MINUTES OF 45th MEETING
COUNCIL OF GREAT LAKES RESEARCH MANAGERS

IJC Great Lakes Regional Office

Windsor, ON
June 20, 2007

Canadian Members Present

John Lawrence (Canada Co-chair)	Aquatic Ecosystem Management Branch, EC; CCIW;
Jan Ciborowski	University of Windsor, GLIER
Dan Bondy	Science and Innovation Partnerships, Health Canada, Tunney's Pasture, Ottawa, ON
Saad Jasim	Walkerton Clean Water Centre, Walkerton, ON
Dale Henry	Ontario Ministry of the Environment; Standards Development Branch
Harvey Shear (via Teleconference)	University of Toronto, Mississauga
Brian Grantham	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Peterborough, ON

U.S. Members Present

Stephen Brandt (U.S. Co-chair)	Great Lakes Environmental Research Lab, NOAA, Ann Arbor, MI
Joe DePinto	Limnotech, Inc. Ann Arbor, MI, also representing the International Association for Great Lakes Research (IAGLR)
Ed Mills (via Teleconference)	Cornell University
Paul Bertram (for Paul Horvatin)	U.S. EPA-Great Lakes National Program Office, Chicago, IL
Russ Kries (for Janet Keough)	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Grosse Isle, Office.
Jan Miller (via Teleconference)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Great Lakes & Ohio River Division
Eugene Braig	Ohio Sea Grant College Program; Ohio State University, Research Center, Columbus, OH
Jeff Reutter (via Teleconference)	Ohio Sea Grant College Program; Ohio State University, Research Center, Columbus, OH

Other Invited Attendees

Fred Luckey (Via Teleconference)	USEPA Region 2, Freshwater Protection Section

Secretary

Mr. Mark Burrows	IJC Great Lakes Regional Office, Windsor, ON.

Introductions & Approval of Agenda

John Lawrence welcomed the participants, the Council members introduced themselves and minor "housekeeping" instructions were provided.

The meeting agenda was reviewed and approved and it was agreed that the order of presentations could be adjusted to accommodate the schedules of those joining by teleconference.

Minutes from the last official CGLRM meeting held October 3-4, 2006 at the USEPA Lab in Duluth, MN were approved.

Notes from the April 24 conference call were briefly reviewed. That call was ended early by a telephone network failure and priority items from that call were moved to today's agenda.

Members briefly discussed item 11 on the agenda regarding what to do with IJC's funding for 2 more research coordination workshops scheduled to be completed before end of US fiscal year. It was noted that the CGLRM spent $30K on 2 workshops already; have another $30 to be spent between last fall and the coming September. A discussion of the CGLRM budget followed; $60K was provided from IJC as part of the 2005-2007 priorities for research coordination. Normal operating budget is about $30-35K; covers travel and operations; $5K for a science vessel coordination workshop; in this year's budget the CGLRM has $9K for the research inventory (salary for student interns). Additional money for the 2007-09 priority process will depend on the work plans. Expect between $375 and 400K divided between collaborative work on the 4-5 priorities.

Expect research coordination workshops to be an ongoing activity.

Action Item: CGLRM Secretary is to check with IJC as to whether the $30K allocated towards research coordination workshops can be spent after September 2007.

Great Lakes Regional Research Information Network (GLRRIN)

Jeff Reutter delivered the presentation that he had given at IAGLR (posted on CGLRM web page at:). Participants discussed history, accomplishments, proposed GLRRIN activities and interaction with the CGLRM. Salient points of the discussion included:

Worked closely with the CGLRM and IJC to put GLRRIN together

Modeled after LEMN

IJC's 2005 biennial report recommended that networks like the LEMN be developed for the other great lakes

Late 2005 National Sea Grant program called for Regional Research and Information Network proposals; submitted GLRRIN proposal.

Under funded; lakes to receive $125K/year for 2 years, ($25K per lake) followed by $10K per lake for following 3 years;each lake has series of 4 coordinators; (2 academic; 2 agency reps); 2 Canadian and 2 US; except for Lake Michigan with all U.S. reps.

Although there is not a lot of funding, expect that the initiative can be carried forward at minimal expense, related to Sea Grant and other agency operations.

Still need a Canadian representative on federal level for regional GLRRIN coordination would welcome recommendations from the CGLRM

GLRRIN:

- Network for coordination, collaboration, communication & resource sharing
- Assists CGLRM in developing/implementing research strategy

- Provides single focal point of contact for all scientists
- Increases research capacity on each lake
- Facilitates rapid response
- Helps communicate research priorities

This Great Lakes project received a very good response at national level meeting between regional representatives; and is seen as being far ahead of the other regions and model for others. 8 regional groups received initial funding; 3 more will be funded.

