defining ecosystem objectives, analyzing the status of beneficial use impairments, and collecting data on pollutant sources and loadings. A deadline of October 1997 has been established for publication of this first phase of assessment.
- ▶ Much progress has been made in community involvement in the LaMP process. During FY 96, an active Public Forum was created, which is a binational group of about 80 members who want to be involved in LaMP development, as well as initiate their own projects in support of LaMP goals. The Forum has reviewed and commented on several of the beneficial use impairment assessments, is developing a vision statement for Lake Erie, is developing methods to share information with the broader public, and is beginning to develop pollution prevention projects.
- ▶ The Lake Erie Team has developed a World Wide Web page to communicate U.S. EPA's role in protecting Lake Erie. This page is expected to go on line in November 1996.
- ▶ The Lake Erie Team has worked with the Southeast Michigan Initiative Team to support progress on the Detroit River Remedial Action Plan, including support for continuing community involvement where there is serious conflict among various stakeholders.
- ▶ Preliminary environmental indicators have been developed by the Lake Erie Team. These need to be reviewed by the LaMP partners and stakeholders before they are finalized.
- ▶ The Lake Erie Team, in partnership with the Lake Michigan and Lake Superior Team, have developed a video highlighting the contribution of teenagers to protecting the Great Lakes. This video will be distributed to schools in FY 97.
- ▶ U.S. EPA involvement in the Lake Erie LaMP has leveraged funds and FTE from four other Federal agencies, four Lake Erie states, the Province of Ontario, and

three Canadian Federal agencies. In addition, U.S. EPA funds facilitate public involvement, with much of the time and travel costs of the public not reimbursed with U.S. EPA funds.

Contact

Francine Norling
Lake Erie Team Manager
(312) 886-0271

Lake Superior

Environmental Problem Statement

Lake Superior is the largest of the Great Lakes and contains about half of the total volume of water in the Great Lakes, or 10% of the fresh water in the world. Its shores are sparsely populated compared to the other lakes and have not experienced nearly the level of development associated with the remainder of the Great Lakes basin. As a result, the Lake Superior ecosystem has remained relatively pristine with large tracts of forested lands and undisturbed habitat and fewer pollutants entering the Lake (except through airborne transport). As a resource, Lake Superior is vital to the basin economy and prosperity. Water usage includes drinking water, sustenance fishing, power generation, transportation of major commodities, and commercial and sport fisheries. The lake is also valued for recreation and tourism as well as for cultural and spiritual reasons.

In spite of its relative pristine condition, Lake Superior is not without problems. Non-point source run off and airborne transport of persistent, bioaccumulative chemicals is a major source of contamination to the Lake, and fish advisories are still needed due to bioaccumulation of toxic substances in fish tissue. In addition, the Lake is subject to stressors of habitat destruction, particularly wetlands, and the invasion of exotic species, such as the sea lamprey and European ruffe.

Program Sponsor and Resources

Region 5 has identified Lake Superior as one of the principle places where the Region will employ its resources to address its most significant environmental problems. The Lake Superior Team is sponsored and supported by the Region 5 Senior Leadership Team (SLT). Team members have been assigned from each of the Region's program offices/divisions to provide a multi-media, cross-program focus to the Team's work. Additional members have been assigned to accomplish core functions of the team, such as coordination of the Critical Pollutant LaMP, communications, and liaisons for public participation groups for the RAPs associated with each of the AOCs within Lake

Superior. Funding for implementation of the binational program, including the LaMP, RAPs, sediment remediation, and habitat protection/restoration projects has come from the Costal Environmental Management (CEM) funding sources provided through the Great Lakes National Program Office (GLNPO) and the Region 5 Water Division.

Stakeholders

The EPA has joined with many Federal, State, Provincial, and Tribal governments in Canada and the U.S. under the umbrella of the Binational Program to Protect and Restore Lake Superior. The Binational Program incorporates the Lake-wide Management Plan (LaMP) for Lake Superior and commits the governments to several additional actions including, implementation of a Zero Discharge Demonstration Project for chemical pollutants, determination of special protection designations, development of pollution prevention strategies, and protection of critical habitat within the Lake Superior basin.

The Binational Program also includes participation by a public stakeholder group, The Binational Forum, made up of U.S. and Canadian members of the public that represent a diverse slice of the basin community. The Forum works with the governments to identify key issues and recommend the appropriate course of action. The general public is the ultimate stakeholder for the overall goal of protecting and restoring Lake Superior. This includes those in businesses, industry, environmentalism, tourism, and those individuals who live and work within the Lake Superior basin.

Goals/Objectives

The long-term strategic goal for Lake Superior is to restore and protect the chemical, physical, and biological integrity of the Lake Superior ecosystem. A Vision for the year 2001 includes:

- Implementation of a fully developed, multi-media program for protection, conservation and restoration in the Lake Superior basin.
- Local communities have acquired the capacity to take the lead on maintaining the Lake Superior program with needed input from federal/state/Provincial governments.
- Heightened awareness and buy-in to protection/stewardship ethic for Lake Superior in the basin; economic and land development decision making consider impacts to Lake Superior.

