UNITED STATES & CANADA

INTERNATIONAL JOINT COMMISSION
PUBLIC INTEREST ADVISORY GROUP
PUBLIC MEETING

In the Matter of:

INTERNATIONAL LAKE ONTARIO/ ST. LAWRENCE RIVER STUDY) September 16, 2004

Transcript of Public Meeting held in the above matter at 1 Vince Tofany Boulevard, Greece, New York on September 16, 2004, beginning at 7:00 p.m., pursuant to Notice. Connected via telephonic conference to Dorval, Quebec, Canada.

PRESENT:

MR. AUGERGER - Town of Greece Supervisor

DOUG DOBSON - Monroe County Legislator

AUSTIN WARNER - Town of Hamlin Supervisor

MARY LOUISE MEISENTHAL - Monroe County Executive Maggie Brooks Representative

PAUL COLE - Representative from Congressman Reynold's office

ED McKEWAN - Representative from Senator Joe Brook's office

DON CONNERS - Representative from NYS Assemblyman Charlie Nesbit's office

GARY GIST - Representative from Town of Webster Supervisor Kathy Thomas' office

TONY EBERHART - Study Manager

DAN BARLETTA - PIAG U.S. Co-Chair

SCOTT TRIPOLI - PIAG Member

HENRY STEWART - PIAG Member & Facilitator, Greece, N.Y.

MARC HUDON - PIAG Member & Facilitator, Dorval, Quebec, Canada (Via telephonic conference)

EUGENE STAKHIV - U.S. Co-Director

BILL WERICK - PFEG, U.S.

ARLEEN KREUSCH - Public Relations

AARON SMITH - Public Relations Assistant

TRANSCRIPTION SERVICE: Associated Reporting Service
Post Office Box 674
229 West Genesee Street
Buffalo, New York 14201-0674
(716) 885-2081

Proceedings recorded by electronic sound recording, transcript produced by transcription service.

INDEX

P R O C E E D I N G

MR. STREIBEL: If everyone would like to take a seat. We'll start this so we can get you out at a reasonable hour. I'd like to invite Supervisor Auberger, supervisor of the Town of Greece, to come up and say a few words.

(Applause)

SUPERVISOR AUBERGER: Good evening. It's great to have you all back here at Greece Town Hall, for the members of the study and for those of you who have not had the opportunity to be part of this area here at Greece Town Hall, I could welcome you if this is your first visit.

Before I say a few words, I'd like to acknowledge some of our representatives who are here from our various elected officials, who took time to either send representatives or to be here this evening.

First of all, I'd like to introduce to you our Monroe County legislator who works, represents the part of the lakefront district, here in, not only in the Town of Greece but for the City of Rochester, Mr. Doug Dobson. Doug, thank you for being here this evening. Also I have my fellow supervisor from the great Town of Hamlin, he come all the way in, it didn't take him long to get here, Mr. Austin Warner, Supervisor, Town of Hamlin. We also have representing Monroe County executive Maggie Brooks, Mary Louise Meisenthal.

We also have a representative from the office of Tom Reynolds, the U.S. House of Representatives, Mr. Paul Cole representing Congressman Reynolds. We have Mr. Ed McKewen representing Senator Joe Robok. The former Town Supervisor from the Town of Brighton, now representing Mr. Charlie Nesbit for the New York State Assembly, Mr. Don Connors. Don. Last but not least we have Mr. Gary Gist who's representing the

Town Supervisor from the Town of Webster, Kathy Thomas. Good to see you.

(Applause)

Well, this group has certainly accomplished a lot in the years that they have been part and gathering research on lake level issues concerning the Great Lakes. And what they try to do is to make all interests be part of this overall study. And I'm looking forward as supervisor, I know on behalf of our other Town Supervisor and elected representatives, we're looking forward to seeing the results of this hard work. It's never easy when you try to factor in all the different areas that come into the effects of lake level within the State of New York and the lakefront community.

A couple weeks ago I had the opportunity of attending the Great Lakes conference in Chicago, where I had the opportunity of working with many different mayors of large cities such as, had the opportunity to meet

Mayor Daly from Chicago, right down to very small village mayors and elected representatives from Canada. It was a very eye opening experience for me, the fact that, how important the Great Lakes are to all of our communities, whether large or small.

In this is out showing this evening, you're here tonight, to show how you care about the levels of the Great Lakes and how it affects all of us. So I commend the study group. I commend you as citizens and representatives for being here to hear what they have to say and to be part of preserving our Great Lakes. Enjoy the evening, and again, welcome to Greece Town Hall. Thank you very much.

(Applause)

MR. STREIBEL: My name is Max Streibel and probably most of you know me or call me or, good, bad or indifferent, but I've been with this project for the past four years. We are in the fourth year of a five year

study. The study we're presenting to you is about water levels and flows in Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River.

The International Joint Commission has made many attempts, as we all know, in developing a better regulation plan than the present one, which is 1958D.

In this latest attempt and for the first time, the International Joint Commission has broken new ground by involving from the beginning the various stakeholders throughout the system, including first nation people. By involving the stakeholders the IJC is trying to make sure that it would not isolate the various users from the study teams, and risk missing any potential concerns in the preparation of the new regulation plan.

In talking about the study teams, I hope that you've taken time to take a look at the panels that we have around the room, if not before you leave tonight. I appreciate you taking that in.

In doing so the IJC could not have been more fair and transparent in its attempt at producing the most comprehensive regulating plan for all the communities and users it serves. We've invited you here tonight to hear what concerns you have and to tell you how the study is going. This may be the first time you have come, although I recognize many faces here; to one of our public meetings, or you may have talked to us before.

We have heard from people around the lake and down the river and we know that there are conflicting viewpoints. We know that nature has a huge impact but regulations are needed to manage water levels. No one can forecast the weather precisely enough to guarantee when water levels should be raised or lowered.

One of the strongest impressions I've learned from working with the study team, and I think I've mentioned this several times at other meetings, is how complex this

lake and river system is. We really needed this type of research to give us the good science, and I stress science, to base better decisions on.

The format for the evening is as follows. There will be about a 30 minute Power Point presentation. Then we will take a break for you to write down your questions. Now in the packages you received this afternoon as you -- this evening, if you picked one up, there's some paper in there so you can write your questions down. During that time, that 30 minute -- I'm sorry, after the 30 minute presentation, during that time while we're setting up for a teleconference, we're going to link up with people attending a meeting like this in the Montreal area, the Duval Montreal area.

Some of you have come to the meeting with one important question in mind. We encourage you to listen to the presentation, knowing that your question will be

presented, not only to the audience here, but also in the Montreal area. And everyone will hear the answer. We will be alternating questions between here and there. Since we want as many people in both places to ask their questions, we ask that you be brief as you can and that the people answering your questions do so concisely.

We have other guests here who will be introduced to you during the presentation. Making the Power Point presentation this evening will be Dr. Barletta, another volunteer on the Public Interest Advisory Group who lives in Greece. But before turning this over to Dr. Barletta, I also would like to introduce one of our IJC commissioners who's with us today, the Honorable Al Olson. Mr. Olson, welcome. Who incidentally is a former elected official, having been Governor of the State of North Dakota. So we welcome him here. Dan.

MR. BARLETTA: Thank you, Max. Before

I get started, I know Max pointed out the panels that we have hanging around the room. On this television screen here we'll have after the presentation and the question -- You can't hear me? These gentlemen have been with us as we're traveling down the river and across the lake, and we're becoming good friends. Anyways, I was saying, after the presentation and the question and answer period -- the video screen over here will show a Power Point presentation that we used the last couple years to give a lot of the background on the study, how the hydraulics and the geology, how it affects the system. If you haven't seen the presentation before, it will only take about 15, 20 minutes so we welcome you to take a look at that.

As far as tonight, the International Joint Commission has asked me to be part of the Public Interest Advisory Group. Our job is to make sure that your concerns and ideas are addressed in the Lake Ontario St.

Lawrence River study. As Max said, we're all volunteers. There are presently 22 of us. There's 11 on the U.S. side and 11 on the Canadian side. Together we have held more than nine public meetings and 51 local stakeholder meetings with over 3500 members of the public in attendance.

The International Joint Commission is responsible for the shared waters between our two countries. It was founded in 1909 by the Boundaries Waters Treaty. In December of 1999 the International Joint Commission initiated our study to review the regulation of the outflows from Lake Ontario through the St. Lawrence River to Trois Riveres, the area circled in red on the slide here. As Max said, we are in the fourth year of a five year study. There's over 120 people involved in the study. The International Joint Commission mandates that all our boards and studies must have equal representation from both countries.

I'd like to briefly just introduce to

you some of the members of the study who are able to join us today. You met Commissioner Brooks. Russ Trowbridge is the U.S. study liaison to the IJC. From the study board we have the U.S. general manager is Tony Eberhart. The U.S. co-director is Gene Stokhiv. Canadian co-chair is Doug Culpepper. And many of you know Dr. Frank Sciremammano. He's on the study board, along with myself. And Pete Laucks in the back, he's a Professor from Cornell.

From the technical working groups, the scientists, we have -- if I miss somebody, please let me know. From coastal processes or coastal erosion we have Pete Zuzak. Roger Haberle is from the commercial navigation group. We've got John Sheen from the hydro group. David Klein is from the environmental group. And Bill Werick, are you here? Oh, he's not here tonight. Okay. And as Max says, and as I mentioned previously, there's a number of us in the Public Interest Advisory Group. We have

Henry Stewart, who is going to be participating with the meeting tonight, I skipped Doug Wilcox, who is in the environmental group. Okay. We have a couple public staff people, Arleen Kreusch, who is our projectionist. And many of you met Aaron on the way in.

Now, when we get to the question and answer period, members of other technical working groups will join us by telephone. So we hope the people here tonight and hopefully the people on the telephone will have the background to answer any of your questions.

Now, thinking about the water coming over Niagara Falls, I'm sure you're not surprised that up to 85% of the water coming into Lake Ontario during periods of average to high water levels in the upper Great Lakes comes from those other Great Lakes.

The light green area, the light green area is the local watershed of Lake Ontario. Right here. The darker green area includes

the watershed of not only the Ottawa River but the St. Lawrence River. Now, the interesting thing about the Ottawa River is the Ottawa River has few control dams on the lower part. So there's no dams down here. Montreal is right in this area. So it's harder to predict how much water from the Ottawa River is going to flow into the St. Lawrence in the next week or so, and this is especially critical in the spring. That is one of the reasons that the flows from the Ottawa River must be carefully considered when regulating the flows on the St. Lawrence River. Just this small fact gives an inkling to the complexity of the system.

