
MINUTES OF 46th MEETING COUNCIL OF GREAT LAKES RESEARCH MANAGERS

NOAA Great Lakes Environmental Research Lab

**Ann Arbor, MI
November 13-14, 2007**

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)
Paul Bertram (for Paul Horvatin)	U.S. EPA-Great Lakes National Program Office, Chicago, IL
Janet Keough	U.S. Environmental Protection Agency, Office of Research and Development, Duluth, MN
Jan Miller (via Teleconference)	U.S. Army Corps of Engineers, Great Lakes & Ohio River Division
Jim Nicholas	USGS, Lansing, MI
Eugene Braig (for Jeff Reutter)	Ohio Sea Grant College Program; Ohio State University, Research Center, Columbus, OH
Leon Carl	USGS, Great Lakes Science Center, Ann Arbor, MI
Annette Ashizawa (for Chris DeRosa)	ATSDR/DTEM/ATB, Washington, D.C.
Steve Colman	Large Lakes Observatory, University of Minnesota, Duluth

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
Dale Henry (via Teleconference)	Ontario Ministry of the Environment; Standards Development Branch
Brian Grantham	Ontario Ministry of Natural Resources, Peterborough, ON

Other Invited Attendees

Mr. John Nevin	IJC Washington D.C. Liaison
Mr. Norm Grannen	USGS,

Secretary

Introductions & Approval of Agenda

Stephen Brandt welcomed the CGLRM to NOAA's Great Lakes Environmental Research Lab in Ann Arbor and briefly took care of some logistical items for the meeting facility. Members introduced themselves and reviewed the agenda. All agreed to accommodate the schedules of those who could not attend both days by moving up the discussion of the Coordinated Science Initiative and the various research coordination workshop proposals as needed. It was noted that the agenda essentially expanded the discussion of the Coordinated Science Initiative and research coordination proposals that began with a teleconference on October 10, 2007.

The status of action items from the June 20, 2007 CGLRM held in Windsor were reviewed as documented on the status report provided with the meeting materials. (ref: <http://ijc.org:8080/glro/glro-web/cglrm/meetings-and-teleconferences/briefing-materials-for-november-13-14-cglrm-meeting-in-ann-arbor/>). Meeting minutes from the June 20th meeting were approved without further discussion.

Discussion of the Great Lakes Coordinated Science Initiative (CSI)

John Lawrence briefly reviewed the substance of the October 10th teleconference discussion about CSI where the Council had agreed that a letter should be sent from the CGLRM to the Binational Executive Committee (BEC) co-chairs. Following the CSI workshop and planning group report, BEC was concerned about the lack of clarity with CSI given other organization's roles and missions. During its last meeting BEC directed its CSI Planning Group to further investigate institutional roles with respect to coordination of U.S. and Canadian research on the Great Lakes. Since the CSI Planning Group is currently working on its response to BEC, a letter from the CGLRM with recommendations on a possible path forward would be welcomed. A draft letter was provided in advance of the meeting to prompt discussion by Mark Burrows as requested during the October 10 teleconference.

The draft letter was discussed; revisions and alternative approaches were proposed. Salient points of the discussion included:

- If we restructure the letter to emphasize that we're facilitating research; we also need something to address the LAMP concerns and draw the LaMPs into the process;
- “Communication and Facilitation” rather than “Coordination” or “framework” instead of “strategy” might be a better choice of words since our current choice of words seems to make some people uncomfortable,

but at this point we should stick with “coordination strategy” and explain our intent.

