

Council of Lake Committees

Hampton Inn Detroit Metro Airport
30847 Flynn Drive
Romulus, MI 48174
Ph: 734-721-1100

24 April 2002

Minutes

Attendees – CLC Chair Bob Lange (NYDEC), Brian Breidert (IN DNR), Bill Culligan (NYDEC), Ken Cullis (OMNR), Tom Gorenflo (CORA), Steve Hewett (WDNR), Bill Horns (WDNR), Roger Kenyon for Rick Hoopes (PFBC), Bill Horns (WDNR), Neil Kmiecik (GLIFWC), Roger Knight (ODNR), Tom Stewart for Sandra Orsatti (OMNR), John Schrouder (MDNR), Gary Towns (MDNR), Tom Trudeau (IL DNR), Jack Wingate (MN DNR). [Not able to be present: Rick Hoopes (PFBC), Dave McLeish (OMNR), (Mike Morencie (OMNR), Sandra Orsatti (OMNR), Tom Rozich (MDNR), Steve Scott (MDNR).]

Bob Adair (USFWS), Gavin Christie (GLFC), Ron Desjardine (DFO), Marg Dochoda (GLFC), Dale Burkett (GLFC), Randy Eshenroder (GLFC), Kofi Fynn-Aikins (USFWS), Marc Gaden (GLFC), John Gannon (USGS), Chris Goddard (GLFC), Dave Gesl (COE), Kevin Ramsay (ODNR), Wayne Schloop (COE).

1. Call to order, announcements, and introductions

B. Lange invited attendees to introduce themselves.

2. Key issues: minutes of the 2001 CLC and 2002 Lake Committee meetings

R. Knight identified an error in the LEC summary, now corrected.

3. Proposal for a binational Great Lakes Ballast Water Commission

B. Horns and B. Lange will draft a resolution for CLC consideration supporting in principle B. Horns' editorial (to be published in the June volume of the Journal of Great Lakes Research).

The secretariat will draft a letter for CLC consideration and B. Lange's signature, requesting that the GLFC support a reference to the IJC to prevent introductions via shipping. Considerations for the reference to be included in the letter are a preference for action over study, the shortest possible turnaround time, and appropriate appointments to any reference group.

4. Preventing entry of Asian carp

T. Trudeau will draft a paragraph on the need to evaluate the Chicago River Sanitary Ship Canal electric barrier, for CLC consideration, as an addition to the following resolution:

Whereas invaders (ruffe) from Great Lakes shipping are poised to invade the Mississippi R.,

Whereas invaders (Asian carps) from Mississippi River basin aquaculture are poised to invade the Great Lakes, and

Whereas the Sanitary Ship Canal on the Chicago River is the expected route for these range extensions,

Therefore, the Council of Lake Committees of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission resolves that, in the absence of adequate primary safeguards from shipping and aquaculture-mediated invasions,

U.S. federal funding is required *on an emergency basis* for maintenance and operation (including backup generator) of the Chicago River electrical barrier, constructed as a demonstration project by the COE under NISA 1996, and

U.S. federal funding is required *on an emergency basis* to evaluate and block any unaddressed opportunities for trans-migration between the Great Lakes and Mississippi R.

The resolution will be shared with the Advisors and the GLFC, with a request that the GLFC endorse it and send to Governments.

17 May, the CLC revised the resolution as follows:

**Resolution Concerning Additional Funding
for Continued Operation and Evaluation for the
Chicago River Sanitary Ship Canal Electric Trans-migration Barrier**

WHEREAS, invaders such as the round goby and zebra mussels in the Great Lakes have invaded the Mississippi River basin, and

WHEREAS other species such as the ruffe may likewise expand their range from the Great Lakes into the Mississippi River basin, and

WHEREAS, invaders (Asian carps) from Mississippi River basin aquaculture are poised to invade the Great Lakes basin, and

WHEREAS, the Cal-Sag and Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canals are the expected routes for these range expansions, and

WHEREAS, critical components of the electric barrier in the Sanitary and Ship Canal have a

three-year life expectancy, and

WHEREAS, there is no back-up power system in case of mainline power failure, and

WHEREAS, no funds are currently appropriated for operation and maintenance of the electric barrier in the coming fiscal year,

NOW, THEREFORE BE IT RESOLVED that the Council of Lake Committees of the Great Lakes Fishery Commission, in the absence of adequate primary safeguards from shipping and aquaculture-mediated invasions, find

that U.S. federal funding is required *on an emergency basis* for maintenance and operation (including a backup generator) of the Chicago Sanitary and Ship Canal electrical barrier, constructed as a demonstration study by the COE under NISA 1996, and

that U.S. federal funding is required *on an emergency basis* for identifying and evaluating a site for a second barrier array, and

that U.S. federal funding is required *on an emergency basis* to implement additional options for enhancing barriers to prevent trans-migration of invasive species between the Great Lakes and Mississippi River basins.