LEMN will retain name for now because it has good recognition; pleased to have Chris Marvin join management team; however disappointed to see Murray Charlton retiring;

Accomplishments:

- Chicago Meeting in Sept/06
- Communications Meeting held in Sept in Erie PA
- Outreach Committed formed in Feb/07
- Elizabeth Everhardus, Director, Communications & Special Projects from Pollution Probe has volunteered to join outreach committee.
- Selected logos and templates. .
- Established web site at www.GLRRIN.info; hosted by GLIN; each of lakes has its own page – incorporated features seen in www.Gulfbase.org and IAGLR web sites.
    - GLRRIN fills a void for GLIN in GLC, by complementing research capacity; 250K visitors per month; can use existing database design.
- Opportunity to increase research inventory participation; with communication and outreach strategies will be able to do a lot to encourage people to link to the research inventory

Proposed that the following areas be looked at for GLRRIN opportunities/development:

- Strategize with IAGLR outreach committee to enhance IAGR's outreach in a constructive manner
- Get people to sign up on the GLRRIN web site to be part of the communications list to create the "one-stop shopping" portal for NOAA or EPA or EC to reach, for example, all scientists in the region on funding, meeting, issues, etc.; or all the fisheries scientists around a waterbody;
- Explore linking databases with IAGLR
- Watershed, tributary, near shore and open lake conference at Windsor
- Continue workshops for new investigators
- Host 5th planning and priorities conference in November 2007
- Respond to tasking from the CGLRM to communicate needs associated with IJC priority work and CGLRM research coordination strategy. For example identifying all researchers that are specialists in a particular field or experts on a particular issue.

Requested CGLRM consider meeting with GLRRIN representatives to talk about ways that GLRRIN might assist council in implementing Great Lakes Research Coordination Strategy; and get some directives from Council about what they'd like to see GLRRIN do; perhaps a 1-2 day meeting in late summer or this fall.

Investigate partnering with IAGLR's new 5-year plan; and proposal to consider workshops to replace a portion of the day after day series of concurrent sessions that presently make up the conference. GLRRIN should consider approaching the IAGLR Board with a proposal that GLRRIN could host a half day research workshop that would be focused on a lake or a particular topic.

GLRRIN is capable of communicating needs/issues both within a lake and across the region, no specific workshops scheduled within the next 6 months.

Since we have workshop money to spend this year; it would be nice to know what other events are being planned by individual lake coordinators

Steve Bortone should be contacted regarding the Making a Great Lake Superior Conference; he's trying to coordinate that with the Superior LaMP and other organizations up there.

Action Items: Consider hosting meeting with GLRRIN, Contact GLRRIN Lake Managers regarding upcoming events, communicate outreach & information needs to GLRRIN to support IJC priority work.

Discussion of IJC Directive dated June 6, 2007 and the Production of Work Plans for 2007-09 Priority Work

John Lawrence introduced the agenda item with background information on Co-chair meetings in Washington, D.C. and the Chicago meeting with the Science Advisory Board (SAB) and the Water Quality Board (WQB) members. He described discussions between the Commission and the advisory group (Board and Council Co-chairs) led to the selection of 5 issues to consider for IJC Priority work funded for 2007-2009. The issues are to be organized under a Nearshore Waters Framework and the work is to take into account integrative issues such as climate change, population growth, urban land-use changes and groundwater discharge. Another overarching aspect that we must be cognizant of is research and monitoring.

<u>5 Priorities under Consideration:</u>

- Eutrophication;
- Beach closures – impairment of recreational use;
- Fish consumption – risks and benefits;
- Chemicals of emerging concern; and
- Aquatic invasive species

Steve Brandt summarized his discussion with the SAB and WQB in Chicago and the general process for developing 5 integrated work plans in collaboration with the SAB, WQB, IAQAB and the HPFT. At the IJC biennial meeting, the WQB and the SAB met separately; then both boards held a one hour joint meeting to discuss where this effort should go. This was just the first meeting and not too much progress was made, so there is not much guidance to give as to the direction the other boards want to take.

General comments regarding the IJC Directive Priorities:

- Should strive to get all ideas "on the table"
- Consider which topics might be "more nearshore" than others (i.e. HAB vs chemicals)
- Work plans should designate a lead board
- The issue of uniform fish advisories is important, but extremely complex and chaotic

s;

- The Council, more so than the others is an enabling body and what it proposes in terms of research coordination will depend on what comes in from other boards.
- Some topics are more mature than others (i.e. Phosphorus) however there are new aspects to the problems and areas where we have failed to meet goals set out in the GLWQA.

The participants discussed the flexible and creative nature of the "deliverables" that might result from the work. Topic focused, or regional focused groups might be formed, workshops, papers published in the Journal of Great Lakes Research, workshop proceedings or other contracted products might be considered. The products are no longer required to be reported in a consolidated "Priorities Report" and the time frame for work might be longer than 2 years, with periodic updates made during the period. Lead commissioners will be designated for each topic that is chosen and work groups are encouraged to invite commissioners to participate in their deliberations.

Council members decided to first review the CGLRM's terms of reference and then discuss each topic in order. Proposed results/deliverables of all the work plans would be discussed followed by an opportunity for members to volunteer to serve on the collaborative work groups charged with drafting the work plans.

Once the co-chairs agree on "deliverables" for each work plan, they will designate collaborative work groups for each issue; the groups are going to have to take input from each board and coordinate it. Process and deadlines:

- IJC staff would help get those work plans assembled; return to co-chairs who would prioritize and present them to the commissioners; commissioners would decide which of the 5 to ultimately fund.
- By June 25, Council secretaries would have input from members and get information to co-chairs by e-mail with copies to everyone.
- June 25 - July 1: board and council co-chairs (= "advisory groups") meet in person or by phone to discuss input ;select output they expect so work plan groups have objectives to meet;
- Members of 5 collaborative work groups would produce a draft work plan by Aug 10; (3 pages max, summarizing deliverables and budget);
- Board and Council co-chairs will meet during week of Aug 10-17 and prioritize them for IJC.
- Co-chairs can get feedback (reality check) from board members
- Co-chairs submit final work plans by August 28;
- Commissioners will meet on Sept 10 to do final ranking and approvals.

