

**Minutes, PIAG meeting
Thunder Bay, Ontario
Oct. 27, 2010**

Welcome Remarks were delivered by Bill Hryb, PIAG member from Thunder Bay. Thanks were also offered to Bill for his good work in setting up the meeting and welcoming us to his home community.

Roll call was taken by Jim Bruce, with members introducing themselves around the table. The presence of Canadian IJC Chair Joe Comuzzi was noted. It was also emphasized that for this one meeting, because of special circumstance (accident, injury, bad weather, etc.), participation would be allowed via teleconference.

Members in attendance: Jim Anderson, Chris Baines, Jim Bruce, Doug Cuddy, Frank Ettawageshik, Dick Hibma, Ken Higgs, Bill Hryb, Dave Irish, Don Marles, Glen Nekvasil, Dave Powers (Co –Chair), Roger Smithe, Jim Te Selle and Dan Thomas. Members attending via teleconference: Kate Bartter, Kay Felt and Al Steinman

Ted Yuzyk, Syed Moin and Tony Eberhardt attended representing the Study Team. Bill Werick attended (by phone) as US Co-Lead of the Plan Formulation and Evaluation Group.

1. John Nevin apologized for the delay in providing the minutes of the July meeting and said they are forthcoming.
2. Tim Heney, CEO of the Thunder Bay Port Authority, delivered a presentation on the Thunder Bay Port Authority and commercial shipping in the Seaway (copy of presentation available upon request). The presentation included interesting and useful information about the history and economic impact of the port, the cargo it ships, and the status of competing transportation alternatives.
3. Ted Yuzyk reported on the Study Board appearance before the IJC at its semiannual meeting in Ottawa. Details of his presentation are provided in the IUGLS Semiannual Progress Report, which is posted on the Study website. Yuzyk focused on key points as they relate to the work of PIAG. There was concern expressed by a member that we need a good communications strategy so that we keep the public informed but don't "get ahead of the science."

4. Bill Werick led a discussion of the decision-making process and an update on the review of Lake Superior regulation. Due to illness, Gene Stakhiv was not available by phone. **Werick noted that he has two-page narratives on alternative plans that should be re-written so that they are shorter, less technical and more useful to the public.** It was suggested that the study find simple images that clearly show the impacts of changes in regulation (i.e. water pouring from a cup into a larger bowl).
5. Syed Moin summarized input he's received from Doug Brown on the report on Institutional Analysis and Multi-Lake Restoration parts of the study. Brown is looking through previous studies and will produce two white papers: One paper for implementing a new regulation plan and another on the institutional analysis requirements for the construction of new structures. Moin said the two white papers are 80 percent complete.
6. **There was discussion of the need to have a longer PIAG meeting in the future.** There is also the need for a joint Study Board/PIAG meeting prior to the release of the proposed regulation plan.
7. Dr. Moin presented preliminary information regarding the IUGLS Analysis of levels Restoration Scenarios, based on the recent IJC guidance. Concern was expressed about the timing of informing the public about the restoration scenarios and the regulation plan. Specifically, some members did not want the release of the restoration scenario analysis to overshadow the main work of the Study with respect to Lake Superior regulation. It was also noted that it was important the public have access to this analysis prior to the consultation in the summer of 2011.
8. Dick Hibma led a discussion on Adaptive Management planning and PIAG's role. A view was expressed that the role of PIAG may or should change, to actively set up a framework to continue the AM plan after the Study is completed.
9. John Nevin and Jeff Kart delivered a communications update, with proposals for public consultation in the summer of 2011. It was noted that the communications strategy needs to focus on what people think of the process, how it was conducted, and whether adequate alternatives were considered. It was also suggested that consultations be in two parts, one on Lake Superior regulations and the other on prospects for multi-lake regulation or restoration. **Responding to the consultation proposal, there was a consensus view that a meeting on Lake Erie should be added to the schedule. Such a meeting could be hosted by Kate Bartter and/or Glen Neksavil. Glen also noted that**

the Study should participate in Marine Community Day on February 18 in Cleveland. A member said that Native American Tribes and First Nations should be included under “political leadership” in the preparatory work for the consultation plan.
Communications staff will revise the consultation plan accordingly.