The Moses Saunders Power Dam at Massena is just one factor controlling water levels. Nature is a more unpredictable factor.

Now, the outflows through the Moses Saunders Power Dam are currently regulated using a set of written rules for releases called Plan 1958-D. Although it takes into account the interests of water uses,

commercial navigation and hydroelectric power, the plan does not consider the needs of the environment, recreational boating or shoreline erosion. 1958-D was based on the kind of water supplies that we got in the first half of the last century.

And after the extreme dry periods of the mid-60's and the wetter periods of the ‘70's, the plan was allowed to deviate -- the plan allowed deviations from the written rules. These days 1958-D is deviated about 50% of the time to make adjustments for changes in supplies, accommodating old and new interests, for ice formation.

So we -- what we call the plan now is 1958-D with deviations. This plan is implemented by the International St. Lawrence River Board of Control and that board also is appointed by the International Joint Commission.

The green area, the green area on this slide indicates that the technical working groups have been in the study and data

collection phase during the first three years. The Plan Formulation and Evaluation Work Group is mandated to prepare computer models that will use all the data to evaluate possible regulation plans for evaluation by the Study Board.

Now, this slide shows that the study board approved these guidelines for deciding which new alternate plans and criteria would best serve the public. The guidelines will be used in ranking options for the International Joint Commission. We know we can't please everyone all the time, but the goal of the study board is to have every significant interest do as well or better than they do now. Now, this is an important slide, so I'm going to give you a few seconds to look over it. And also, just to let you know that in your folder and on the table up front is a handout and it's labeled Visions, Goals and Guidelines of the International Lake Ontario St. Lawrence River. Any Plan or criteria that the study

board comes up with, we want it to be environmentally sustainable. We want to have no disproportionate loss to any particular stakeholders. We'd like to have flexible management of the plan. Mitigating alternatives will be mentioned. That will be left up to the IJC to decide what could be done with them. We want any plan or criteria to be adaptable to possible climate change. We're trying to make the decision process as transparent to the public as possible.

That's one of the reasons why we're having many meetings. And we want to have any plans and criteria adaptable to future technology. Now, based on the input we have received from the public and the scientists, the Study Team has written criteria, metrics, and performance indicators. These are being studied in order to come up with a variety of plans. As you see on this slide, the team will keep refining these things, starting with criteria. Those are the water

levels people prefer or want to avoid.

Next, they will develop plans that will try to create those water levels more often. Then they will measure the economic and environmental benefits. Those are the performance indicators, to see if the new plans and criteria really help society. You'd think that if you gave people the water levels they wanted you'd increase benefits automatically, but that doesn't always happen. And we'll touch on that in a bit.

First though, let's clarify some of these definitions of the terms that we're sharing with you.

In the folder that you received, there is a list of first cut of suggested evaluation criteria, for plan formulation. And it's labeled -- it's a big thick one. It's preliminary criteria metric for plan formulation. We don't want to put this all on the slide because it gets really long, really boring and you'll all be sleeping.

It's there for you to read later.

These suggested evaluation criteria are not final. In fact, they are being adjusted as we go through the decision process, based on study research and public input. We hope you will review these criteria and comment on them. The suggested evaluation criteria represent the shared common objectives by the various stakeholders, such as not letting the water level get too high or too low, or reducing or accentuating the changes in levels and flows. But all these terms will be easier to understand if we show you some examples.

We talked earlier about the extent of the Study. This evening, as Max said, we are paired with Duval, which is outside Montreal, Quebec. We'll talk more about that later. Now let's look at our area.

When I talked about criteria, a graph here showed the lines that represent the criteria, the minimum and maximum levels that the stakeholders and researchers have

come up with so far. We're going to give you an example what these lines mean. But just so you got some reference points. And this is from all the different technical working groups, and there's just one major graph here. Presently Lake Ontario is controlled between 243.3, which is approximately down in here, and 247.3, which is between the red lines and the dotted yellow black line, so right about here. That's the present range of water levels.

The recreational boating and tourism group would like to minimize the frequency, severity and duration of water levels on or below 245.2 feet, or above 247.2 feet from April 15th to October 15th. If it's necessary to change the water levels more than 7 tenths of a foot from the beginning of May to the end of June, they don't want us to do any more often than would have happened before March of 1955, the time we call pre-project.

They also don't want to have the water

drop from the spring peak to the first week of September more than 9.6 inches any more often than really necessary. The rec boating technical working group has come up with these performance indicators to evaluate their criteria. These are economic and environmental impacts the study researchers say will occur because of one plan or another.

Beach users prefer that levels are maintained within the range of 243.4 to 246.7 feet during May through August to have the best access to beaches and all the associated recreational benefits. For those living along the shoreline, the coastal group has developed the criteria shown with this line. The erosion process occurs at any water level. But the levels in the winter are the most important. The research shows that winter storms cause the most damage because the wave action force during the winter months is more severe. Therefore, we have a lower maximum of 245.1

feet from November to the end of February. Coastal group would like to see that 246.7 feet be the upper limit from May to August. Above this level the erosion process accelerates in the summer.

On these slides we've kept the explanation of performance indicators very brief. A more detailed explanation, actually there's another handout in your folder called preliminary performance indicators. Many of you might have seen this last summer. We had a draft of that last year and it's been revised since last summer. But the explanation is a little bit more detailed for each one of those performance indicators.

The environmental technical working group has found that wetlands need higher lake levels about once every 50 years, now in your handout it's going to say every 20 to 25 years. That criteria has changes in the last two weeks; the research has shown that they could go to every 50 years going

to that level.

So during periods of high supplies and lake levels the environmental technical working group would like Lake Ontario to rise to 247.7 feet at the time it would usually peak, although a few inches higher than it would rise under the current plans, for about three weeks.

In a different climate situation, wetlands need a very dry period about once every 20 to 25 years. So during periods of low supplies and lake levels, the environmental technical working group would like Lake Ontario be held at 245 feet or below for two years in succession with a gradual return to higher levels during the succeeding two years.

So you can see most of the time no change is needed but a few times a century to allow the lake to go a little higher or a little lower, and this will give us healthier wetlands which we believe, and the researchers are still working on this; in

turn will give us a greater abundance and diversity of fish.

Under normal climatic conditions the minimum wintertime weekly Lake Ontario levels should be kept above 245 feet in most years. In Lake Ontario the first week of April is important for fish spawning. If Lake Ontario levels can be 246 feet and higher in the first week of April the fishermen will be happy when those young reach keeper size.

You'll notice on this slide the performance indicators are the impacts that could occur rather than economic measures.

Commercial navigation companies find these levels on this slide important. During the shipping season if the levels get above 247.2 feet, the ships must reduce their speed to prevent shore damage on the eastern end of Lake Ontario. This, of course increases their cost.

The two minimum levels shown on this slide are important for the companies also.

Any level below 243.9 feet means they have to reduce their speed to maintain safe underkeel clearances. Below 243.6 feet the ships must reduce the size of their loads. And both these levels increase their costs.

Again, for a more detailed explanation of these performance indicators from this technical group, I'd like to refer you back to that handout.

Now minimize the frequency, severity and duration of Lake Ontario levels of 243.1 feet and lower so that municipalities, industries and shoreline property owners with wells are not negatively impacted. Now, these are mainly economic, but the social impact on people with wells could be considerable.

Now this slide here, we didn't have a graph to go with it, but these are the performance indicators being proposed by the hydroelectric power group. I'll give you a few seconds to read through this, but you've got to remember, whether it's a hot day or a

cold day we all need electricity.

Let us know what you think by contacting us by regular mail or email. Our addresses are in the material you have received. We especially need to hear from you about the different, about any of the metrics that need to be different. We'll be summarizing all the comments and concerns expressed at this meeting, at the meetings this summer, and thus providing your input to the plan formulation and evaluation group, along with the study board. Your input will be evaluated and incorporated into the study where possible.

Now regulation began in the early '60's with the plan, as I mentioned before, called 1958-D, at that time, it was the most advanced plan using the technology available at that time. Shortly after its use changes occurred in the climate. First we had extended drought period in the '60's, and extreme precipitation in the '70's, along with demographic changes that include new

stakeholders in the system.

The board of control was allowed to deviate from Plan 1958-D to satisfy these new conditions. Plan 1958-D with deviations, then 58-DD up on the screen; became the actual although not formally recognized operation plan. During this study we are researching and developing plans based not only on economic rules, but plans with the environment as the most important component plans that stakeholders are giving us, and plans using information from other attempts made in the past. All these plans are being entered into a computer model called the Shared Vision Model. Next year we'll be returning to you with the 2005 plan options for your consideration. This slide shows our tentative meeting dates for next summer, when we will present you with the best alternate plan based on science and your input. Please mark the dates on your calendars.

The Public Interest Advisory Group, the Study Board, the study general managers and International Joint Commission liaisons will continue to meet with the plan formulation and evaluation group throughout this winter. We will develop recommendations for plans to bring to you next year. In the fall of 2005 our report will be submitted to the commissioners of the International Joint Commission for their decision process.

Now, over the last three and half years, many people have been involved in the Public Interest Advisory Group. Like I said before, they have all been volunteers. But we're all interested in the lake and the river. Some for a variety of reasons have been unable to stay on the PIAG, but you'll see my name along with the other members that are here today on this board.

On this slide and the next slide you'll see the names of the Study Board members, some of whom also have not been able to stay on the Study Board. You'll see the names of

the people here tonight to whom you've been previously introduced.

Now, for the next portion of the meeting as Max said, we'll be connecting with some of our experts who cannot attend tonight's meeting in person. You've already met the experts who are here, and we'll also be connecting with Montreal.

We're going to take a short break, give you an opportunity to write down your questions and answers, and to set up our equipment. If you don't have a pad or pencil, we have some out at the table in front where you signed in.

(Applause)

MR. STREIBEL: Thank you, Dan. Before we take the break, I would just like to acknowledge Roger Gauthier, who is in the corner over here, and he's got a computer set up back there that you may be interested in. But his area of responsibility in this study is to come up with a way of categorizing, storing, archiving information

that's been derived for all the work that the various technical groups are doing. So if you want to see what he's doing, I suggest you go over there. If you haven't taken advantage of the panels, do that. But it's going to be a quick five minutes to get the teleconferencing going. We're going to call this back as soon as we've made that connection.

There will be two microphones. There's one there and there's one over here, that we would ask you to come up to when we reconvene. And Henry Stewart will be facilitating the question and answer period. We'll tell you when it's your turn to ask the experts. So Henry will be coordinating that facet of the presentation tonight. Thank you.

