

RA SM 33.0
#1512 (F)

DECISION
MAKING
5.0 RAD

THE ST. MARYS RIVER REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

A Review

Prepared by:

David Evans
Community Affairs Consultant

October, 1994

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Pg.
Background	1
The St. Marys River RAP Public Involvement Program	3
Research Methodology	3
General Conclusions and Observations	5
Results of Responses To the Questionnaire	7
Results of the Follow Up Telephone Interviews	25
Review of the Letter from Algoma Steel	26
Appendix 1: Cover Letter	
Appendix 2: Questionnaire	
Appendix 3: List of Respondents Who Indicated Their Responses Were Not Confidential	

BACKGROUND

The **1978 Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement** signed by Canada and the United States requires that the two Governments prepare cleanup or Remedial Action Plans (RAPs) for 43 Areas of Concern around the Great Lakes.

The International Joint Commission, the bi-national group responsible for overseeing the implementation of the **Great Lakes Water Quality Agreement**, identified 5 Areas of Concern which border the United States and Canada.

Three of these Areas of Concern, the Detroit River, the St. Clair River and the St. Marys River, border Ontario and Michigan. In December 1985, the state Government of Michigan and the provincial Government of Ontario signed an agreement to work together to produce joint RAPs for each of these three Areas of Concern. Ontario was given the lead role in developing the St. Marys River RAP.

From the start, the International Joint Commission, the Canada-Ontario Remedial Action Plan (RAP) Steering Committee, established under the **Canada-Ontario Agreement Respecting Great Lakes Water Quality**, and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources (DNR) recognized that for RAPs to be effective, community support was required. Therefore, public involvement in the development of each RAP at the local level became an important and early hallmark of the RAP program.

Michigan DNR decided to establish the first public advisory committee for the Detroit River RAP, where it was given the lead role. In 1988, when Canada-Ontario RAP Steering Committee released its public involvement guidelines, public advisory committees were not yet a feature in Canadian RAPs; there was still resistance to having the public work closely with Government.

When the Canadian public involvement guidelines were revised in 1990 to reflect the growing public demand for more direct involvement in the development of RAPs through the creation of public advisory committees, there were public advisory committees in 16 of the 17 Canadian RAPs, including the three Upper Connecting Channels RAPs.

Membership in the Upper Connecting Channels' public advisory committees is made up of people from both Canada and the United States. To reflect this, these committees are called Binational Public Advisory Committees or BPACs. The BPAC for the St. Marys River RAP was created in 1988 and has become the focus for public involvement for the RAP.

There has been no overall assessment of RAP public involvement programs since the Canada-Ontario RAP Steering Committee undertook one in 1989. That assessment involved BPAC members, as well as the public involvement consultants hired to assist in the delivery of each of the locally-designed public involvement programs.

The only other assessment of RAP public involvement programs was undertaken in 1993 by the four North Shore of Lake Superior RAPs.

There has been criticism over the years by St. Marys River BPAC members of the public involvement program for their RAP. Because of a change in the Canadian management team for the St. Marys River RAP, it was decided to conduct a public involvement program review.

Program reviews are useful because they:

- 1) provide insight into how those who participate in a public involvement program feel about the program;
- 2) allow the participants an opportunity to rate the success of the program and their involvement; and
- 3) provide the basis for making changes to the program in order to improve the program.

This program review, which attempted to involve past, as well as present members of the St. Marys River BPAC, will not only provide the new Canadian RAP management team, working with program people from Michigan DNR, the basis for making changes to the public involvement program, it will be helpful to others participating in or organizing/running other community-based public advisory committees.

THE ST. MARYS RIVER RAP PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM

The public involvement program for the St. Marys River RAP, like all other areas around the Great Lakes where RAPs are being prepared, is organized at the local level. All BPAC members represent or have a local interest.

BPAC meets regularly, alternating between Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario and Sault Ste. Marie, Michigan. Members work closely with the RAP Team to identify local environmental problems, develop use goals for the Area of Concern, and review scientific studies, including documents required by the International Joint Commission like the Stage 1 report titled *Environmental Conditions and Problem Definition*.