In order to accomplish these goals, the Lake Superior Team has identified a number of objectives to move towards the long-term goals for the Lake:

- Reduce loadings of toxic substances of concern to Lake Superior

- Remediate contaminated sediment within Areas of Concern (AOCs) on Lake Superior
- Protect and restore key habitat in the Lake Superior ecosystems
- Encourage sustainable community development
- Build local capacity for stewardship and leadership

Obstacles

- Government funding uncertainties and budget cuts
- Federal/State laws that discourage efficient energy usage, sustainable land development, and pollution prevention
- Federal/State government actions (e.g. permits issuance) that are contrary to the goals of the Binational Program for Lake Superior

Successes

- ▶ The planning stage document of the Critical Pollutants LaMP, the Binational Pollution Prevention Strategy, the Ecological Criteria and Identification of Important Habitat, and the Ecosystem Principles, Objectives, Indicators and Targets for Lake Superior have been developed and are currently undergoing public review and comment.
- ▶ The Binational Forum (the public stakeholder group) developed load reduction targets for the critical pollutants. The recommendations were incorporated verbatim into the Critical Pollutants LaMP.
- ▶ Through grants from EPA and Great Lakes Protection Fund, Western Lake Superior Sanitary District (WLSSD) developed a blueprint for mercury elimination that will enable WLSSD to achieve zero discharge of mercury.
- ▶ The States of Wisconsin, Minnesota, and Michigan are partnering with energy utilities in these three states to look for ways to reduce mercury emissions from coal powered utilities in the Lake Superior Basin.
- ▶ Several habitat restoration projects have been initiated and/or continued in 1996, including: Tern nesting habitat restoration, reintroduction of Trumpeter Swans, an endangered species, and Macrophyte restoration in Chequamegon Bay area; Whittlesey Creek restoration in Bayfield, Wisconsin; and Grassy Point marsh restoration in Duluth Harbor, Minnesota.

Contact

Margaret Guerriero
Lake Superior Team Manager
(312) 886-0399

THE UPPER MISSISSIPPI RIVER

Environmental Problem Statement

The Upper Mississippi River basin extends from the confluence with the Ohio River northwards to its headwaters in Minnesota. The Mississippi River and its ecosystem have been heavily influenced by man and his activities: navigational structures, 27 locks and dams on the main channel, flood protection levees, changes in land use/land cover. Within the basin are some of the most highly productive agricultural lands in the world. Also within the basin, one will find a significant numbers of species, including fish, birds and mammals.

The river is experiencing significant adverse environmental impacts. For the Upper Mississippi River basin there are three areas of major concern: sedimentation, nutrient loading contributing to the "Hypoxia" problem in the Gulf of Mexico, and the loss of habitat. Sedimentation is impacting backwater areas of the river. These sediments are smothering fish and mussel habitat. Sources of the sediments include erosion from agricultural lands, and from urban areas where development is occurring as well as recreational home development. Barge traffic on the river also stirs and resuspends the sediments.

Nutrients used in agricultural production as well as nutrients from urban runoff are thought to be contributing to the "Hypoxia" problem in the Gulf of Mexico. The problem may not be only the result of nutrient runoff. Another potential source of the nutrients is the transport of the nutrients through the Mississippi River system. Navigation and flood control structures that have been constructed on the river have changed the interaction with the floodplain.

Habitat loss is a great concern. While the refuge system does help protect some of the wetland and backwater habitats, other areas are threatened. Within the basin, losses of wetlands, forests and prairies have been significant. In Illinois 99.99% of the prairies have been lost. In Iowa and Illinois approximately 80 % of the wetlands have been drained or filled. In addition to the loss of habitat due to development, habitat is effected by the navigation system and the movement of barge traffic. The navigation structures have changed the way the river functioned in the past. Interaction with the floodplain has been interrupted. Natural fluctuation of water levels not longer occurs which may contribute to changes in vegetation in the backwater areas.

Program Sponsor and Resources

The Upper Mississippi River Team is supported and sponsored by the Senior Leadership Team, (SLT). Additional funds have been garnered from the Office of Policy Planning and evaluation, Office of Wetlands, Oceans and Watersheds, as well

as the Office of Research and Development. Partnerships have been developed with the Federal agencies, Army Corps of Engineers, U.S. Geological Service, Biological Resources Division and the Water Resources Division, Fish and Wildlife Service and the Natural Resources Conservation Service as well as with the States, Illinois, Iowa, Minnesota, Missouri and Wisconsin, and many non-government organizations.

Goals

- To identify and prioritize watersheds and subwatersheds that are contributing significant amounts of sediments and nutrients. We will be working with the Natural Resource Conservation Service, National Biological Service and U.S. Geological Service to identify problem watersheds and to prioritize activities.
- To develop Best Management Practices to address the sediment and nutrient problems. Some of these actions will require us to work with the agricultural community in addressing these problems.
- To identify areas where wetlands, forests and prairies can be restored or enhanced. Emphasis will be placed upon habitat opportunities within the Mississippi River floodplain.

Stakeholders

As indicated above the stakeholders include the Federal agencies, Fish and Wildlife Service, U.S. Geological Service, Biological Resources and Water Resources Divisions, Corps of Engineers, Natural Resources Conservation Service, the States, many non-government organizations from the environmental area as well as the agricultural community and the navigation industry. We have also been working with the academic community, Universities of Illinois, and Wisconsin at Madison and Stevens Point, and St. Mary's College in Winona Minnesota.