(Off the record To connect telephonically with Dorval, Quebec, Canada)

MR. STEWART: Ladies and gentlemen, if we could have your attention. I don't mean

to interrupt too strenuously but if we could have your attention and ask that you rejoin us in your seats. Thank you very much.

We're going to start now because under some time constraints because of the joinder we have with the other location. We're now at the question and answer point of the session. As was indicated, my name is Henry Stewart. I'm a member of the Public Interest Advisory Group as well. We're all volunteers. I happen to live in Greece and have a cottage on the lakeshore in the Town of Huron in Wayne County. All of us on the PIAG have various concerns and interest and are very involved in seeking to see that on behalf of the public this study is carried through in a very deliberate manner that is very attentive to the interests of all stakeholders concerns about water levels and issues regarding Lake Ontario and the St. Lawrence River. So with the question and answer period now, you're going to have a chance to come one by one to either of the

microphones, preferably the one closest to you. Your comments and questions will be recorded so that the study team can be sure that they're taken into account throughout the progress of this study.

Please come to the microphone so that everyone here can hear you and so that everyone in the other remote location of Duval, Quebec, Canada can hear you as well. When you come to the microphone we ask that you state your name and tell us where you're from, and please spell your name as well so that we can be back in touch with you and it will be accurately recorded.

We ask everyone asking a question to be as concise as possible and we also ask that everyone who has occasion to answer a question also be concise because our teleconference with Duval will have to end promptly at 9:00 p.m. If you wish to, after that, however, you can stay and talk with any member of the study team who might be able to assist you in answering a question

or addressing a concern that you have.

Now, if anyone happens to ask a question that's very similar, that you might deem as very similar to the one that you were planning to ask, please consider delaying asking yours until other people have had a chance to ask other questions and then if there's time you can come and ask yours in a slightly different format or degree. And we could take that up. And if for some reason your question is not answered tonight, we can assure you that if you bring it to our attention or turn it in in writing, we will try our very best to get an answer for you.

I believe at this time we're ready to join with the remote location of Duval, Quebec, Canada. I believe that Mr. Marc Hudon, who is also a member of the Public Interest Advisory Group, may be the facilitator there. If we're connected, is Marc Hudon there?

MR. HUDON: How are you doing, Henry?

MR. STEWART: Marc, how are you? Thank

you very much. We're glad we're connected here, and we hope this will be a very important session for both the individuals here and the Town of Greece, near Rochester, New York, USA, and those in Duval, Quebec, Canada. Do you have anyone who would like to start off the questions, Marc?

MR. HUDON: We will. I think tonight, we'll let you go ahead with the first one.

MR. STEWART: All right. Is there anyone here who would like to come to the microphone, please, and start off? First we'll start with the young woman over at that microphone, and please identify yourself.

MS. COE: My name is Kay Coe, C-O-E. I live in Hamlin, New York, and my question is, when considering the water levels and erosion potential, does the group evaluate the effects of the fast ferry wave action on the shoreline?

MR. STEWART: That's a very good question, very timely, and we believe and

hope that the ferry may be resurrected and that this will become even more timely. Is there anyone who might -- Max, would you like to answer that?

MR. STREIBEL: That really hasn't been part of the study although that's been brought up. And I think the hopes are that should the ferry, when the ferry does start up again, they've been very much made aware of the fact that they're going to have to do something to change either their route, speed or what have you, because there's been a lot of concerns, not only from Hamlin but right down through Parma and Greece. But that per se is not part of the lake level study.

MR. STEWART: Is there anyone else who needed to say anything about that? If not, we'll move on to the next question but were you going to make a comment about that?

MR. SAWYKO: Just a follow-up on that. My name is Leon Sawyko, S-A-W-Y-K-O, and I have a property in Hamlin also. And it

seemed to me that one of the areas that you might consider studying is the distance from shore that you might recommend boat traffic travel, depending on the various lake levels, because it is a tremendous wave action that we get on the shore.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mr. Sawyko. Any other comments from the study team? Pete Zuzak?

MR. ZUZAK: My name is Pete Zuzak. I'm a member of the coastal technical working group that's been involved with the scientific components of this study for the last three years. I think it's critical to point out that a ferry, the ferry, fast ferry that's running on the lake here, is regulated by state and federal entities other than the IJC. This study is involved -- but the purpose of this study is to talk about lake level fluctuations, the rise and fall of the lake and the regulation of the dam, and that's something completely different to permitting a ferry to travel

internationally across the border to Toronto. So I think that if you're looking for a bone to pick, it's with the stage agencies or the coast guard that permitted that ferry, and those are the people I suggest you pursue this issue with.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Pete. At this time, you got a follow-up to this?

MS. THOMAS: Yes.

MR. STEWART: All right.

MS. THOMAS: My name is Vicki Thomas, T-H-O-M-A-S, and I live in Hilton, New York. And I've actually contacted the Coast Guard of Buffalo. I'm not sure the state, the county and the city, given the study has been done to allow the erosion to continue to affect when the fog comes in and stuff like that. And pretty much the city passed the complaint over to the Coast Guard in Buffalo, and then the tax people. I called the tax people about five times, and I never got a phone call back, and I personally don't think they care.

And the Coast Guard in Buffalo said because they are five miles out, that they are in the shipping lane, and they are in their legal rights. So, unless you change legislation, nothing happens with what's going on. And I think the whole thing is, it's not so much the ferry, or whatever, the erosion would seem to be an issue, with the level of the lake and erosion.

MR. STEWART: Thank you very much. I take it that with no other comment with respect to that issue we should in fairness switch to the Duval location and give them a chance to ask their first question. Marc. Marc, can you hear us?

MR. HUDON: Yes. Are you there?

MR. STEWART: Yes, Marc. If you would wish to have your group ask a question at this time.

MR. HUDON: Yes, we have a gentleman.

MR. STEWART: It's difficult to hear, I think.

MR. HUDON: Is it any better now?

MR. STEWART: Yes. Marc, thank you.

MR. HUDON: Okay. Would you please give your name.

MR. FITCH: My name is Tom Fitch.

I'm curious about the linkage between the levels in the lake and the river and the groundwater levels, what impact, if there is a lake -- whether or not there is a variation of environmental impact of the variation in the groundwater levels are and whether or not they're considered in this study.

MR. HUDON: Thank you very much. Does anyone in the room want to field that?

MR. FAY: David Fay from the hydraulics, hydraulics technical working group of the study. I also work for Environment Canada. I think the short answer to your question, is, we've kind of peripherally considered it, but we don't think it's a big factor in our study, but we don't know an awful lot about the interaction between the lake and groundwater. We just think it's very small.

And that's the short answer.

MR. HUDON: Anyone else who would like to add?

(No response)

MR. HUDON: Okay. That's it on this point, Henry. And we'll be back to you now.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Marc. Is there anyone from the study team who wishes here to address that issue, beyond what David has mentioned? Gene Stakhiv?

MR. STAKHIV: I'll take a shot at it because in fact we know, if you recall, that water balance figure that we showed earlier in the presentation, the water coming into Lake Erie, 85%, the precipitation and evaporation. So we know three out of the four numbers. We deduce the groundwater input from the total water balance, and out of that we can also deduce that it's a relatively small number. So we do have very good figures for four out of the five variables, except for groundwater, so it's whatever is left over from the overall water

balance. And from that we deduce that it's a relatively small contribution.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Gene Stakhiv, U.S. co-director of the study team. Anyone else wishing to address the issue? If not we can move on to the next question from our individuals in the U.S. Would anyone like to ask a question at this time? Thank you.

MR. BUDINSKI: My name Ken Budinski. I live here in Greece, New York. And that's spelled B-U-D-I-N-S-K-I. My question is, what is the economic justification for international shipping west of Montreal? Last time I looked into the matter there was only like 1000 ships a year using this, but it seems like everybody is wanting high water for shipping and hydro and recreational boating. There is no tendency to bring the water levels back to what they, what it used to be and what it's probably supposed to be.

But everybody seems to want high level. I've been keeping track of the water levels

every day for the last 14 years and I've seen nothing but going up. And I don't see any -- and a lot of it has to do with the shipping thing. What is the economic justification? In fact, there's only a small number of ships, and how much money do these ships pay with respect to the cost of keeping the seaway open for them? I just don't see it.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Ken. Would anyone from the Study Board itself wish to answer that question? I don't know if we have anyone from commercial navigation here. Roger. Thank you.

MR. HABERLY: I think the general question was, if I interpreted it correctly, is why is there a need for higher water levels potentially towards the end of the year?

MR. STEWART: What was the justification for the higher water levels?

MR. HABERLY: What was the justification for the higher water levels.

FLOOR: And we're bringing in the alien species with these ships, and terrorist risks.

MR. HABERLY: The seaway is used heavily by commercial navigation to bring commodities to Canada and to the United States. Water levels also impact on the amount of hydropower that can be generated through the power plants themselves. For the commercial navigation study itself, we looked at five years of shipping 1995-1999, and during that five year period there were approximately 28,000 vessels that actually used the seaway system.

So they're quite heavily utilizing the St. Lawrence. This converts to somewhere around 55 million tons of actual commodities moving from the, from Montreal area up to, through the St. Lawrence through Lake Ontario and into the United States and into Canada. Some of the major flows that go back and forth are iron ore coming from Labrador, Quebec, going through the

seaway, going to steel plants in Canada and the United States. There is -- there's iron ore that comes through Cleveland and Toledo and there's a steel plant located directly at Toledo which would take iron ore, and that's shipped into the United States. The seaway is also used for grain going out from Lake Superior through the system for export to Europe, two major movements. Grain out, iron ore in. Those are two of the major uses of the seaway for commodities.

FLOOR: What's the dollar value?

MR. HABERLY: Doug might have some insight on that.

MR. CUTHBERT: Thank you, Roger. My name is Doug Cuthbert. I'm the Canadian co-director of the study. Roger is basically the U.S. leader of our commercial navigation working group. There is perhaps a misplaced concern that hydropower and shipping interests want high levels on Lake Ontario. Arleen, while I talk, if you could bring up that screen that showed the desired levels

for commercial navigation.

Hydropower themselves, in my perspective, don't want high water levels. They want flows down the river, but the levels of Lake Ontario really don't affect hydropower at all. But to say that hydropower wants higher water levels I think is incorrect. They want the flow down the river. Whether the levels are high or low, it's the flow that they are concerned about.