BPAC is closely involved in other water quality-related issues in the Area of Concern, as well as the Great Lakes system as a whole. BPAC has membership on the Ontario Provincial PAC Council (which has representation from all Ontario Areas of Concern where a PAC exists) and membership on Michigan State Wide Public Advisory Council panel for RAPs.

Communication with the general public is ongoing and accomplished through public meetings/open houses, six local reference centres, a display, a newsletter, media coverage, distribution of BPAC meeting minutes and report-backs from BPAC members to the groups or interests they represent. Activities are undertaken on both sides of the international border.

A more detailed description of the public involvement program for the St. Marys River RAP is contained in the Stage 1 report submitted to the International Joint Commission.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The first step in this program review was for the consultant to meet with the new Ontario management team working out of Thunder Bay, Ontario.

At that meeting, it was decided that a questionnaire:

- 1) would be sent to every BPAC member, whether or not that member was still active in the program;
- 2) the questionnaire would contain both open and close-ended questions so respondents could answer questions with a limited number of possible responses,

- as well as provide more extensive comments, if they wanted;
- 3) the questionnaire would have similar questions to those posed to the members of the four North Shore of Lake Superior PACs (for comparison purposes) and additional questions specific to the needs of the St. Marys River RAP public involvement program;
 - 4) respondents could request a more in-depth, personal interview; and
 - 5) the questions would be designed to have respondents consider the impact their PAC has had on more than just the RAP-related issues.

A copy of the questionnaire was sent to 24 people.

As of October 3, 1994, twelve (12) people or 50 per cent of those receiving the questionnaire had filled out and returned the questionnaire. An additional stakeholder (Algoma Steel) provided a copy of a letter about the RAP program written in March, 1994, but did not fill out the questionnaire.

At the end of the questionnaire, respondents were asked if they wanted a personal interview. Six (6) of the 12 people (50 per cent) requested an interview.

It was decided that responses would be reported only in total and not broken out by country.

General comments to the open-ended questions are identified as coming from a particular respondent only if that person indicated that his/her comments are not confidential.

The results of the personal interviews are provided separately from the results of the questionnaire.

Percentages, where utilized, are rounded up.

A copy of the questionnaire and cover letter are provided as appendices.

GENERAL CONCLUSIONS AND OBSERVATIONS

One is struck by the generally negative responses to the questionnaire.

There is a strong sense on the part of the respondents that the RAP public involvement program is either not effective (Questions #6, 8, 14, 15b, 22, 25 and 28) and 67% feel an extensive (Question #26) effective program (Question #31) is required. Some feel public involvement is non-existent. BPAC members feel they are being ignored (Questions #8 and 9) and not consulted when they should be (Question #11). As well, there is a strong feeling that, in addition to being disinterested in BPAC, the RAP is disinterested in the Area of Concern (Questions #8 and 12).

There is some hope that a change in management, particularly the relocating of the Canadian RAP Co-ordinator to Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, will bring wanted changes to the program.

Most of the respondents (Questions #2 and 3) have been members of BPAC from the start and intend to continue to be involved (Question #24). All feel they have a good understanding of RAP (Question #6), so the frustrations about how the program is being run and BPAC's being ignored and/or not involved are serious considering the RAP program's commitment to public involvement; only half of the respondents feel there isn't a commitment to involving the public in RAP implementation (Question #27).

Many respondents indicated that not enough of the general public is concerned about/involved in issues related the Area of Concern. One person said that if the sectors were reporting back effectively, there would be little need for general public communication by BPAC. Therefore, it should be of some concern that 36 per cent of respondents "don't/am not required to report back" to their sector. (Question #7)

While many (78%) say things are happening (Question 12), report changes (Questions #13a and b) and report that BPAC is having an influence on the community (Questions #16 and 17), many also report many reasons why things are not happening (Question #14).

There seems to be a sense that leadership is lacking in the program (Question 15b).

The multi-sectoral make-up of BPAC (Question #19) is important (75%) and the lack of representation of and involvement by industry on BPAC is of concern (Question #20).