Further details of the process discussed in Chicago for collaboration on drafting the work plans are summarized in the memo from the IJC GLRO dated June 18, 2007 and provided with the meeting briefing materials. The process flow chart was reviewed and it was agreed to focus on providing the input that the Co-chairs would need to take to the Co-chairs meeting scheduled between 6/25 and 7/1.

Co-chairs of the advisory boards have proposed the 5 priority areas and the CGLRM member's input will be put into one work plan for each of the issues submitted by all of the advisory boards. The Commission will review the overall work plan and budget and will decide which parts to fund. If they care to, the Co-chairs might make a case for more funding for fewer items.

Participants discussed the general nature of the works plan topics and clarified what's meant by a work plan. The work plan will essentially describe what the Council will do over the next 2 years, expected workshops and outcomes. For example, workshops to measure and coordinate a basin wide framework for addressing a particular topic, status of current work, inventories, goals and guidelines, coordination of monitoring and reporting protocols.

Review the Council's Mandate

Participants reviewed the Research Coordination strategy and the mandate of the council as dictated by IJC. Two years ago, the Council adopted a single charge as mandate: research coordination; a strategy that is distinctive from setting research priorities. Research Coordination is facilitating coordination of research:

a) Within lakes;

b) Across lakes on particular topics that are uniformly important across all lakes.

Part of research coordination is also communication and facilitation of research findings and plans, opportunities. There are many facets to research coordination; information flow; ship science; topic specific workshops; web sites, etc. The CGLRM should keep all of those on the table as possible priority work.

As the strategy has evolved, the Council realized that there are currently many lists of priorities and we would need to work towards communicating those priorities to the larger community. This approach doesn't necessarily match the bullets stated in the CGLRM's terms of reference. Some of tasks assigned to the CGLRM overlap with those assigned to the SAB; however coordination and facilitation is a unique role that none of the other Boards have.

Comments on Proposed Priorities

General comments

The issues range with respect to maturity; e.g. eutrophication has been around for 60 years; chemicals of emerging concern always coming up; but problem is accelerating, immature and we don't know how to deal with them on an ongoing basis because have more and more to deal with; beach closures have been around a long time; from health perspective; fish consumption is interesting; different agencies have different perspectives.

The issues are national issues and in many cases it would be good to create a dialog between other regions and the Great Lakes. Can deal with all 5 from the communications aspect and a workshop aspect, but different types of forums; they deal with different issues; and of different maturity.

Look at outcomes and what we can do; forums, workshops; conferences; we can advertise for discussion; cyber/web seminars; maybe a special session at IAGLR or special volume on a topic like one of these; we could fund a formal review.

Eutrophication

We still have hypoxia and still have algal blooms; relates directly to what's already in the agreement.

It's not just a Lake Erie issue, either; seeing the problem in most of the other lakes.

How has climate change influenced eutrophication (water temperature and ice cover) Could link the causes of these changes to climate change – e.g. In Lake St. Clair, we can see changes in temp and pH, correlated with onset of algal blooms; we saw a temp of 27 degrees and pH of 8.7; linking these issues with climate change. There are data being collected, esp. at water treatment plants. There is not much that we can do about climate change, but we can document changes and effects on water quality.

Might form a body (e.g. on Harmful Algal Blooms (HAB)); certain agencies are interested in HAB and others aren't; we could form a standing body on each of the issues.

Eutrophication; sounds a lot like the subgroup that we had in reviewing the agreement.

We could form a group similar to the modeling subgroup reviewing the ability of models of 70s and 80s to review target loads. Ask how they are working today given that we're seeing the return of some near shore problems that we thought were solved.

There was a related session at IAGLR that we might build on. The session organizers are thinking of getting input from people who were working on this problem for a special topic issue for the Journal of Great Lakes Research (JGLR); one suggestion would be that Council could maybe sponsor or co-sponsor the special topics issue that would be published; covers the entire topic as described here. Approximate cost = 30K

Ohio EPA is esp. concerned about HAB.

Ohio has formed Ohio Phosphorus task force; bringing in Ohio EPA & DNR, Heidelberg people; had a brainstorming session last month to focus on SRP to identify possible sources such as Shunts? Changes in tributary loadings? Tile drain failures? There's a wide spectrum of possible causes. Some speculate that even the trend to no till agricultural practices may be contributing to the problem of SRP.

In the 70's when doing Phosphorus loads (whole lake; not near shore –> different end point); multiple models were used and compared in doing that; that's a valuable coordination aspect that can we could focus on here to make sure that people developing models (multi-stressor) are adequately interacting and networking and sharing tools.

Years ago the IJC SAB created a Lake Erie task force to coordinate modeling activities to get the people working on models to work together; maybe could do exactly that… sort of a near shore eutrophication HAB task force.