For navigation, these figures here effectively say that if the elevation of Lake Ontario is above 243.9, and that's a foot below what it is right now, I we're at 246 roughly now. So it's two feet below what it is now. Then they're limited, then they have to reduce shipping. But as long as it's above that figure, they don't have any limitation relative to their draft or their shipping.

If it goes above 247.2 then they are concerned with the high end. So on Lake Ontario I think it's a misnomer to say that

commercial shipping and hydropower want high levels.

Now, down the St. Lawrence River it's another story. From Montreal downstream, shipping certainly is affected by water levels and low levels are a big concern down there. Thank you.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Doug. Is there anyone else who wishes to comment? Frank Sciremammano of the Study Board.

MR. SCIREMAMMANO: Frank Sciremammano. I'm also a member of the control board. In my 10 years on the control board, navigation on Lake Ontario has never requested higher levels and has generally, the effect of navigation is really Montreal Harbor which wants more water, which actually has the effect of lowering Lake Ontario. So I think that the question is a little misplaced for navigation and I would agree with the other speakers on that.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Frank. Does anyone else wish to address this issue? If

not, we can turn it back over to Marc Hudon for another question from Duval. Marc.

MR. HUDON: Can you hear me?

MR. STEWART: Yes. Thank you.

MR. HUDON: Can you hear the translation?

MR. MENUE (VIA TRANSLATOR): My name is Claude Menue and I represent the group called the Group of St. Lawrence users and our reason for being is to have a group of stakeholders who are preoccupied by water levels in the St. Lawrence River and most of us, or almost all of us have lived through the impacts of the last five years, due to the very low water levels we've seen. And these situations have led us to learn to understand the situation why did this occurred and why has it happened three out of the last six years, if memory serves me. And we have done some research. We've done a survey with the users, and these are people from navigation, also people involved with coastal inhabitants, marinas,

hydroelectricity and many municipalities, recreation and the environment, so just about anything that can be considered as a use of the river is represented in our group and participates in our work. And our survey has highlighted some things first. When the level of the river designs below the chart zero, and that happened for long periods in the last few years. There are some very big difficulties for users. And these situations have to be avoided at all costs.

From an observation such as that one, there is a common position that can be summarized as follows. The zero on the map is the minimum, the minimum acceptable for uses of the St. Lawrence. And when I say minimum, it means the minimum threshold. Everything below that is unacceptable due to the impacts that it produces. And we could describe the comfort level as being 30 centimeters or one foot above the zero of the map because starting at one foot and

above, the impacts are much lesser. So this position, we've described it in a document, as well as the results of our survey. I have some copies with me if anybody wants any. I will be pleased to give you a copy. And we also wanted in our position, and is treated; the commission has already received a copy. We wanted to highlight that the St. Lawrence interests can be specific in many ways. Traditionally the coastal users or various citizens groups, especially in Lake Ontario, may have shown an awareness, a mobilization that was greater than that observed here, and we wanted to counter this situation by creating our group and by having a position that represents the interests of the St. Lawrence River. And I've briefly described it here, but in my written document you will find a more complete version.

Now, concerning the study, I'm surprised that after three years that we haven't been given any results of the work that has been

done so far. I mean, we are now less than one year away from the end of the study. We're being consulted on the study. But we're being offered a description of the issues, but no results. We know from those who follow the work closely that there are some results that are known, even if they're preliminary.

Even if for the moment they describe some trends more than certainty, I think they should have been given further consultation because according to what we've been described, this weeks consultation, or these days anyway, is the most important one in the process. And now is the time to react.

But all we can do is react by saying, well, you've forgotten this or that. It would have been much more interesting to be able to react by saying, well, the results that you've obtained or the trends that you've seen correspond or don't correspond to the expectations of the stakeholders.

But right now we don't have much meat to put on the bones. And the website of the study or the Joint Commission isn't any more eloquent on the results. We find some generalities or very technical aspects, but almost nothing on the results of the working groups. And that's a sad case. I mean, we would have expected to have more meat on the bones in terms of consultation. Thank you.

MR. HUDON: Does anyone in the room here want to comment on the reasons why there aren't any more data available on the ongoing work? Andre Carpentier from the study group and also from the control commission.

MR. CARPENTIER (VIA TRANSLATOR): I'm surprised to hear Mr. Menue's comments, especially when you say there aren't very many results. In a presentation like this one, we can't give you all the results. What we wanted to do was to summarize them, give you the highlights, giving you the

lines and the metrics and all the results are there.

The conclusions by the working groups are represented in terms of requests for revenues that need to be satisfied or avoided, as we've mentioned that previously. And the documentation is available on the website or upon request. You must understand that we can't, we can't present all these results. Both for each interest group. But they do exist. They are available.

Now, the comment that there was a survey in various stakeholders groups, well, the Joint Commission has received these results and they have been included in the results and comments that we will take into account in our study.

MR. HUDON: Thank you, Andre.

MS. KENNEDY: Hello. My name is Elaine Kennedy and I'm a member of the Public Interest Advisory Group. I just wanted to add one point to Andre's comments. Am I too

loud? Too fast. Oh, sorry. I just wanted to add a comment to Andre's comments. And that is that one of the things that we are being very careful about is that our science must be peer reviewed before we put it out to the public. We want to make sure that our science that we're basing our results and our decisions upon has been reviewed and therefore it is acceptable to other scientists and therefore critical to the scientific community. So I just wanted to add that little bit to --

MR. HUDON: Henry, if you will allow us, we had another comment from Mr. Tom McCauley.

MR. STEWART: All right. Thank you, Marc.

MR. HUDON: Mr. Tom McCauley,

MR. McCAULEY: I just wanted to say that we're glad that you've done this survey and we consider it to be very important and the results that you submitted was sent, there are people at the other end who are aware

because they received them, as well as the co-chairs, as well as the modeling group.

And we want to keep -- we want to keep the study as transparent as possible from the outset. We received as much important data as possible. And since you're a group with many interests, we are very happy and satisfied to include it in the study for the preparation and the evaluation of our plans.

MR. HUDON: Thanks, Tom. Okay, Henry. Before I pass it on to you, I have a small request to make.

MR. STEWART: Yes.

MR. HUDON: We have the best translator people here at this end, but there is smoke coming out of their boots. So I'm wondering if you guys can speak a little bit slower to help us.

MR. STEWART: Certainly. I think everyone could hear that and we will note that, as you can tell we've having very significant efforts put forward to have translation occur in this technological

circumstance of the teleconference.

We really have sought, and it's necessary, of course, to speak with our international study to have everything be accessible to people of both languages involved, particularly French and English. So as you can tell, that makes for some slowdown, but it's very vital to our process. Does anyone wish to respond at all to the question. Then we can move on to a question from the audience here. And sir, that would be great. Thank you.

MR. MOORE: My name is Jack Moore. We have a cottage down in Troutburg, which is just west of Hamlin Beach on Lake Ontario, near Orleans County Line Road. The cottage has been in the family since the 1800's. It was built by relatives. I can remember as a kid when we had a huge beach. We haven't had a shoreline there in recent years. It's just all eroded. We've had to put rocks in every year to -- we lost a lot of ground. We've lost tons. And my question, and

again, since this last storm of a week ago that came in from the east, it did even more damage to -- the water level is very high now. We just lost our steps over the weekend. And I'm wondering, I can't understand, we've never been able to understand why the water is kept as high as it is. Why it isn't closer to the 243 level. And our feeling is that your statistics probably go back to the '50's when the St. Lawrence Seaway was built, when they probably should be going back a lot farther.

So if somebody could address that. I'd just like to know if there are any plans since the last storm to drop it down before we have more erosion, because we have a very serious erosion problem right now if something isn't done.

(Applause)

MR. STEWART: Thank you for that. In that regard, I don't know whether Frank or Doug or anyone else, Pete Zuzak. All right.

MR. ZUZAK: My name is Pete Zuzak, again. I'm a coastal scientist with the coastal technical working group. We have a slide in front of us here in Rochester. It may be difficult to see the years along the X axis or along the bottom. I believe it's the last century. So we have from 1900 in the lower left corner, to 2000 in the far right hand corner. On the left hand axis you have supply of water to Lake Ontario, and as you can see, 1900 to approximately 1950 there was a steady decline in the supply of water.

And that is the single most important factor in the level of Lake Ontario, prior to regulation. This is one of the reasons you had a significant beach in front of your property. The levels, the supply of water to the system was decreasing, and thus the lake levels were on the lower side.

Around 1960 the dam came into play and then shortly after, in the mid 1960's you have that second spike or drop. And again,

we had some near record low supplies. And again, that provided for very low levels on Lake Ontario. Regulation has an impact on the water levels you see, but the overriding factor is the supply of water to the system. Now, since the mid ‘60's the supply of water to the system has been steadily increasing, as you can see on the graph, until the spike that we have in, near the change of the last century.

So one of the biggest factors, and the reason everyone is talking about the high levels of the last several decades is not because there’s a conspiracy for higher levels, not because the lake is being regulated, as Doug mentioned, higher for shipping. There’s simply a lot more water in the system. It’s a natural process.

It’s related to the global climate factors, mesoscale climate factors, and that’s the biggest reason, one of the biggest reasons for the fact that you’ve seen less beach in front of your property.

There are other factors related to sand and the occurrence of sand, and one of the unfortunate ones is the development -- construction of shoreline protection structures. The more people armor their shoreline, the less erosion there is, and the less sand there is available to build beaches. So there is a give and take situation there. As we develop the shoreline and more of it goes from agricultural lands to residential, the values increase, and people want to protect their lands. The impact of that though is there's less sand available in the system to build beaches. And that's one of the unfortunate things we're seeing on this lake. It's been going on quite extensively on some of the other lakes, like Lake Erie now, for quite some time.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Pete, and then Doug Cuthbert.

MR. CUTHBERT: We in the study team -- it's Doug Cuthbert again, the Canadian study

director, we're very much aware that one of the reasons for the study is the concern in this area of Lake Ontario of shoreline erosion and the loss of shoreline, and the threat to buildings. That's been loud and clear. And probably if it wasn't for that we wouldn't be here tonight.

The regulation plan right now acts to keep the levels lower than they naturally would have been. And the plot that you see up here shows what the levels are actually in red. If there was no regulation they would be the lines in blue. So the regulation plan has acted to lower the water levels, the high levels that you have, added on the other side to increase low levels. The question is, do we use the control dams to the degree that they're able to lower them further?