Many feel (Question #20) that some sectors have too much influence, but only one sector, the environmental sector, was actually identified, however. Having too much influence, respondents report, has caused some members to quit BPAC. Another concern is that sectors represent narrow self-interests, keeping the focus away from RAP (Questions #20 and 21).

Voting, report 75 per cent of respondents, is the preferred method for reaching a decision. However, voting, rather than consensus developing, may promote narrow self-interests and, as one person says, "sure votes" (Question #21).

It is interesting to note that just as many people have not changed their attitudes about other people/sectors as a result of involvement in BPAC, as have (Question #22). How RAP may be a forum for understanding, as well as change needs to be revisited.

Many people feel there is a role for the media in promoting BPAC and RAP (Question #30), less than half of respondents (33%) feel that media coverage has supported their involvement in RAP or BPAC (Question #23).

It is clear that respondents feel that the public involvement program for the St. Marys River RAP needs improvement.

The role, responsibilities and functions of BPAC members, as one respondent suggests (Question #31), need to be set out clearly, understood and agreed to by all participating in the program. Therefore, it is recommended that a review of the terms of reference for BPAC should be the starting point for any new approach to public involvement taken by the new RAP management team. (It would be helpful if the Ontario Ministry of Environment and Energy and the Michigan Department of Natural Resources also clearly established the roles and responsibilities of all the other players in the program.)

RESULTS OF RESPONSES TO THE QUESTIONNAIRE

The following summary is based only on the responses from those who filled out the questionnaire. Therefore, "Total" percentages, most often, are based on N = 12. Where people provided more than one answer, the new total number of responses is reported in the discussion and the percentage is based on that total.

1. My answers are not confidential, therefore, my name is _____.
I represent the _____ sector.

Responses: 9 (75%) not confidential; 3 (25%) confidential

Discussion: It is assumed that people's willingness to state that their comments are "not confidential" indicates that they want their participation in this program review acknowledged and their detailed comments reported. A list of those who indicated that their answers were not confidential is provided as Appendix 3.

2. I:

Responses:

	Total
- have been a member since the start of the program	9 (75%)
- replaced someone else	2 (17%)
- am a relatively new member	1 (8%)
- no longer am a BPAC member	0

3. I have been a PAC member for _____ years/months.

Responses:

	Total
- 1 - 2 years	0
- 2.5 - 3 years	2 (17%)
- 4 - 5 years	1 (8%)
- 6 - 7 or more years	9 (75%)

Discussion:

The groupings are based on the responses provided. The length of service of the four people who did not provide a response was based on their answer to Question #2. One person who did not provide a numerical response, but wrote in: "forever."

4. I:

Responses:

	Total
- volunteered to be a BPAC member	6 (50%)
- was elected to represent my sector	0
- was asked if I wanted to represent my sector	5 (42%)
- was told I would be our sector's representative	0
- other (please explain)	1 (8%)

Discussion:

The person whose response was "other" indicated, "I was nominated at the organizational meeting of BPAC." Another person indicated that he was asked to represent his sector, and volunteered to do so; this person is included in the "was asked if I wanted to represent my sector" category.

5. I am:

- a representative from Canada 6 (50%)

- a representative from
the United States 6 (50%)

6. I feel I have a good understanding of the RAP process.

Responses:

	Total
Yes	12 (100%)
No	0

Discussion:

One person indicated he had a good understanding of the RAP process as it "is supposed to work". Another person also commented that RAP is "afraid of BPAC."

7. I report back to my sector:

Responses:

	Total
- verbally, after every meeting	3 (21%)
- by distributing RAP minutes	1 (7%)
- I don't/am not required to report back	5 (36%)
- by sending out a summary of what's happening	0
- relying on the newsletter	1 (7%)
- other (please explain)	4 (29%)

Discussion:

Two respondents provided two responses to this question (N=14).

People who indicated "other" explained that they: report to City Committee; report on items of importance to their agency or group; report at quarterly meetings if there is time; and write articles and letters to the editor, attend U.S. Environmental Protection Agency meetings, make presentations to City Committee which is aired on television.