To summarize;

1. Big issue is nutrient loading

2. Other contributing factors that could cause HAB

3. Toxin production and its consequences

4. Workshops to coordinate work on that

A Journal of Great Lakes Research special issue could be a mechanism for dispersing findings of research already done; another topic is a fact finding and consensus of expert opinion on what work needs to be done to help enhance work that started in Ohio; about what are the significant points likely to be causes of what we've seen in terms of HAB; this could lead to recommendations of specific types of research.

If we're getting calls for more nutrient reductions; there is a huge cost associated with that and managers want to be sure that this is the need before invest huge amounts of money in a strategy that we're not sure of… they want to get expert opinions and a sense from experts as to whether is it a loading issue; related to temperature; or different plans; or a need for land use changes. We need to know what we do and don't know; how to we determine what we don't know and what's the best avenue for research.

We could consider having a user needs assessment… held 3 on HAB: Toledo, Green Bay and one other location; brought in everyone to explain what the HABs are; what microcystis are and what people need to know to better manage toxics; 60 people showed up ; cost of rooms was $3K in each local; reports being produced.

Could examine recreational and human aspects; another aspect is in lake processes (benthos, fish and wildlife, etc.);

There is ongoing work to look at microcystin levels in fish and whether this should be worked into fish consumption advisories. This relates two issues of concern.

Beach closings

Two issues; science (tracking) and policy (what we do); Canadians are looking at new guidelines.

There will be an issue of the Clean Water act and control of discharge; have to look at relation between water treatment and beach closures.

The policy issue is whether we want to bring different agencies together to sort out the issues and the way we mandate the posting of beaches; the CGLRM aspect would be to address only as it relates to research coordination.

Managers are currently attempting to make decisions on beach closures based on best information available; best information is often too late; or prediction of contaminant levels; it also depends on assessment of what the real risks are associated with different levels of beach contamination; lots of risk science. The areas to focus on are risk and testing; fate and transport; and then the whole area with regard to the health risks and the connection there; are people really getting sick if coliform levels exceed a certain threshold or not?

Need some diagnostic tools (e.g., DNA diagnosis) to know if treatments have been successful in controlling the problems.

There are National and Great Lakes beach associations that have conferences; and this is the topic of discussion at these meetings.

The issue isn't new; being given attention at the national level; lots of work, too, on best monitoring methods; just sent out survey.

It is difficult to identify the role of the council on beach issues relative to others because there's so much work already going on; have trouble seeing roles that don't duplicate efforts.

The CGLRM has a role in terms of coordination. Various centers each have areas of excellence but they're not talking to one another; that is exactly where the Council could play a role. The Canadians are all meeting together and discussing things, but not in communication with the US side. NOAA and EPA co-funded a workshop on Green Bay relating to beach condition and closings; that definitely didn't include the Canadians.

Then CGLRM can recommend a) who's doing what; b) have a workshop to determine what the appropriate indicators are. The big ticket thing is 'bilateral' [= binational] coordination. The CGLRM can also use GLRRIN to help carry this out.

The heads of the 11 federal agencies still meet by conference call weekly to continue collaboration with the GLRC Working Group, but they don't talk about beaches (mention wetlands, AIS, etc.).

The approach is much the same as the eutrophication issue; consider common standards, but probably stop short of suggesting action levels. Science of risk assessment is relevant and not necessarily how the policy would evolve.

To summarize, would have the same types of outputs as for the eutrophication issue;

Only 2 components this one - > causes and –> health risks/consequences

Fish Consumption Guidelines

New issue is 'benefits' aspects of risks and benefits

Questions to address include: The data available were for marine fish; omega fatty acids etc.; does the same hold true for freshwater fishes? We do know much about bioaccumulation of near shore fish vs. open water fish? Is that an issue? States and Provinces focus on near shore and federal people on offshore.

Pharmaceuticals haven't entered fish consumption guidelines yet, but it affects fish development, growth and reproductive condition; with a possible link to policy issues.

Most of guidelines are associated with dioxins, PCBs and Hg; take a conservative approach – assume native, subsistence fish eater as a worse case.

The fish consumption issue is not necessarily a near shore issue if it were, then the levels would be greater in smallmouth bass than in lake trout… there's lots of bioenergetics and lake trout have higher levels that smallmouth bass or walleye; should we be focusing on near shore vs. offshore?

We should focus on the pronouncements about benefits of eating fish relative to risk and whether it pertains to freshwater fish… knowing that would be useful.

The IJC role would be finding out who knows about that and whether there's enough information to answer that question; and identifying the additional information needs.

Policy side of this is a driving function; have contaminant level update, establish limits of benefit vs. harm and if cross that line, reduce the number of fish you consume. Will we say that can cross the line because there's a trade-off benefit? We haven't evaluated that from the Canadian side; do omega 3 acids counteract the contaminant effects?

The European experience indicated that except for 3 fishes that had high levels of Hg, the benefits outweighed the risks in terms of IQ of children and health of mothers. In terms of first Nations, alternate food sources may not be as healthy as the fish.

In some sense; want an advisory that weighs the health benefits vs. the risks; in this case it's a case of better defining the benefits; already know about the risks.

Could look at the multiple stressors; have science of PCBs, dioxin, Hg, etc. individually, but not the effects of the combined inputs; encourage that look at the multiple toxicity approach. That can be part of an assessment of the risks; this one is possibly most troublesome because it's not near shore.

Suggest getting a group of freshwater scientists with marine scientists; get a couple of invited speakers; work on our coordination role.