- Make it clear that we intend to work with other groups, CMI, LaMPS, GLRRIN etc. and we will not attempt to direct resource management, but to inform the process.
- De-emphasize the Lake Ontario example, and speak more broadly about workshops to do A, B, or C on a lake;
- Need to emphasize that mission is “coordination” not “prioritization;”
- If BEC wants to do research to learn more about a given topic; we could pull together all the people around the Great Lakes with the expertise about the topic area; to some extent identify information needs and who’s doing what; where. This activity would need to be balanced with the Science Advisory Boards role to scope out science needs and stay focused on the Council’s coordinative role.
- Communications and access is important. During the recent conference in Duluth it was suggested that we need a ‘facebook’ for research people; there’s now technology where can connect people and expertise. (This is included in the Council’s activities related to the Great Lakes Regional Research Information Network (GLRRIN))
- One advantage is that the Council has an office and people who can do staff work related to research coordination; the other groups may or may not have that infrastructure.
- CGLRM action should complement/facilitate what the Coordinated Monitoring Initiative (CMI) does; some indications that people feel that the CGLRM efforts are interfering with what the CMI is already doing with monitoring.
- CMI is at a “detail level” directing the movement of ships and specific sampling operations. The CGLRM shouldn’t work at that level of detail.
- BEC would like a group responsible for reporting progress in this area to BEC and that is something the CGLRM could easily do since CGLRM members attend the BEC meetings anyway.
- It would be good to be more direct in the tone of the letter and clearly indicate what the Council will and will not do. Be very clear that we do not have some sort of hidden agenda.

- From the Lake Ontario work we learned to be inclusive, but not to the extent that participants from academic institutions become ineligible to compete for funds. We could also address lessons learned from that experience in the letter to BEC.
- It would be good to include something about using the CGLRM network to facilitate communications with the research community.
- We should revisit the Council's research Coordination Strategy; take the latest draft of the document and edit it down so that it better reflects our current discussion.

Action Items:

- Council secretary and co-chairs will revise letter to BEC in accordance with the discussion and send it.
- The Council Secretary will work on a revised Research Coordination Strategy document that eliminates misconceptions about how research is prioritized and by whom. To avoid a prolonged process he will distribute a revision and ask for comments within a fixed period of time (1 month), after which a revision will be finalized.

Briefing on Nearshore Framework Workshop to be held November 19-20, 2007 in Dearborn:

Mark Burrows and Stephen Brandt briefed the group on developments leading to the nearshore workshop being held November 19-20 at the Dearborn Inn. This activity is in response to the Commission's June 6th Directive on the IJC 2007-09 priority cycle and was also addressed in a September 10 letter from the WQB.

The nearshore framework workshop arose as a result of discussions between the Commissioners and the advisory group co-chairs. They decided to use the event to look at the nearshore framework for IJC work and address task 1 of the IJC directive (by end of year, provide advice to the 2 parties about why it's important to address the nearshore in a new GLWQA). Part 2 of the directive gave the go-ahead on the work plans proposed by the 5 collaborative workgroups, who are proceeding independently. Salient points of the discussion included:

- Next week (November 19-20) will be the first of 2 expert workshops; everyone on the IJC Great Lakes advisory boards/council is invited. The IJC is expecting about 50 people; that includes 17 IJC staff and about 37 others from outside the IJC (Ref: rsvp list as of last Wednesday).
- The agenda is to talk about current scientific knowledge, management programs and policy, governance and institutional challenges. A report of the workshop will be provided to the commission with findings and recommendations.

- Karen Vigmostad is in charge of the event and is trying to come up with recommendations quickly. Murray Charlton, Jennifer Vincent, Tracy Mehan, Mike Donahue, Paul Muldoon, Dan Tarlock and Steve Brandt will be speakers. It will be a working session and targeted at setting a framework for IJC activities for the next few years.
- Topics covered include the state of scientific knowledge, research direction and management policy; how the nearshore is addressed by existing policies, governance and institutional challenges and opportunities and how the federal binational government has affected nearshore quality. It stresses binational issues and includes ample time for open discussion about what is and isn't known about the nearshore. Findings and next steps will be covered.
- A lot about this workshop seems more focused on governance than on the science; several key experts on hypoxia are unable to attend because of schedule conflicts. The follow-up meeting needs to be organized so that people working on that issue will have a chance for input.
- About 1/4 of the program is about science; the purpose is more to set the stage and identify fundamental issues; i.e. that the condition of the nearshore is determined by the watershed and the open lake.
- Although it may appear that there isn't' enough time to educate the Commissioners about what we do and don't know and where we need to go, the first workshop will lead to topics covered in the second one, which will be more in depth; this will identify the big issues.
- CGLRM representatives at the nearshore workshop will include Paul Horvatin, Steve Brandt, John Lawrence, Leon Carl, Eugene Braig and Russ Kreis.

