

Notes from the 23rd and Final Meeting of the International Upper Great Lakes Study Board

Lord Elgin, 100 Elgin Street, Ottawa
14-15 February 2012

Day 1 –

1. Welcome/ Attendance:

Study Board: Gene Stakhiv, Ted Yuzyk, Jim Bruce, John Boland, Don Burn, Allan Chow, Jonathan Bulkley, Jim Bredin, Jon Gee, Dave Powers

Study Managers: Tony Eberhardt, Syed Moin

TWG Reps: Bill Werick, David Fay, Jacob Bruxer, Wendy Leger, Scudder Mackey, Yin Fan

Communications: Tom Shillington, Jeff Kart, John Nevin

IJC Liaison: Paul Pilon, Mark Colosimo

Agenda was approved and is included as Attachment 1.

2. Overview Review of the Final Report (Ted Yuzyk):

- a. Report nearing completion
- b. All chapters will be provided to IJC before the 31 March Study end date.
- c. IJC hearings on the Study will be held last week in June, first two weeks in July
- d. Focus of day will be on Chapters 4-9 covering key points and 11 for completeness
- e. Discussion regarding specific chapters:
 - i. Jonathan Bulkley expressed concerns that SVM should be more clearly described in Chapter 6. How were economic benefits determined? Bill Werick – We do have summary reports from the six sectors that will be referenced and more details on economics will be provided. Need for clarity by Bill in Chapter 6 tables.
 - ii. There is confidence in the science and the scientists involved in the work, so all the details don't have to be provided.
 - iii. Chapter 4. Questions raised by Jim Bruce regarding the hydroclimatic trends and their consistency in what we know of climate change on the Great Lakes. The description in this chapter related to this topic was accurate. Jim will provide written comments on the hydroclimate summary in Chapter 11 for consideration.
 - iv. Chapter 11: Summary of Key Findings:
 1. With Lake Superior 2012, only on the St. Marys is there a real difference.
 2. Further comments were noted by the Board. However, the Board was asked to review this chapter in detail by Friday, Feb. 17th and provide comments to Tom Shillington.
 3. When the chapters are sent for peer review, the Board will also receive them.

3. Adaptive Management (Wendy Leger):

- a. Briefing of the IJC in December - Commission approved the proposal outlined in the “white paper” regarding the Advisory Board and the overall adaptive management strategy.
- b. February 9th Videoconference
 - i. a dozen agencies participated including USACE, EC, DFO, GLERL, NOAA, USGS
 - ii. enthusiastic response/ support for the concept
 - iii. next workshop on March 7-8 in Windsor
 - iv. concerns about funding – more details needed
- c. Next steps:
 - i. Agencies need to provide letters of support
 - ii. IJC approved US funding bridging IUGLS to post-Study activities
- d. March workshop – March 7-8 in Windsor
- e. Post-Study Funding
 - i. \$1M secured so far to support LOSLR AM (USACE \$500K in GLRI; TNC has \$300K in GLRI for wetlands monitoring; NY \$200K; Ontario \$100K, looking for additional COA funds; EC looking for funding)
 - ii. About \$200K available from IUGLS (US and Canada)
 - iii. A draft estimate of required funding has been prepared, but this needs to be refined to identify what values can be verified; being already performed by agencies within their budgets
 - iv. Should focus on regional studies
 - v. Invitation and agenda for the workshop need to go to agencies by Friday, February 17th
 - vi. Consider inviting people involved at regional sites to the workshop

4. Development of “White Papers” – that will be provided to the IJC as “lessons learned”:

- a. Study Decision Process (Gene Stakhiv):
 - i. Board did very well considering the practical circumstances and realities of mobilizing numerous and diverse technical resources
 - ii. Many Board meetings and teleconferences – enough time to ponder and determine relative importance of issues
 - iii. Board was captive of the study schedule and contracting difficulties that delayed some aspects
 - iv. PFEFG drove the Board decision processes – date for combined Plan Formulation and Evaluation Group establishment will be noted
 - v. What could have been done better:
 1. More proactive engagement of Board in assigned TWGs
 2. More direct involvement in SVM
 3. Greater engagement in “circles of influence” meetings
 4. Biggest fault – not providing a comprehensive set of evaluation guidelines and decision criteria
 - vi. Board and PIAG:
 1. PIAG conducted a conventional one-way public involvement process
 2. SVP requires a more intensive engagement
 3. Board should have insisted on a more comprehensive “circles of influence process” led by PIAG members