In Lake Ontario PCBs and dioxins are the drivers, not Hg; in the marine example Hg was the risk that was quantified.

A good aspect to study is whether there are any agreed upon methods for risk assessment; at a really basic method, sampling and extraction is an issue; many people are measuring whole body burden; others are moving forward to fillets; real issue is figuring out any kind of assessment that works across species and sizes; this is needed before do any assessment; risk assessment and basic sampling could be addressed.

Differ by jurisdiction, its State driven; also had FDA and EPA issuing general guidelines; but the states administer; this is where bilateral and coordination aspects are key.

FDA jurisdictions (advisories) relate to interstate transport;

Possible product: coordinative workshop to get people to talk about methodology and evaluate risk assessment methods; pull together Great Lakes and Marine scientists.

Did SOLEC come up with guidelines for fish advisories and wouldn't that be useful? – No - Found that, under topic of sport fish advisories, we couldn't assess condition across the basin because each state has their own set of species, sizes, and methods. We had proposed to look

across some states; the issue is still chaotic; SOLEC doesn't try to set standards; they try to use standards if they exist.

Contaminants of Emerging Concern:

We do not even know the relative importance of different forms of loading from a mass balance perspective? STP input and timing (CSO pulses) vs. transport in streams and non-point runoff from farms and manure spreading operations. Also don't know how things dilute, what the detection limits are. It's really tough to identify different classes of compounds because there are so many; solubility is so high and concentrations are so low; need to refine the science.

The same on the ecological side; once start to get into whole-life toxicological tests, talking about 8-12 mo for each test –> slow and expensive.

The issue won't be just the presence, but also technologies needed to remove compounds; combinations are needed –> e.g. ozonation and another treatment method.

Is there anything that makes this a near shore issue? - Yes; both outputs are mainly to the near shore and inputs are near shore. This is a drinking water problem, possibly fish consumption; and many farmers use water for irrigation; all of these compounds cycle through the food web.

This is more near shore than nutrients because concentrations are so low, tributaries are probably more of a problem and seasonal loadings are also an issue.

There have been several workshops on this issue - GLNPO is hosting one in July on monitoring and surveillance, and emerging chemicals are part of that; (?July 16); probably binational. There was the workshop in NY (Lake Ontario mainly); but most studies are focused on Lake Ontario; fewer studies on some of the other lakes. Most scientists are around Lake Ontario because most of the population is there, too.

If we could do something on developing common screening methods, that would be useful. The number of chemicals of concern is enormous; need to relate to toxic equivalents, too.

The surveillance workshop is part of the binational toxics strategy workshop.

In the emerging issue section there's something on chemicals; >5,000 chemicals listed as of increasing concern; worldwide problem, not just Canada & US.

As before, have workshops; determine research needs; get different groups conversing.

Need to look at all the potential sources (point and non-point) and look for presence by lake and by location on the lakes; depends on population and activities.

If talking about the shorter term (research is longer term) for the Great Lakes that setting some baseline information down is key; what's been done; have the information collected on existing technology for measuring (so could plan a survey/monitoring strategy) ...those are the first two critical pieces; then find the current state of technology for removal; then can think about how to apply some of the stuff; that can be made more unique to the Great Lakes.

The CGLRM could possibly work with GLRRIN to identify all labs capable of doing analysis and what the capacity is. MOE and Trent University are the only facilities that can do analysis in Ontario and they are loaded down with work.

Aquatic Invasive Species

Theme was that IJC work collaboratively on research and monitoring needs for AIS detection.

Look at economic impacts, and also the opportunity costs associated with AIS: looked at a lot of literature; appalled at the almost urban legend way that the cost associated with AIS are passed

along without any real rigor; there really hasn't been a very good economic analysis or justification of the problem.

Consider addressing a rapid research response; if find a new invader, can you marshal forces to get a rapid assessment of the life cycle, impacts, etc. . . . that takes a lot of organization. This issue came up when Hemimysis was discovered in Muskegon and we wanted to find how widely it had spread; all of the coordination had to be done ad hoc.

This is something the CGLRM should do that fits with its research coordination strategy and it could exploit the kind of networking that GLRRIN is trying to promote.

If we need a rapid research plan; first choice is to determine who's available; people with taxonomic expertise; boats for sampling; set up a GLRRIN type network so could get people in the field right away. We could seek advice from the Great Lakes Panel about who could participate.

Volunteers for Collaborative Work Groups

Eutrophication:	Joe DePinto, Jan , Paul Bertram, Harvey Shear
Beach closings:	Dale Henry (delegate); Jim Nicholas (nominated)
Fish Consumption:	Russ Kries, Eugene Braig; [Suggested that we ask Joel Weiner to recommend someone from Health Canada]
Emerging Chemicals:	Chris DeRosa (nominated), Saad Jasim
Aquatic Invasive Species:	Chuck Kruger (nominated); Ed Mills

Volunteers will serve on collaborative work groups; meet with delegates from other boards and produce a work plan (no more than 3 pages) on deliverables; deliver the work plan back to the Co-Chairs on Aug 10. The Great Lakes Regional Office will help orchestrate; will provide resources for meetings; notices and invitations for commissioners to participate. IJC Commissioners have requested that they be invited to join in and kept advised of progress.