5. Management options for impeding spread of *Heterosporis*

S. Hewett reported that Wisconsin DNR has prohibited the collection of bait in waters infested with *Heterosporis* and has prepared a brochure to advise anglers. Michigan and Ontario have the authority to prohibit the collection of bait in waters with aquatic nuisance species. T. Stewart reported that commercial fishermen are concerned that the parasite *Heterosporis* will affect the perch fishery directly and through public perception of infested foodstuffs. T. Gorenflo reported that the Great Lakes Fisheries Trust has requested a full proposal from Dan Sutherland (U of WI) to investigate the transmission of *Heterosporis*.

The CLC approved the following resolution, directing that it be sent to the Fishery Trust and to fish chiefs:

Whereas the microsporidian parasite *Heterosporis* is expanding its range in the Great Lakes area, and

Whereas *Heterosporis* has the potential to affect fisheries for yellow perch and other species,

Therefore CLC member agencies resolve to

support research on the biology and transmission mechanisms of the parasite and its hosts, and to

act to impede the spread and to minimize the incidence of infestation in Great Lakes fish.

The CLC will discuss management options next fall.

6. Corps of Engineers' Navigation Study

W. Schloop (COE) reported on the navigation study that recommends a feasibility study be undertaken to deepen connecting channels, ports, and the Seaway and widen and increase the length of the locks (http://155.79.127.50/index.cfm?chn_id=1422). A feasibility study would take ~5 years and would include public hearings and environmental impact analyses, e.g. impacts on water levels and amounts of foreign ballast water discharged into the Great Lakes. The June to September period is an appropriate time period to comment on the navigation study, and the CLC encouraged its members to do so. Schloop suggested that rather than saying 'don't do it', agencies should suggest conditions, e.g., "If you're thinking of deepening the river, you should consider..."

Schloop reported that the Governments of Canada and the United States will need to respond shortly to an ageing Seaway. (Apparently, over the years, alkali aggregate causes concrete to 'grow', interfering with gate operation.) Alternatives will be 1. do nothing, 2. fix on a piecemeal basis, and 3. replace the Seaway.

7. ANS Conference presentation on impacts of exotics

B. Lange reported that there was not a lot of focus at the ANS Conference on solving the problem of exotic introductions, but rather on reporting new introductions and range extensions. He was also surprised to see that the onus for solving the problem was on governments rather than on the private sector, as is the case with chemical pollution.

8. Recommendations of interim CAP review panel for FY 2002 funding

B. Lange reported that the Lake Committee Chairs (or their representatives) had convened as an interim CAP Review Panel. The panel discussed criteria and considerations for supporting proposals for funding under the FY 2002 Coordination Activities Program, including proposal soundness, supportiveness of the Joint Strategic Plan, contribution to sound management and conservation, and past performance of the PIs. The CLC recommended the following proposals for GLFC consideration in June:

Expanding the use of fish models for Lake Huron. (Aug 2002 – Aug 2003). Jim Bence (MSU). Lake Huron Committee. \$24,625 U.S.

A 1/5 or 1/6 funding in partnership with agencies: Acoustic mensuration gear for Lake Erie fishery agencies. (Year 1 of 1.) Mike Bur (USGS), John Deller (ODNR), and Don Einhouse (NYDEC).. Lake Erie Committee. \$24,000 U.S.

A new signal processing system for inter-agency fisheries acoustics surveys in Lake Erie. (2002) Don Einhouse (NYDEC) and Larry Witzel (OMNR). Lake Erie Committee. \$16,300 U.S.

Development of a lakewide electronic database for lower trophic level reporting in Lake Erie. (2002) Tim Johnson (OMNR) and Betsy Trometer (USFWS). Lake Erie Committee. \$11,250 Cdn.

Lake Superior coaster brook trout conference and synthesis. (2003). Don Schreiner (MnDNR) and Ken Cullis (OMNR). Lake Superior Committee. \$10,000 U.S.