- 4. PIAG played a passive role
 - vii. Board and TWGs:
 - 1. Board played a key role in development and reviews of study strategies
 - 2. IPR turned out to be a key driver
 - 3. More direct involvement of Board members would have improved TWG performance
 - viii. Discussion:
 - 1. Note that there was no consideration of invasive species as an issue with the Commercial Navigation TWG
 - 2. General consensus that the process worked well
 - 3. Early decision workshops were not very helpful, improving as workshops proceeded
 - 4. Frequency of Board meetings was helpful
 - 5. Should include discussion about St. Clair work, restoration, etc.
 - ix. Observation from the IJC Study liaison:
 - 1. Keep lessons learned short (no more than 10 pages)
 - 2. Itemize actual time that was volunteered by Board members
- b. Peer Review Process (Ted Yuzyk):
- i. Background: LOSLR and IUGLS approaches
 - ii. Context: Purpose and costs
 - iii. Purpose:
 - 1. Validate the science
 - 2. Political – transparency or assurances for the public. Didn't really change public perception.
 - iv. Resources/ investments – small overall
 - v. Benefits:
 - 1. Exposure to different perspectives
 - 2. Validation of results
 - 3. Level of study effort enhanced
 - 4. Credibility of the Study to general public – transparency
 - 5. Continuity of evaluation of a complex study
 - vi. Challenges:
 - 1. Transaction time on both sides
 - 2. Quality of effort on both sides
 - 3. Expertise limitations, particularly on Canadian side
 - 4. Posting of assessments on external (ASCE, CWRA) sites
 - vii. Discussion:
 - 1. Need to mention internal review by TWGs, Board, modelers and agencies (like USGS)
 - 2. Substantial improvement over the “last year” (2005) review conducted during LOSLR
 - 3. Future reviews could consider a smaller parsing of products, e.g., a review of a regional ecosystem study rather than a review of all environmental work
 - viii. Overall assessment: Benefits significantly outweighed the shortcomings and the IJC should continue to have such reviews for future major studies

- ix. Recommendations:
 - 1. IJC formally adopt IPR as an integral part of future studies
 - 2. IJC use the IPR strategy used during IUGLS with modifications
- x. Next steps: Draft paper to Study Board, input by IJC Advisors, input by IPR Group, completed by 31 March 2012

Recognition Ceremony:

All Board Members and the Co-Managers were recognized by Gene Stakhiv and Ted Yuzyk for their five years of dedication and support to successfully achieving the goals set by the IJC. The Directors were lauded by the Board for the superb leadership they provided.

Special recognition was given to:

Wendy Leger for contributions in the development of the adaptive management strategy;
Bill Werick for contributions leading to the selection of the recommended plan through shared vision planning;
David Fay for contributions guiding the development of numerous alternative plans;
Dr. Yin Fan for the development of Nat64 an immediate predecessor to Lake Superior Plan 2012;
Jacob Bruxer for contributions during multi-lake evaluations and overall study support;
Dr. Scudder Mackey for contributions leading to the evaluation of all ecosystem study aspects;
Jeff Kart for his assistance during the summer 2011 public meetings and other communication efforts;
John Nevin for communication assistance throughout the Study;
Tara Buchanan for her administrative assistance throughout the Study; and
Tom Shillington for his assistance with final report editing.

Day 2 –

“White Paper” Development (continued from Day 1):

- c. Plan Formulation and Evaluation (David Fay and Bill Werick):
 - i. Orders – changes briefly outlined by David
 - 1. Including deviations for ice and emergency and also peaking and ponding
 - 2. Expect the IJC will endorse a new Order by June 2012
 - 3. Set of questions for the Summer Meetings for IJC – e.g., when under new plan do you hit Criterion C levels compared to old plan?
 - 4. Bill and David will prepare some slides that may address questions that are anticipated. Include legal advisors in distribution.
 - 5. David will concentrate on changing the Orders (pointing out issues and questions, operating procedures, emergency response). Peter Yee will help with this.
 - ii. PFEG (Bill) – “White Paper” should include:

1. Lessons learned
2. How could we have made the selection process better?
3. Was there value in the performance indicators and coping zones?

d. PIAG Lessons Learned (Jeff Kart):