Action item: Council secretary to extract member's input from the meeting notes and provide to Co-Chairs for discussion.

Research Inventory Analysis Project

Eric Bacyinsky, a University of Michigan intern studying policy and environmental science described his work with the CGLRM's Research Inventory (visit http://ri.ijc.org). His goal is to assess how good is the inventory, and what's needed to improve it. Armin Busatlic, a computer science major at the University of Windsor is also assigned to the CGLRM for the Summer semester and is assisting with website development, programming and database management.

Current status of inventory: 1190 records; up about 11 % since spring; 941 individuals listed; up about 22%.

Discussed goals to increase the Research Inventory's value as a whole; improve influence as a decision-making tour and outreach efforts to increase participation. The group discussed efforts to link with other inventories and web sites.

Eric requested recommendations as to how to proceed with his analysis, areas to explore and institutions that may have been overlooked. Council members suggested checking Sea Grant sites for lists of active researchers, agency sites such as MOE and others.

Action item: Members are requested to review enclosure (2) and send any suggestions to bacyinskye@windsor.ijc.org

Science Vessel Coordination

Armin Busatlic described his efforts to improve the Great Lakes Association of Science Ships (GLASS) web site (www.CanAmGlass.org). A new geographical interface and more sophisticated functions and searches are intended to make the site more intuitive and easier to use. A link to the development site will be sent to CGLRM members for review and comment once it is further along. **Members are encouraged to attend the next science vessel coordination workshop scheduled during Industry Days, January 14-18, 2008 at the Great Lakes Maritime Academy and the Holiday Inn West Bay in Traverse City Michigan.**

Great Lakes Coordinated Science Initiative (CSI)

John Lawrence briefed the CGLRM about this initiative which was initiated by the Binational Executive Committee (BEC). In 2006, BEC heard from a number of groups that there was some confusion as to the relationship among different research coordination groups; BEC felt that since the Parties were responsible for delivering on the GLWQA, they needed a body that could report directly to them. Accordingly, they charged 2-3 people from EC and 2-3 from U.S. agencies to form a work group to go and design some sort of cooperative monitoring and research initiative. The group developed a framework and returned to BEC at the April 2007 meeting to review a suggested framework and to receive approval for further developing the concept at a workshop proposed for September 2007. The goal is to make CSI inclusive of all other coordinative groups; complete the framework and initiate some cooperative activities. The CSI slide presentation is enclosure (3) to the minutes.

The assignment was to evaluate the needs, values and objectives, identify what organizations currently exist and the value of a more structured approach, focused under the obligations of the GLWQA.

Why? –> Many groups claim to coordinate science however the GLWQA identifies that the parties are responsible for coordinating action.

The goal is to gain efficiencies and develop binational consensus on science assessments; BEC wants to simplify, not add another coordinating body to an already confusing mix.

An integrated, demand-driven, Great Lakes Coordinated Science Initiative based on knowledge needs.

Why? – To set direction for future science, align science with policy results; establish focus for governance and management of science-based, horizontally integrated capacity. Identify priorities for integrative and collaborative science based on knowledge needs. Ensure alignment of science with needs and commitments.

Other issues to address:

- mission critical science must continue
- the need to address priority common issues and support outcomes (e.g. ecosystem health)
- need for management structure to set priorities and manage resources
- need participation of partners/ stakeholder in identifying priorities
- need to identify role for existing coordinating groups

The proposed framework was developed in Canada as a research framework for water for 5 federal science departments: EC; HC; DFO; Natural Resources; and Ag Can.

Expanded the human health and ecosystem health items to try to capture what the various Great Lakes agencies were doing.

For each one, the group started with general issues (e.g. chemical threats, etc.); and then started to identify what some of the other agencies are involved in; e.g. ocean science priorities (NOAA).

The work group considered the Ocean Action Plan; as well as the COA, GLWQA, GLRC, DFO, and others.

They found that by using this framework they could capture in a general way all of the initiatives that are responsibilities of the various agencies in the Great Lakes region.

They propose to hold a workshop in September 2007 for the purpose of:

a) further refinement of the CSI framework to be sure that priority areas have been captured

b) prioritize those items in terms of their potential for collaborative research and monitoring

This might amount to a simple process of "multi-voting" to help participants to identify areas that have the highest potential for multi-agency collaboration. (give each person 3 colors of sticky dots; participants place as many votes(dots) as they want on listed areas; those with most dots have highest potential for collaboration) —> managers would then encourage agencies to collaborate in those areas.

If the concept could get just 1 or 2 projects going to demonstrate the benefits of joint projects or shared support the effort could win more support.

The work group received BEC's blessing on the proposed framework during the April meeting. They told BEC that if this CSI initiative is to succeed, BEC will have to commit to a longer term, permanent subcommittee to make sure that things proceed. BEC's response was that it was premature to approve that step, but they requested the work group to develop terms of reference for such a permanent group.

The work group is planning on another teleconference in a couple of weeks to identify invitees. A call went out at the last BEC meeting for designates and there was lots of good suggestions for people who should be put on the list.

Organizers hope to have in the range of 100-120 people at the September workshop. They recognize the need to address the role of the CGLRM and plan to invite members of the CGLRM.

The group discussed overlap with the CGLRM's role, the wisdom of multi-voting on priorities and whether the goal should be identifying priorities, or listing priorities and identifying potential areas for collaboration.