Successes

- ▶ Assessments, a survey of persons living in the Upper Mississippi River Basin regarding the future uses of the river, a status and trends report, the identification of sites where the natural hydro graph could be restored for a period of time, and the assessment of the fate and transport of nutrients in the Upper Mississippi River Basin Another project is to help identify economic and job potential associated with the environmental amenities along the bluff lands of the Mississippi River in and around Savanna, Illinois.
- ▶ The Region was part of the successful negotiation of land use resulting from the base closure of the Savanna Army Depot. 13,000 acres are being dedicated to a wildlife refuge under the auspices of US Fish and Wildlife and the community will receive 2,500 acres for its use and development.
- ▶ We have begun the initial steps in developing a program that addresses the

environmental and ecosystem as well as the economic needs of the basin. We have three interagency agreements with the U.S. Geological Service, Biological Resources Division. These Interagency Agreements focus on the main stem of the river at this time. A "Status and Trends" report will be completed and available in the second quarter of FY-97, criteria will be developed to identify areas in several of the pools where the natural hydrograph could be restored to the river in several of the pools on the river, and the fate and transport of nutrients will be initiated during FY-97. The natural hydrograph has been a project of interest to the environmental community for several years. This will help restore the natural vegetation and the aquatic community and improve water quality. The status and trends report will provide information on areas of concern and needs. A couple of grants to the University of Illinois will help evaluate the potential for habitat restoration along both the Illinois and Mississippi Rivers.

- ▶ A new partnership was formed on February 1 & 2, 1996 at meeting of 120 people who represented multiple views and opinions of the purpose, use, and future of the River. The "Environmental Summit/Big River Partnership" was formed and a common goal for the river's future was set. Within the partnership, five workgroups were established to address specific environmental issues: water level, flood plain and aquatic habitat, watersheds, river training structures, and future conditions.

Contact

Bill Franz
The Upper Mississippi River Team Manager
(312) 886-7500

NORTHWEST INDIANA GEOGRAPHIC

Environmental Problem Statement

The Northwest Indiana Geographic Initiative area spans the southern shore of Lake Michigan. The past century has seen intense industrialization (with steel and petroleum refining industries dominating), severe environmental degradation, and major alteration of the natural ecosystem. The area was selected as the first regional geographic initiative area. Lake and Porter Counties are non-attainment areas for ozone and particulate Clean Air Act standards, and LaPorte County experienced six ozone exceedances in 1995. Up to ten million yards of contaminated sediments line the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal and the Grand Calumet River, of which 150,000 cubic yards enter Lake Michigan each year. Millions of gallons of free petroleum products float on the ground water table, some of which enters waterways. Numerous sites require

cleanup, whether through Superfund, RCRA corrective action, or the Leaking Underground Storage Tanks programs. Low income and minority citizens are adversely affected by these environmental problems. With numerous units of local government in the area, problem solving is often complicated. Sprawl is emerging as an important sustainable development issue. The Region and the State have been working closely together to find and implement solutions to these problems.

Program Sponsor and Resources

The Northwest Indiana initiative is sponsored by the Senior Leadership Team, with specific sponsorship from the Regional Counsel and the Director of the Office of Public Affairs. Staffing resources came from all Divisions in the Region. Limited new funds were allocated to the initiative in FY96. Approximately \$60,000 in Coastal Environmental Management funds were allocated to the initiative. All other activities were funded in FY95 and carried over into FY96.

Stakeholders

Stakeholders in the initiative area are numerous and varied. In the three county area, the initiative works with several environmental groups, the Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission, various county and municipal governments, State and Federal agencies, local health advocacy groups, and industries. Stakeholder involvement varies depending on the scope and nature of the activity, and developing stakeholder relationships was a focus of the initiative in FY96.

Goals/Mission

The Mission for the initiative is "To champion community based environmental protection by building local capacity, and to protect and improve the Northwest Indiana environment and enhance the quality of life for its residents". The goals for FY96 were as follows:

- Form and strengthen partnerships with local governments and communities.
- Identify important community issues and needs.
- Maintain and improve EPA-State Partnerships.
- Continue ongoing Northwest Indiana Environmental Initiative Action Plan implementation activities. This is a plan jointly developed by EPA and the Indiana Department of Environmental Management (IDEM) and identifies areas our agencies work on jointly to bring about environmental improvement in six priority areas.
- Establish baseline for measurement of problems and progress.
- Bring "new tools" to program implementation, including brownfields, environmental justice, pollution prevention, compliance assistance,

- communications, and common sense decision making.
- Ensure that activities include the full geographic area, expanding from Lake County, the original initiative area, to Porter and LaPorte Counties as well.

Obstacles

Several barriers or obstacles existed which impacted our work in Northwest Indiana. First and foremost was the uncertainty with the budget during the entire first half of the year, and then the extremely limited funding available for the balance of the year. Another barrier exists in the extremely fragmented geopolitical landscape of the area; no one unit of government dominates or leads in the area, leading to "Balkanization". This Balkanization is not limited to governments, but also affects how citizens react to problems in the area, and creates difficulties in doing effective outreach. A third barrier to community based environmental protection is the sheer magnitude of the environmental degradation in the area. As most people have lived with it all their lives, unless a specific issue arises which affects them directly, it is difficult to engage interest. We are responding to this by communicating more with local governments, and approaching established groups and offering our assistance and support.