Is that a solution to the problem? Well, certainly it would have repercussions on many other interests but it would in the short term probably reduce the erosion on

the shoreline. In the longer terms, depends on the nature of your shoreline. Your shoreline may be eroding on a long term basis regardless of what water levels are. And I would suggest that with the information that Pete Zuzak and the study has now, there's an ability to understand that what's happening in this shoreline, in the Rochester Greece area, in a way that we've never had that ability before.

Through your technology, the modeling, the understanding of the coastal geomorphology has been advanced in the study to know what's going on. Now, what the solutions are, there's a range of different solutions, but at least, I think we can understand what's happening on the shoreline. Thank you.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Doug. Mr. Wilcox from the environmental group.

MR. WILCOX: Thank you, Henry. I have just two comments. I agree with things that Pete has said and what Doug has said, but a

perspective on this. The control board right now is doing what it's required to do, following the current regulation plan. The reason we are here tonight, if there were low supplies, the control board is going to try to keep the water high. If there are high supplies we would try and keep them low. They don't have the ability under the current plan to do something different than that.

The purpose for this whole $25 million study is to generate a plan that will allow the control board to do something different if they see a need to do it, to protect any interest, and that's very critical.

I'd like to add to what Pete said in the supply curve. We've done work on the upper Great Lakes looking at climate change through history through paleo methods and have an over 4,000 year record of lake level history. What you're seeing there, the up and down in the supplies of water have been going on, it's a natural process, being

going on for thousands of years. So we have to deal with that. And it is the supplies of water coming into the lake that drive lake levels, and we can't change it.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Doug Wilcox. Does anyone else have any comment about the same subject? Frank Sciremammano.

MR. SCIREMAMMANO: I think the other speakers have covered it pretty well, but I wanted to talk about the immediate situation from the control board's point of view. We're well aware of what's going on. As you know, the remnants of the hurricane dumped a lot of water. We had a cool, wet summer. We're now about 10-1/2 inches above the long-term average. We're meeting next Tuesday and Wednesday and we're going to look forward about six months. The last time we did that, the last two times we did that, the critical period was in the fall when we thought we'd need extra water for Montreal. Now we have a lot of extra water. So my anticipation is, we will have a

discussion next week in anticipation of hopefully providing some relief so that we don't have a problem next spring. So that deals with the immediate situation.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Frank. Does anyone else have any comment or monologue with respect to that issue? All right. Marc, we're ready for you next.

MR. HUDON: Thank you very much, Henry. Can you hear me?

MR. STEWART: Yes. Thank you.

MR. HUDON: I think we have a gentleman who has a question.

MR. MALVAIR (VIA TRANSLATOR): Hi. My name is Paul Malvair. I'm the regional director of the food and Fisheries for the department, for the government of Quebec. It is our responsibility, originally, we were based in Colette, to put out a commercial fishing license as well as the development of commercial fishing along the river. One of our concerns is to know whether there has been a study made of the

impact on water levels on spawning Sturgeons and other fishes in the river and near the shores, like St. Catherine's in particular and other shores of the St. Lawrence River and have the impacts of commercial fishing with regard to water levels. Is it possible to invest money to study this?

MR. HUDON: Is there someone who will answer that question for us? State your name.

MR. LAFANE (VIA TRANSLATOR): Peter Lafane. I'm in Canada. Yes, we have developed a model for the estimate and the habitats for the different species. With regards to reproduction, there was certain species on which we concentrated, there is the pike, perch. There has been a lot of energy put into estimating the reproductions of the habitats of species. So, nothing has been made in particular for commercial fishing, but we have made some -- The model works pretty well, and we collaborated with

other groups, so it's a -- and we are always in a back and forth type of communication with the study groups.

MR. HUDON: Another comment from Madame Christian Jones.

MS. JONES (VIA TRANSLATOR: We've also taken recent studies on the large pike in different areas and certain spawning grounds, in order to coordinate water levels with the different pike. We've also done some studies from Quebec, that give us a 30 year study of the abundance of different fishes and we've noticed the abundance. We've been able to relate the type of different species according to water levels. And finally, this work has become the basis or formed the basis for the elaboration of different factors, indicators that have come into play in different models and projections that have been made. To come back to commercial fishing, I mentioned; we did not give any particular attention to the commercial

aspects. That is something that we should listen to.

MR. HUDON: Thank you. Are there other comments on the same point? All right. Yes, there's someone who wants to make a comment on that same subject.

MR. CLAUDE MARCELS (VIA TRANSLATOR): I know that there are studies that are being made, but what do those studies say? We have a very, a lot of water, we have a very strong growth and abundance of fish. So those are studies that come in support of all that has been observed in the big rivers, where we have a floodable plain area, and so the more water flows in the more fish that can access the larger habitat and the more the younger of these fishes have success and can survive to the adult stage. So in the prospect of wet lands and fish habitat is connected to the stream water influx into the system and the natural fluctuation of water levels throughout the world. And we need to have a raising of

water levels in the spring and then a lowering of the levels toward the end of summer, a hydrology system, and we have variation throughout the year.

The performance indicators are going to be developed to underline the importance of those different hydrological factors on the recruiting of different fish species. Thank you.

MR. HUDON: Thank you. Are there any other comments on this same subject? Otherwise it's back to you.

MR. STEWART: Thank you. Would anyone here from the study team wish to make any comment or follow-up with respect to that issue? If not, we can move on to another question. Sir, thank you very much.

MR. LOWE: My name is Rob Lowe. I'm a lakeshore resident. My question is, when it comes to regulating lake levels do you give equal or unequal weighting to the various stakeholder interests? The ones I'm thinking about are power, environment,

coastal, riparian, shipping and recreation?

MR. STEWART: Thank you. That's a very good question. I think it's at the heart of a lot of the issues that the technical working groups are working on both together and individually. And Gene Stakhiv, the U.S. co-lead, will be able to answer that.

MR. STAKHIV: There are two parts, two parts to that answer. One is, we're developing the longer term new operating rules. Both the criteria and the flows, which would give more or less equal weight to all of the interest groups, including recreational boating and shoreline, because right now in the orders of approval, there are really only three purposes for which the control board should be giving consideration.

But the control board itself, the actual decisions, week to week, day to day decisions, actually does give weight to all six factors, which is why you have plan 58-DD, with deviations. And in fact, they

deviate considerably probably 50% of the time from the actual rules of the game, to take into account recreational boating, shoreline, shoreline damages, and even the environment. And in the new plan that we're developing, all six purposes will be given equal weight. Economics. Well, you saw one of -- the first guideline we had there was, we would develop plans that are environmentally sustainable and that produce the greatest economic benefits as well.

MR. STEWART: One circumstance that I have had occasion to observe as a member of the Public Interest Advisory Group is that in the economics of valuing the various aspects of benefit or loss, there have been issues that have come up with respect to, how does one value loss of a property owner's land versus how does one value loss of certain aspects of how much shipping weight can be put on in terms of a load onto commercial navigation, and all that.

And how does one determine how to best

make it legitimate, accurate and competitive between what those losses are. And I've been particularly interested in how the economic team has looked at that and how the various technical working groups have looked at it. They try to be very conscientious about that and I think that might have some bearing on answering the question as well. Does anyone else have anything to respond or to add to what Gene has mentioned? Is this a follow-up to that issue? Yes? Thank you.

MR. QUICK: James Quick from Wolcott, New York. Riparian. Been there since 1957. A couple years back John Gangus from the Corps of Engineers came and visited me and saw our problems. I'm hoping that the people on the study groups will also come and see each one of these individual problems along the way. We have a problem on the south shore of the lake because we have predominant winds from the northwest. Obviously that doesn't affect the Canadian

neighbors up to the north. We used to get relief from Toronto back in the ‘50's when we had a south wind for about three days, and there was 3,000,000 boaters up there.

MR. STEWART: Thank you very much. Is there any other follow-up or response with respect to that issue? Questions? Pete Zuzak from the coastal processes group. Thank you, Pete.

MR. ZUZAK: I think, just to respond to the question of erosion and it was addressed earlier by the other gentleman. As far as what we have done. And my group, the coastal group has been addressing these issues of the privately owned parcels along the lake. One of the things we’ve done, last summer I personally flew around the lake in a helicopter, and I saw everybody’s property around the lake. So we are very familiar with the issues you have. We have studied your problems extensively in the field. We’ve taken measurements. We’ve used computer tools, the best available

science to understand why the shoreline erodes, what drives that erosion. It's primarily the storms and the wind-driven waves.

And we've made recommendations. You saw the black line earlier. Could we go to that, to the line of the criteria. We'll see that the, the black line there used, it has two elevations in the slope. One of the things that we're recommending, starting with January at the beginning on the left hand slide, that's our upper level, the upper threshold, and that's close to two feet lower than the current operating range.

So we're making recommendations and trying to make great strides forward to recommend levels that are going to be lower than the current operating range and will provide some relief to shoreline erosion. So there has been a tremendous effort going into this issue. I want to make that clear. The levels that we're recommending have to

increase in the summer when the supplies are coming up. In May through August we have more relief for higher levels because there's less storm activity.

So we're giving different levels at different times of the year to account for the storm activity and we're trying to make recommendations that will help give some relief to the shoreline erosion problem.

MR. SCIREMAMMANO: Frank Sciremammano from the study board. I just want to point out, and maybe Dan can help me with that pointer, that the recommendations coming out of this study in terms of the coastal is, right now the upper limit is 247.3 roughly up here, throughout the year. Upper limit of the regulation range. So basically the control has mandated and the plan is designed to keep it below that through the year.

So you see that already we're getting at least a recommendation and feedback and recognition of the problems that are on the

shoreline, that that should be lowered, especially during the storm season. So that will be factored in, along with all the other requests. But there is a response to the issue. There is an understanding of the issue. And this is what the science tells us would be best in terms of helping to alleviate it. Now, how that gets factored in and what the final result will be will be discussed over the next year and a half. But that input is in there right now.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Frank Sciremammano and also Pete Zuzak, and Doug Wilcox from the environmental technical working group has a comment.

MR. WILCOX: There's another component to erosion. It's not just high water levels and storm events, but it's rebuilding the shorelines. And shorelines naturally in all the upper lakes during low lake level periods, sand has come to shore and blown up, and recreates beaches, recreates dunes. We need to have occasional low lake

levels in order to do that. The current regulation plan along with a period of high supplies has not allowed that to happen. If we have low supplies in the future and a regulation plan that allows lake levels to go low periodically, some of your shoreline property can potentially rebuild, provided they have a supply of sediment to do that. We need a plan that will allow that to happen.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Doug. Any other comments? Yes, sir.