Coordination of Lake Superior brook trout genetic research. (2003.) Chris Wilson (Trent U., Wendylee Stott (USGS), and Loren Miller (U of MN). Lake Superior Committee. \$28,800 Cdn

The CLC also advised that the following lake committee sponsored proposals to the Fisheries Research Program were suitable for funding from the Fisheries Improvement Act, contingent upon a favorable recommendation from the Board of Technical Experts:

Population dynamics of burbot in the Eastern Basin of Lake Erie (January 2003-2005). Martin Stapanian. Lake Erie Committee. \$19,000 US.

Comparative modeling of the ecosystem impacts of exotic invertebrates and productivity changes on fisheries in the Bay of Quinte and Oneida Lake (September 2002-2005) Scott Millard and Edward Mills. Lake Ontario Committee. \$300,000 US. (BOTE funds being used to pick up half the cost)

Natural lake trout strain identification in Lake Huron (April 2002-2003). Wendylee Stott, David Reid, and James Johnson. Lake Huron Committee. \$10,000 US.

The GLFC will use other budgets to support Great Lakes Fish Health Committee representative Joe Marcino (MN DNR) to participate in efforts to create a national fish health policy for the United States.

9. Permanent structure for CAP review panel

The CLC recommends to the GLFC that the 5 Lake Committee Chairs (or their designees) and the CLC chair or Vice Chair serve on the CAP Review Panel. It recommended that the Panel elect its own chair and develop its terms of reference and a review process for consideration by CLC. N. Kmiecik asked if GLIFWC member tribes could participate as with the Restoration Act Review Panel, and was advised to contact the Secretariat if the request was made. It was noted, however, that the Restoration Act Review Panel and the Coordination Activities Program related differently to tribes, the latter through A Joint Strategic Plan and Lake Committees. J. Schrouder suggested that the Panel advise the GLFC on early scheduling in the FY 2004 Request for Proposals to facilitate early committee input in proposal generation.

10. CLC role in BOTE and Fisheries Research Program

The CLC approved CLC Chair and Vice-Chair B. Lange and D. McLeish to serve as its representatives to the GLFC's Board of Technical Experts.

11. Great Lakes Fish and Wildlife Restoration Act

J. Wingate requested that Lake Committees provide their priorities for the Restoration Act grants to B. Lange by early September. Phrased as questions or hypotheses, committee priorities will add refinement or focus to the priorities. J. Schrouder suggested that priority information needs will emerge from the environmental objectives workshop discussed in item 15.

Wingate proposed that FY 2003 Restoration Act pre-proposals be due on January 1, 2003, as are the submissions to the GLFC's Fisheries Research Program. Lake committees will be asked to rank all proposals high, medium, or low priority. The Restoration Act Review Panel will meet in late January to determine requests for full proposals, which will be due on March 1, 2003. Peer reviews will be arranged in March and April, perhaps by the secretariat whose expenses might be reimbursed in some arrangement with the USFWS. The Review panel will meet in conjunction with the April CLC meeting to select the final projects. The Review Panel's recommendation will be transmitted to the CLC for transmittal to the USFWS by May 1, 2003.

The CLC approved the strategy for full appropriation of authorized funds for Restoration Act grants. They appointed a task force of Gary Isbell or Roger Knight (OH DNR), a MI DNR rep, and J. Wingate to work with the secretariat to implement the strategy. The task force will share the strategy with Advisors.

12. Great Lakes Governors' priorities

M. Gaden recommended that agencies contact their respective Governor with fish management priorities. The GLFC will be writing again to Great Lakes governors and C. Goddard will circulate the draft for CLC and CGLFA input. T. Gorenflo suggested that the GLFC also write to tribal leaders, and that it mention ballast water control as a top management priority. J. Schrouder suggested that the letter might be more effective if addressed to DNR Directors with a copy to respective Governors. R. Eshenroder suggested that the GLFC letter could fairly claim to reflect a consensus of managers, researchers, and citizens.

13. COE Fisheries Habitat Initiative

D. Gesl (COE) presented information about the Corps of Engineers' Fisheries Habitat Initiative. M. Dochoda suggested that just as removal of artificial barriers is habitat improvement so, too, is removal or remediation of artificial access, e.g., barriers on the Chicago River canal, construction of onshore ballast treatment facilities on the Seaway. The latter might require Canadian partnership. Gesl wasn't sure if Canadian contributions qualified as matching funds, but was interested in testing the idea.