Successes

- ▶ The Northwest Indiana region is currently confronting the interrelated issues of land use, sprawl, and the environment. Community leaders have realized the importance of sustaining the economy, improving the environment, and being able to compete economically in the future. Based on local interest in sustainable development, the Region provided a grant to the Northwestern Indiana Regional Planning Commission (NIRPC) to conduct a sustainable development initiative. During FY96, NIRPC convened a diverse group of government, business, industrial, environmental, and community groups to come together to further this issue. The these meetings laid the ground work for a series of Sustainable Development Round Tables, which are being held during the first half of FY97. This issue is bringing about a stronger appreciation for environmental quality, and the importance of including regional impacts of activities in decision making. This effort will be used as a springboard for starting a community based risk assessment project, which was partially funded in FY96 and will be underway in FY97.
- ▶ The Indiana Harbor Ship Canal and the Grand Calumet River are both filled with contaminated sediments. Together with IDEM, we have been working on implementing a strategy for their cleanup.
- ▶ Progress continues with the Indiana Harbor Ship Canal dredging project; the U.S. Army Corps of Engineers completed and public noticed its draft environmental impact statement for the project, after several years' delay. The proposed disposal site for the dredge materials appears to be acceptable to

most of the community, especially when compared to the previous proposal which engendered enormous community opposition. The Region worked closely with the Corps on the EIS and jointly held several availability sessions to explain the project prior to the formal public hearing.

- The Region and IDEM laid the groundwork for cleanup of the Grand Calumet River by beginning work on establishing a sediment cleanup Partnership, involving industries located along the river, governments, and citizens. The Partnership will combine several initiatives, such as river corridor planning, sediment cleanup, and natural resource restoration.

Contact

Sally Swanson
Northwest Indiana Geographic Initiative Team Manager
(312) 353-8512

Greater Chicago

Environmental Problem Statement

The mission of the Greater Chicago Initiative team is to protect and restore environmental health and beauty in Greater Chicago: where we live, where we work, and where we play. The Initiative covers Cook County, with an emphasis on the Southeast and West Sides of Chicago (both environmental justice areas). Outstanding problems within the area include nonattainment with the ozone standard; large-scale groundwater and soil contamination; deterioration of critical habitat and biodiversity; illegal dumping; and contaminated sediments. The Greater Chicago team works with our Federal, State, local, and other partners to develop strategies that will address these problems. Activities for FY 96 included public outreach efforts on the need to attain the ozone standard and the relationship of ozone alert days to health effects, such as asthma; the development of public dialogue on the critical question of the development of large-scale contaminated groundwater and soil areas, including the need to preserve and/or restore critical habitat so as to engender biodiversity; work to build State and local illegal dumping programs; and the development of programs with business and the community for pollution prevention.

Program Sponsor and Resources

The Greater Chicago Initiative is sponsored by Region 5's Senior Leadership Team. \$50,000 in discretionary funds were allocated for Chicago team priorities in FY 96. There were approximately 50 staff working, at one time or another, on the Chicago Initiative last year.

Stakeholders

Representatives of the Illinois Environmental Protection Agency, the Cook County Department of the Environment, the Metropolitan Sanitary District of Greater Chicago sit on the Initiative's Steering Committee. Stakeholders include other Federal, State, and local units of government; industrial, environmental, public health institutions, university, environmental justice organizations; private citizens; and anybody else who is interested in identifying environmental problems and developing and implementing solutions to these problems.

FY 96 Goals

Fiscal Year 96 goals included:

- the creation of an environment conducive to sustainable development
- the identification of environmental problems and solutions with our community partners
- the institutionalization of communication mechanisms among all stakeholders
- the utilization of tools and resources to accomplish our mission
- the development of objective baselines and measures of success

Tools

The goals were to be accomplished through using the tools of enforcement, permitting, pollution prevention/compliance assistance, brownfields, environmental indicators, environmental justice, facilitation, and voluntary initiatives.

Obstacles

Distrust between stakeholders is a major obstacle. The Greater Chicago Initiative encompasses a large area, with sophisticated governments and other organizations who are accustomed to acting on their own. While many participants recognize the need for coordination and dialogue between all stakeholders, there is still a tendency to operate independently.

Successes

- Developing the City of Chicago's Illegal Dumping Program Capacity.
On or about January 7, 1996, a joint undercover investigation by the U.S. Attorney's Office and the FBI, named Operation Silver Shovel, became public. The investigation concerned the existence of several large illegal dump sites that contained mainly concrete and other forms of debris. EPA was neither aware of

nor participated in the investigation. Since January, the Regional illegal dumping team has actively worked to build the City of Chicago's Illegal Dumping Program capacity, as well as respond directly to requests from the City for assistance in responding to the needs of investigating and remediating 16 illegal dump sites

At the request of the City, Regional staff have looked at all 16 sites and conducted six removal assessments. In addition, our emergency removal staff removed hazardous wastes that have been identified at any illegal dump sites. Data and information has been forwarded to the City and the States Attorney's office. A Region 5 toxicologist visited several Silver Shovel sites in order to assess any risk to human health. It is expected that we will be sharing the results of that assessment with the impacted communities soon.

Some waste materials from these sites often are transported to rock crushers for recycling. In a related matter, our Air and Radiation staff have initiated coordinated Federal, State, and City inspections of these rock crushers to ensure that these facilities are in compliance with the rules.