8. Which of the following do you feel your PAC has had an influence on?

Responses:

	Total
- the RAP program	5 (25%)
- RAP Co-ordinators	5 (25%)
- the federal Government (either either U. S. or Canadian)	2 (10%)
- state or provincial Government	3 (15%)
- influenced all	2 (10%)
- influenced none	2 (10%)
- no response	1 (5%)

Discussion:

A number of people provided more than one response to this question (N=20).

John Campbell feels that BPAC is only "window dressing to give the perception of public involvement" and that "nobody listens to our BPAC." Verna Lawrence says that BPAC "is a farce" and that "good members leave because nothing is accomplished."

In response to the second half of the question ("For those you have not influenced, why do you think this is so?"), responses included:

- the RAP Coordinators are too busy studying the problems; the various agencies do not have the authority to get things done; there are not enough resources to get things done; the public is indifferent to the issues; the "feds are too distant from the local Area of Concern;" there is not enough media coverage; too much competition for resources; and public involvement reaches only a small segment of society.

Donald Marles observed that while BPAC has had an influence on all, "BPAC is more futuristic than MOE or MDNR." Jim Elliott pointed out that BPAC has "forced a different approach to the RAP process, forced the RAP Coordinators to become mediators and forced governments to listen to the public."

9. Has your PAC influenced other decisions in the community?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	4 (33%)
No	2 (17%)
No Response	5 (42%)
Unknown/Not sure	1 (8%)

10. Has your PAC influenced:

Responses:

	Total
- others in your sector	2 (14%)
- others in the community	4 (29%)
- industry	4 (29%)
- your municipal government	3 (21%)
- no response	1 (7%)

Discussion:

Two people provided more than one response to this question (N=14). Two responded by turning the question around by writing "no" to either all or some of the categories.

11. Has your PAC become a forum for others to consult you on other than RAP-related issues?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	4 (33%)
No	6 (51%)
Sometimes	1 (8%)
No Response	1 (8%)

Discussion:

John Bain indicated that BPAC has influenced current development projects as well as Sault Ste. Marie's (Ontario) Official Plan.

12. Do you feel your involvement in the RAP program has resulted in action? In other words, are things happening?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	7 (58%)
No	4 (33%)
Yes and No	1 (9%)

Discussion:

One person said that the OMOE Sarnia people were not really interested in the St. Marys River RAP (that is why things are not happening) and hopes the OMOE Thunder Bay people will take more of an interest in the Area of Concern.

13a. How do you know that things are happening?

Responses:

	Total
- you are being told by your RAP team	3 (12%)
- your area of concern is being remediated	5 (20%)
- local business/industry has changed how it operates	5 (20%)
- community attitudes are changing	4 (16%)
- your behaviour has changed at work	2 (8%)
- your behaviour has changed at home	3 (12%)
- no response	3 (12%)

Discussion:

Most people provided more than one response to this question (N=25).

13b. Please provide some examples of the things that are happening.

Responses:

Things that people say are happening include:

- funding has been approved for separating storm and sewer drains; Task Teams bring more expertise into the process; people can swim in some areas; the Canadian RAP Co-ordinator will be in Sault Ste. Marie (instead of out of Samia); sediment remediation project; lamprey control programs; Algoma steel and other industry have

put in some pollution controls; environmental assessments are more public; BPAC is being consulted by industry; and public awareness of BPAC is increasing.

14. If things are not happening, why is this the case?

Responses:

Things are not happening because:

- there is a lack of resources; RAP is "unwilling" to meet BPAC on its own terms; BPAC is being ignored; the RAP Co-ordinators have had no interest in the program; the International Joint Commission has no power to enforce its requirements; too much bureaucracy; poor media coverage; orders too lax and monitoring is poor; too few people feel they can make a difference; the RAP team makes decisions without consulting BPAC; and personal agendas are keeping the program from getting things done.

Marilyn Burton said things are not happening because the program is "all talk, no go!"

15a. Who, in the past has shown leadership to implement the public involvement program for your RAP?

Responses:

A number of people mentioned the hired facilitator. One person referred to him as the "fired facilitator."

