

Great Lakes Panel on Aquatic Nuisance Species

Policy and Legislation Committee

April 14, 2005

Participation

- Helen Brohl, Chaired
 - Joe Mion, ODNR-Wildlife
 - Jim Weakley, LCA
 - Steve Shults, IL DNR
 - Mike Ripley, CORA
 - Chris Wiley, Transport Canada
 - Tom Flatt, IN DNR
 - Ron Martin, WANR
 - Margaret Dochoda
 - Roger Eberhardt, MDEQ
 - Chuck Shea, USACE
- Ted Lawrence, Scribe

Facilitation Questions

- What aspects of the GLRC are relevant to the work of the GLP?
- How should the GLRC AIS action plans be applied to the work of the Panel?
- What role might Panel members play on the GLRC initiative?
- What does the GLRC mean to us?

Observations

- Many Panel members directly contributed to GLRC
- Long-term, Panel exists by law; GLRC by Exec. Order
- The federal response to GLRC could impact the Panel
- Panel is bi-national (whole system); GLRC is not (at least politically)
- FACA restrictions may limit direct comments about GLRC outside of National Task Force (i.e. limit Panel influence to Collaboration process)
- Not sure what the Collaboration end results will be once completed

More Observations

- The GLRC has weight on many levels even if the follow up plan is not clear.
- GLRC does not clearly address coordination: does it then fracture or divert attention away from other GL collaborative efforts?
- GLRC summaries are valid in of themselves and have use on many levels.
- The timeline was compressed, often chaotic.
- The compressed process forced people to generate a real document of priorities in lieu of ongoing discourse
- The GLRC may impact the direction of existing or new funding.

Questions

- What is the outcome of the GLRC?
- What will happen to the GLRC AIS plans once submitted?
- What is the role of the National Task Force to the GLRC?
- Will Panel recommendations to the Task Force on the GLRC have impact?
- How will the federal response to GLRC impact the Panel?

Recommendations

- The Panel and individual members should take ownership of the GLRC recommendations. The Panel becomes attached to the GLRC by expressing an association:
 - Whenever possible make a connection: “Panel members directly contributed to the GLRC...”
 - “The Panel is pleased that its members contributed to significant portions of the AIS strategic plan...”

Recommendations

- Because all or part of the GLRC summaries are valid and may carry weight if referenced, the Panel and individual members are encouraged to use the information. The Panel could, wholly or in part, use the summaries in recommendations to the ANS Task Force.
 - Vet the recommendations through the Panel to make them bi-national. This help validate the importance of the Panel.
 - Panel review can put an emphasis on funding priorities of AIS vs. other GLRC issue areas.
 - Panel review would provide opportunity to combine other AIS priority documents (LAMPS).

Recommendations

- The Panel should offer itself as the “regional entity” to weight in on GLRC recommendations or as regional coordination organization (through the Task Force).
- Get clarification from Task Force on Panel and Task Force role in GLRC.

Action Items

- Write to the Task Force asking for clarification on the Task Force role or expected response to the GLRC.
 - This is an opportunity to ask that the Task Force recommend that the Panel be the a regional coordinating agency.
 - This is an opportunity to take ownership of many of the GLRC recommendations through Panel membership participation.
 - This is an opportunity to reinforce that the Panel is bi-national and the GLRC was not so that the Panel is a natural conduit.

Action Items

- Panel should review the GLRC summaries to determine where they could be “adopted” by the Panel and be used to further Panel causes.
 - Again, this attaches the Panel to the GLRC.
 - Quick way to generate recommendations to the Panel,
 - Also a quick way to validate the info to the Task Force since the Task Force connection to the GLRC is not clear.
 - This is a way to get the recommendations to a bi-national approach.

P & L Committee under a new Operational Guidance

- Facilitated Questions:
 - Under the proposed GLP Operational Guidance and FACA restrictions, is there a role for a “policy” or “legislation” committee?
 - What would a redesigned committee do and what might we call it?
 - What might a mission statement be?

General Discussion

- **A policy committee could:**
 - “Coordinate”
 - Analyze policies and legislation to keep members informed.
 - Do what it always did but under FACA guidelines
 - Make recommendations to the Task Force on legislative initiatives, before or after passage
 - Provide situational analysis on legislation, i.e. intentional and unintentional consequences
 - Provide guidance on govt. initiatives
 - Help provide regional coordination on policies for use by the Panel.

Questions

- How does the Panel choose which issues to pursue?
- How does Panel handle policy questions?
- Is there a difference on who handles the policy issue depending upon the subject?
- Should a policy committee frame/define the issues first?
- Doesn't the Panel still need policy outreach despite the FACA restrictions?

Recommendations/Action Items

- Define the FACA rules so that committee guidance principals can be outlined.
- Then: Develop committee Guiding Principals
- Then or Now?: Create an outreach proposal by which the Committee can educate and inform anyone. The proposal would need Task Force approval. But, once approved, could be used to promote expertise, provide policy statements, etc.
- Rename the committee to the “Policy Coordination Committee”
- Define Panel procedures for designation of issues to committees. Technically, Panel agrees to pursue issue and hands off to specific committee for recommendations within period of time. Ability to handle will depend upon member engagement and staff assistance capabilities.