The team has made a major effort to build the capacity of the City's illegal dumping program. The Region has provided a project manager to directly assist in supervising the remediation at the 915 S. Kildare site. The project has advanced into a second stage and the project manager is conducting site assessments for other Silver Shovel sites for the City. Region staff are assisting the City in the development of a computer system with GIS capabilities to identify, map, and track waste disposal activities, violations, and violators. The U.S. EPA Criminal Investigations Division will be providing surveillance and enforcement training to various City departments with jurisdiction over illegal dumping activities, and is in the process of arranging the same. A seminar on Best Waste Management Practices for Builders and Contractors was held on June 13, 1996. Lastly, our Brownfields team is working with the City on the redevelopment potential of the Kildare and other sites. All this Regional assistance is in conjunction with a \$350,000 grant recently awarded to the City by the Region for the purposes of further building the capacity of the illegal dumping program.

Lastly, the investigation has stayed in the news for months, and the Region has received numerous inquiries from the press, Federal and State legislators, interested citizens, and the Administrator's office about the status of sites, community involvement, and assorted other issues. Our Office of Public Affairs and the illegal dumping team has worked very hard to ensure that all relevant information is disbursed to those that are interested.

In summary, the events of Operation Silver Shovel provided to the Region a

challenging opportunity to coordinate a multimedia approach to a long-standing environmental problem that fell through federal regulatory cracks. Lacking direct or even delegated regulatory authority, the illegal dumping team has successfully developed a multi-faceted approach to building the capacity of the City to address existing illegal dumps and to develop a long-term approach to avoiding such problems in the future.

► PCB Removal at Altgeld Gardens

During November, 1995, the existence of a PCB contaminated soils site at Altgeld Gardens was brought to the attention of the Greater Chicago Team. In the course of expedited soil testing activity, undesirable levels of PCBs were found in the front yard of a child care center. Although the levels detected were below regulatory action levels, the Altgeld PCB team was able to convince the Chicago Housing Authority to remove the soils near the child care center because of the presence of such young children. Several public meetings were held, as well as meetings with the child care center, the Altgeld Gardens Local Advisory Council, and People for Community Recovery (a local environmental group). Central Regional Laboratory staff worked after hours on weekends to expedite data collection and analysis. Rapid attention to this problem assuaged community concern about the child care center/ PCB problem and residents are pleased with the present progress being made on the site as a whole.

► Greater Chicago Pollution Prevention Partnership

Initiated in 1991, the Chicago Pollution Prevention Partnership (P3) is an organization of Federal, State, and local regulatory agencies united with representatives of industry, academia, environmental groups, environmental lawyers, and other citizens for the purposes of promoting pollution prevention activity. This year, the P3 has transformed itself from an information-sharing body that financially supported an engineering position at the Hazardous Waste Research Council to a more proactive group that has developed a strategy to inform and encourage industry to implement pollution prevention techniques. The P3 group has just held a meeting with members of a northside industrial association, providing an opportunity for business to dialogue about pollution prevention and compliance assurance with all the Chicago regulatory agencies in one place at one time, for the first time in the Chicago area.

Contact

Mardi Klevs
Greater Chicago Initiative Team Manager
(312) 353-5490

Southeast Michigan

Environmental Problem Statement

The Southeast Michigan Initiative area, comprised of 8 counties and 5 major watershed, including the City of Detroit and its suburbs, has been identified as an area with major environmental problems. Several rivers in the area, which flow directly into the Great Lakes system, have many impaired uses, combined sewer overflows and contaminated sediments. There are also major toxic pollutant releases, polluted air sheds and serious land use problems, including undeveloped Brownfields sites. In addition, many areas are subject to environmental justice concerns due to high minority and low income populations and depressed economic areas which could benefit from redevelopment to revitalize the sustainability of the community, both economically and environmentally. With a population of over four million, the citizens of the areas stand to benefit from increased attention to strategic environmental planning, remediation, permitting, enforcement, as well as, the implementation of new and innovative approaches to environmental protection.

Program Sponsor and Resources

The SEMI Team is sponsored by David Kee, Director of the Region 5 Air and Radiation Division (ARD). The ARD provided administrative support to the Regional Team Manager.

Financial support was obtained through Regional Geographic Initiative (RGI) funds from the Office of Regional Operations and State and Local Relations in Headquarters in the amount of \$645,000. Also, because much of the work in Southeast Michigan is in conjunction with Remedial Action Plan (RAP) work on the Great Lakes, a large portion of our projects were funded by the Coastal Environmental Management (CEM) funds, pursuant to the Clean Water Act of approximately \$210,000.

Besides the Regional Team Manager, who is devoted full time to the team effort, human resources to the team consisted of contributions of FTE from the Regional Program Offices. The core team members and some others had a specific amount of their time devoted to SEMI team work throughout the year, whereas others were involved on a project-specific basis.

Stakeholders

In addition to the internal team members from the Region 5 programs and offices and other regional teams, the initiative has developed partnerships with many external stakeholders in the SEMI area. These include, but are not limited to: other federal

agencies, Canadian federal and provincial environmental agencies, state agencies, county governments, city and other local governments, state and local health departments, regional planning agencies, citizens, community groups, faith groups, environmental groups, industry and academia.

Goals

- To implement actions consistent with Agency mandates and community concerns.
- To act as a clearinghouse and advocacy base for SEMI.
- To develop environmental quality indicators against which results can be measured.
- To increase stakeholder participation and "buy-in" to environmental improvement and protection activities.
- To promote a sense of pride and commitment by the stakeholders which will motivate and sustain them to continue to strive toward environmental protection and improvement.
- To promote effective communication, education and public outreach among the stakeholders.
- To establish partnerships that will enable stakeholders to efficiently coordinate and focus their efforts in environmental protection/improvement
- To promote a sense of confidence among all stakeholders that their environmental concerns/problems will be addressed.
- To implement and encourage innovative solutions to environmental problems.