Response to WQB Regarding Management of 2007-09 IJC Priority Work Groups

Members briefly discussed the process leading up to the selection of the 5 topics, under the nearshore framework. Noted that the CGLRM had volunteers for each group and that the SAB thought it would be good to have a lead for each priority area. Mark Burrows reviewed initial progress on the AIS work group and others commented on the status of other groups. All are in preliminary stages of organizing and meeting. Most have not started work at this point, awaiting the outcome of the Nearshore workshop to see if there would be any changes in direction.

The memo from the WQB was reviewed and discussed and all agreed that a group leader for each IJC priority work group was a good idea; however CGLRM members didn't feel it was necessary to designate a lead board. It was felt that

members of the groups could keep their respective advisory boards/council informed and serve as representative for the boards/council. It was feared that as soon as one advisory group was designated as a lead, the “team effort” would erode and undermine the premise of establishing multi-board work groups.

Action item:

Mark Burrows will draft a letter response for the CGLRM signature responding to the WQB and communicate the CGLRM's decision.

Discussion of Proposed Research Coordination Workshops for 2007-08

The funds (\$30K) were provided by the IJC for the 2005-07 priority cycle and repeated requests have been made for proposals from CGLRM members on how that money should be spent; it's been an agenda item for the last 2-3 CGLRM meetings. One suggestion was to work something out with the Great Lakes Regional Research Information Network (GLRRIN) however nothing concrete was proposed; so after the last meeting in June, Mark Burrows actively solicited workshop proposals. Steve Colman followed through with a proposal from Bob Hecky. That proposal and two others were discussed during the October 10th teleconference call.

- Connecting Catchments, Climate Change and the Nearshore Shunt;
- Developing a Science Strategy to Address VHS and Similar Emerging Diseases in the Great Lakes Basin
- Nonpoint nutrient loadings and nearshore ecosystem behavior; framework for effectiveness

Those three proposals were discussed during the teleconference and it was agreed to discuss them further at this meeting. Also, a fourth proposal was made to consider a coordination strategy workshop for the binational cooperative monitoring year planned for 2009 on Lake Erie.

The group discussed developments leading up to proposals and lessons learned from the research coordination workshops held in preparation for the 2008 collaborative monitoring year on Lake Ontario. The group discussed the merits of each proposal, other related events and work being carried out. The elements of each proposal that related to research coordination as well as the IJC's decision to examine topics under a nearshore framework for 2007-09 were discussed. The possibility of coordinating what is done by the CGLRM with the activities of the eutrophication work group to take advantage of funding from both priority cycles was also discussed.

The prospect for continued funding for research coordination workshops was also discussed. The intent is to request funding from the IJC for implementing the research coordination strategy on a routine basis and a proposal will be included in the next CGLRM budget submission. Salient points of the discussion noted:

- The State of Ohio developed the State of Ohio Lake Erie task force, bringing in the agriculture experts and took the approach of examining the following question: What is likely to be contributing to the nearshore problem in Lake Erie?
 - Are we getting agricultural runoff?
 - Is there an urban component?
 - Does the nearshore shunt hypothesis explain what we are observing?
- This Ohio task force effort fits in extremely well with the proposal by Jan Ciborowski and the Lake Erie Millennium Network.
- Several issues have been brought to light for example, the possibility that our institution of "no till" farming has exacerbated the problem; previously, tilling put the phosphorus 8" into the soil; but now it may be staying on the surface and running into the lake. Other aspects like animal feedlots are also being looked at; if the CGLRM wants to contribute to the process, then it would be vital to expand that effort out of the state of Ohio to a wider audience.
- The recent discussion of VHS at the meeting in Duluth convened by the National Park Service highlighted how much more needs to be learned about VHS and it provides ample support for further work in this area. Several groups have expressed an interest in providing funding support including the OMNR and the GLFC.
- VHS has been designated as an Aquatic Invasive Species by Ontario
- We must be aware of parallel initiatives; the Army Corps of Engineers has a contract with the GLC to address changes associated with farming. The soil and water conservation districts address related questions, the regional working group for the Great Lakes Regional Collaboration is considering action on VHS and there may be more.
- SOLEC in October 2008 has developed a nearshore theme and may be a good opportunity to convene a side meeting to coordinate IJC work group activities.
- The emergency regulations put in place to control VHS have had a strong response from the bait industry; many other groups are also concerned about potential impacts. There's some information about VHS out there, but as to research, it's surprising to find how little we know. VHS is the current issue, but could frame as a workshop allowing one to develop approaches to assess similar diseases that might appear in the future; efforts in place to do modeling of transmission; make it general for the lake basin; look more toward the future.

- A joint IJC & GLFC effort would be preferred since this is an important fishery issue. In terms of the research coordination strategy the VHS proposal is looking at: "Who's doing what and what capabilities do they have?"...what are the big gaps; how can we coordinate on what we're doing and address needs.
- We know that we lack information on the course of the disease and transmission dynamics; these are key pieces that need to be addressed.
- Some are skeptical that VHS is likely to be a sustained issue; Lake Erie experienced big kills in 2006 and VHS was gone in 2007; may not come back. However it would be beneficial to make VHS a case study for dealing with the arrival of new, exotic diseases.
- The source of the materials entering the nearshore and intermingling with invaders and native organisms is extremely variable; the most interesting gap is the distribution in the nearshore; a watershed nearshore flow science workshop would be a good idea to consider.

The discussion continued through the end of the day on November 13 and was continued on the morning of November 14th. Those present discussed the scope of the workshops that might result from each proposal, timing, who might attend or want to attend and the limits of the resources available. The group agreed that although all the proposals addressed very important issues, the watershed/shore-side inputs proposal from LEMN/Jan Ciborowski and the VHS proposal from Brian Grantham were most feasible given the resources available. The following decisions and action items were noted:

Decisions:

- Focus on coordination; facilitation
- Ensure that all interests are represented; however limit the participants to a manageable number with due consideration of the available funding, partner agencies and the venue.
- Keep in mind the limitations of federal funding and engage partners as needed to cover expenses such as hospitality costs.
- Advise GLRRIN about the work and request their involvement on the steering committees.
- Use electronic distribution of documents/reports and minimize printing costs.
- Agreed to fund LEMN proposal with amendments in the amount of \$25,000 (Can).
 - Focus of the workshop would be the land-based delivery of nutrient, pathogens, contaminants; the water people would be in the audience; who's doing what would be described by the land based people.
 - Expand focus to address basin-wide shared concerns
 - Ensure participation from the LaMP managers and Lake Committees.

- Agreed to provide funding for coordination workshop on VHS in the amount of \$5,000 (Can)
 - VHS workshop will be dependent on having GLFC as a significant contributing partner in concert with other activities related to VHS.

Action Items:

Steering committees: Implement plans as discussed and approved.

- VHS steering committee- Brian Grantham and Eugene Braig
- Watershed focus workshop steering committee- Janet Keough, Paul Bertram, Joe DePinto, Brian Grantham, Jan Ciborowski, and Steve Brandt
 - Schedule a conference call; to take stock of next workshop - Watershed steering committee will need to convene to redraft agenda and terms of reference more along the line of what was discussed today

Mark Burrows: Send an e-mail to council members with a timeline for nearshore document strategy; and keep them apprised of developments concerning the IJC 2007-09 work groups.

Process for soliciting/selecting Research Coordination Strategy (RCS) workshop proposals.