It is recognized that for the most part even the BEC agency representatives can't tell people what to do; they can only encourage people to work together on issues that they think are important. Funding is also a question at this time, it could end up being shared between EC and EPA; but that's an issue that hasn't been resolved. To a large extent it will be self-funded neither EPA nor EC have been given dedicated resources to do this. Many details of the initiative and how it might differ from what the CGLRM is doing remain to be determined, but John Lawrence does see a role for the CGLRM.

Action item: John Lawrence will keep the Council posted on the project's progress. All members should look for an invitation to the September CSI workshop and should plan to attend.

Cooperative Monitoring and Research, Lake Ontario 2008

Ed Mills and Fred Lucky joined the meeting via teleconference to discuss the current status of the Lake Ontario research and monitoring coordination workshops and possible next steps. 2 workshops have been held so far; the first in Kingston (Oct/06) focusing on biological research and monitoring priorities for US/Can 2008 monitoring year; paper has been completed; LAMP and LOC have reviewed that report and have selected biological research and monitoring priorities for 2008; those priorities are listed in their letter posted on the web site.

A forwarding letter from the CGLRM Co-Chairs to the IJC has been drafted recommending that the IJC urge Parties to support the effort.

The second was held on Grand Island NY (March/07) on contaminants; the draft paper is near completion; expect to have workshop report that helps communicate priorities from LAMP for priority research; wrapping up the first 2 workshops and looking for where to go next in pursuit of the Research Coordination Strategy (RCS).

The group reviewed the process flow chart included on page 8 of the RCS document. The latest edits to that chart more clearly delineate the steps that involve the CGLRM from those which are solely the responsibilities of funding agencies.

The Lake Ontario initiative is to the point where there has been a great exchange of ideas and we are now at the stage where we haven't been heard from for a while, and a workshop is in order. The objective of the next workshop could be to select team leaders for some aspects of the monitoring program; however it may take some time for all the elements to come together.

Fred Luckey thanked the Council for its support of the workshops which really helped revitalize efforts and built new partnerships, especially in the nearshore; the agencies are close to securing funding to complete the effort.

To summarize components:

- replication of 2003 biological water quality sampling with focus on nearshore; to better understand nearshore/offshore nutrient transport
- 20-m contour tow to get better picture of various parameters and tie in to nearshore
- lakewide fisheries assessment'

Funding on the Canadian side, is provided by COA and EC: on the U.S. side U.S. State funds; open water LOLA efforts haven't located specific funds for analysis yet, so in the worst case, archive samples would be collected for analysis at a time when funds become available.

For the lakewide fisheries assessment it's NYDEC, and EPA is looking for funds to help USGS with vessel time; not sure about status, but think it's slowly coming together.

Fred Luckey requested help from the CGLRM in organizing another workshop; it's time to initiate the momentum again; its important not to be hanging people out there; they supported the Kingston workshop and they're anxious to hear how it will be accomplished in 2008.

The potential pitfalls of discussing funding in advance of agency decisions and RFP actions were discussed and it was agreed that the integrity of the grant process must be carefully maintained so no potential applicants are excluded.

Participants discussed IJC funding currently available for RCS workshops ($30K), competing events, the need to be able to process the data and the time available. We could plan for 50 to 60 people and perhaps hold it in November if the funds could be expended during that time period instead of by the end of September.

Implementation of the Research Coordination Strategy – Proposed Council sponsored activities through September 2007

The following proposals were discussed:

a) Having a joint meeting with GLRRIN
   - The meeting could be focused on the specifics of implementation and do something rather than just talking about it.
   - If the Council was far enough along with 2007-09 priority work that it could make some implementation requests of GLRRIN, GLRRIN people would like that.
   - One thing that comes to mind is to get a jump start on some of the things we're going to be doing for the next 5 years; can we start to work on implementation of eutrophication and interacting with GLRRIN with what we're already moving forward with;

Would be easy to encourage GLRRIN overall and each of the lakes to provide some input on each of the priority areas that IJC has listed ; either new ones or pulling together existing work; also outreach –> tell public why these 5 issues are so important.

b) Conduct workshops to identify "who is working on what" (agencies/tasks underway)
   - The IJC funding could be used for other RCS activities besides workshops such as developing white papers or conducting an evaluation of who's doing what; GLRRIN does have the network to do that.

c) Contract with GLRRIN to identify experts, research, education and outreach under eutrophication topic
   - maybe work with GLRRIN to find out who's actually working with HABs and ; being communication arm and rounding up list of experts
   - rapid research response team; try and come up with a capability or some way to be able to tell extent of knowledge; who could go out to sample; who'd be a taxonomic expert, etc… could say that for all 5 topics; and that would be useful work and a nice challenge to put out to the individual networks

d) Conduct "need to know" type workshops with academics to document information needs.

e) Run a one-day workshop either just before or just after the CSI meeting in mid-September, which is meeting in Windsor.

If the funds could be expended later in the year, the IJC priority work deliverables will be better defined. We may want to come back to overarching drivers; if want to look at 20- 50 years down the road; climate impacts; population growth, etc. are the big drivers.

The next step on Lake Ontario work is a federal agency conversation to see what has been proposed; haven't even seen a proposal yet; there's an information needs assessment and perhaps agency funding should be used to decide the specifics.

