

Memo#2

To: Professor Gen
From: Jennifer Roffle
Re: Love Canal Stakeholder Analysis
Date: June 25, 2007

PART ONE: DESCRIPTION OF STAKEHOLDERS

Policy Problem	The public policy problems in Love Canal were intricate. There was no scientific consensus on what were the actual health risks to Love Canal residents. In 1979, the EPA had found chromosomal damage in some of the residents, but without a control group it was difficult to determine if the chromosomal damage could be linked to the toxic waste that had been dumped by Hooker Electrochemical Company in the 1940s. All of these scientific issues led to problems in determining the public policy solution? Were the health risks in Love Canal severe enough that it should be declared a public health emergency? Who should be financially responsible for the cleanup, the state, federal government, Hooker? Should the residents of Love Canal be relocated? Should the relocation be temporary or permanent? Who should be financially responsible for the relocation, the state, federal government, Hooker?
Identification of Stakeholders	<p><u>FORMAL PLAYERS</u></p> <p>State Players: Governor Carey, New York State Officials, U.S Congressman John LeFalce</p> <p>Local Players: City of Niagara Falls, Niagara County Health Dept, Niagara Board of Education</p> <p>Federal Players: EPA, Department of Justice, White House officials, President Carter</p> <p><u>INFORMAL PLAYERS</u></p> <p>Citizens: Love Canal Residents, Lois Gibbs spokesperson for Love Canal residents</p> <p>Private: Hooker Electrochemical Company</p> <p>Media: Local Press, National Press</p>
Stakeholder Preferences	<p>The state and local players in the Love Canal wanted the same thing in the policy solution. They wanted the federal government to share in the responsibility for the cleanup and relocation of the residents permanently for two reasons. 1). Relocation is expensive and Governor Carey was still upset that the federal government had not assisted them with the first relocation 2). The state and local players needed someone else to be the focal point of the citizen's fears, frustrations, and anger regarding the health hazards in the Love Canal.</p> <p>The federal government players wanted slightly different things in the policy solution. The EPA wanted the results from research on Love Canal residents to guide their decision-making in formulating a public policy solution. The Department of Justice wanted a policy solution that would make state, local, and Hooker responsible for cleanup and relocation.</p> <p>Hooker Electrochemical Company wanted to be absolved of any financial responsibility in paying for the cleanup and relocation of the Love Canal residents.</p> <p>The local and national media wanted the same thing. They wanted a public policy solution that was newsworthy.</p>

Stakeholder Preferences

The White House and President Carter wanted a public policy solution that was based upon facts. They wanted EPA's assessment on what were the actual health risks for Love Canal residents before they implemented a policy solution. More importantly, the Carter administration wanted the state of New York to be financially responsible for the public policy solution because they did not want to get involved in matters that they considered state problems.

The citizens wanted a public policy solution that accurately informed them of all of the health risk the Love Canal area posed to them. They also wanted to be informed if they actually had a medical problem caused by the toxic waste dumping. Most importantly, the citizens wanted a public policy solution in which the government would be responsible for the cleanup and relocation.

Stakeholder influence on Primary Stages

The state and local players had major influence in four stages of the policy cycle in the Love Canal Case. They influenced agenda setting because both Governor Carey and U.S. Congressman John Lefalce worked tirelessly to make Love Canal a national story in order to elicit federal support for cleanup and relocation. The state and local players also influenced formulation and adoption of the policy because they were proponents of permanent relocation whereas the federal government did not feel that the Love Canal residents were in immediate danger that required relocation. In the Love Canal case the state and local players implemented the actual policy with financial assistance from the federal government.

The various federal players influenced the policy cycle differently. The EPA had the most influence in agenda setting. EPA helped set the agenda in the Love Canal case because it was their report on chromosomal damage that acted as the catalyst in igniting the Love Canal residents fear, erupting a national media frenzy, and mobilizing people to push the federal government for cleanup and relocation.

White House officials and the Carter administration had the least influence in the Love Canal policy decision because they were always reacting in response to the pressure from the state and local players, media, and the citizens. The Carter administrations were the stakeholders who finally agreed to adopt the policy solution of relocation and cleanup.

The citizens of Love Canal had influence in the agenda setting and formulation cycle. The Love Canal citizens continually pressured their elected leaders to help them and they used the media to galvanize sympathy for their situation. The citizens also influenced the formulation stage with the leadership of Lois Gibbs. Lois Gibbs head of the Love Canal Homeowner's Association advocated for government-funded relocation public policy solution versus having the residents remain in their homes.