14. Data sharing protocol

The CLC encouraged M. Dochoda to resend the data sharing survey. With the benefit of the survey responses, the CLC will again discuss future directions during its fall meeting.

15. Environmental objectives

The CLC will sponsor a fall workshop (perhaps in concert with the October 23, 2002 CLC meeting) to:

- (a) present each lake's approach to environmental objectives;
- (b) evaluate consistency in format, making recommendations to CLC; and
- (c) identify research, technical, or policy needs which may warrant a proposal to the GLFC or USFWS funding programs.

The Habitat Conservation Committee funds that the GLFC provided to support the development of environmental objectives could be used to support the workshop, if needed. Each Lake Committee offered to assist in organizing the workshop. If willing, LHC's Arunas Liskauskas (OMNR) might lead. Likewise the LMC hoped to secure CAP funding for its initiative with Ed Rutherford (U of M) as PI, and would want to participate in organizing the workshop. K. Cullis stated that he thought the LSC will support. The LEC is reviewing its environmental objectives and will help (G. Towns). B. Lange promised that LOC will help as it can. B. Horns would check with Chuck Ledin (WDNR), Chair of the Fish Habitat Conservation Committee, regarding his availability. B. Lange will report on the planned workshop as part of his June report to the GLFC, and requested that each lake committee advise before then on its progress in organizing the workshop.

16. Peck & Schneider vessel report

M. Dochoda and J. Gannon (and possibly Jim Peck and/or Clif Schneider – B. Lange and J. Schrouder will contact them) will consult with agencies and with Mike Gardiner (USCG) and report back at the fall meeting on the possibilities for inspection of fish management and research vessels operated by U.S. fisheries management agencies, as recommended in the Peck and Schneider report:

... "We recommend that the GLFC should facilitate an effort by the agencies to require U.S. fisheries vessels to at least meet the same safety standards that currently apply to Canadian fisheries vessels operating within the Great Lakes. The need for adopting Canadian standards, or some equivalent protocol, should be apparent when U.S. lawmakers and agency personnel consider that U.S. fisheries research vessels have no safety requirements, while similar vessels in Canada must comply with a fairly rigorous Coast Guard safety standard. An ideal inspection protocol would be more comprehensive than the Canadian standards, perhaps akin to the American Bureau of Shipping standards, which would include all vessel systems. ..."

Agencies will be canvassed for interest in an arrangement similar to the CORA-USCG agreement to provide regular comprehensive inspections by outsiders such as the Coast Guard Auxiliary. Auxiliary willingness to serve will be ascertained. Agencies will be asked to name

contacts to work with M. Gardiner on an umbrella agreement with state subagreements as needed.

B. Lange will develop a proposal for discussion during the fall meeting about lakewide assessment plans that can be used with the Schneider & Peck report to guide vessel purchases, sharing, etc. He had in mind a comprehensive look at assessment needs to support the fisheries management decision-making to achieve the fish community objectives. J. Gannon stated that the USGS Great Lakes Science Center could use such assessment plans or agreements as justification in the budgeting process. Currently, the GLSC's deep-water fisheries research program is based on a 1970 Executive Order and a 1980 lake trout rehabilitation plan assigning USGS the lead in preyfish and lake trout rehabilitation assessment. .

17. GLSC science delivery and large vessels program

J. Gannon (USGS) reported that there have been many reviews of the GLSC program and that one is now planned by the American Bureau of Shipping. An internal USGS review is planned in 2003, rather than the 2002 Ecological Society review that was proposed last year. (Jim Peck, Clif Schneider, and the secretariat will be invited to participate in the USGS review.) He welcomed a bulleted list of expectations from each of the lakes for inclusion in the GLSC reviews. T. Gorenflo will send J. Gannon the Lake Committee priorities for GLSC large vessels on Lakes Superior and Huron and will copy the other Lake Committees.

B. Horns thought the central question was, "Was it a mistake to place the Great Lakes Science Center under the USGS – it was under the USFWS – and what should we do about it?" J. Wingate opposed moving the GLSC from the USGS, and instead would encourage USGS's Chris Groh to 'fix it'. D. Burkett suggested that the 1995 review of the GLSC would be useful in presenting the CLC's case to Groh.