- i. Clarity on the Terms of Reference – specificity of the IJC’s intentions. Ted Yuzyk – we have numerous papers from the past on this topic that will be made available for the “white paper”.
- ii. Reporting requirements – briefings to the IJC/ context. When appointed by the Commission, there are expectations – could members be appointed by the Board?
- iii. Advocacy (this is most important) – implement confidentiality rules. Will draft suggested rules.
- iv. Commitments – advising constituents, understanding time required
- v. Meeting structure – follow same format that was successfully used in IUGLS
- vi. A positive was having co-Directors willing and able to explain the Study to the public
- vii. Mark Colosimo – would like some estimate of the in-kind time spent by PIAG members

e. Information Management (Jacob Bruxer and Syed Moin):

- i. Archived study assets - essentially complete on Phase 1, working on capturing all on Phase 2
- ii. Legacy IUGLS Website – expected to be done by 31 March 2012
- iii. Tools for discovering and accessing Study assets – keyword search tool, interactive decision schematic tool (similar to flowcharts).
- iv. This will be a useful tool for AM
- v. Jeff will prepare headlines on the Study web site about this IM framework and its availability.
- vi. Drafts will be developed for a Study Board teleconference during first week of March

5. Wrap Up (All): Two Study teleconferences are planned:

- a. March 5 at 10 to discuss “white papers” and report status
- b. March 19 at 10 to discuss any final items and adaptive management



Final Study Board Meeting #23

Tues., February 14 - Wed., February 15, 2012

Lord Elgin Hotel, 100 Elgin Street, Ottawa, ON K1P 5K8

Tel: (613) 235-3333

Objectives:

1. Detailed discussion on Chapters of the **Final Report and Recommendations**
2. Development of Study **"White Papers"**
3. Discussion of **AM strategy and other Post-Study activities**
4. **Study participant recognition**

DRAFT AGENDA Tuesday, February 14, 2012

Item	Time	Topic	Lead
1	0900 - 0915	Welcome & Approval of Agenda	Yuzyk/Stakhiv
2a	0915 - 1000	Overall Review of the Final Report <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Specific Study Board comments</i> • <i>Chapter 11: Discussion on Study conclusions and recommendations</i> • <i>Review of Summary Report</i> • <i>Next Steps</i> 	Yuzyk/Stakhiv
	1000 - 1015	Health Break	
2b	1015 - 1100	Final Report Discussion (continued)	All
3	1100 - 1200	Adaptive Management <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • <i>Report on February 9th meeting</i> • <i>Planning for AM workshop (tentatively on March 7-9 – occurring based on interest expressed at the Feb. VTC)</i> • <i>Post-Study AM activities and funding</i> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> ○ <i>Status of IUGLS funding</i> ○ <i>Additional IJC support</i> ○ <i>Other agency support</i> • <i>Next steps</i> 	Leger/Read
	1200 - 1300	Lunch	
4a	1300 - 1400	Development of "White Papers": <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Study Decision Process 	Stakhiv
	1400 - 1415	Health Break	
4b	1415 - 1530	Development of "White Papers" (continued): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Peer Review Process 	Yuzyk
	1530 - 1730	Recognition Ceremony	Yuzyk/ Stakhiv
	1730	End of Day 1	

Wednesday, February 15, 2012

Item	Time	Topic	Lead
	0900 - 1000	Recognition of Study Board at Executive Meeting (IJC Office)	All
	1000 - 1030	Health Break	
4c	1030 - 1130	Development of “White Papers” (continued): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • Plan Formulation and Evaluation including Orders of Approval 	Eberhardt/Werick/Fay
4d	1130 - 1230	Development of “White Papers” (continued): <ul style="list-style-type: none"> • PIAG: Lessons Learned 	Bruce/Powers/Nevin
	1230 - 1330	Lunch	
4e	1330 - 1430	Development of “White Papers” (continued): Information Management	Moin/Bruker
5	1430 - 1500	Wrap up	All
	1500	End of Day 2	



Meeting with the Commission
Wednesday Morning, Feb. 15, 2011

- **Recognition of the Study Board**
- **Briefing (30 minutes) to address:**
 1. **Assessment of the Feb. 9th VTC on AM**
 2. **Funding beyond Mar. 31st**
 3. **The March AM workshop**
 4. **Further guidance on the establishment of the GL Levels Advisory Board**