MR. MACK: Ray Mack, M-A-C-K, from Hamlin. As part of this study, will you be sharing this with the Army Corps of Engineers and the DEC, because if the result of this comes back that many of the property owners are not happy, we are going to need permitting in order to protect our property. Okay.

Now, will this go to the Army Corps or the DEC with an emphasis to say, we've decided to put it at this level and expedite

permitting because if anybody's got permits in here in the past, they could take upwards of a year, and you can watch a lot of your property erode, your homes, and so forth. Thank you.

MR. STEWART: Thank you. Doug Cuthbert.

MR. CUTHBERT: Thank you for asking that question. Doug Cuthbert again, the Canadian co-director. There is a member of the board who is from the New York DEC, so the DEC has been plugged in right from the beginning. But there's also been discussions with DEC to provide the information that Pete Zuzak has described that they're looking at in the coastal zone work. From my perspective I would like to see all of that information made available to the DEC as well as in the Province of Ontario those agencies that are responsible for permitting so that they can take advantage of that time. Now, the challenge is to make it happen effectively but that's been our attempt.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Doug. Dan

Barletta.

MR. BARLETTA: You all know me, I've been talking tonight. I just want to mention, your comments. I've gone through the same thing, trying to get permits. These gentlemen heard me say that. I said the same thing to commissioner Folsom this afternoon. The comments have been there. They're getting this and they're going to keep getting it from me personally.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Dan. Gene Stakhiv.

MR. STAKHIV: Let me beat this dead horse. We had a meeting just last night with representatives from DEC, with the Corps of Engineers, discussing these very issues, telling them that the results of the models, all of this information should be plugged into that decision-making. So they're aware of it. Whether -- but it always takes time. Any bureaucracy it will take time before it finally penetrates, but we've initiated the process and we've got a

couple of persistent fellows who are very interested in making sure that this happens.

There's another program that the Corps has that you need to be aware of. It's called the Advanced Measures Program. If we know that we have very high lake levels and there's a lot of water coming in, and we're entering into the, let's say the stormy winter season, you can actually ask for an expedited permit to build up your protection, shore protection. But you have to demonstrate that the conditions are going to be extraordinary. And that's been invoked several times over the past decade that I know of. The last high flood season that we had I think in '97 or '98. So that's another program that you could use. And you could turn to the Buffalo District for assistance on that. And we have a representative here from the Buffalo District, Tony Eberhardt.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Gene. If I might, Marc, just interject one question

that was left with me by an individual who had to leave because it does follow up with respect to this topic and it may just be quickly addressed. It was addressed in part by Gene's answer. But a woman by the name of Mary Voelkl, V-O-E-L-K-L, from Edgemere Drive in Greece, asked the question, when the plan is finalized, and whatever plan that may be is adopted, will the public be made well aware ahead of time, for example, as to which years there might be the greatest high level or the least low level, so that the public, particularly the property owners, can plan for that high level or low level and be able to know the reason for such to come about. That follows I think with what we were talking about so I interject this now, if there could be an answer to that.

MR. CUTHBERT: Doug Cuthbert again. There's no reason why not. That's I guess jumping ahead a bit into the operational side of it, but that's something that I

expected we would be able to address and recommend at the implementation stage. So thanks for the comment.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Doug. Any other responses? Is this a follow-up to the same topic? If we could return, we really need in fairness to return to Duval, Canada to let them ask a question and then you can be next after that. Marc in Duval, can you hear us?

MR. HUDON: Yes, Henry. We have a comment on the same subject before we go to another question.

MR. STEWART: Thank you.

MS. KENNEDY: This is Elaine Kennedy from the Public Interest Advisory Group. One of the things that we have, we on the public group have discussed is the idea that we would make recommendations to the control board about their communication plans. And so therefore, one of the things that we definitely recommended was some sort of way of communicating better with the public, and

hopefully that lady's concerns would be addressed in a better communication plan for the control board.

MR. HUDON: Henry, we have a comment from another person.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Mark.

MR. CARPENTIER: Yes. Just following on that. I'm Andre Carpentier from the control board. I just want to note that we are doing right now some forecasting of levels that, you know, we are expecting. But the big issue of that is the uncertainty of the water supplies. The U.S. Corps of Engineer and Canada also did some forecasting for the next three, four months, but you can see that there is a range of levels where we can be.

That everything depends on water supplies. So even with the new plan, we can again do better communication but with always levels that will fluctuate between high supplies and low supplies. I don't think we can expect that the next time that

we will have, I would say one of the teams forecasting the reasons -- Mother Nature will still be the leader.

MR. HUDON: Merci, Henry. Thank you, Andre, for commenting on that same subject.

SAM ST. MARTIN: The recreational boating and the tourism technical working group. And I would like to ask the people in Greece, what is the lowest, what is really the level you'd like to have. Is it something like 220 feet?

(Laughter and applause)

MR. ST. MARTIN: Because I've hearing about too high, you know, the levels are much too high, but if you go down, and I'm quite sure a lot of people would like to see it down 220 feet. Then how far would you have to walk to your boat?

(Laughter and applause)

MR. HUDON: Any other comment on this particular point? Otherwise, I guess, Henry, we'll go with our next question, if there is one.

MR. LAPIERRE JURONE (SIC): LaPierre Jurone, I'm from the Priority Intervention Zone -- (unintelligible)

When you presented the water levels, the water levels for high water for the environment and pleasure boating and the other elements that you mentioned, there's one observation, or a question that came to mind. Since the end of the '70's we see the levels drop year in year out, so this is a drought basically. So this frees up some shoreline that is under the influence of the pressure of some contractors and I mean, people have been asking for construction permits in zero to 20 year levels.

So your forecast for water levels for the next 20 years will they be modified if a higher level creates damage to those houses that have been built in the zero to 20 year area. I mean, some houses are built there because the flood maps haven't been designed yet. So nothing keeps a township from building there.

Another question, are there any maps that allow you to see the impact of these houses in these potential flood plains to know the impact or the damages that might be caused? So that's my question. The high levels that you define for the environment do they take into account these houses that have been built illegally possibly, I apologize for that word, you know, there are some in Lake St. Clair and some in Montreal even. So that's the question that I'd like to ask.

MR. HUDON: So can anyone give an answer?

MR. Duwaul(sic): Hi, I'm (unintelligible) Duwal, I work for Environment Canada. I worked on the flood plain issues. And all I can say or all I can respond is that the position of each property or each house is known. First we established the 100 year flood plain and the 20 year flood plain. Afterwards we've identified each house in these two flood plains and this gave us the magnificent

total of 5,000 buildings of all sizes, shapes, whatever, that we built in these flood plains.

Now, the way we are going to work to establish the performance indicators is that while we know the municipal evaluation of each of these properties, so that if ever there's a flood, well, we've established some curves of local damage applicable to the whole portion , for those dwellings in the river portion.

So with these levels, these anticipated levels, we're able to estimate damage on each property. These results were compiled at the municipal level so that for a given water level at each hydrometric station that you'll find in the river, we're able to state which flood damage there will be to the buildings in each municipality.

Now, these are the performance criteria that have been established. I don't know if it answers your question because this was in the legislative framework.

MR. HUDON: Does Christain want to say something?

MS. CHRISTIAN HUDON(SIC): We'll I'm Christian Hudon from the technical environment working group. I work for Environment Canada.

So in the greater Montreal area there was a net loss of 80% of the wetlands due to urban sprawl eating away year in and year out for residential construction. We now see that at each low level period we can see an increase of this sprawl because people simply take over the available shoreline. We build a cottage and then when the water levels are too low, we increase the size of the cottage, and eventually we build foundations. At some point the cottage becomes a second home, and eventually a first home.

So, the people who built in the flood plain know it. They know they're taking a chance. It's a chance they're taking. And when the river takes over it's rights, as

well often see in the case of important floods that occur each spring when people are flooded out and they complain. And it's understandable, because we've acquired some rights which we have tried to take from the river.

But eventually the river will take back what we borrowed from it. Borrowed is the word. And I want to emphasize the fact that the coastal owners have taken over some rights and they demand that the levels be regulated on the low side to avoid their being flooded. It's their property, it's legitimate, but the wetlands don't vote. They are not asking for anything, they are not claiming anything. And this is what we see everywhere along the shores of the river, and this is the trend, due to the fact that water levels are lower and lower, and soon we will have a magnificent river with cement walls on either side and no longer any wetlands. Thank you very much.

MR. HUDON: (unintelligible)

MALE VOICE: So thank you for the comments and the answer, but I would go further. This raises the issue of responsibility. And the value levels that you've established, who will be responsible for them? Knowing that public safety, Quebec public safety washes its hands each year of the funds they have to compensate riverside properties.

So what's the solution, what's the avenue that you've imagined between the criteria to protect the environment on the one hand, who will be responsible? Will the municipalities, are they aware of all of that? Were they made aware?

And the second thing I would say, what will we privilege between the environment and have a criteria of flexibility or of elasticity in your presentation? So what will decide which has priority?

MALE VOICE: Well I can't speak to responsibility. What I know about the law, and I don't know much, is that in the zero

to 20 year zone, there is a plan that exists BUT to my knowledge there are no new buildings in that area. I mean, you've got existing buildings but no new ones, at least theoretically. And there are some criteria or some rules of expropriation that have been dictated by the Department of Environment that are really specific if a building has more than 50% damage and it's located in the zero to 20 flood plain, while it's theoretically expropriated.

I say theoretically because all the owner has to do is no request for indemnity and no one will bother him.

MR. HUDON: Henry before we go back to you we have one last comment, probably, on the same topic.

MALE VOICE: I've worked with the study group on water use, but it's not for this group that I'm responding. It's the work I've done at municipal affairs in the past. In fact, the municipalities are always aware that people are building on the shoreline.

That is part of the game. There are some promoters who exert pressure so that these buildings can be built.

Unfortunately, I think the situation was well described, sometimes, many of these buildings sometimes are flooded out, and of course then you try to get compensation. But in general the municipalities are not able to support these indemnities. So maybe the larger cities are able to compensate partially. And we hope that the state will do so. And we know that the government in Quebec, the funds are limited, and we have had health problems, education problems. So many of you have issues like that, but people who live in these flood plains will have to get use to taking chances. And if they're flooded out, they'll have to live with their flood without being compensated.

MR. HUDON: Thank you. Are there any other comments from Dorval? Henry, we go back to you.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Marc. Doug,

did you have a comment to follow up on that or a question?

MR. CUTHBERT: I have a question.

MR. STEWART: Okay. Is there any comment to follow up on this or any response from the study team? All right. I know that the gentleman in the back had a question. I don't know whether, if we could defer for a moment first. Thank you.