Someone said, among others, "myself." Another person indicated that it was volunteers, not the paid employees that have shown leadership. Two people named specific people who are members of BPAC. One person identified "MOE and DFO."

Discussion:

John Campbell said "no one" has shown leadership and that "our public involvement program is a joke." John Bain noted that "leadership is misdirected and confused and poor attitudes not resolved or dealt with."

15b. Who, in the future, should lead/take responsibility for the implementation of the public involvement program?

Responses:

Included in the responses are the chair, RAP program staff, BPAC members (mentioned by four people), the RAP team, the agencies that have the funding and the local RAP Coordinator.

Discussion:

Whoever takes the lead, one person noted that "mature hands at the control" are required. Another pointed out that technical solutions "must be implemented by government, not the public, as government has the mandate to do so." Another suggested, "OMOE or Michigan DNR or provide the funds for BPAC to do the job."

Someone said that the RAP should "stop misleading BPAC into feeling it is independent."

16. Would others in your community be as environmentally conscious if there wasn't a RAP program?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	9 (75%)
No	3 (25%)

17. Do others in your community feel you are contributing to solving environmental problems?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	6 (50%)
No	2 (17%)
Not Sure/Don't Know	4 (33%)

18. Are you seen in the community as being more credible on environmental issues as a result of your involvement in the RAP?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	5 (42%)
No	5 (42%)
Not Sure/Don't Know	1 (8%)
No Response	1 (8%)

Discussion:

Someone crossed out the last word in the question (RAP) and substituted "BPAC".

19. Is the multi-sectoral make-up of your PAC important for getting things done?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	9 (75%)
No	2 (17%)
Yes and No	1 (8%)

20. Are some sectors having too much influence?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	5 (42%)
No	3 (24%)
Not Sure/Don't Know	2 (17%)
No Response	2 (17%)

Discussion:

In response to the question Which sector(s), only one sector, the environmental sector ("environmental advocates" said one person) was specifically identified.

Someone pointed out that "the continual raising of minor local issues has detracted from RAP focus and caused some members to quit."

Three people mentioned that the lack of participation by industry is hurting the program.

21. Has voting been the best method for reaching a decision?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	9 (75%)
No	1 (8%)
No Response	2 (17%)

Discussion:

Five people added to their response and said:

- voting is the best method "if anyone listened to us"; workshops are more productive; voting is the "American and Canadian way"; that while voting is the best method for reaching a decision, proper information is needed; and the one-sided representation of some sectors leads to a narrow focus and decisions become a "sure vote."

22. Have your attitudes about other people/sectors changed as a result of your involvement on BPAC?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	6 (50%)
No	6 (50%)

Discussion:

Marilyn Burton wrote, "We have some great people serving on BPAC and they are concerned about the health of their river and environment. They have "hung in" regardless of the many frustrations with BPAC's functioning/malfunctioning. Implementation of cleanup, where BPAC can see the results of its time, effort, studies, etc. will be a great boost in morale for BPAC members. Action and results are the desired goals of BPAC. We do not want to see our involvement wasted, just going through the motions. Delisting by changing the criteria will not cut the cake. Real solutions are needed."

John Bain said, "I feel I should be a part of BPAC to try and bring some balance to the views represented - to remind 'them' that some municipal officials 'care.' My role has changed from a more 'technical' contribution to a more 'political' one."

23. Has media coverage supported your involvement in the RAP?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	4 (33%)
No	6 (50%)
No Response	2 (17%)

24. Why do you continue to be on the PAC?

Responses:

	Total
- I like working with other PAC members	8 (31%)
- I'm learning things	8 (31%)
- things are getting done	5 (19%)
- other (please explain)	4 (15%)
- I don't attend PAC meetings any more	1 (4%)

Discussion:

Almost everyone provided more than one response to this question (N=26). Those who indicated an "other" reason wrote:

- BPAC "is the only vehicle we have and we hope that it works," "because I refuse to leave," "I'm afraid to leave because a bad situation may get worse," and "we have a responsibility to be involved."

25. Does the RAP public involvement program involve enough of the public?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	2 (17%)
No	9 (75%)
No Response	1 (8%)

Discussion:

One person indicated that the public is involved "too much."

