d. The water diversion project would have no discernible effect on Great Lakes water levels.

e. The water diversion project is necessary to meet a crisis or emergency situation.

f. There are no direct adverse environmental impacts associated with the construction or operation of this proposed water diversion project.

j. The water diversion project is for the benefit of a community that already has in place a plan for water conservation, water treatment, and managed growth.

Canadian and Michigan government survey respondents generally agreed with the non governmental respondents that the conditions that were likely to increase their organization's support of a water diversion project were (a) no net loss, (d) no discernible effect on water levels and (f) no adverse environmental impact, but conditions (e) and (j) would have no effect on their support or opposition to a diversion project.

Of these five conditions identified , the criteria that would equip existing diversion policy was criteria to address small, out of basin water diversion projects by Great Lakes states would be (a) no net loss of water, (e) to meet a crisis or emergency situation, and (j) a community with water conservation and managed growth policies. The other two conditions dealing with adverse environmental effects and discernible effects on Great Lakes water levels (while very important for any policy) are more likely to be used to evaluated large scale rather than small scale water diversion projects.

When both the government and non government groups were asked to identify the criteria in Table 2 that were most important to their respective organization's position on a water diversion project, the non governmental and governmental Canadian respondents (but not the Michigan respondents) added conditions (b) and (c):

b. The project is temporary in nature and will be terminated at a set date in order to meet the benefitting community's current water needs.

c. There is no feasible alternative to the water diversion project in order to meet the benefitting community's current water needs.

It should also be noted that these conditions were listed by Michigan interests as generally having no impact on their policies; hence they would not likely be opposed by Michigan interests.

Thus, it would appear that survey respondents in Michigan and Canada generally agree upon at least three specific conditions applicable to large and small scale projects which could affect the predisposition of the groups to support a water diversion project. In addition, there are four other conditions that are supported by at least two of the four groups (Canadian and