MR. MOORE: Thank you. I'll try and make it fast here. Jack Moore, again. I guess the question I have is, when you have storms, all of a sudden the lake rises up so fast. Why can't, why can't we let the water out of the dams? Why do we have to wait and have another study and get together. There ought to be a control.

If the water level rises drastically within a week's period, like a foot or a couple feet, they ought to be letting it out at the other end. I don't understand why that can't happen.

(Applause)

MR. STEWART: Thank you for that question. I believe Frank Sciremammano who's on the Study Board and as he mentioned is also on the control board, would be a very good person to answer that.

MR. SCIREMAMMANO: I don't need that. Actually I do need it. That's a good question and part of the problem is just the physics of the situation, the amount of water that we're dealing with.

If, for instance, we want to get the lake down, this slide shows, the lake down by two centimeters over a course of one week, and that's not a lot. Okay. You're talking a lot more than that. But if we wanted to do that, in Montreal it would raise their level by 23 centimeters. Right behind the dam, which is this area, the dam is sitting here, it would drop by 30 centimeters.

The multiplier I like to use is 10. Whatever we do on the lake, the effect downstream is 10 times. So if we want to

get a foot off the lake quickly, we're going to raise Montreal by 10 feet during that same period. That's the difficulty. That's why we try and anticipate what's going to happen and do things slowly so that we don't flood them out while we're trying to alleviate the situation up here. But the problem is just the amount of water in a bottleneck, getting it through, if that makes any sense.

FLOOR: Can't we sell it to Las Vegas?

(Laughter)

MR. SCIREMAMMANO: Oh, that's a whole 'nother issue. But the idea is, it takes time to get it out.

MR. STEWART: Hopefully since that answers that question quickly and we have another gentleman waiting to as a question right at the microphone. Doug Dobson?

MR. DOBSON: Thank you, Henry. My name is Doug Dobson, D-O-B-S-O-N. In addition to being the legislator that represents eight miles of shoreline along Lake Ontario all

the way down to the Genesee River, I also live on Lake Ontario shoreline. My question is to the gentleman at our board, coastal experts.

What is the expected outcome of waves that occur probably twice a day in the range of two to eight foot high, on ice wall, or ice buildup along the shoreline, at various levels, low levels and high levels? Would one anticipate that at high levels with waves coming in twice a day in the range of two to eight foot, would the ice act as a battering ram on structures, and at low levels would one expect the ice to act more as a claw and pull the shoreline and cause greater erosion?

I would be interested in knowing what the scientific and coastal experts' viewpoints of these on the impact of constant wave action with ice at various levels.

MR. STEWART: Thank you. Doug, I know that Pete Zuzek hopefully heard most of

that. I don't know whether you heard all the question, Pete, enough to answer it, with respect to the issue of ice formation as well as wave action.

MR. ZUZEK: I'll try and if I don't hit it on the head, maybe you can reiterate and we'll try it the second time.

My name is Pete Zuzek, coastal technical working group. Ice, if it's thick enough and it's shorefast, in the sense that it's sitting on the near shore, not on the shoreline, and it goes out a fair length, say a hundred feet, is definitely your friend in the wintertime, because that ice will block the incoming wave energy from reaching the shore, from smashing into your sea walls and causing damage. So, if there is a significant volume of ice

there, it's definitely your friend in the winterti me.

If there is a smaller volume, and I won't try to really define what small means, because every area of the lake is different. The geology of your shoreline will also impact how the ice interacts. So whether you have sand or bedrock or clay, will have some impact on how that ice interacts with the waves.

There has been some literature that suggests, and in the spring when the ice thaws, if it is shorefast and you have clay, for example, or you have sand, that parts of the bottom can be thrust up from the lake and carried off with the ice. That's a very, there's a very small piece of

literature on that, and quite frankly, our feeling at our company is that the benefits of ice far outweigh the, some of those occasions when it can be detrimental and actually scour out the bottom of the shore.

So in the long term, ice is your friend. There may be some locations around the lake or on the river, particularly where there are floes, and you have ice moving with the river current, where the ice chunks can scour out the bottom, but for Lake Ontario in general terms, ice is a good thing.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Pete. Frank Sciremammano also has a response to that question.

MR. SCIREMAMMANO: I'm not so sure it's a response as a clarification. Doug, if I heard you right, it's another ferry question. Was that right? What effect will the ferry wake -- that's what you were saying, have on the ice formation?

MR. DOBSON: Well, I'm more interested

in knowing what constant wave action, you know, caused twice a day --

MR. SCIREMAMMANO: By the ferry though?

MR. DOBSON: Well, all right, but I didn't want to, I didn't want to go there.

(Laughter)

MR. SCIREMAMMANO: The reason I think we need to be very explicit, we've had at least four people bring up the ferry tonight. I was also handed a letter with some pictures. We heard it. I've heard it. I've gotten a number of phone calls, gotten a number of emails. We're going to -- if we can't do it in this study we're going to try to figure out who's responsible for that and try to get to the bottom of it. That's all we can say.

(Applause)

MR. SCIREMAMMANO: We heard that the ferry is an issue, and I've heard it. Just like you, we are frustrated over who we actually talk to about that.

So, but we will follow up on it and I'll

make sure that we do. And I don't think you've studied isolated waves from wakes of boats necessarily, twice a day wakes as a separate item. But if we can do something we will, and if not, we'll find out whoever can. But we heard you that the ferry is an issue and we'll try and get to it.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Frank. Pete?

MR. ZUZEK: Again, Pete Zuzek. Just to follow up. There is a vast body of literature on fast ferry impacts, both fast ferries from an engineering standpoint, and the impact of fast ferries on coastal communities.

So if, for example, you typed in your web browser, fast ferry, there will be a vast array of literature there at your fingertips. So there's a body, a large body of scientific research on fast ferries. In fact, there was a conference that used to be held every year, solely on fast ferry impact. So there is a lot of science out there and some of that may help you as you

try to address this issue.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Pete Zuzek. Any other followup with respect to that issue? If not, we send it back to Dorval. Marc?

MR. HUDON: Thank you, Henry.

MALE VOICE: (UNINTELLIGIBLE) Carpentier, a member of the ST. Lawrence (UNINTELLIGIBLE) I was hoping tonight I'd be able to get ahold of the preliminary report. You've indicated previously this is not possible.

But I would like first of all to ask for the report once the report has been correlated or made public. That they be sent to the users of the St. Lawrence groups so that the stakeholder's groups can become aware of them, analyze them, and do what I thought I was going to be able to do tonight by coming here, number one.

Number two, I would ask the representatives of the International Joint Commission to come and meet our group so

that we may ask questions, make recommendations if needed, and insist on the fact that there are through this group, that there is fairly varied sampling of the different problems and positions, and we may be able to get then a fairly clear position of people effected by the St. Lawrence.

So, to take into consideration not just the land use but fun and fluoride and the different uses so please take advantage of this platform that is being offered to you.

MR. HUDON: Thank you, Madame Carpentier. Is there a comment on this or a request? Yes?

MR. McCAULEY: We're going to try to set up a meeting within four to five weeks. Tom McCauley is my name. With the technical experts as well. And it will be little, local meeting. For the reports, as soon as they're ready, but you can have access to the Shared Vision Model with all the data that is included at this point, and you'll be able to compare.

This is what we wanted to do but we have not had time to do, make models, geo-data, and to compare them for you. But that meeting will be the beginning of a joint analysis.

MR. HUDON: Thank you, Tom. Are there any other comments on the same subject, Lynn Cleary of the Study Board?

MS. CLEARY: The report on the third year of study, there is some partial information and there is a revision of the literature that was consulted in order to draw up this report. And the whole thing should be made public within three weeks, something like that. Four weeks maybe, a month.

MR. HUDON: Thank you for the information. Are there any more comments on this subject? All right. Back to you, Henry.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Marc. Does anyone have a question at this time from this audience? If not, I know that one

individual who had to leave passed a note to one of the other questioners, and it's been brought to me. I could read it to you. The individual's name is Bonnie Ann Briggs of Kendall, New York.

(Mr. Stewart reads Ms. Brings question)

MR. STEWART: She says, "my name is Bonnie Ann Brings, and I live in Kendall, 22 miles from where we are now here in Greece. I have owned property on Lake Ontario since 1978. We have not been able to swim in Lake Ontario for several years due to the pollution. Are any of your environmental studies related to a cleaner lake, and if so, what is the outlook for a cleaner lake?"

Now, I know our particular study team is working with respect to lake levels and flows, as compared with issues with respect to cleanliness, but I also realize that they go hand in hand in certain degrees, although I don't know that much about the issues of

the environment. But I believe that Doug Wilcox might wish to address that.

MR. WILCOX: You certainly have a legitimate concern.

We had to focus on, in this study on lake levels, and all of our studies are directed to environmental issues that are directly controlled by lake levels. There are some correlations through water quality in some areas that are related to lake levels, but in the bigger picture they're more driven by other factors. So that's not part of this study.

As Doug Cuthbert has talked about, and other people, talked about other issues, they need to be addressed by other groups in other studies, but we've talked about that in the environment group, considerably envisioned potentially looking at some nutrient related issues. But compared to all the other things that were involved, they were a very minor component and not largely driven by lake levels. So they

belong somewhere else.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Doug Wilcox of the environment technical working group, and I believe that Gene Stakhiv, U.S. co-lead, has a comment to make as well.

MR. STAKHIV: One of the confusing aspects of our system of government is that at any given time there are probably 20 studies going on in your area by various agencies.

And the IJC, the commission itself, has a water quality board, their lake area management plans, lots of studies going on having to do with water quality. Completely independent of our study.

There's also, you've heard of the Corps of Engineers navigation study, the St. Lawrence seaway study. And many of these studies sort of deal with some common aspects. But our study essentially is just looking at the physical lake level changes and how it affects shoreline erosion. But let me assure you that there are many

studies going on about water quality. Every wastewater treatment plant, there are studies on the effects of septic tanks on the lake. But you'll have to get that information from those people running those studies.

Doug made a good point. The reason we're doing so much, we're putting so much effort into information management is, we're trying to make the information that we develop for our study, $20 million worth of shoreline erosion studies and everything else, available to all of the other institutions, all of the other agencies, New York DEC. We're trying to get them plugged into our information.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Gene. Does anyone else wish to make a comment about that issue in question? Yes, Ken?

MR. BADINSKI: Ken Badinski. Where are these data and how can we review them? I've question some of these figures that are presented here tonight, and I'd like to see

the scientific studies, have the data, and review them myself. Where do we see these data?