26. Is such an extensive program required given the problems in your Area of Concern?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	8 (67%)
No	3 (25%)
No Response	1 (8%)

Discussion:

Someone said the program needed to be more extensive than it is already. Another person observed that if the sectors were effective, there would be no need for general public outreach.

27. Do you feel there is a commitment to involving the public in RAP implementation?

Responses:

	Total
Yes	6 (50%)
No	4 (33%)
No Response	2 (17%)

28. What of the past public involvement program did you dislike?

Responses:

People dislike that:

-there is poor sector participation; the public is not involved; public opinion is not considered by the RAP team; there is too much focus on the Canadian source of the problem; international events are not promoted on both sides of the border; everything is centred in Canada ("We are binational!"); workshops because people can not take time off to attend them; there is no public involvement program; the RAP Co-ordinators are not doing their job; and there is no clear distinction between BPAC and RAP; the cleanup and restoration program has been delayed.

29. What of the past public involvement program did you like:

Responses:

People like:

-the newsletter; speaking to groups; the workshops; the fact that younger people are getting involved; the initial part when the public played a useful role; and the Task Team approach which involves more technical/knowledgeable public in the process.

30. What changes would you make to the public involvement program?

Responses:

Suggestions include:

-offer a "bribe" to get full sector participation; have public workshops when the Task Team reports are completed; use BPAC better; an information "blitz"; distribute new brochures; provide tours of the river; hold meetings all along the river; a flow chart to help people understand where their voice originates and terminates; regular newsletters; environmental seminars; regular media coverage (for example, get local newspapers to do a BPAC "news" column); collect ideas at a mall display (go to where the public is); and scale the program down and get on with implementation.

Discussion:

Someone suggested that if a member misses three meetings in a row, they should be given the chance to explain their absences and if need be taken off BPAC, making room for others.

A number of people feel that BPAC is not consulted (even on things like meeting agendas) and that RAP staff do not take BPAC seriously. BPAC members say that BPAC should be used properly and not neglected. As well, if BPAC is supposed to be concerned about the river and its environment, BPAC should be consulted before industries are located along the river so that their impact can be assessed; no more "done deals" without BPAC involvement.

31. Are there any other comments you wish to make about the RAP public involvement program?

Responses:

John Bain wrote, "If you want the program to achieve public credibility, it must be managed towards that goal! Someone has to clearly define the purpose, role and functions of BPAC and get on with the job. The "amateurs don't have the time or resources to do the job."

Marilyn Burton asks, "In the whole BPAC process who is responsible? Who is accountable? Does the process work? Is it really accomplishing what it is supposed to accomplish?" She goes on to say, "Delisting without decontamination would be public misrepresentation. And any adding to existing contamination would be a travesty of justice to the public of both nations."

John Campbell would like to see "a good and effective public involvement program implemented" as "one is badly needed in our area."

Donald Marles observes that the RAP Co-ordinators need to work together "instead of grandstanding and being self serving." He also notes that the paid staff need more funding and must do more work.

Verna Lawrence notes that "You can't bully volunteers! You must work with them!!!!" and "...the river should be cleaner because of BPAC not in spite of it."

RESULTS OF THE FOLLOW-UP TELEPHONE INTERVIEWS

Six respondents indicated that they would be interested in a follow-up interview. All of the interviews were conducted over the telephone. As one person was out of the country, only five people were interviewed.

It was previously reported that there is some optimism that the management team from Thunder Bay, along with a RAP Co-ordinator headquartered in Sault Ste. Marie, Ontario, will get the program back on track. This was confirmed in the telephone interviews (for example: "we must try and forget what happened in the past and hope things will get better" and "maybe it will better to be managed by those upstream instead of those downstream").

There is some concern that the St. Marys River RAP is an "add on" and "maybe Thunder Bay will not be fully committed." However, someone said, "are atleast they (the Thunder Bay team) are willing to discuss the issues at length and bring back answers." Respondents want "openness" and "action" from the Thunder Bay team.