The media influenced the agenda setting and adoption cycle. The stories covered by the press sensationalized the problems in the Love Canal and brought them national attention. The media also influenced the adoption of the relocation policy because their stories put pressure on the Carter administration to act quickly or they would lose the confidence of the people.

Stakeholder Powers

The state and local players hold power in all stages of the public policy process including agenda setting, formulation, adoption, implementation, and evaluation. In the Love Canal case the state and local players wielded their power by setting the agenda, formulating, adopting, and implementing the public policy of relocating the Love Canal residents.

The EPA holds the power of expert knowledge. In the Love Canal case the EPA struggled to effectively wield its power for two reasons. 1). Leaks to the press on their reports made it difficult for them to handle the situation in an orderly and systematic manner. 2). EPA's research was incomplete and the lack of control group made it difficult for them to be able to say that the chromosomal damage in the residents could be tied to the toxic waste dumped in the 1940s.

The White House officials and the President hold the power to formulate and adopt policy solutions. In the Love Canal case, the White House and the President did not effectively wield its power. The media, the citizens, and the state and local players used their power to make the Carter administration bend to their will. At first the federal government promised \$3-5 million dollars for temporary relocation, but with pressure from Governor Carey, the citizens, and the media the Carter administration agreed to permanent relocation and \$15 million dollars for the project.

Citizens hold the power to elect legislatures who represent their interest. The citizens in the Love Canal wielded a lot of power because their representative U.S Congressman John LeFalce advocated vocally for cleanup and relocation of Love Canal residents.

The media holds the power to command public attention. In the Love Canal case, the media was very effective in making the country feel sympathetic and creating a public sentiment that the government should intervene and help with relocation.

PART TWO: ANALYSIS OF STAKEHOLDERS

Stakeholder Conflicts

There were several conflicts amongst the policy players, however, the primary conflict always boiled down to who should be financially responsible for the cleanup and relocation. The state and local players wanted the federal government to provide financial assistance and the Carter administration resisted.

Another problem in the Love Canal case was the conflicting powers amongst the different players. In the Love Canal case it was unclear who should have the power to formulate, adopt, and implement a public policy solution. The federal government wanted the state and local players to formulate, adopt, and implement a policy that they paid for and the state wanted the federal government to perform this role.

The differences in the powers among the different players resulted in checks of power. The state and local players checked the power of the federal government by forcing it to respond to the Love Canal crisis. The media checked the power of the federal government because it kept the heat on them to respond to the problems in Love Canal or suffer the consequences of being labeled the "bad guys" who did not want to relocate the residents.

<p>Existing and Potential Common Ground</p>	<p>The Love Canal case had many coalitions that were formed purposively. The EPA and the Department of Justice purposively worked together. The DOJ filed a lawsuit on behalf of the EPA against Hooker, City of Niagara Falls, the Niagara County Dept of Health, and Niagara Board of Education for \$124.5 million for the cleanup and relocation.</p> <p>The coalition between the Congressmen LeFalce and the Love Canal citizens was formed purposively. Congressman LeFalce developed a relationship with Lois Gibbs who was the spokesperson for Love Canal resident homeowners association. Oftentimes Congressman LeFalce would speak on behalf of the residents to various governmental officials including President Carter about the Love Canal case.</p> <p>The conflict over who should pay for the cleanup and relocation made a coalition between state, local players and the federal government difficult. If the state, the local players, and the federal government had a better working relationship in the Love Canal case they might have been able to work collaboratively with the EPA and perhaps formulated a public policy solution that was not rushed and based upon factual research.</p>
<p>Prognosis</p>	<p>Based upon my analysis of the stakeholders in the Love Canal it is not surprising that the final public policy solution resulted in the residents being relocated permanently and the financial responsibility being shared between the state and federal government. The state and local players, citizens, and the media wielded a lot of power and influence in the Love Canal case in all stages of the policy process First, the state and local players, citizens, and media was able to set the agenda in the Love Canal case. They made what might be considered exclusively a state problem a national problem. They also influenced the formulation, adoption, and implementation of policy. The federal government and the EPA were not necessarily ready to declare Love Canal a state of emergency that required relocation. Yet, the state and local players, citizens, and the media continued to put pressure on the federal government to assist them financially with permanent relocation and clean-up. Essentially, the Love Canal case illustrates how the mobilization of multiple stakeholders whether purposively or circumstantially influences the outcome of a policy decision. Each of the stakeholders played an integral part in getting the Carter administration to agree to pay for permanent relocation of the residents.</p>