In general, the SEMI team acts to fulfill the goals of community-based environmental protection in the area and the region's commitment to the area. The team strives to operate consistently with agendas established jointly with the stakeholders/communities by working in partnership with them to determine those areas needing support. To the extent possible, the team coordinates internally and externally to ensure that resources are brought to bear on the most pressing environmental issues/problems in the area.

The philosophy of the initiative is community-based environmental protection. It is a problem-solving approach that provides a framework for identifying environmental problems, setting priorities and forging innovative solutions through common sense ways in an open, inclusive process. The approach is driven by the stakeholders in southeast Michigan who are devoted to restoring and sustaining healthy ecological and human communities.

Obstacles

- The furloughs in the past year, were an obvious deterrent to the team efforts,

especially because they occurred right after the Region had just established the 17 new teams, one of which was SEMI. It was difficult to gain momentum and get progress underway, both internally and with our external partners.

- Although the Region has made a strong commitment to the teams, there still appears to be some confusion over priorities and a sense of competition between team and programmatic goals. This is decreasing over time, but was difficult to deal with in the first year of the new teams existence.
- Mistrust of the federal government on the part of many of our external stakeholders. The more successes we can achieve, the less burdensome this obstacle becomes.
- In general, there were many administrative and logistical problems that made it difficult to communicate and coordinate with external stakeholders. Additional administrative and travel resources may have helped this situation.

Successes

- ▶ The SEMI Environmental Forum has been established which hosts bi-monthly roundtable meetings with SEMI external stakeholders in order to share information and facilitate productive partnerships to address problems (Grant to local Regional Planning Agency for facilitation of the forum, \$40,000).
- ▶ A grant in the amount of \$85,000 has been established with the Southeast Michigan Council of Governments to develop a profile of environmental indicators to use as a baseline against which we can measure success. This will be done in conjunction with a stakeholders group.
- ▶ A grant has been issued in the amount of \$85,000 to a not-for-profit organization to facilitate "Good Neighbor" discussions between communities and industry in areas where there is controversial environmental issues. Thus far, progress has been made in three communities.
- ▶ A grant for \$100,000 was issued to a local university to develop and implement a two-week Environmental Teachers Institute in Summer of '97, which will focus on local issues and teachers from environmental justice communities.
- ▶ Grant funding has been provided to a not-for-profit organization to assist local Remedial Action Plan (RAP) Public Advisory Councils in becoming empowered and to build their own capacity. Roundtable meetings will also be held among the Councils.
- ▶ Grant funding in the amount of \$50,000 has been provided, through the State agency, to fund specific project in RAP Areas of Concern on the Great Lakes in Southeast Michigan.
- ▶ Grant funding in the amount of \$135,000 and other technical assistance has been provided to the City of Detroit to deal with a major problem of illegal

dumping through their law enforcement agencies. This project has been met with much success in violators prosecuted, vehicles impounded, and clean-ups ordered. In addition, it has initiated a program of community surveillance.

- ▶ Grant funding totaling \$20,000 to the Michigan Dept. of Agriculture to conduct several outreach programs on pesticide use; both agricultural and urban.
- ▶ Funding in the amount of \$30,000 has been provided to the Michigan Dept. of Agriculture to build an agricultural/household hazardous waste collection facility in Southeast Michigan.
- ▶ Funding in the amount of \$75,000 and technical assistance on previously funded projects has been provided to several communities on Brownfields projects including the City of Detroit and others.
- ▶ Funding in the amount of \$25,000 has been provided to a local university to continue development and maintenance of a major GIS system for the SEMI area.
- ▶ Development of a competitive solicitation of projects (i.e. Request for Proposals (RFP)) which will be issued early FY '97 was completed. Projects solicited are ones that address priority issues raised by Southeast Michigan stakeholders. These projects are required to contribute, at least, a 5% match. At least \$200,000 of FY96 money will be used to fund the projects.
- ▶ Funding in the amount of approximately \$30,000 has supported grants to employ student interns through the Environmental Careers Organization. The interns have supported the development of an Environmental Education Directory for Southeast Michigan and the SEMI GIS systems.
- ▶ Funding and technical assistance has been provided to States and not-for-profit organizations to implement Pollution Prevention Assistance and Outreach Projects. These include efforts with Publicly Owned Treatment Works (POTWs) and with hospitals in the area of mercury reduction. Pollution Prevention Networks have also been established and implemented.
- ▶ Technical Assistance has been provided to State and other agencies on several major contaminated sediment projects in southeast Michigan which will result in the remediation of a large volume of contaminated sediments.
- ▶ Technical Assistance has been provided on EPA programs such as Green Lights and Beneficial Landscaping (also known as Green Acres) to promote energy efficient lighting and beneficial landscape procedures.
- ▶ Discussions have been ongoing with partners to implement environmental education to the communities to impart knowledge of environmental procedures and encourage involvement in the process.