There is strong support for the Task Teams. The Task Teams are "revitalizing the technical part of the RAP program", creating a "new and productive dynamic" to the RAP and the public involvement program, as industry, as well as many government agencies not involved in BPAC are getting involved.

However, there is a concern that losing the paid facilitators may hurt what is perceived as a (not so public) forum that is "bringing people together" to deal with real issues; it is recognized, however, that a commitment has been made by the RAP to complete the work of the Task Teams.

Not keeping the paid facilitators is an example of what one person felt might be an imposition of change before change is either prudent or the new management team is fully aware of the special needs of the St. Marys River RAP.

To another, letting go of the paid facilitators is reflective of the lack of funding committed to the program. Without funding, people "can't feel the agencies are sincere" about the program. This same person was concerned that the BPAC not only has to seek its own funding, but is being split into two because it can not incorporate internationally.

It is felt that what is to happen after the Task Teams are finished should be a consideration of the RAP Team (which has members of BPAC on it) now.

As well, someone indicated that the issue over membership should be addressed now. "Sit down with the BPAC executive now, and don't wait until there is a new Co-ordinator."

Public involvement requires that those involved influence decisions. Again, some expressed in the interviews that BPAC is not having the influence it wants and feels it should have. The concern that industry is not involved was expressed again, but as one person indicated, the lack of involvement by industry should not diminish the influence of those who have decided to stay involved.

Support for protecting the St. Marys River is strong (even though the program is "dragging on longer than anyone expected") and those interviewed not only re-iterated their support for the RAP program, but their support for public involvement in the program.

REVIEW OF THE LETTER FROM ALGOMA STEEL

Algoma Steel, as its contribution to this program review, provided a copy of a letter about the RAP program it sent to the Canadian RAP Co-ordinator. (The company did not fill out the questionnaire.) The letter is dated March 1, 1994.

Algoma Steel expresses a concern in the letter about the lack of public involvement in the program, pointing out that the actual number of people actually involved has diminished over time. The company feels that concerns it has voiced about incomplete and out-dated data are "lost as a result of a high proportion of government input and the momentum that has built up around this project."

The letter indicates that Algoma Steel "has no choice other than to withdraw from active participation." (As stated in other sections of this report, BPAC members feel industry participation on BPAC and in the RAP is vital.)

APPENDIX 1

DAVID EVANS
50 Alexander Street
Apt. 2401
Toronto, Ontario
M4Y 1B6
(416) 961-8923

July 21, 1994

Dear BPAC Member:

As you know, you will be getting a new Ontario RAP Co-ordinator. With this change in leadership comes an opportunity to do things differently. As part of the new Co-ordinator's review of the St. Marys River RAP, I have been asked by Jake Vander Wal to work with you, as a member of the Bi-national Public Advisory Committee, in conducting a review of the public involvement program.

You know from personal experience that public involvement is an important and integral part of the RAP program and that the success or failure of the RAP is tied directly to quality of the public involvement program.

Your responses to the enclosed questionnaire will not only help in assessing the overall effectiveness of the public involvement program, but it will allow you to specifically identify and comment on past mistakes, as well as provide suggestions for how things could be done in the future. I am confident that your new Ontario RAP Co-ordinator will want to know what you think and will be open to, and will act upon, your suggestions!

The report that I will prepare will become a part of the State 2 RAP. It, along with similar evaluations, also will be helpful to others participating in community-based advisory committees.

Please return the questionnaire by August 26, 1994 using the enclosed self-addressed stamped envelope. If you have any questions, feel free to give me a call at (416) 961-8923 (collect). Please note that you can indicate on the questionnaire that your answers either are confidential or they can be attributed. As well, you can also indicate that you have more to say and would like to be interviewed.

It is a pleasure to be working with BPAC once again! And, I really appreciate your help doing this review.

Yours truly,

David Evans

APPENDIX 2

ST. MARYS RIVER REMEDIAL ACTION PLAN PUBLIC INVOLVEMENT PROGRAM EVALUATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Please respond to the following questions.

You may wish to provide more than one answer for some questions.

Any comments you wish to make are welcome!