For example, the economics of the seaway and the fact that the shoreline residents would like to see a 246.7 water level. Where are these data?

MR. GAUTHIER: I'm Roger Gauthier with the information management technical working group. I would like to say that they're readily available on-line tonight, but they're not. We do have a necessity for going back through the reports that have been compiled in the year 2 and year 3 and putting them on-line so that you do have access to it. It is part of the plans. Within the next three months we are intending to have the data itself, reports and any of the analysis readily available. We are going to be delivering them via the internet. It's the most expedient mechanism for us to be able to deal with that. And if you've got particular concerns, particular

geographies, particular areas of issues, please send an email to the communication specialist.

We certainly can get you the information that is available in the study, one case at a time basis. But collectively we are behind. We need a couple more months to pull all the information and put it on the web.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Roger. Thank you, Ken. I know there was a gentleman in the back, did you have a comment about that as well? Before we have another question we need to -- all right. Pete Zuzek again has a response to that issue as well.

MR. ZUZEK: Dan has asked me to maybe deal with a small part of your question which is the threshold levels or the upper levels that coastal is recommending. And that was the black line that you saw earlier amongst all the other lines up on the graph. And as I stated earlier, in the summertime it's about half a foot lower than the

current upper range, and in the wintertime it's close to two feet lower than the current upper operating range. So, we've made great strides in trying to come up with levels that are lower.

Now, that black line, if you had to say, what does it mean, or what does it encompass, it is close to three and a half years of science, computers upon computers of data. There's a vast amount of information that's gone into that line. Scientific data collected, studied in the office, desktop work, all of it's been peer reviewed, as was mentioned earlier, from the other side. We have a peer review group that looks not only at our science but also our economics as well.

So there's a tremendous amount of work that goes into that line. A lot of science. And we feel it's the best available position for it.

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Pete.

FLOOR: Is the website you've referred

to this one here? Is that the website?

MR. STEWART: Any other comments with respect to that issue? And we should throw it back to Dorval before we follow up with another question. Marc, is there another question up there in Canada?

MR. HUDON: Yes, Henry. We have a pretty good question from a gentleman.

MR. AYA: My name is Frank Aya, and I guess I would class myself as recreational boating, although this issue addresses several other aspects. At the time that the seaway was built, well, things were as they were back in ‘58.

Now, there’s been a dramatic increase in recreational boating, and at the time that the seaway was built they used about a quarter of the area of Lake St. Louis as a dumping ground for rock. So that made a quarter of the area of Lake St. Louis useless for recreational boating. And I would like to know if anything can be done about that, the seaway that created the

problem?

Does anybody have any comments on that? And maybe there are other sections of the whole St. Lawrence area where this sort of thing has happened also. Thank you very much.

MR. HUDON: Thank you very much. Does anyone want to comment? That was a very good question. No. Doesn't seem so. Nobody wants to take those rocks out tonight for sure. But we have a comment there.

MALE VOICE: Not a comment but I'll try to give a very quick answer. My name is (unintelligible), I am the Canadian general manager of the study.

Quite honestly and quite frankly, the quick answer is that the IJC has not asked us to look into structural changes. That doesn't give you the answer for what can be done, but that's the fact. Thanks.

MR. HUDON: I guess the comment is noted anyhow. We have another comment on the same subject?

MS. KENNEDY: I'm afraid I cannot offer you a solution but I will add to your misery because those shallows that have been created by these dredged spoils that were put on either side of the seaway, have generated shallower areas, and on those shallow areas you now have submerged aquatic vegetation that is growing, and that really loves it out there.

So, that the recreational boaters not only have to deal with the shallower area, but they have also to deal with lots and lots of plants that prevent them from going there. So that's not anything to help you, really. And with lower levels you can expect to have even more plants and even a smaller surface area which you can actually use for navigation purposes. Good luck.

MR. HUDON: Yes, go ahead.

MALE VOICE: And when the water level goes down and the plants are torn up by boats passing in the seaway itself, the big commercial ones, a lot of that, I'll call

them weeds, end up on property owners waterfront, and in low water levels it stinks.

MR. HUDON: Any further comments? I guess not. Henry?

MR. STEWART: Thank you, Marc. I believe we have time for one more question here before we may need to terminate the general teleconference of this, although we'd be available to stay here for anybody else who might have questions. But sir, did you have a question to join in the teleconference? Thank you very much.

MR. DELVE: My name is Dave Delve from Rochester, New York here. And since we have the people on-line from Montreal, I just wondered, how much fluctuation in a high water event Montreal can take it without having significant damage?

I know that there's a -- maybe you can answer that question.

MR. STEWART: Frank, would you like to answer that? Frank Sciremammano.

MR. SCIREMAMMANO: I can't give you a specific number right now. We do have specific numbers that are the flood alert levels for that area. And then the flood damage levels. There have been situations just in my tenure on the control board where we've had water running down the streets of the suburbs of Montreal, in order to help provide some relief by dumping some water out. We try obviously to avoid that.

But when you have too much water, you have to kind of spread the misery. And sometimes we could take a little here and they take a little there. But we do know the number. I don't have in front of me -- oh, there we go right there. Montreal harbor, that's what they would like. We do have actual flood levels though and that may not correspond. Is that the flood level? Okay.

(Referring to a slide)

MR. SCIREMAMMANO: So alert level is the -- well, again, this is above sea level so

it's not going to mean much for us. 26.575. And then the 28.215 feet above sea level is where they're actually flooding. So we know where they'll flood. And the question is, when we have a problem, we need to release water, and we can bump against that. If we're flooding and they're flooding, then it's a matter of spreading the misery. We haven't luckily run into that recently. Does that help?

Okay. 5.5 is the chart data. 5.5 meters. So you could see they have about three meter range that we can work in, so about 10 feet. That's about eight feet above where they are right now. Good. Thank you, Doug, for that.

MR. STEWART: Thank you. Frank, is there any followup further to that question and issue? I'd ask at this time in this audience whether anyone else will wish to ask a question before we may need to leave the teleconference part. Is anyone desirous of asking a question to be shared with the

Dorval, Quebec, Canada audience.

FLOOR: Where is Dorval relative to Montreal?

MR. STEWART: Al, can you tell the exact geography there?

MR. AL: Just west of it.

MR. STEWART: Dan?

MR. BARLETT: Montreal is right here. Dorval is right here.

MR. AL: The Montreal airport is in Dorval.

MR. HUDON: Henry, we have a couple of comments before signing off.

MR. STEWART: And we'd be happy to stay with you for those. We have no further questions at this point here, so we will stay on to listen to the comments and questions from you.

MR. CARPENTIER: Andre Carpentier from the Study Board and also from the control board.

I think we, tonight we heard a lot of question about, you know, high levels on

Lake Ontario and why we don't dump the water down in the Montreal area, even if we had some room to get that. I think that's why, you know, we have a control board with people all around the system, Lake Ontario and St. Lawrence River and I think that's why also we have a Study Board with a lot of people, again, all along the, all the system.

If we want to do what the gentleman mentioned, that when you got water we dump the water down, then if we don't have water, what we will do? Empty the Lake Ontario or go keep the water on Lake Ontario?

I think that's not the way that a big system like that should react. We should wait and look at what's happening. And don't, you know, try to react as, you know, every time we got some water. I don't think that's the way and I think that's why we need to have some information as we are getting right now on each interest. And that's the way I think that should be. And

I think that's also a good example why we want to link people on the St. Lawrence and on Lake Ontario, in order that everybody, if they're interested in the system to know the interests that on each side of the system.

I think that's very important that everybody understand and take into consideration at every point of the system.

MR. HUDON: On this point are there any other questions? Henry?

MR. STEWART: Yes, Marc. Thank you for --

MR. HUDON: I just want to say something. On the way, driving over this afternoon, I was listening to a damage report about what Ivan had done in the southern states, and the reporter was saying that there's another wind coming, and it would make Ivan look like chicken feed. And they've named this new one coming Gene, and I was just concerned that if it's in relation to our Gene, Canada may have to be evacuated. Can you reassure us?

(Laughter)

MR. STEWART: I know Gene is still here. He's waving in the back. He seems quite friendly. And he says not to worry.

MR. HUDON: All right. Thank you folks, we'll meet again soon.

(Phone conference with Dorval, Quebec, Canada was terminated at this point.)

MR. STEWART: Are you still there? Okay. Thank you folks for that aspect, with respect to the joinder with Montreal. I know that Max Streibel will make some closing remarks. I'd just like to note having facilitated this that it might seem strange to have this teleconferencing, especially with the translation, but as was said by Marc Hudon, another member of the PIAG, actually it was said by Mr. Carpentier of the study board and the board of control, it's been a really eye-opening experience for me on the Public Interest Advisory Group to get to know individuals from around Lake Ontario, north, south, east, and west sides,

and all the way up the St. Lawrence River, both members of the PIAG, but also members of the public, and to see the diverse concerns and interests that are there, and to become aware of those and considerate of those, and it really leaves certain parochial interests behind. So this is a real effort to do that and to have us all appreciate what's going on around the basin. We hope it's a really helpful endeavor for all of the members of the public to see that as it is for us and the PIAG and to come away with an appreciation for those diverse and sometimes conflicting interests, but also to realize that in this study the end result it is believed will bring about benefit with respect to all of the stakeholder interests that you see on these banners here, the diverse and competing interests. And also do that in a way that won't make the circumstances for any one interest, and in particular here in Greece, the interests of lakeshore residents and

property owners, be in any worse circumstances than they are under the current plans and the current system. So thanks a lot for your attention and interest. And I'd like to turn the floor back to Max Streibel for closing remarks. Thank you.

MR. STREIBEL: First of all, I'd like for everyone that's here tonight, these seats are hard, we're sitting on the same seats back here, so you really endured and I appreciate that. And there will be people here, if you do have a question, you know, that you'd like to ask, there will be someone here to try to answer that question. If not, in your package you've got the addresses and methods of getting ahold of us. You know, for any future questions.

I'd like to think that many of you were here last year when we were here. I can see that we've made some definitive progress since last year. And as the data now is being, finally being analyzed and we start

using the Shared Vision Model, when we come back here next year, and hopefully the audience will be just as great as it was this evening, we'll be here with some options to share with you, the Shared Vision Model. And as you heard this evening when you heard from our comrades in Montreal who have a different situation than we have, and since you can see that there are different interests, different issues that have to be addressed, and we're trying to do that in the best most scientific manner possible.

So again, thank you very much and stay in touch with us, and we'll certainly stay in touch with you. Thank you.

(Proceedings concluded)