10. Jeff Kart also gave a brief presentation on social media initiatives.

11. IJC Chair Joe Comuzzi expressed much interest in the discussion, suggested that PIAG members visit the Long Lac and Ogoki diversions when we come back next year for a public meeting.

12. Summary of comments during the “Roundtable” session:

Bill Hryb: In commenting on the IUGLS schedule he noted that there is a lot of work to do in a very short time.

Dave Irish: The Recreational Boating Contextual Narrative said the data is not substantive enough to draw conclusions. Essentially, the key point of the narrative is people will boat no matter what water levels are. He also highlighted legal barriers between the two governments regarding right of entry and exit into ports. The report also said that with respect to the level of coastal tourism, water levels do not appear to make a difference.

Jim Anderson: Somewhat concerned that public and interest groups will misunderstand the restoration analysis that was added on by the IJC. **Need to make contact with new ministers in Ontario to brief on this issue to avoid any problems. Jim volunteered to set up the meeting.**

Jim TeSelle: Lots of other projects going on simultaneously. Scarce resources will be devoted to the same projects. Change in U.S. Congress is a great concern (spending cuts). It will take some really good planning on our part and good setting of priorities if we are to get the word out to the public.

Dick Hibma: **It’s important that we either find or develop an inventory of Great Lakes initiatives, figure out where they link together, where they overlap and identify synergies with the work of the Study, especially the AM plan.**

Glen Nekvasil: Expressed concerns about the New York state ballast water law, which he believes would bring the Port of Thunder Bay and international shipping to a stop.

Frank Ettawageshik: Reported on the Lake Superior TT meeting in Romulus. Key point was that it’s difficult to restore something that’s constantly changing. The meeting helped me do a better job explaining the issues to the people I represent. It’s important that IJC develop a long term relationship with the Native American Tribes and Canadian First Nations. Investing the

time in doing that may be beyond the scope of this immediate Study, but important to work through it. (He and Chair Comuzzi explored this further, later)

Dan Thomas: Wanted members to be aware of the Hydrologic Separation Study (to keep the Asian Carp out of the lakes) managed by the Great Lakes Commission and Great Lakes and St. Lawrence Cities Initiative.

Doug Cuddy: The restoration analysis needs to be put out for the public in advance of the consultation next summer on the new regulation plan.

Don Marles: Interested in devolution of the current Lake Superior Board of Control and replacing it with an expanded board that includes the public.

Kay Felt: Work on multi-lake regulation and the Detroit River, etc. is important. Interested in status of work with respect to timing of flows in the St. Marys River and the Great Lakes Fishery Commission's work controlling the sea lamprey. High level consideration is needed of how we communicate with tribes and first nations and to take full advantage of the expertise we have on PIAG in this regard. Appreciated the opportunity to participate on the phone, but emphasized the importance of in person meetings.

Kate Bartter: Thanks for the teleconference, but also reinforced the importance of being there in person.

Dave Powers, One of the most important things we talked about today was the potential for the message to get hijacked next summer – a few centimeters that would result from a changed regulation plan or the much bigger impacts of restoration scenarios. That message needs to be very carefully managed and needs a strategy to make sure the public gets the full story regarding Lake Superior regulation and multi-lake regulation scenarios. When is it? Who delivers it? The timing is important because it affects other issues.

Jim Bruce: **Suggested that PIAG meet with Study Board at their morning session of February 24th, and continue our meeting the rest of the day and possibly the next morning. This meeting would be in Windsor.** Important that we discuss and carefully develop the messages we are going to convey to the public. We need to make a very clear distinction between Lake Superior regulation on the one hand and the exploratory look at lake level restoration on the other. Also need to have some very specific PIAG input on how the Board carries out the decision-making process.

At the suggestion of Bill Hryb, PIAG approved entering a letter from Shipping Federation of Canada letter into the minutes (attached).

Meeting adjourned at approximately 4 pm.