1. My answers are not confidential and can be attributed, therefore, my name is _____ I represent the _____ sector.

2. I:

- have been a BPAC member since the start of the program _____
- replaced someone else _____
- am a relatively new member _____
- no longer am a BPAC member _____

3. I have been/was a BPAC member for _____ years/months.

4. I:

- volunteered to be a BPAC member _____
- was elected to represent my sector _____
- was asked if I wanted to represent my sector _____
- was told I would be our sector's representative _____
- other (please explain) _____

5. I am:

- a representative from Canada _____
- a representative from the United States _____

6. I feel I have a good understanding of the RAP process.

yes _____ no _____

7. I report back to my sector:

- verbally after every meeting _____
- by distributing RAP minutes _____
- by sending out a summary of what happening _____
- relying on the RAP newsletter (when it is available) _____
- I don't/am not required to report back _____
- other (please explain) _____

8. Which of the following do you feel BPAC has had an influence on:

- the RAP program _____
- RAP Co-ordinators _____
- the federal Government (either U.S. or Canadian) _____
- state or provincial Government _____

For those you have not influenced, why do you think this is so?

9. Has BPAC influenced other decisions in your community?

yes _____ no _____

10. Has BPAC influenced:

- others in your sector _____
- others in your community _____
- industry _____
- your municipal government _____

11. Has BPAC become a forum for others to consult you on other than RAP-related issues?

yes _____ no _____

12a. Do you feel your involvement in the RAP program has resulted in action? In other words, are things happening?

yes _____ no _____

13a. How do you know that things are happening?

- you have been told by your RAP team _____
- your area of concern is being remediated _____
- local business/industry has changed how it operates _____
- community attitudes are changing _____
- your behavior at work has changed _____
- your behaviour at home has changed _____

13b. Please provide some examples of the things that are happening.

14. If things are not happening, why is this the case?

15a. Who, in the past, has shown leadership in implementing the public involvement program for your RAP?

15b. Who, in the future, should lead/take responsibility for the implementation of the public involvement program?

16. Would others in your community be as environmentally conscious if there wasn't a RAP program?

yes _____ no _____

17. Do others in your community feel you are contributing to solving environmental problems?

yes _____ no _____

18. Are you seen in your community as being more credible on environmental issues as a result of your involvement in the RAP?

yes _____ no _____

19. Is the multi-sectoral/Bi-national make-up of BPAC important for getting things done?

yes _____ no _____

20. Are some sectors having too much influence?

yes _____ no _____

If "yes", which sector(s) and what has been the result?

21. Has voting been the best method for reaching a decision?

yes _____ no _____

If "no", why?

22. Have your attitudes about other people/sectors changed as a result of your involvement on the BPAC?

yes _____ no _____

23. Has media coverage supported your involvement in the RAP?

yes _____ no _____

24. Why do you continue to be on the BPAC?

- I like working with other BPAC members _____

- I'm learning things _____

- things are getting done _____

- other (please specify) _____

- I don't attend BPAC meetings any more _____

25. Does the RAP public involvement program involve enough of the public?

yes _____ no _____

26. Is an extensive program required given the problems in your Area of Concern?

yes _____ no _____

27. Do you feel there is a commitment to involving the public in RAP implementation?

yes _____ no _____

28. What of the past public involvement program did you dislike?

29. What of the past public involvement program did you like?

30. What changes would you make to the public involvement program?

31. Are there any other comments you wish to make about the RAP public involvement program?

If you have more to say and would like to be interviewed, please provide your name and telephone number so an interview can be arranged.

NAME

TELEPHONE NUMBER

Please return your completed questionnaire to:

David Evans
50 Alexander Street
Apt. 2401
Toronto, Ontario
M4Y 1B6

APPENDIX 3

A List of Respondents Who Indicated Their Responses Were Not Confidential

Roman Aikers, Elected Official
John Bain, Municipal Representative
Marilyn Burton, Citizen Representative
John Campbell, Recreation/Tourism Representative
Joe Carn, Municipal Representative
Jim Elliot, Municipal Representative
Kara Flanigan, Public Health Representative
Verna Lawrence, Elected Official
Donald Marles, Environmental Representative