The CLC requested that Commissioner Roy Stein (OSU) chair a 'blue ribbon panel of experts to identify the scope of the issues identified below, adding other issues as appropriate, for the purpose of recommending an organizational arrangement that the panel believes has good prospects for redirection and resolution. The panel should include a representative from the GLSC (perhaps Steve Rideout) and report back to the CLC within six months to a year.

Issues of Concern

- Vessel operations
 1. cruise schedules not completed
 2. vessels poorly maintained resulting even in vessel loss
 3. new-vessel designs questionable
 4. new technologies not fully deployed
 5. understaffed

- Science delivery
 6. understaffed
 7. poor morale

- 8. poor image
- 9. marginal prospects for recruitment of top scientists
- Mission
 - 10. no clearly articulated concept of purpose
 - 11. weak cohesion among program elements
 - 12. inshore/laboratory research overemphasized at expense of large-vessel research
 - 13. no assurance that recent budget increases allocated to large-vessel program
- Partnerships
 - 14. GLFC-sponsored committees dissatisfied with performance
 - 15. confidence and trust diminished or absent
 - 16. inadequate/evasive response to 1995 review and subsequent queries
 - 17. questionable commitment to U.S. v Michigan

Statement of Purpose

It is the view of the CLC that the capabilities of the GLSC to deliver a large-boat program and the associated science have seriously eroded for over a decade and that

- The vessel operations of the GLSC are vital to fishery management of the Great Lakes
- The needed turnabout in science delivery has not emerged from numerous internal reorganizations
- An independently developed action plan for reorganization is needed to address the deficiencies described above.

18. Basin wide lake trout rehabilitation - time for RESTORE II?

B. Lange will discuss with BOTE the possibility of its native fish restoration theme area sponsoring a RESTORE II workshop. The workshop would review 10 years of progress, status of RESTORE implementation, identifying bottlenecks and impediments, and featuring creative, unconventional thinking about management options, such as Mark Ebener's pulse stocking suggestion.

19. Basin wide sturgeon law enforcement

This presentation was postponed.

20. SOLEC Fisheries Indicators

I To further cooperation with LaMPs and SOLEC, the CLC suggested that SOLEC organizers

Thank Roger Knight (OHDNR), Gavin Christie (GLFC), Tom Nalepa (NOAA), and Chuck Bronte (USFWS) for their 20002 reports and ask that they consider authoring again in 2002. (G. Christie and R. Knight have already committed.)

Request that Chuck Madenjian (USGS) or Jeff Schaeffer (USGS) write the 2002 preyfish populations report, in place of Guy Fleischer who is no longer in the Great Lakes area .

Request aquatic habitat sub-reports from people such as Michigan's Troy Zorn (tributary connectivity in MI or Lake Huron), U of M's Ed Rutherford (open water habitat classification in Lake MI), and McMaster University's Pat Chow-Fraser (Lake Ontario wetlands inventory). Perhaps lake GIS databases and environmental objectives will allow a basin wide look at such measures of fish habitat in future.

Request the preparation of a salmon and trout report from a person such as MSU's Jim Bence. Contact Lake committee chairs for guidance in accessing data.

Contact LHC Chair Tom Gorenflo (CORA) and LSC Chair Ken Cullis (OMNR) to arrange for state of the lake presentations from those two lakes.

21. Stocking databases

Info item.

22. Expanded DFO role in the Great Lakes

R. Desjardine described some recent rethinking on DFO's role in the Great Lakes, offering more participation in technical and law subcommittees – DFO is a long-term member of the Fish Health Committee -- and expressing a personal interest in participating in the proposed fall environmental objectives workshop. The CLC welcomed DFO's help. T. Gorenflo stated that DFO already has seats waiting on the technical subcommittees of the LHC and LSC.

23. Future meetings

The Upper Lakes Committees will meet in Milwaukee, WI, 17-20 March 2003.

The LEC will meet in Port Huron, MI 24,25 March 2003 for a day and a half. LHC and LEC technical subcommittees will plan the half-day session on Lake St. Clair.

The LOC will meet in Kingston, ON 27,28 March 2003 noon to noon. (This will be the LOC's state of the lake conference.)

The CLC will meet 23 October 2002 and 29 April 2003 in the Detroit Airport area.

24. Other business

B. Adair invited input to a draft USFWS fish and wildlife management plan.

The CLC approved cancelling the production of a tumor poster. The tumor manual is posted on the web and the poster would add little to biologists' diagnostic capability.

S. Hewett advised agencies to check a Federal Register notice that would prohibit fishing boats in military zones and around power plants.