The meeting participants discussed the process for soliciting and selecting research coordination workshop proposals. Salient points noted were:

- Previously, the Council decided the activities for the first two RCS workshops by open discussion of ideas and developing resolution; this is the first time we've had competitive proposals. There are basically two options for this process: 1) keep it informally based or 2) have a formal set of criteria, release an RFP and formally evaluate submissions.
- Adopting a process which requires a solicitation turns the issue into a competition; which is contrary to how the CGLRM has operated in the past; the Council is a collaboration and needs to be able to let ideas for workshops "bubble up" from its members.
- A Standard Operating Procedure (SOP) or set of guidelines that can inform newcomers about the process would be helpful.
- Funding issue-based opportunities is a good idea and can be done on a lake-wide regional basis if travel expenses are a big concern and travel expenses are often a problem.
- The CGLRM should facilitate and use BEC to interact with the LaMPs to assure that we're working in the right direction.

- Taking advantage of web-based forums and technology to reduce meeting expenses might be appropriate depending on the circumstances.

Decision: Keep an informal, consensus based process.

Action Item:

Mark Burrows: Request funding in next CGLRM budget proposal for continued implementation of the research coordination strategy. Keep members up to date by posting relevant documents and updates on the GLRO website.

Members: visit <http://ijc.org:8080/glro> GLRO web site to keep up to date with progress.

Membership and Budget

Participants reviewed the membership and makeup of the CGLRM, IAGRL and DFO representation was discussed. Brian Grantham was welcomed as a new member; and Steve Colman was recognized for being reappointed for a new 3 year term.

Terms expiring in mid to late 2008:

Dan Bondy (6/08), Dale Henry (10/08); Jacinthe Leclerc (6/08), Jan Ciborowski (12/08), Bill Meades (6/08), Chuck Krueger (6/08), Jim Nicholas (6/08), Jeff Reutter (6/08), Saad Jasim (6/08), Chris DeRosa (6/08), Jan Miller (12/08), Jan Keough (7/08), Joe DePinto (6/08) and Steve Brandt (6/08)

Bob Sweeney is the new Executive Director for the International Association for Great Lakes Research; living in Port Huron. Jan Ciborowski agreed to speak to will speak to Lynda (IAGLR president) regarding an IAGLR representative.

The CGLRM has at this point spent 58% of its operating budget for FY2007 approximately \$16K remains for travel; have \$30K for research coordination through to the end of March; the Council may incur some additional expenses for co-op student support for the research inventory and science vessel coordination web site support.

Action items:

- Jan Ciborowski will explore a new appointment nominee from IAGLR
- John Lawrence will look into an appropriate nominee from DFO, possibly Scott Millard.
- Mark Burrows will take action to address terms expiring in 2008

Next Meeting

The next CGLRM is scheduled for March 18-19, 2008 at NWRI in Burlington, ON.

Enclosures: (1) Council Meeting Agenda, November 13-14, 2007
Enclosure (1) to CGLRM meeting minutes

Agenda
46th Meeting of
Council of Great Lakes Research Managers
November 13-14, 2007
NOAA Great Lakes Environmental Research Lab
Ann Arbor, Michigan

Time	Item	Topic	Lead
1 p.m.	1	Welcome, housekeeping items	Brandt
	2	Introductions	All
	3	Approval of Agenda	Brandt
	4	Approval of minutes from the June 2007 Meeting	Brandt
	5	Discussion of the Great Lakes Coordinated Science Initiative (CSI), Direction from the BEC meeting and possible role(s) for the CGLRM	Lawrence
	6	Briefing on Nearshore Framework Workshop to be held November 19-20, 2007 in Dearborn	Burrows
	7	Discussion of Research Coordination Strategy & Process for soliciting/selecting RCS workshop proposals.	Brandt, Lawrence, all
8:00 a.m.		Reconvene at GLERL November 14, 2007	All
	8	Proposed Research Coordination Workshop for 2007-08- Discussion and selection	All
	9	Membership & Budget	Burrows
	10	New Business	Brandt
	11	Next Meeting	Brandt
Noon	12	Adjourn	Brandt