Maybe Lake Ontario part of GLRRIN would be where to provide funds to let people get involved; and the Lake Ontario GLRRIN could use some resources to help organize.

EPA wasn't "in the room" for the LEMN planning meetings; they were theoretical workshops that gave rise to general proposals; then when an RFP was generated, LEMN put together a specific proposal. Being asked to respond to a request for information is different than making a request for funding… the former can be considered and possibly be organized as an RFP.

Action items:

- Council Secretary to investigate feasibility of shifting expenditure of funds to November and report back to CGLRM.

- Request proposal from Ed Mills regarding work on Lake Ontario, see what they submit as a proposal and then decide whether to invite Jeff to host a workshop through the GLRRIN network for Lake Ontario.
- Investigate the timing of the State of the Lake Michigan meeting and if it would be suitable to add a day for a research coordination workshop.
- Discuss feasibility of a one-day workshop either just before or just after the CSI meeting in mid-September, in Windsor with LEMN.

Using the New GLRO Web Site

Rather than using the several different web sites where the CGLRM has posted information for downloading; this new site is a one-stop posting and download site for all the advisory groups facilitated by the Great Lakes Regional Office of the IJC.

Web address:

http://ijc.org:8080/glro

This site employs a Content Management System (CMS) that greatly simplifies web site management and allows all advisory group members to post information with an appropriate level of access and control. User names and passwords can be utilized to control access if needed, but are not required for most things.

The majority of Council business will be conducted using this web site in the foreseeable future.

New Business

Participants discussed whether to invite ship operators like the Coriolis II to give a presentation at the next CGLRM meeting. The group decided that it would be a good presentation for the next research vessel coordination meeting; not suitable for the Council.

Reminder: The steering committee for GLASS would like the CGLRM member's input as to whether GLASS is meeting the Council's expectations; members are invited to come to Traverse City for the meeting Jan 14-18, 2008.

Membership and Budget

Participants reviewed the membership and makeup of the CGLRM and briefly discussed establishing standards for participation on CGLRM meetings/events. The group decided to invite Steve Coleman to serve a new term on the CGLRM and to keep actions regarding meeting participation informal. Budget items were covered during the earlier discussion of research coordination and CGLRM activities.

Action items:

- Council secretary - ask Steve Coleman if he would like to be appointed to a new term.
- Given the recent emphasis on human health, request suggestions from Joel Weiner regarding a possible nominee from Health Canada.

Next Teleconference/Meeting(s) -

A decision about the next teleconference and face to face CGLRM meeting was deferred until after the Co-Chairs meeting and a decision on priorities work.

Enclosures: (1) Council Meeting Agenda, June 20, 2007

(2) Research Inventory Project Presentation Slides

(3) BEC CSI Presentation Slides

Enclosure (1) to CGLRM June 20, 2007 Meeting Notes

Agenda

45th Meeting of
Council of Great Lakes Research Managers
June 20, 2007
IJC Great Lakes Regional Office
100 Ouellette Ave, Windsor, ON N9A6T3
PH: 519-257-6700

Time	Item	Topic	Lead
08:30 a.m.	1	Welcome	Brandt
	2	Introductions	All
	3	Approval of Agenda	Brandt
	4	Approval of minutes from the October 2006 Meeting	Brandt
	5	Great Lakes Regional Research and Information Network (GLRRIN) Progress Report on IAGLR Session	Reutter
	6	Discuss Co-Chairs Meeting and WQB/SAB discussion in Chicago and IJC Priority Work for 2007-2009; Discuss Council Work Plans for 2007 - 2009 IJC Priorities under the Nearshore Framework	Brandt, Lawrence
12:00		Lunch	
	7	Development of a Great Lakes Coordinated Science Initiative (CSI) and September 2007 BEC CSI Workshop	Lawrence
	8	Science Vessel Coordination, the Great Lakes Association of Science Ships and the Great Lakes Observing System Science Vessel Sub-System	Burrows, Armin Busatlic
	9	Research Inventory Analysis Project	Burrows, Eric Bacyinski
	10	Cooperative Monitoring and Research Lake Ontario 2008 Status Report on Research Coordination Workshops & Papers	Burrows, Mills (Call in @ 3 pm)
	11	Implementation of the Research Coordination Strategy - Proposed Council sponsored activities through September 2007 (Follow-on discussion to item 10)	All
	12	Using the new GLRO Website to Conduct CGLRM Business	Burrows
	13	Membership & Budget	Burrows
	14	New Business	Brandt
	15	Next Meeting	Brandt
4:30 p.m.	16	Adjourn	Brandt

Hotel Information ((#) shows position on map):

Radisson Hotel (92)
333 Riverside Drive West
519-977-9777
1-800-267-9777
Gov. $102 - $112
Reg. $139 - $144
Parking $10 for overnight

Hilton Windsor (93)
277 Riverside Drive West
1-800-445-8667
(519) 973-5555
Gov. $125
Reg. $159
Parking $11 Valet Parking $21

Casino Windsor Hotel (95)
Riverside Drive East
1-800-991-8888
(519) 258-7878
Gov. $109 - $125
Reg. $165 - $190
Free Parking

Travelodge Hotel (94)
33 Riverside Drive East
1-800-578-7878
(519) 258-7774
Gov. $99
Reg. $109 - $119
Parking $7.50