Contact

Laura Lodisio
SEMI Regional Team Manager
(312) 886-7090

Gateway

Environmental Problem Statement

The Gateway Initiative is a community-based effort that targets 18 communities in the metropolitan East St. Louis (Metro East), Illinois area, many with environmental justice populations. Over 70 industrial facilities, including oil refineries, chemical companies, a steel mill, a commercial hazardous waste incinerator, five active or closed hazardous waste landfills, and copper, lead and zinc smelters lie in this 60-square mile area on the eastern flood plain of the Mississippi River. The area does not meet health-related air quality standards for ozone and lead, and ambient air concentrations for cadmium are among the highest in the country. In addition, the community has deep concern over the prevalence of illegal dumping, open burning, abandoned and deteriorating houses, and persistent flooding.

Program Sponsors and Resources

The Superfund Division is the program sponsor, but as a regional team, there is support from all the programs. The Gateway Team consists of a core of 8 people, with an extended team that ebbs and flows as projects dictate. We also have an active enforcement and compliance assistance workgroup that includes the Illinois EPA and Illinois Attorney General's Office. In FY96, over \$300,000 in grants were in place to support environmental activities by local groups such as New Spirit Neighborhood Organization, Neighbors United for Progress, Project HOPE, Stop Pollution in Illinois, Clean Sites, East St. Louis Community Action Network, American Lung Association, and St. Clair County Sheriff's Department.

Stakeholders and Partners

The stakeholders are the people who live, work and play in Metro East, Illinois. Our partners include other federal agencies (HUD, ACOE, Region 7), state agencies (Illinois EPA, Illinois Department of Public Health, University of Illinois), local agencies (St. Clair County Sheriff's Department, East St. Louis Housing Authority, City of East St. Louis), and numerous neighborhood organizations.

FY96 Goals

The goals of this initiative are to improve the quality of life and protect the natural resources within these communities while building sustainable public involvement in local environmental issues.

We accomplish this by taking direct action; facilitating the involvement of other federal, state and local agencies; awarding grants that will develop environmental stewardship at the local level; and by empowering individuals with education and opportunities for

increased public involvement.

Successes

Not all of the successes listed below are the result of direct Regional program involvement, however, all can be attributed to the synergy and partnerships generated by the Gateway Initiative.

- ▶ Over 17,000 illegally-dumped tires from at least 5 communities have been collected and shredded for use as fuel supplement by local plants.
- ▶ Twenty of the 1800 abandoned and derelict structures in East St. Louis have been demolished through a private donation to a neighborhood organization. Twenty more are proposed for demolition under Superfund emergency response due to the poor condition of exterior transite (asbestos) siding.
- ▶ Community gardens have been sampled for heavy metals of concern to the community (lead, cadmium, arsenic). Most came up clean. Information on ways to reduce exposure to these metals in gardens with elevated levels has been shared with neighborhood groups.
- ▶ Neighborhood leaders learned about the major pieces of environmental legislation at our six-session Citizens' Environmental Academy. As a direct result of the information taught in this class, residents felt empowered to demand that soil samples be taken at the site of an abandoned gas station before the city went ahead with plans to turn it into a park and community garden.
- ▶ USEPA and Illinois EPA enforcement staff are promoting community issues when asked by facilities for suggestions for supplemental environmental projects during enforcement discussions. Most recently a State of Illinois consent decree resulted in a company setting out containers in communities plagued by illegal dumping, and paying for disposal.
- ▶ A grant awarded to the St. Clair County Sheriff's Department was used to establish an environmental crimes unit. This unit focuses on educating the public about illegal, but common, activities such as dumping and open burning. Repeat offenders and egregious violators are fined. In two instances the environmental "cop" was responsible for discovery of significant problems - a major oil spill and a site that required emergency response.
- ▶ Local law officials from 15 enforcement agencies in Gateway participated in our environmental awareness training. This training focused on local environmental issues such as fly-dumping, tire accumulation and open burning.
- ▶ A public service announcement on the hazards of open burning, especially for asthmatic children, resulted in at least one city council (Belleville, Illinois, population 62,000) to place restrictions on burning landscape waste.
- ▶ The neighborhood organizations that attended our grant writing workshop will have a greater chance of success when applying for federal and other grants.
- ▶ A resident of East St. Louis was trained to provide in-home instruction on techniques for housekeeping that are known to reduce exposure to lead dust;

families of children with elevated blood lead levels were targeted.

- ▶ Site assessment work was done at 20 abandoned sites in East St. Louis at the request of the community. The vast majority do not appear to be contaminated. Only one, an old lead smelter, warranted off-site sampling. The results of the site assessments and sampling have been made available to the economic redevelopment office in East St. Louis, and will be conveyed to the general public in a newsletter later this year.

Contact

Karen Lumino
Gateway Regional Team Manager
(312) 886-0981

NORTHEAST OHIO

Environmental Problem Statement

Over 4 million people live in the 15 county Northeast Ohio area. Historically, the area was heavily industrialized ... iron and steel, automotive, rubber, chemicals, refining and manufacturing. Dramatic demographic and economic changes have occurred over the past 40 years. Similarly, jobs and the tax base have also shifted. The area is experiencing sprawl without growth in population.

Historical practices and changing land use patterns have introduced unprecedented stresses on environmental quality, habitat, biological life, public health, and infrastructure. Traditional compartmentalized approaches, while successful, need to be replaced with regional approaches to better address the challenges of the next decade that require regional solutions.

Program Sponsors and Resources

The program sponsor is the Region 5 Senior Leadership Team, and the team sponsor is Robert Springer, Assistant Regional Administrator, Resources Management Division. According to the data reported in the Region 5 Activity Profile, 14.8 FTEs were allocated to implement the NEOI. Regional reorganization established first the outstationed organization in the community, dedicated to the community-based environmental protection. Additionally, \$652,000 was allocated to fund four grant projects.

Stakeholders

The Regional Environmental Priorities Project (REPP), partially funded by a U.S. EPA

grant to the Center for the Environment at Case Western Reserve University, is nearing completion of a three year science and community-based program to assess and identify the top environmental concerns in 7 of the 15 county Northeast Ohio initiative area. The project depended on balanced technical information and on the involvement of a broad array of constituencies. The project surfaced the top five environmental concerns of the community: outmigration from the urban core, quality of the urban environment, quality of outdoor air, quality of surface water, and use of resources/energy.

During FY'96, meetings were held in Northeast Ohio with 25 groups having a total audience of over 700 people to get acquainted in the community and to receive input concerning initiative design and Federal role. In addition, follow-up meetings have been held with two groups to provide feedback, report progress, and receive additional input.

FY'96 Goals

- Meet and develop relationships in the community jointly/coordinated with the state to determine the environmental issues of concern to the community and Federal role.
- Build credibility by supporting existing community-based partnerships with agendas consistent with the NEOI mission to help assure the success of the action organization.
- Develop/Implement a coordinated strategy to improve the agency's responsiveness to inquiries and complaints from the community (reactive).
- Develop/Implement a coordinated marketing/communication strategy to reconnect the agency and its employees with the community (proactive), to communicate results achieved, and show case work in progress.
- Develop a three year strategic action plan that will serve to guide the realignment of Federal resources to best help the community solve their highest priority environmental concerns.

Obstacles

- Budget Impasse/Government shutdown.
- Programs continue to drive (program v. goal driven).
- Fragmented funding sources.
- Fragmented/Non-user-friendly databases
- Need for two-way accountability

Successes

- ▶ Developed Relationships in the Community
25 meetings with total audience over 700 people.

- Range of individuals, groups, and interests.
- Starting to become recognized.
- Receiving valuable input and positive feedback for NEOI.
- One follow-up meeting to report progress.
- Involved community stakeholders in Region 5 urban sprawl policy development.
- Staffed booth at three county fairs and Earthfest.
- Responded to hundreds of citizen inquiries and complaints.
- ▶ Achieved Environmental Results by Assisting Partners
 - Two by-pass discharges abated.
 - Four properties cleaned-up for redevelopment.
- ▶ Building Capacity of the Community
 - 50 local regulators trained, OSHA/USEPA/OEPA - asbestos, multimedia, and criminal inspections.
 - Co-hosted first GIS user workshop to promote networking among users.
- ▶ Build Credibility
 - Provided representative to eight partnerships.
 - Assistance provided for 31 projects in support of 10 partnerships.
 - Provided information/assistance with contacts.
 - \$652,000 in grant funding provided for four projects.
 - Disseminated information concerning competitive grant funding opportunities.
 - Citizen/Elected official complaint projects, eight completed, four in progress.
 - Changed name of initiative in response to community

Contact

A. R. Winklhofer
 Northeast Ohio Initiative Team Manager
 (216) 522-7260

TRIBAL LANDS

Environmental Problem Statement

Region 5 has a duty to uphold its trust responsibility to the 33 Indian Tribes in the region. The Tribes do not have the necessary resources or administrative infrastructure to adequately address environmental problems that effect their communities.

Regional Program Manager: Valdas V. Adamkus, Regional Administrator
Program Sponsor: Bob Springer, Assistant Regional Administrator

Stakeholders

Stakeholder involvement: the tribal staffs, councils and chairs are directly involved in planning and implementing the joint environmental work represented by the

agreements.

Tribal representatives meet quarterly with the region's Senior Leadership Team (SLT). EPA staff meets regularly on implementing the tribal program through the Regional Indian Workgroup, with the coordination and guidance of the Indian Program Manager and three EPA Tribal Liaisons.

Objectives/Goals

- Through the Tribal planning process, the Indian Program is driven by the goals of each community. Its environmental goals -- both human and ecological -- are delineated by the tribal environmental staff and reservation tribal council. Tribal-specific goals are too numerous to list here.
- The Indian Program's key overall goals for the agreement process are:
1) work together through direct and routine communications to protect the Tribal environment; 2) foster direct Tribal participation in EPA's national planning/budgeting process; 3) Present a joint multi-year plan clarifying directions agreed to by both the Region and the Tribes; 4) Identify the top environmental priorities that the Tribes need to address through the EPA's programs and responsibilities; 5) Clarify that Region 5 will pursue solutions to the Tribes' environmental problems, within resources that are made available from year to year; and, 6) Establish an annual process for revisiting and revising tribal priorities to reflect new conditions.
- Because many tribal environmental goals cannot be achieved solely through EPA, the tribal agreements often include plans to reach out to other federal or state partners for their technical assistance, funding, etc. We created the Five Agency MOU Workgroup to address these concerns.

Obstacles

- Lack of resources necessary to adequately address environmental priorities
- State and Tribal relationships

Successes

- ▶ Tribal Environmental Agreements (TEAs) have been signed by all Minnesota Tribes, ten Wisconsin Tribes and four Michigan Tribes. Divisional Blueprints are prepared based on the priorities identified in the TEAs. Success/ Environmental Results are measured in each Division's Blueprint.
- ▶ A process for updating the TEAs has been established.

Contact

Michelle Fonte
Tribal Contact
(312) 886-2943